

PERSPECTIVES ON THE  
RECEPTION OF HAYDN'S CELLO  
CONCERTO IN C, WITH  
PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO  
MUSICOLOGICAL WRITINGS IN  
ENGLISH ON HAYDN'S  
CONCERTOS AND THE CLASSICAL  
CONCERTO

by

EDWARD NIEL FURSE

A thesis submitted to  
The University of Birmingham  
for the degree of  
MASTER OF MUSIC

Department of Music  
College of Arts and Law  
The University of Birmingham  
September 2009

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

# ABSTRACT

This thesis illustrates the extraordinary quality of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, Hob. VIIIb: 1, and addresses the musicological literature in English that relates to it. Chapter 1 introduces the concerto and reveals its relatively straightforward tonal design, before describing the subtle touches that enliven this simple structure. These include Haydn's sophisticated orchestration, carefully-crafted thematic relations and well-integrated instrumental writing. Haydn is shown to be manipulating generic expectations throughout the work. Chapter 2 illustrates the scarcity of literature in English pertaining to Haydn's concertos and the problems posed by the twentieth-century re-emergence of a number of these works. It reveals the disjunction between praise for the Cello Concerto in C and the perpetuation of negative perspectives on Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos, referring specifically to charges relating to conventionality, maturity, form, and virtuosity. Chapter 3 widens its scope to include literature on the Classical concerto, in order to show that the emphasis upon Mozart's later concertos has distorted perspectives on concertos from the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Haydn's Cello Concerto in C is presented as an aesthetic alternative to Mozart's later and more complex works. This chapter also touches upon the Classical-concerto literature's unhelpful emphasis upon first movements.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER ONE Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, Hob. VIIb: 1	4
1.1 Tonal Design	
1.2 The Esterházy Orchestra	
1.3 Thematic Relations	
1.4 Generic Expectations	
1.5 Instrumental Writing and Virtuosity	
1.6 Conclusions	
CHAPTER TWO Haydn's Concertos: Historiography and Perspectives	23
2.1 Historiography: Introduction	
2.2 Historiography: Tovey on Haydn's Concertos	
2.3 Twentieth-Century Developments: Rediscovering Haydn's Concertos	
2.4 Twentieth-Century Developments: Categorizing Haydn's Concertos	
2.5 Historiography: Karl Geiringer	
2.6 Historiography: H. C. Robbins Landon and David Wyn Jones	
2.7 Historiography: Richard Wigmore	
2.8 Historiography: Michael Thomas Roeder and Simon Keefe	
2.9 Perspectives: Introduction	
2.10 Perspectives: Maturity	
2.11 Perspectives: Struggle	
2.12 Perspectives: Form	

2.13	Perspectives: Conventionality	
2.14	Perspectives: Virtuosity	
CHAPTER THREE The Classical Concerto: Historiography and Perspectives		52
3.1	Perspectives: The ‘Classical Concerto’	
3.2	Historiography: Introduction	
3.3	Historiography: Tovey on the Classical Concerto	
3.4	Historiography: Literature on Mozart’s Concertos	
3.5	Historiography: Jane R. Stevens and an Alternative Approach to the Classical Concerto	
3.6	Historiography: General Accounts of the Classical Concerto	
3.7	Perspectives: First Movements	
3.8	Perspectives: The Classical Concerto from 1750 to 1775	
3.9	Perspectives: Mozart and Haydn	
3.10	Perspectives: Galantry	
3.11	Perspectives: Maturity	
3.12	Perspectives: Musical Details	
APPENDICES		86
APPENDIX 1	Elements from the Second Movement of Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C	
APPENDIX 2	Elements from the Third Movement of Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C	
APPENDIX 3	Annotated score of the First Movement of Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C	
BIBLIOGRAPHY		87

# LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, Hob. VIIIb: 1

TABLE 1.1: Tonal Design of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C

TABLE 1.2: Elements from the First Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C

CHAPTER TWO Haydn's Concertos: Historiography and Perspectives

TABLE 2.1: Twentieth-Century Re-Emergence of Haydn Concertos

TABLE 2.2: Periods of Haydn's Concerto Writing

TABLE 2.3: Landon and Jones's Tonal Design for the First Movements of Haydn's Concertos

CHAPTER THREE The Classical Concerto: Historiography and Perspectives

TABLE 3.1: Sample Definitions of the Term 'Classical Concerto'

TABLE 3.2: Haydn and Mozart Periods of Concerto Composition

**PERSPECTIVES ON THE RECEPTION OF  
HAYDN'S CELLO CONCERTO IN C,  
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO  
MUSICOLOGICAL WRITINGS IN ENGLISH ON  
HAYDN'S CONCERTOS AND THE CLASSICAL  
CONCERTO**

# INTRODUCTION

Haydn's Cello Concerto in C (Hob. VIIIb: 1) is one of the finest concertos written during the eighteenth century, with its remarkable rediscovery in 1961 hailed by H. C. Robbins Landon as 'the single greatest musicological discovery since the Second World War'.<sup>1</sup> It immediately became extremely popular with audiences and musicians across the world, and remains one of the most often performed concertos from any period of musical history. This study will explore the work in more detail, before investigating why it has proved so difficult to incorporate within traditional perspectives of Haydn's concertos.

My interest in Haydn's Cello Concerto in C was initially aroused by my work as a cellist, in which capacity I have given a number of performances of the solo part. It is a work which I admire, and this study reflects my desire to situate the concerto more clearly within the musicological traditions to which it relates. Musicological literature in English has generally received this concerto well, but there has been little attempt to assess the work's wider impact upon perceptions of Haydn's concertos or the Classical concerto in general. The result is a mixed approach in which praise for the Cello Concerto in C sits awkwardly alongside widespread criticism of early Classical concertos, and Haydn's earlier concertos (of which the Cello Concerto in C is one) in particular.

This study owes an early debt to James Webster's *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of the Classical Style* (1991), which defends Haydn's early symphonies in

---

<sup>1</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, 'The Pre-Classical Concerto and the Concerto Parallel to Mozart', in Robert Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 63.

the face of traditional musicological criticism.<sup>2</sup> The Cello Concerto in C is written in a different musical style from that of the ‘Farewell’ Symphony, but suffers similarly from a general criticism of Haydn’s earlier works.<sup>3</sup> Richard Wigmore (2009) provides a typical example:

Haydn’s characteristic strengths – concision, tight thematic unity, intensive dialectical argument – found only limited scope in the concerto genre, at least until the D major Keyboard Concerto (c.1780) and the Trumpet Concerto of 1796.<sup>4</sup>

Chapter 2 will explore the limited literature in English that relates to Haydn’s concertos, investigating the problems posed by twentieth-century rediscoveries and challenging some of the more persistent perceptions of these works.

Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C is an early example of the ‘Classical concerto’, yet praise for this work has not been incorporated into general approaches to this subject. The Cello Concerto in C is occasionally mentioned in passing, but the overwhelming focus of the Classical concerto literature is upon Mozart’s late concertos. Chapter 3 will explore this emphasis on Mozart and its affect upon the reception of Haydn’s early concertos. It will also investigate the importance placed upon the first movements of Classical concertos.

This study begins with an introduction to Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C, and it will be assumed that readers have access to a score.

---

<sup>2</sup> See in particular the ‘Historiographical conclusion’: James Webster, *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 335–373.

<sup>3</sup> See the description below of Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C and its ‘galant’ character. The ‘Farewell’ Symphony (No. 45 in F sharp minor) is one of Haydn’s contrasting ‘Sturm und Drang’ compositions.

<sup>4</sup> Richard Wigmore, *Haydn* (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), 157.

## CHAPTER ONE

### Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, Hob. VIIIb: 1

Relatively little is known about Haydn's early career, so it is impossible to accurately account for the conception of his Cello Concerto in C. The only record of the work is its appearance in Haydn's own thematic catalogue of compositions, compiled in 1765 to prove to Prince Nikolaus Esterházy that he was working diligently. Most accounts therefore weave a historical tale around a limited core of evidence, with the hope of illuminating some of the circumstances surrounding the concerto's composition.

Haydn's Cello Concerto in C was written in the early 1760s with a very specific audience in mind: his employer, either Prince Paul Anton Esterházy or his brother Nikolaus, and the rest of this illustrious Hungarian court. Haydn was still only vice-Kapellmeister to the court at this time, and his intention would certainly not have been to shock or confuse his audience. He was employed to write music that would reflect well upon the Prince, showing him to be a man of impeccable taste and abundant riches. Haydn was therefore expected to conform to the style and aesthetic known to the Prince and his audience, whilst demonstrating his own talents and those of the musicians. His compositional output in the 1760s was large, presumably due to the demands of the Esterházy and his favorable circumstances. The Cello Concerto in C was therefore one of a multitude of works written during these early-Esterházy years, and intended primarily for a limited number of performances at the court.

The concerto form provided an opportunity to display the skills of individual members of the Esterházy orchestra. Haydn had recommended to the Prince many of the musicians who were employed during the early 1760s, and he immediately set about writing concertos for these new additions. Two of his violin concertos were probably intended for the violinist Luigi Tomasini, one of which carries the inscription '*fatto per il Luigi*', whilst the horn concertos would have been written for either Johannes Knoblauch or Joseph Leutgeb, for whom Mozart wrote his horn concertos. The cellist Joseph Weigl was appointed to the orchestra just a few weeks after Haydn's arrival, and was no doubt the intended recipient of the Cello Concerto in C.

Haydn wrote a number of highly virtuosic cello parts for his early symphonies, providing Joseph Weigl with plenty of opportunities to impress the new vice-Kapellmeister.<sup>5</sup> Weigl was already a friend from their days in Vienna together and Haydn's letters reveal that they remained close in the years that followed.<sup>6</sup> The Cello Concerto in C would certainly have provided Weigl with an excellent opportunity to display his talents to the court. There is no record of the work having been performed during Haydn's lifetime, owing largely to the lack of surviving documentation from Eisenstadt and Esterháza, but it may be presumed that it was performed once or twice before disappearing into the estate's large library of music. Given that the work is not mentioned in any of Haydn's correspondence, was not published in his later years, and disappeared into obscurity, it may be presumed that it was not a work to which Haydn ascribed a great deal of significance.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Haydn's Symphonies 6–8 for examples: 'Le Matin', 'Le Midi' and 'Le Soir' (Hob. I: 6–8).

<sup>6</sup> See H. C. Robbins Landon (ed.), *The Collected Correspondence and London Notebooks of Joseph Haydn* (London: Barrie & Rockcliff, 1959).

The score to Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C was rediscovered by the musicologist Oldřich Pulkert at the Prague National Museum in 1961, launching an extraordinary new chapter in the work’s history. Prestigious cellists such as Mstislav Rostropovich and Jacqueline Du Pré immediately took up the work and instituted its current position as a mainstay of the cello repertory. The work is also popular with audiences, fits well into the modern orchestral format of Overture – Concerto – Symphony, and has become one of the most regularly performed concertos from any period.

### 1.1 Tonal Design

The underlying structure of this work is relatively straightforward. All three movements are of similar length and follow a similar basic plan:

Movement:	1 (I)	2 (IV)	3 (I)
Ritornello 1:	I	I	I
Solo 1:	I → V	I → V	I → V
Ritornello 2:	V	V	V
Solo 2:	V → vi	V → vi	V → iii
Ritornello 3 [Solo 2a]:	vi → (V)	vi → (V)	iii → (V)
Solo 3:	I	I	I
Ritornello 4:	I	I	I

‘Ritornello’ denotes the full orchestral sections that contrast to passages in which the soloist is playing. The bracketed dominant chord at the end of Ritornello 3 is written in this way to indicate that the music ends with a dominant chord, but only to serve as a link

to the tonic entry of Solo 3. In the second movement Ritornello 3 is replaced by a solo section with the same function, the implications of which will also be explored below. The first and second movements include cadenzas at the end of Solo 3, which was a regular occurrence in concertos of this period.<sup>7</sup>

Literature on the Classical concerto focuses a great deal of attention on Ritornello 1, which is often known as an orchestral ‘exposition’ or ‘introduction’.<sup>8</sup> The eighteenth-century composer certainly had a choice to make: should he move strongly into the dominant in Ritornello 1 in anticipation of the move that the soloist would make in the latter half of Solo 1, or should this dramatic moment be reserved for the soloist? It is a choice that is discussed below in relation to musicological literature, but it is worth stating Haydn’s solution at this point. The music of the first movement’s opening makes an early move to the dominant in bar 5, followed by a stronger cadence in bar 11 and a sustained dominant pedal in bars 15–17. This opening never sounds as though it has moved away from the home key, however, and Ritornello 1 ends with a number of considerably stronger cadences in the tonic.<sup>9</sup> The feel of this orchestral move to the dominant is therefore very different from the conclusive move made by the soloist during Solo 1, which includes multiple cadences and dramatic G major scales in the solo part.<sup>10</sup> In the second movement the music also briefly moves to the dominant in bar 7, before immediately reverting to the tonic from bar 9. This contrasts sharply with the close on the dominant of the dominant in bar 34 that leads, with the help of an orchestral interjection,

---

<sup>7</sup> See bar 128 in the first movement and bar 111 in the second.

<sup>8</sup> The opening section of the Classical concerto form is referred to as an orchestral ‘prelude’ by Arthur Hutchings, a ‘first exposition’ by Cuthbert Girdlestone and as a ‘first ritornello’ by Charles Rosen. [Arthur Hutchings, *A Companion to Mozart’s Piano Concertos* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), 7, Cuthbert Girdlestone, *Mozart’s Piano Concertos* (London: Cassell and Company Limited, 1948), 24, and Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style* (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), 197].

<sup>9</sup> See bars 18–20 of the first movement.

<sup>10</sup> See bars 39–47 of the first movement.

to the dominant section from bar 35 onwards. A similar procedure is found in the last movement, where the orchestra initially moves to the dominant in bar 20, before sliding back to the tonic via various minor keys. The contrast between bars 23–24 and the corresponding place in bars 68–69 of the solo section is particularly vivid: in Ritornello 1 the orchestra starts traveling back towards the tonic at this point, but in Solo 1 the cellist flamboyantly reasserts the dominant with double-stopped chords.

Each section of the movement has a specific tonal role throughout Haydn's Cello Concerto in C. Ritornello 1 asserts and confirms the tonic, Solo 1 moves to the dominant, and Ritornello 2 confirms this dominant. This dominant confirmation is clearly articulated in the first movement's Ritornello 2, with a strong dominant pedal in the bass line of bars 49–50 and a close on the dominant of the dominant in bar 52, before the final perfect authentic cadences in the dominant in bars 55–58. The dominant cadences in Ritornello 2 of second and third movements are similarly unequivocal.<sup>11</sup> Solo 2 explores the widest range of tonalities, before cadencing on a related minor key. In all three movements this new key is clearly stated at the end of the section, complete with a strong cadence to which the orchestra responds. This response has the same tonal function in all three movements: it takes up the minor key, before leading back to the dominant in order to introduce the soloist's return to the tonic at the start of Solo 3. The minor key immediately loses some of its import due to this section's refusal to confirm the new key in the manner that Ritornello 2 did for the dominant. Solo 3 and Ritornello 4 both reassert the tonic in the manner that became common in sonata-style movements of the eighteenth century. Whilst each of these sections has a clearly defined tonal function, Haydn varies his treatment of each. It is therefore not at the large-scale tonal level that the composer

---

<sup>11</sup> See bars 53–56 of the second movement and bars 106–108 of the third movement.

makes his mark on this work, but in the details of his orchestral writing, thematic relations and manipulation of generic expectations.

## 1.2 The Esterházy Orchestra

This concerto was written specifically for the orchestra at Esterházy and tailored to the players at Haydn's disposal. In the early 1760s the orchestra is thought to have consisted of around twelve players: four violins, one viola, one cello, one double bass, one bassoon, two horns and two oboes. All of these players were accomplished freelance musicians, as the instrumental parts in many of Haydn's early symphonies will testify.<sup>12</sup> It is possible that Haydn would have accompanied some of his works from the harpsichord, an option adopted in various modern performances of this work, but it is more likely that he led the orchestra from within the violin section. The limited number of violins no doubt affected Haydn's orchestrations, explaining the frequency with which the first and second violins double each other on the principal melodic line. The string parts for this concerto must have sounded somewhat soloistic performed on so few instruments. Certainly, with such a talented group of players at his disposal, Haydn had the luxury of knowing that he could write the same virtuosic cadential figures for soloist and orchestra alike. The use of first violins and accompaniment in bars 6–7 of the first movement also provides an early orchestral illustration of the solo/tutti contrast to come.

This work is one of a small number of Haydn's early concertos that include both oboes and horns, which gives the work an even fuller sound during the ritornellos. The orchestration of this work is relatively straightforward, as Haydn's aesthetic and

---

<sup>12</sup> See Haydn's Symphonies 6–8 again for examples: 'Le Matin', 'Le Midi' and 'Le Soir' (Hob. I: 6–8).

circumstances demanded. It is essentially a work for strings and solo instrument, supported by oboes and horns during the ritornellos. The oboes generally double the violin and viola parts, either exactly or by sustaining the principal melodic notes. This is predominantly at the same register, but Haydn sometimes uses the oboes an octave higher than the violins. In bars 6–7 of the first movement, for example, the second-violin notes are beneath the first-violin melody, whilst the different timbre of the oboes enables them to inhabit the same pitch range as the first violins without obscuring the melodic line. The oboes are employed with great care throughout the work, despite their minimal role in proceedings. This is particularly apparent in bars 15–17, the first time in which they have an independent role to play. Here the oboes hold a strong dominant pedal that precedes the tonic cadences of bars 18–21. This heightens the effect of the tutti *forte* and enables the violins to play the new theme in unison. The same procedure applies in bars 89–93 and 130–133, when the same theme returns in Ritornellos 3 and 4. The pedal is a key feature of this theme, the implications of which will be explored below. Haydn also shows great awareness of the role that the oboes play in providing him with two sets of upper voices during the tutti sections. This enables him to put the melodic line in the violins, whilst using the oboes as accompanying voices. This is essential given that during the solo sections there will also be two upper voices: the cello in its upper register and the accompanying violins. In bar 20, for example, the oboes perform the role that the violins will have during Solo 1, which frees the violins to play the principal melodic line.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, the oboe pedal from bars 15–17 reappears in bars 36–38 of Solo 1, now played by the first violins. In the final movement the oboes are also used to provide pedal

---

<sup>13</sup> See bar 41, which is the corresponding place in Solo 1.

points that heighten the tension of an already taut and frenetic movement.<sup>14</sup> Other subtle touches include their use to heighten the affect of the minor shift in bar 23 of this last movement.

The principal role of the horns is similar to that of the oboes: outlining the harmony and filling out the sound of the tutti. Unlike the oboes, however, they are occasionally used during of the solo sections. They add emphasis to the accompanying *forte* tonic chords in bar 26 of the first movement, for example, highlighting the fact that the solo part has differed from the orchestral opening of the piece by remaining firmly in the tonic during its opening theme. There is a particularly prominent entry towards the end of the movement too, during which the horns accompany the new cello figure with oscillating dominant and tonic chords in bars 111–113. The same procedure applies in bars 55–58 and 190–193 in the last movement, where the horns fill out the sound of the accompanying string parts, increasing the tension during the solo cello's only visit to its lower register during this movement. Another more subtle use includes withholding them from the tutti entrance in bar 89 of the first movement, in order to save them for the restatement of the theme in its original key in bar 91.

The full power of the orchestra is largely reserved for the main ritornello sections, but there are occasional orchestral interruptions to solo sections. These have very specific musical roles. Bold interruptions in bars 34 and 97 of the second movement serve as dramatic cadence points: the first leads the soloist firmly out of the tonic and into the dominant, whilst the second resolutely maintains the soloist in the home key. In bar 46 the Ritornello 2 section is expected, but instead a loud and unexpected diminished seventh chord is presented by the orchestra, to which the soloist responds in particularly

---

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, bars 31–34.

eloquent fashion. Similarly, in the final movement, bar 233 appears to herald the work's final ritornello, only for the soloist to burst back in just two bars later. The aesthetic of the time generally demanded a simple melody-and-accompaniment relationship between soloist and orchestra. Haydn maintains this throughout much of the work, but applies the ingenuity and resourcefulness alluded to above, incorporating a wealth of fine details into a seemingly simple whole.

### 1.3 Thematic Relations

Themes, motives or 'schemata' play a crucial role in the way that music is put together.<sup>15</sup> It is often easy to oversimplify this phenomenon by identifying first and second 'subjects', whilst disregarding swathes of other material. This is particularly important for eighteenth-century concertos, many of which include large numbers of themes alongside a wealth of cadential and other material. To illustrate the complexities involved, the following table illustrates the order of various musical elements within the first movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C:<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>16</sup> See Appendix 3 for an annotated score of the First Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C.

TABLE 1.2: Elements from the First Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C

Ritornello 1:	A: 1→5 B: 6→7 C: 8→11 D: 12→15 <sup>3</sup> E: 15 <sup>3</sup> →18 F: 19 G: 20→21	Ritornello 3:	E: 89 <sup>3</sup> →93 Q: 94→95 <sup>3</sup> F: 95 <sup>3</sup> →96
Solo 1:	A: 22→26 C: 27→32 <sup>3</sup> H: 32 <sup>3</sup> →34 <sup>3</sup> I: 34 <sup>3</sup> →36 <sup>3</sup> E: 36 <sup>3</sup> →39 F: 40 G: 41→42 <sup>3</sup> J: 42 <sup>3</sup> →45 G: 46→47 <sup>3</sup>	Solo 3:	A: 97→101 C: 102→104 H: 105→106 R: 107→110 <sup>3</sup> S: 110 <sup>3</sup> →113 <sup>3</sup> T: 113 <sup>3</sup> →116 E: 117→121 <sup>3</sup> F: 121 <sup>3</sup> →122 <sup>3</sup> G: 122 <sup>3</sup> →123 <sup>3</sup> J: 123 <sup>3</sup> →126 G: 127→128
Ritornello 2:	A: 47 <sup>3</sup> →48 K: 49→50 L: 51→52 D: 53→55 F: 56 G: 57→58	Ritornello 4:	A: 129→130 <sup>3</sup> E: 130 <sup>3</sup> →133 F: 134 G: 135→136
Solo 2:	A: 59→63 C: 64→67 <sup>3</sup> M: 67 <sup>3</sup> →71 <sup>3</sup> N: 71 <sup>3</sup> →77 <sup>3</sup> E: 77 <sup>3</sup> →80 O: 81→83 <sup>3</sup> F: 83 <sup>3</sup> →84 <sup>3</sup> J: 84 <sup>3</sup> →88 <sup>3</sup> P: 88 <sup>3</sup> →89 <sup>3</sup>		

This division of the movement into thematic elements is inevitably somewhat rough and arbitrary, reflecting the limitations of an analysis of this nature.<sup>17</sup> It is useful, however, to consider the role of various sections in the movement as a whole.

A and E: In terms of the frequency with which they occur these are the movement's most important elements.<sup>18</sup> Every section begins with one or other of these themes, which are both very distinctive and recognizable to the listener. *A* clearly sets out the tonic triad and is lively in its rhythmic character. In keeping with traditional notions of the sonata-style 'second subject', *E* is a contrasting, more lyrical theme.

F, G, K, L, O, P and Q: These are all cadential figures used by either orchestra or soloist. *F* is a distinctive one-bar element that clearly designates the key area at the end of every section. *G* is the mostly commonly used element with which to close off a section, except at the end of Solo 2 and Ritornello 3, where it is replaced by *P* and *Q* respectively. This replacement of *G* avoids establishing these keys too clearly: see the discussion of tonal areas above. *O* provides a cadential introduction to *F*. *L* is used to provide a cadence on the dominant of the dominant during Ritornello 2, preceded by the two bars of dominant pedal in *K*.

---

<sup>17</sup> For a more thorough analysis of Classical concertos, see James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). This work will also be discussed in Chapter 3.

<sup>18</sup> Repetition is not necessarily a relevant criterion with which to assert the importance of these sections, but their dominance is certainly confirmed by experiences of listening to the work.

B and D: These are both elements that only occur within the ritornello sections, with *B* appearing only once. Their function is to provide a tutti/solo contrast within the ritornello itself. *D* is tonally vague, which provides a further contrast to the loud orchestral cadential material that surrounds it.

J: This is an important element that occurs in all the solo sections, but is reserved entirely for the soloist.

M and N: These elements are typical of concertos from the mid eighteenth century. They are developmental passages during which the soloist indulges in ‘rhapsodic arpeggiation’, exploring various key areas in a virtuosic manner. These sections sometimes appear monotonous to modern ears: see the discussions below.

C, H, I, R, S and T: *C* is a less clearly defined element, initially found in Ritornello 1.<sup>19</sup> Each solo section then includes a version of it, before proceeding to elaborate on this material. In Solo 1 this soon turns to the slightly more virtuosic *H*, before rising through *I* to *E*. In Solo 3 versions of both *C* and *H* are found, followed by three more elements reserved for the cello. *R* is somewhat cadential and virtuosic music that rises from the tonic towards the dominant. This enables the pedal G of the soloist’s new theme *S*, with

---

<sup>19</sup> This element is ‘less clearly defined’ because it appears in a number of different guises throughout the work. These appearances are similar enough to be worthy of comparison, but are not such definite repetitions as those above.

its distinctive V and I oscillations. *T* is a melodic element that cadences back into the tonic before *E* reappears.

Haydn uses this collection of musical elements to great effect, creating a continuous thread of music that both indulges and surprises a listener's expectations. See the appendices for thematic diagrams of the second and third movements.

#### 1.4 Generic Expectations

Haydn would have been well aware of the aesthetic tastes and expectations of the Esterházy-court audience, many of whom would no doubt have been familiar with numerous contemporary concertos. We do not know precisely how knowledgeable this audience was or how differently this music might have been heard in the eighteenth century, but certain assumptions might be made. This work largely conforms to expectations of the concerto genre at this time; the work is in a familiar three-movement form, with an uncomplicated tonal design split clearly into ritornello and solo sections. Haydn writes all three movements using the same basic structure outlined above, which both familiarizes audiences with the scheme and allows the composer to manipulate expectations as they arise. It is plausible to assume that many in his audience would have known Haydn's earlier concertos and were therefore already initiated into his typical procedures. The importance of these elements in the actual experience of hearing a piece of music is easily exaggerated, but they are certainly integral to the way in which Haydn

constructs this work. It is also sensible to expect many of these techniques to be appreciated by an initiated listener, whether consciously or subconsciously.

One of the most familiar metaphors applied to the genre of the concerto is that of the individual and the crowd.<sup>20</sup> During Ritornello 1 an audience awaits the soloist's entry, and Haydn pays great attention to the handling of this expectation in each movement. The cellist's entry in the first movement, for example, begins with a full C major chord in bar 22, complete with open G and C strings. This is one of the fullest sounds that the cello can offer, producing a strong opening gesture with which to introduce the soloist.<sup>21</sup> The rest of this five-bar opening phrase includes seven further chords complete with resonant open strings. The soloist's entry in the second movement is a vivid contrast, beginning with an almost inaudible pedal note in bar 16. A listener might expect the soloist to enter with the slow movement's main theme at this point, but the cello merely accompanies the violins whilst they restate the theme. The cello then begins its statement of this theme in bar 18. A similar procedure applies at the start of the third movement, with the cello entering on a long tonic pedal in bar 41, whilst the violins restate the main theme. Haydn then introduces the soloist with an exhilarating C major scale in bar 44, before soloist and violins play the theme together in bars 45–48. It seems certain that there is some through-compositional logic here, possibly even linked with the cello's pedal notes during theme *E* in bars 77–78 and 117–118 of the first movement.<sup>22</sup> Giving the solo instrument long

---

<sup>20</sup> See, for example, Donald Francis Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos* (7<sup>th</sup> edn., London: Oxford University Press, 1981), 6–14.

<sup>21</sup> In Haydn's time at the Esterházy court, the cellist would probably have played the bass line during the *tutti*s, so the distinction of soloist from orchestra at the start of Solo 1 would have been even more important. This distinction is much clearer during modern performances in which the soloist remains silent until the solo part begins.

<sup>22</sup> See Webster's explanation of the through-composed nature of Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony: James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and his article on Mozart's concertos: James Webster, 'Dialogue and Drama in

pedal notes was certainly unusual in concertos of the time, and Haydn conspicuously employs the technique on multiple occasions in all three movements.<sup>23</sup>

Haydn also appears to have paid a great deal of attention to the moments where he differs from formal conventions: both his own and those of his immediate contemporaries. There are examples throughout the work, many of which coincide with rare dynamic markings or unusual musical elements. Many of Haydn's early concertos end Solo 1 with the same cadential material that ended Ritornello 1, but in the first movement of this concerto Haydn chooses to add a new theme (*J*) at this point. It is a theme reserved for the soloist and accompanied by suspensions in the string parts.<sup>24</sup> Haydn's *pianissimo* markings are rare and generally correspond with particularly important musical moments; here attached to the long string suspensions that accompany the lower section of the cello's theme in bars 44–45. Normality resumes in bar 46 with dramatic dominant scales and a return to the expected cadential material. Similarly, the cadential material in bars 51–52 of the following Ritornello 2 seems to indicate the arrival of the cellist's entry, only to surprise the listener with the violin's theme *D*. Equivalent techniques are employed in the second movement, with two particularly conspicuous examples. Bar 46 has already been alluded to, in which the expected dominant cadence is interrupted and the orchestra enters with a diminished seventh chord instead. The soloist responds just one bar later by leaping to the upper register of the cello and performing an overtly virtuosic passage, before providing another dominant cadence that is now followed by the expected Ritornello 2 and dominant confirmation. The second

---

Mozart's Three-Movement Concerto Cycles' *Mozart's Piano Concertos* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001).

<sup>23</sup> Links between aria and concerto forms are well documented, and there certainly seems to be a correlation between the soloist's pedal notes and the *messa di voce* vocal technique from the same period.

<sup>24</sup> See bars 42–45 of the first movement.

and more striking effect occurs at the end of Solo 2, where the orchestra is expected to enter with Ritornello 3 in bar 80. Instead the strings are marked *pianissimo*, and the cello continues to play. The soloist here provides a beautiful theme that takes on the formal function of Ritornello 3; moving the music back from the relative minor to the dominant. Normality is resumed with the arrival of the main theme in the tonic in bar 89, representing the start of Solo 3.

### 1.5 Instrumental Writing and Virtuosity

This concerto features excellent writing for the solo instrument, which includes a number of virtuosic elements without compromising the work's coherence. This is done by ensuring that the soloist's virtuosity is carefully integrated within the music as a whole. Cadential material provides many of these opportunities, but so too does the need for development during the middle part of each movement. Haydn also uses some of his most inspired instrumental writing at important musical moments within the work.

Speed and agility is a much-coveted element in a soloist's playing. In this concerto Haydn exploits the fact that a fast scale performed by the violins seems even more virtuosic when repeated by the solo cellist. Given the quality of his orchestral violinists, the composer is able to present a lot of his virtuosic cadential material in the violin parts of the ritornello before they are taken up by the cellist. This technique makes the appearance of such cadential material in the solo part seem musically logical, even if the cellist then extends upon or embellishes such ideas. Frequent demisemiquaver movement in the solo part, such as bars 33–34, 41–42 and 46–47 of the first movement's

Solo 1, seems related to the preceding ritornellos; bars 20–21 of Ritornello 1 in this case. A similar passage of demisemiquavers in bars 12–14 of the second movement's Ritornello 1 introduces this virtuosic element that the soloist will take up. The third movement is marked *allegro molto* and features remarkable writing for the cello throughout. Virtuosity is a characteristic feature of this final movement, so the semiquaver and even demisemiquaver writing is particularly appropriate. The cellist begins with a rapid scale in bar 45, before going on to perform extended passages of virtuosic runs in all registers of the instrument.

Double-stopping is employed at key moments throughout this work. In the first movement this is initially employed to great effect in the cello's version of figure *F* in bar 40. This figure is used to confirm the current tonal area of each section and is initially introduced by the violins in bar 19 of Ritornello 1. In all the subsequent solo iterations of this motive, the cellist plays thirds in order to produce both violin parts at once. The same technique is employed even more conspicuously in bar 35 of the slow movement, in which the soloist imitates both the violins' parts from bar 8 of the opening. The third movement includes a number of jagged double-stopped figures in the solo part of bars 68–70, before the soloist virtuosically performs both the pedal and the main theme together in bars 206–207.

Haydn also employs the cello's upper register to great effect during this work. In the first movement the solo part rises slowly, before presenting theme E in this upper register in bars 36–39. Haydn was clearly particularly aware of the balance at this moment, for he uses one of his rare *pianissimo* markings to ensure that the violins' semiquaver D pedal in the same register will not interfere with the solo line. The highest

point of Solo 1 is then reserved for the section's final cadence in bar 47; contrasting well with the low register of the second half of theme *J* which precedes it. Similar material appears at the end of Solo 2, with an affecting rising line reaching up to  $a^2$  in bar 82, and a final run up to  $e^2$  at the final cadence. The second movement's false entry of Ritornello 2 in bar 46 has been discussed above, but it is no coincidence that Haydn chooses this moment to suddenly put the cello in its upper register. The demisemiquaver rise up to the start of the cadenza in bars 109–111 is a similarly dramatic piece of writing.

Unsurprisingly for such overtly virtuosic music, the final movement features the cello in its upper register for the most part. Haydn even exploits this element, dipping dramatically to the cellist's lowest register in bars 56 and 190 in order to start a new ascent. Some of the most dramatic writing is saved for the very end of the movement, with statements of the movement's most conspicuous themes, *A* and *D*, in the highest regions of the cello's register. This includes the cello playing the upper part of thirds with the first violins in bar 226.

## 1.6 Conclusions

Haydn's Cello Concerto in C is a work of rhetorical strength, which did not merely provide Weigl with an opportunity to display his talents. This work includes an array of compositional techniques and slights of hand that blend seamlessly into the piece as a whole. The balance between movements is effective, with a satisfying range of moods and colours. The design of each movement is simple but finely wrought, with ingenious approaches to the concerto form in general. Themes and musical elements are arranged carefully, so as to familiarize the listener with some and surprise them with others. Virtuosity abounds throughout the work and is effectively integrated into the musical whole.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Haydn's Concertos: Historiography and Perspectives

Joseph Haydn's concertos represent a small but fascinating, and extremely popular, section of his output, yet have received a mixed critical reception. This chapter will explore the literature in English on Haydn's concertos since the turn of the twentieth century and investigate some of the perspectives that emerge. It is a small body of literature, with most authors touching upon Haydn's concertos in the course of a larger project and providing only brief summaries of the works. The scene has not been helped by the number of lost and spurious concertos attributed to Haydn, or the gradual re-emergence of many of Haydn's concertos over the course of the twentieth century. Dubious traditional perspectives continue to be associated with Haydn's concertos as a result, parroted by numerous programme notes and CD sleeves. These include charges relating to maturity, form, conventionality and virtuosity that will be explored below. In many cases authors continue to criticize Haydn's pre-1770 concertos as a group, which offers an extremely distorted picture of the early-Esterházy concertos. Haydn's Cello Concerto in C is usually presented as an exceptional piece of music from this period, but its position within Haydn's concerto output as a whole remains unclear. This study hopes to encourage a more detailed look at Haydn's concertos, argues for a greater distinction to be made between the pre- and early-Esterházy concertos, and challenges some of the perspectives presented within Haydn-concerto literature.

## 2.1 Historiography: Introduction

Negative perspectives of Haydn's concertos were in evidence throughout the nineteenth century, illustrated explicitly by Tovey's damning article on the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2), which was published alongside his highly influential essay on the Classical concerto.<sup>25</sup> Two main bodies of work account for the majority of relevant literature that follows: biographical approaches to the composer and literature on the Classical concerto that includes sections on Haydn's concertos. This chapter will look in more detail at the handful of biographical works in English that meaningfully touch upon Haydn's concertos: Karl Geiringer's *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music* (1968), the more substantial contributions by H. C. Robbins Landon and David Wyn Jones (1976–1980, 1988, 2002), and the most recent Faber 'pocket guide' *Haydn* (2009) by Richard Wigmore. It will also consider the only monographs on the Classical concerto with sections specifically relating to Haydn's concertos: Michael Thomas Roeder's *The History of the Concerto* (1994) and Simon Keefe's *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (2005).

These areas of research attempt to include Haydn's concertos within the remit of their work, but without focusing a great deal of attention upon this genre of the composer's output. The result is a minimal literature in English pertaining to these works and a conspicuous lack of detailed analysis. Seminal works on music of the Classical period often feature large sections on the concerto that avoid Haydn's concertos entirely,

---

<sup>25</sup> See Donald Francis Tovey's, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos* (7<sup>th</sup> edn., London: Oxford University Press, 1981). The collected edition was first published in 1936, but the article on the Classical Concerto bears the date 1903 in its title. It is not clear when the individual programme notes were written, but they are thought to be from the late nineteenth century.

including conspicuous examples such as Charles Rosen's *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (1971), which will be addressed in Chapter 3. There are no major articles on Haydn's concertos or references to them in collected volumes such as W. Dean Sutcliffe's *Haydn Studies* (1998) or Elaine Sisman's *Haydn and his World* (1997). References are often brief and insubstantial when they do occur, including errors such as Matthew Head's allusion to the wrong D major keyboard concerto in the recent *Cambridge Companion to Haydn* (2005).<sup>26</sup> Other works touch upon Haydn's concertos in passing, such as Daniel Heartz's excellent *Haydn, Mozart, and the Viennese School, 1740–1780* (1995), but there is no attempt to discuss these works in detail.

## 2.2 Historiography: Tovey on Haydn's Concertos

Donald Francis Tovey's influential article on the Classical concerto will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 3, but his approach to Haydn may be introduced at this stage. His ideas were initially laid out in programme notes from the late nineteenth century, before being collected together with his general essay 'The Classical Concerto', dated 1903. These are now widely known as the *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol. III, Concertos*, and this work has had a profound impact upon both biographical approaches to Haydn's concertos and historical accounts of the Classical concerto to this day.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Matthew Head, 'Haydn's exoticisms: "difference" and the Enlightenment' *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 83. Head is writing about Haydn's late Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11) but both in the text and on his musical examples marks 'Hob. XVIII: 2'. Hob. XVIII: 2 is one of the early organ concertos, also in D.

<sup>27</sup> Tovey's section on the 'concerto principle' is one of the most often quoted passages on concerto writing, whilst references to this work abound in literature related to the Classical concerto. [See seminal works such as Rosen (1971 and 1980) and Kerman (1999) for example]. Only recent work primarily based upon eighteenth-century theorists such as Koch has escaped his influence [See works by Stevens (1971, 1974, 1983), Ratner (1980) and Keefe (1998, 2001, 2005) for example].

Tovey devotes just one page to Haydn's concertos, referring only to the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2); a work which he would have known through the distorted and re-orchestrated nineteenth-century version by Gevaert.<sup>28</sup> The Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1), the Cello Concerto in C, and most of the early keyboard and violin concertos were all probably unknown to Tovey. He begins by writing that, 'The concertos of Haydn all date from his Esterházy period', which is no longer considered to be the case.<sup>29</sup> The early organ/harpsichord concertos are thought to have been written for the pedalless organ which Haydn played at church in Vienna during his pre-Esterházy years.<sup>30</sup> Despite his unfamiliarity with the majority of Haydn's concertos, Tovey's general disdain for Haydn's attempts in this genre has proved influential amongst subsequent writers. Tovey is highly critical of the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2), criticizing the 'small scale' nature of Haydn's concertos; with 'forms [that] hardly deviate from those of the vocal aria on a large scale,' 'primitive' scoring and extravagant instrumental writing.<sup>31</sup> He is particularly critical of what he perceives to be the clichéd thematic material in all three movements of this concerto, ending with the following statement:

At all events, bars 5 and 6 of Ex. 3 irresistibly remind me of

Flat as my hat,

Flatter than *that!*

---

<sup>28</sup> François-Auguste Gevaert (ed.), *Joseph Haydn: Konzert in D* (Leipzig, Breitkopf and Härtel).

<sup>29</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 62.

<sup>30</sup> See H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1], Haydn, the early years, 1732–1765* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 196, for further details.

<sup>31</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 62.

But we digress. And so does Haydn.<sup>32</sup>

A theory emerged in the first half of the nineteenth century that this concerto was not written by Haydn at all, but by one of his composition pupils, Anton Kraft. This idea has been discounted in the light of the 1951 discovery of Haydn's autograph score, but the theory inevitably appealed to Tovey. In later editions of his volume on concertos, Tovey devotes an opening 'Appendum' to assessing the implications of this development. He appears relieved to discover that this work might not be Haydn's, discussing the 'average' concertos that Haydn produced at Esterházy and describing his efforts in this genre as 'a form in which Haydn never put forth his full power'.<sup>33</sup>

### 2.3 Twentieth-Century Developments: Rediscovering Haydn's Concertos

Tovey had probably only heard the late Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11), Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2) and a few of the early keyboard concertos when he was writing his article on the concerto at the start of the twentieth century. These two D major concertos were published in Haydn's lifetime and performed throughout the nineteenth century, although usually in significantly altered forms with expanded instrumentation.<sup>34</sup> The distinct lack of material in this genre of Haydn's output inevitably led commentators such as Tovey to marginalize these works and focus their attention elsewhere.

---

<sup>32</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 63.

<sup>33</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol. III: Concertos*, ix.

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, the famous Gevaert edition of the D major Cello Concerto (Hob. VIIb: 2), which re-orders and re-orchebrates parts of the piece [François-Auguste Gevaert (ed.), *Joseph Haydn: Konzert in D* (Leipzig, Breitkopf and Härtel)].

The rest of the Haydn concertos that are known today have emerged gradually over the course of the twentieth century. Months or years usually passed between scores being rediscovered or re-examined and their new ‘first performances’, but the following table provides some rough dates of re-emergence.<sup>35</sup>

1909	Violin Concerto in C, Hob. VIIa: 1
1909	Violin Concerto in G, Hob. VIIa: 4
1929	Trumpet Concerto in Eb: Hob. VIIe: 1
1950	Violin Concerto in A: Hob. VIIa: 3
1962	Cello Concerto in C: Hob. VIIb: 1

Each new arrival presents musicologists with a dilemma: Does the latest rediscovery fit into preexisting perspectives of Haydn’s concertos or should these be reformed in the face of new information? This is particularly relevant given the large proportion of Haydn’s concertos that have emerged over the last hundred years. Unfortunately, the

<sup>35</sup> Landon explains that the Violin Concertos in C and G (Hob. VIIa: 1 and 4) ‘were discovered in one of the old Breitkopf MSS. in the Archives of Breitkopf and Härtel in 1909 and were published that same year by Walter Davison, both for the first time’. He adds, however, that the Violin Concerto in C (Hob. VIIa: 1) was ‘as good as unknown when it was first recorded by Michelle Auclair after the Second World War’ [H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1], Haydn, the early years, 1732–1765* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 516]. Landon gives the re-emergence date for the Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1) as 1929 [H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Work. [Vol. 4], Haydn, the years of ‘The Creation’, 1796–1800* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 239–240]. With regard to the Violin Concerto in A (Hob. VIIa: 3), he writes that ‘The first performance of the Concerto in modern times took place in the Mozart-Saal of the Konzerhaus in Vienna, on 6<sup>th</sup> October 1950 (soloist: Edith Bertschinger) [H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1], Haydn, the early years, 1732–1765* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 517]. There are numerous accounts of the rediscovery of Haydn’s C major Cello Concerto in 1961. See, for example, H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1], Haydn, the early years, 1732–1765* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 518. Re-emergence dates for the keyboard concertos and horn concerto are not clear, but there is little mention of them in early literature on Haydn’s concertos.

continued lack of interest in Haydn's concertos has led to many of these works being awkwardly fitted into preexisting perspectives that will be explored below.

#### 2.4 Twentieth-Century Developments: Categorizing Haydn's Concertos

Haydn's concerto output certainly presents a somewhat complicated picture, not least because of the recent rediscoveries. A huge number of concertos appear in the composer's catalogues but remain lost, whilst numerous concertos are spuriously or erroneously attributed to Haydn. Research by musicologists such as Geiringer, Landon, Jones, and others has helped to clarify the situation, but loose categorization of these concertos continues to hinder informed criticism of Haydn's attempts in this genre. There is of course a certain amount of continuity throughout Haydn's concerto writing, but it is important to distinguish clearly between the following stages:<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> The date of composition for some of these works is unclear, particularly the Violin Concerto in G (Hob. VIIa: 4). It is thought to have been written shortly before Haydn began his work at the Esterházy Court. See H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1]*, 517–518, for more details.

TABLE 2.2: Periods of Haydn's Concerto Writing

Pre-Esterházy Concertos (1750–1761)

Organ Concertos, Hob. XVIII: 1, 2, 5, 8, and 10.  
Organ and Violin Concerto, Hob. XVIII: 6.  
Violin Concerto in G, Hob. VIIa: 4

Early-Esterházy Concertos (1761–1770)

Violin Concertos in C and A, Hob. VIIa: 1 and 3  
Cello Concerto in C, Hob. VIIb: 1  
Horn Concerto in D, Hob. VIId: 3  
Keyboard Concertos in F and G, Hob. XVIII: 3 and 4

Later Concertos (1770–1796)

Piano Concerto in D, Hob. XVIII: 11  
Cello Concerto in D, Hob. VIIb: 2  
Concertante in Bb, Hob. I: 105  
Trumpet Concerto in Eb, Hob. VIIe: 1

[The lire concerti (written in a very different concert-grosso style), divertimenti and all spurious or lost concerti have been omitted from this list]

Dividing the later concertos from Haydn's earlier works is not unusual, but his pre-Esterházy concertos are too often grouped together with the early-Esterházy concertos and assessed as a whole. It has already been stated that most of the pre-Esterházy works are believed to have been written for Haydn to perform on a pedalless organ during services at the church where he worked. These works provide a fascinating insight into Haydn's early concerto style, but were written with a very specific and practical function in mind. As a result they are inevitably conservative works, simplistic in form and with a distinct lack of the virtuosity normally associated with the concerto genre. It is unfortunate that so much literature relating to Haydn's concertos has not made a greater distinction between these early works and the more substantial concertos that followed.

The early-Esterházy concertos have emerged slowly over the twentieth century, but now represent a large, important and distinct section of Haydn's output.

## 2.5 Historiography: Karl Geiringer

The first substantial writing in English on Haydn's Concertos is found in Geiringer's *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music* (1946).<sup>37</sup> This is an insightful account of Haydn's career and, unlike previous biographers of the composer, Geiringer attempts a comprehensive survey of Haydn's music. Geiringer's chronological approach leads to an effective categorization of the concertos in a manner similar to Table 2.2, but with a further division splitting the later D major concertos for cello (Hob. VIIb: 2) and piano (Hob. XVIII: 11) from the Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1) and Concertante (Hob. I: 105).

Geiringer presents a scheme that is followed by the majority of other commentators on Haydn's concertos: he briefly examines each work in turn, interspersed with general comments relating to this genre of the composer's output. The result is an interesting but somewhat superficial exploration of Haydn's concertos. After reviewing the Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1), Geiringer offers the following conclusion:

A review of Haydn's whole output in the field of the concerto forces one to admit that he showed no particular interest in this form of composition. The few masterworks among the concertos hardly make up for the number of routine compositions written for a single performance and never meant for wider

---

<sup>37</sup> This work was first published in English in 1946, but various subsequent editions followed. These include editions from after 1961 that refer to the newly rediscovered Cello Concerto in C, one of which is referred to in the course of this study.

circulation. This will not surprise anyone familiar with Haydn's personality.

Unlike Mozart, he was no virtuoso. The rather dramatic gifts of the professional performer, which great virtuosos like Liszt, Paganini and even Mozart possessed in abundance, were completely lacking in Haydn. His reserve made it impossible for him to become a success as a soloist, and while he progressed as a composer, his interest in the concerto gradually faded. Most of Haydn's concertos were written during the 1750s and 1760s, the smallest number of them (though these include the finest works) during the eighties and nineties.<sup>38</sup>

It is important to note that, despite the statement above, Geiringer praises most of the re-discovered early-Esterházy concertos and all of the later concertos. Whilst evidently not convinced by the Keyboard Concerto in G (Hob. XVIII: 4), the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3) is the only early-Esterházy work that Geiringer openly criticizes, writing that it is 'rather conventional in musical language and old-fashioned in its technique, thus revealing the composer's modest interest in the form'.<sup>39</sup> He comments favourably on the Violin Concertos in C and A (Hob. VIIa: 1 and 3),<sup>40</sup> remarks that the Horn Concerto (Hob. VIIId: 3) includes 'all shades of emotion, from powerful energy to tender longing',<sup>41</sup> and writes of the Cello Concerto in C that it is 'a broadly conceived, festive piece, offering the soloist opportunities to display substantial technical skill'.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Karl Geiringer, *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music* (3rd edn., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 325.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 234.

<sup>40</sup> Geiringer praises Haydn's virtuosic writing in these concertos and adds that they 'are imbued with a warmth of expression rarely to be found in Haydn's early concertos'. [Geiringer, *Haydn*, 234.]

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

There therefore seems to be a disjunction between Geiringer's general comments regarding Haydn's early concertos and his descriptions of the early-Esterházy concertos, suggesting that these more general statements are based primarily upon the pre-Esterházy concertos or upon inherited ideas that do not relate to his experiences of the music itself. This is particularly apparent in his comments regarding virtuosity, which will be explored below.<sup>43</sup>

## 2.6 Historiography: H. C. Robbins Landon and David Wyn Jones

Geiringer's approach is shared by the substantial sections on Haydn's Concertos found in H. C. Robbins Landon's *Haydn: Chronicle and Works [Vol.s 1–5]* (1976–1980), David Wyn Jones's *Oxford Composer Companion: Haydn* (2002) and their jointly authored *Haydn: His Life and Music* (1988). Both of these authors have contributed much to our knowledge of Haydn and his works, and are well-qualified to attempt general surveys of Haydn's career. Landon includes a separate section on each concerto, but often focuses upon matters of authenticity or intended orchestration. There is no attempt to analyse any of the concertos in detail, although there is often a certain amount of technical discussion and quotation of themes. In such a vast work, these sections are particularly isolated by his chronological approach, which does not include a significant overview of Haydn's work in this genre.

Landon's collaboration with Jones is less substantial in its dealings with Haydn's concertos, but the authors do attempt some general comments. Some of these points will

---

<sup>43</sup> See the section below, 2.14 Perspectives: Virtuosity.

be isolated and discussed below, but it is unfortunate that the authors approach the pre- and early-Esterházy concertos together, explaining that:

There are, however, plenty of features in common between the two groups to enable them to be discussed together and, since Haydn was never again to devote so much time and energy to the concerto, an appraisal of the composer's attitude to the genre is most appropriately made here rather than in a later chapter.<sup>44</sup>

The result is a negative overview of Haydn's concerto-writing, which does a considerable disservice to the early-Esterházy concertos.

Jones provides the first detachable section of writing in English on Haydn's concertos. This eight-page contribution begins with an overview of these works, before dividing them into sections and looking at each in turn. Whilst this overview is well-written and persuasive, Jones follows his earlier practice of criticizing the pre- and early-Esterházy concertos as a whole. The result is a particularly critical passage in which Jones complains that Haydn's pre-1770 concertos are 'shackled by stylistic conventions and the limitations of contemporary musical syntax,' that the use of sequences frequently leads to 'prolixity' and that these are 'curiously impersonal works'.<sup>45</sup> He concludes that: 'their weaknesses are the weaknesses of the prevailing style of the day and not necessarily Haydn's own'.<sup>46</sup> In his review of individual concertos, Jones is critical of the pre-Esterházy concertos and also dismisses the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3)

---

<sup>44</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon and D. W. Jones, *Haydn: his life and music* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), 86–87.

<sup>45</sup> David Wyn Jones (ed.), *Oxford Composer Companion: Haydn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 45.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

as lacking in ‘strong individual profile’, with ‘undistinguished’ thematic material and ‘routine’ solo-writing.<sup>47</sup> He praises aspects of all of the remaining early- Esterházy concertos, however, displaying the same disjunction between his general summary and the appraisal of individual works that was found in Geiringer’s work.<sup>48</sup> Given the very different circumstances surrounding the conception of the pre- and early-Esterházy works, it is extremely unfortunate that general studies continue to criticize these concertos as a whole.

The works of Landon and Jones, whilst limited by the necessities of their comprehensive look at Haydn’s works, represent the most important surveys of Haydn’s concertos. They are brief studies, yet illustrate many of the perspectives that will be explored below.

## 2.7 Historiography: Richard Wigmore

Richard Wigmore provides the most recent survey of Haydn’s concertos, with an eight-page section from his Faber ‘pocket guide’ *Haydn* (2009) devoted to this genre of the composer’s output. Wigmore’s approach is very similar to Jones’s *Haydn* (2002), beginning with some general comments on the concertos before dividing them into sections and looking briefly at each in turn. Jones and Wigmore both resist the purely chronological approach by splitting the concertos into instrumental categories. This is in fact less helpful than it first appears, because in each of the wind, strings and keyboard

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>48</sup> Jones praises in particular the ‘glorious cantilena’ from the second movement of the Violin Concerto in C (Hob. VIIa: 1) and the virtuosity demanded of Tomasini in both this concerto and the Violin Concerto in A (Hob. VIIa: 3). He also states that the Violin Concerto in A’s finale is ‘a very fine movement, carefully worked out and sophisticated in its thematic manipulation’ [Jones, *Haydn*, 48].

categories, one of the later concertos is included amongst a collection of much earlier works. Wigmore and Jones both divide the early organ concertos from the later keyboard/piano concertos, although in his introduction to the concertos Wigmore also criticises Haydn's concertos from the '1750s and 1760s' as a whole.<sup>49</sup> This is clearly intended to be an approachable exploration of Haydn's works, timed to coincide with the 2009 anniversary celebrations. The result is a reasonably balanced account of Haydn's concertos which is simply and clearly written. It does however perpetuate the negative perspectives that persist in relation to Haydn's concerto writing and the pre-1770 concertos in particular. Wigmore's introductory page on the concertos provides perhaps the best example of how these ideas are typically presented; combining biographical assertions with an emphasis upon the late Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1) and Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11).<sup>50</sup>

## 2.8 Historiography: Michael Thomas Roeder and Simon Keefe

The works of Roeder and Keefe belong primarily to the following chapter on the Classical concerto, but include notable sections devoted specifically to Haydn's concertos. Roeder's *The History of the Concerto* (1994) includes a detachable section on Haydn's concertos that is of a similar length to Jones and Wigmore's contributions. His layout is also similar, beginning with an introduction before dividing the concertos into three sections: 'The Keyboard Concertos', 'The String Concertos' and 'The Trumpet Concerto'. Roeder seems not to know the Horn Concerto in D (Hob. VIIId: 3) and writes

---

<sup>49</sup> Wigmore, *Haydn*, 157.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 157.

that 'Haydn's attention to the concerto was limited to a group of early works and a smaller group from the 1780s and 1790s'.<sup>51</sup> Like Geiringer, Roeder displays affection for the Violin Concertos in A and C (Hob. VIIa: 1 and 3) and the Cello Concerto in C, but without dividing these clearly from the pre-Esterházy concertos. In typical fashion, it is the later concertos that receive the vast majority of attention.

Keefe's article 'The Concerto from Mozart to Beethoven: Aesthetic and Stylistic Perspectives', in his own edited book *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (1995), looks only at the later concertos for cello, piano and trumpet. Keefe draws upon criticism over a long period of time, including Kollmann (early nineteenth century), Hanslick (late nineteenth century) and Landon (twentieth century). This is a now familiar musicological technique that is excellently represented by Leonard G. Ratner's *Classic Music* (1980), and in earlier articles on the Classical concerto by Jane R. Stevens, including 'An 18th-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form' (1971) and 'Theme, Harmony, and Texture in Classic-Romantic Descriptions of Concerto First-Movement Form' (1974). This approach is refreshingly different and will be explored in relation to the Classical concerto in the following chapter. In this instance Keefe devotes just four pages to Haydn's concertos, focusing primarily upon the dialogue between soloist and orchestra. Despite claiming to be 'informed by late eighteenth-century criticism',<sup>52</sup> his arguments still read as rather arbitrary descriptions of the interaction between soloist and orchestra.

---

<sup>51</sup> Michael Thomas Roeder, *The History of the Concerto* (Portland: Amadeus Press, 1994), 169.

<sup>52</sup> Simon Keefe (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 75.

## 2.9 Perspectives: Introduction

Geiringer, Landon, Jones, Wigmore and Roeder all present brief and somewhat superficial surveys of Haydn's concertos. This is perhaps inevitable given the scope and intentions of their large works, yet regrettable given the lack of research into this area of Haydn's output. Keefe's article offers an alternative approach, but Haydn is only visited briefly in the course of a wider argument. Discussions of Haydn's concertos are therefore usually fitted into biographical approaches to Haydn or historical treatments of the Classical concerto. Traditional perspectives emerge throughout this literature; not least the grouping of the pre-1770 concertos that has already been touched upon. These perspectives are not always helpful, and the remainder of this chapter will concern itself with the more prevalent and important examples.

## 2.10 Perspectives: Maturity

The idea of Haydn's early 'immaturity' has been dealt with at length in Webster's influential monograph: *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of the Classical Style* (1991),<sup>53</sup> yet it is a theme which continues to dominate literature in English on Haydn's concertos. Reviews of Haydn's concerto output invariably praise the Cello Concerto in C, but focus their attention upon the later concertos. It would appear that the re-emergence of the Cello Concerto in C has proved difficult to incorporate within traditionally negative perspectives of Haydn's early concertos. The result is a disjunction

---

<sup>53</sup> See in particular the 'Historiographical conclusion': James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 335–373.

between general comments regarding Haydn's concertos and specific reviews of this concerto. It is often not clear whether authors consider the Cello Concerto in C to be an extraordinary work that deserves to be measured against other great concertos, or the best of a bad bunch of mid eighteenth-century concertos.

Geiringer's stance is clear enough from his chapter titles: The pre-Esterházy concertos are reviewed under the heading 'Youth 1750–1760', the early-Esterházy concertos under 'A Phase of Transition 1761–1770', and the later concertos under the headings 'Maturity 1781–1790' and 'Consummate Mastery 1791–1803'. With such an overt biographical narrative to uphold, Geiringer only allows himself to describe the Cello Concerto in C as 'one of the most significant works from this period',<sup>54</sup> before describing how in writing the Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1), 'the aged composer threw himself into the novel task, creating the finest solo concerto of his whole career',<sup>55</sup> and concluding that 'Most of Haydn's concertos were written during the 1750s and 1760s, the smallest number of them (*though these include the finest works*) during the eighties and nineties'.<sup>56</sup> Landon takes a similar stance, describing the Cello Concerto in C as 'surely one of the finest works of this period',<sup>57</sup> before describing the Trumpet Concerto as Haydn's 'best' concerto.<sup>58</sup> A sense of discomfort is more apparent in works since Webster's monograph, most notably in Jones's general introduction to Haydn's concertos. He is highly critical of Haydn's early concertos and the mid eighteenth century concerto in general, but adds that:

---

<sup>54</sup> Geiringer, *Haydn*, 235.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 324.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 325 (Emphasis added for this study).

<sup>57</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works*. [Vol. 1], 518.

<sup>58</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Work*. [Vol. 4], *Haydn, the years of 'The Creation', 1796-1800* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 239.

It has been fashionable to condemn the mid-18<sup>th</sup>-century style but even in this much maligned period it was possible to write great music. Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, one of the finest artistic expressions of the age, remains one of the most popular concertos in the repertoire.<sup>59</sup>

Since Jones has provided much of this maligning, it is difficult to establish whether or not he considers this work to be deserving of genuine praise. He later describes the Trumpet Concerto as Haydn's 'masterpiece in the genre' and concludes that:

With the Trumpet Concerto of 1796 Haydn's long, if disjointed career as a composer of concertos drew to a close. Over 40 years separate his first and last works in the genre and, as in every aspect of his work, the technical, stylistic, and expressive gulf between them is almost inconceivable.<sup>60</sup>

Wigmore also singles out the Cello Concerto in C for praise, but claims that:

In any case, Haydn's characteristic strengths – concision, tight thematic unity, intensive dialectical argument – found only limited scope in the concerto genre, at least until the D major Keyboard Concerto (c.1780) and the Trumpet Concerto of 1796.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 45.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>61</sup> Wigmore, *Haydn*, 157.

This study shares the sentiment that Webster asserts in relation to Haydn's early works; that they ought not to be assumed to be weaker or more 'immature' than his later concertos. Although this appears to be the case in the pre-Esterházy concertos, the same cannot be said for the Cello Concerto in C. This work, and the early-Esterházy concertos in general, need to be judged more thoroughly on their musical merits, rather than through the traditional perspective of maturity.

### 2.11 Perspectives: Struggle

Literature on Haydn's concertos commonly finds significance in the fact that Haydn wrote few concertos in proportion to his overall compositional output, and that most of these were written at the start of his career. Geiringer's explanation, in which he states that Haydn 'showed no particular interest in this form of composition', is quoted in full above.<sup>62</sup> Landon and Jones claim explicitly that 'Haydn never felt entirely at ease in the concerto genre',<sup>63</sup> before later adding that:

At first Haydn was content to go through the motions of concerto writing, but as his style developed he became frustrated by the lack of interaction between form and content; after the 1760s Haydn rarely wrote concertos.<sup>64</sup>

Jones adds that 'Haydn clearly found the concerto a problematic genre in which to work',<sup>65</sup> and Roeder claims that Haydn 'had no great interest in the concerto'.<sup>66</sup> These

---

<sup>62</sup> Geiringer, *Haydn*, 325.

<sup>63</sup> Landon and Jones, *Haydn: his life and music*, 351.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.

examples represent a common but unhelpful series of claims with regard to Haydn's concerto writing, akin to 'Sandberger's Tale' from Webster's monograph.<sup>67</sup> Haydn's concertos represent a small proportion of his total output, with a sharp decline in the number of concertos written after the 1760s. This might suggest that either Haydn lost interest in writing in this genre, or that Prince Nikolaus Esterházy did not favour this type of composition. There is however no explicit biographical evidence relating to this compositional change of tack, or to suggest that Haydn struggled with or disliked the concerto genre. It is impossible to verify whether or not the scarcity of concertos written after his arrival at the court of Esterházy is indicative of his struggles with the musical form itself, or merely an inevitable result of his circumstances. The rediscovery of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C suggests that Haydn was an extremely capable composer of concertos from an early stage in his career.

## 2.12 Perspectives: Form

Jones states that the late Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11) displays 'a mastery of the sonata-ritornello principle that had hitherto eluded him'.<sup>68</sup> This is a common theme which is related to the idea that Haydn's later concertos are more 'mature' and sophisticated than the earlier works, so it is important to assess the limited evidence proffered.

---

<sup>65</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 45.

<sup>66</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 169.

<sup>67</sup> Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*, 341–347.

<sup>68</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 47.

Landon and Jones start their joint approach to Haydn's early concertos with the following first movement scheme:<sup>69</sup>

TABLE 2.3: Landon and Jones's Tonal Design for the First Movements of Haydn's Concertos	
Ritornello 1:	I → V → I
Solo 1:	I → V
Ritornello 2:	V
Solo 2:	modulating then establishing vi
Ritornello 3:	→ I
Solo 3:	I
Ritornello 4:	I

The description of Ritornello 1 differs from the scheme for Haydn's Cello Concerto in C alluded to in Chapter 1, and Landon and Jones's scheme is misleading in this respect. A great deal of attention has been paid to the opening ritornello of the Classical concerto, originating with Tovey's forthright opinions on the matter.<sup>70</sup> The discussion centers upon whether the opening ritornello ought to move to the dominant in the manner of a sonata-style exposition, or remain in the tonic and save the modulation for the soloist. Tovey prefers the latter, for it gives the orchestral ritornello a more introductory character that does not detract from the impending entrance of the soloist. Landon and Jones write that 'Haydn moves with a great sense of purpose to the dominant key in the opening ritornello in a way Mozart was normally concerned to avoid'.<sup>71</sup> If this were the case then the soloist's move to the dominant would be less dramatic, and Landon and Jones claim that 'The end-result of many of Haydn's concertos is that Solo 1 seems arbitrary in direction

<sup>69</sup> Landon and Jones, *Haydn: his life and music*, 87.

<sup>70</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 16–20.

<sup>71</sup> Landon and Jones, *Haydn: his life and music*, 87.

and content that is only partially compensated for by the virtuosity of the soloist'.<sup>72</sup> In fact, Haydn's usual practice is to touch lightly upon the dominant in the exposition, but to save the actual modulation for the soloist. Tovey describes this effect in a paragraph from his article on the Classical concerto that is referring to Mozart's techniques, but applies equally well to Haydn's concertos. Tovey explains that upon reaching the dominant in Ritornello 1, 'we feel we are *on* the dominant, not *in* it'.<sup>73</sup> The first movement of the Cello Concerto in C illustrates this point perfectly, as alluded to in the analysis above, but this procedure can also be found in all of the other rediscovered early-Esterházy concertos. In the Violin Concerto in C (Hob. VIIa: 1), for example, the music moves to the dominant as early as bar 12, followed by a stronger cadence in bar 23, yet the music never settles in the dominant. This markedly contrasts with Haydn's establishing and confirming of the dominant key area at the end of Solo 1 (bars 88–101). Haydn does move concretely to the dominant in the exposition of his later Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIIb: 2), but this is an exception, and Mozart also experimented at least once with this idea.<sup>74</sup> Landon and Jones's general scheme for Haydn's concertos should not include a move to the dominant in Ritornello 1, as this is usually not the significant harmonic event that their table implies.

Jones and Landon go on to claim that it is Haydn's usual practice to restate the main theme at the start of both Ritornello 3 and Solo 4, thus producing a damaging repetitive element. They write that, whilst Mozart tended not to include Ritornello 3 at all, Haydn:

---

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>73</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 18.

<sup>74</sup> See Mozart's Piano Concerto in Eb (K. 449).

Retained this intervening ritornello which begins, in most cases, by presenting the main theme in the submediant minor before re-establishing the home tonic, with the redundant result that the main theme is heard twice in close proximity.<sup>75</sup>

This is certainly not the norm for the early-Esterházy concertos. The analysis above alludes to the effective manner in which Haydn starts Ritornello 3 with a *forte* version of theme *E* in the first movement of the Cello Concerto in C, and similar techniques may be found elsewhere. The Horn Concerto in D (Hob. VIIId: 3) starts Ritornello 3 with material from bar 12 of Ritornello 1, whilst both the Violin Concerto in C (Hob. VIIa: 1) and the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3) also begin Ritornello 3 without the main theme. It was standard practice for some of Haydn's contemporaries to begin Ritornello 3 with the main theme, but this is not the case in the majority of Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos.<sup>76</sup>

Other attempts to substantiate claims regarding the form of Haydn's concertos are sparse, particularly in relation to Haydn's Cello Concerto in C and others from his early-Esterházy period. Some formal elements within the Classical-concerto form inevitably developed over the course of the eighteenth century, but these may be explained by the passing of time and the influence of other composers upon the concerto genre. The claim that Haydn struggled with the form of his early concertos and that they are formally weak works is unsubstantiated.

---

<sup>75</sup> Landon and Jones, *Haydn: his life and music*, 87.

<sup>76</sup> The only early-Esterházy examples of this repetition are in the A major Violin Concerto (Hob. VIIa: 3) and the G major Piano Concerto (Hob. XVIII: 3). In the case of the Piano Concerto in G (Hob. XVII: 4), the Ritornello 3 is so short that the piano's continuation seems a rather satisfying continuation of the orchestra's phrase.

### 2.13 Perspectives: Conventionality

Jones writes that Haydn was ‘shackled by stylistic conventions’,<sup>77</sup> and this is a common theme throughout literature on Haydn’s concertos. Tovey claims that all three movements of the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2) are clichéd, whilst Geiringer criticizes the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3) for being ‘rather conventional in musical language’.<sup>78</sup> Landon shares this opinion, writing that the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3) ‘suffers from the conventionality that places it at a lower spiritual level than most the other works composed about 1764 or 1765’, adding that Haydn’s early keyboard works generally suffer from a ‘curious lack of profile’.<sup>79</sup> Details are limited, however, and it is often unclear which elements are considered conventional and under what circumstances.

The most conspicuous example concerns the sequential writing usually found during Solo 2 of the first movements of Haydn’s concertos, represented by themes *M* and *N* in the analysis above. This ‘rhapsodic arpeggiation’, as it is sometimes described, was a common element used throughout mid eighteenth-century concertos. It would appear to be the early stages of ‘developmental’ sonata-style writing and is often the most static element of the movement, yet it has an integral role to play. In the Cello Concerto in C this period builds a great deal of tension in the lead up to the arrival of the relative minor. Wigmore writes that in the Cello Concerto in C, ‘its purposeful central “development”,

---

<sup>77</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 45.

<sup>78</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 63, and Geiringer, *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music*, 234.

<sup>79</sup> Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1]*, 520.

has none of the longueurs of comparable movements in other concertos',<sup>80</sup> whilst Landon and Jones add that the Solo 2 of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C contains 'demonstrative writing that is vigorous rather than effete'.<sup>81</sup> Once again there is a disjunction in their approach, for these authors are extremely critical of the same procedure as applied in other early Haydn concertos. Landon is particularly critical of these 'apparently necessary gigantic sequences' in Haydn's concertos,<sup>82</sup> later writing of the Organ and Violin Concerto (Hob. XVIII: 6) that 'as far as the fatal series of sequences in the middle of the first movement, Haydn does not disappoint us'.<sup>83</sup> Jones similarly complains of the Organ Concerto in C (Hob. XVIII: 2) that 'the first movement, invariably the most stilted and prolix in Haydn's early concertos, contains two gigantic sequential passages that, perhaps more than anything else, reveal the composer's inability to infuse the form with life and purpose'.<sup>84</sup>

Haydn's early concertos are generally criticized for being 'conventional', but the elements cited are often those that are subsequently praised in his Cello Concerto in C. Landon writes somewhat disparagingly of the Violin Concerto in A (Hob. VIIa: 3) that 'we note chain passages of dotted rhythms, sequences, echo effects, and the rest of the paraphernalia of the late Baroque concerto',<sup>85</sup> and of the Violin Concerto in C (Hob. VIIa: 1) that 'again we notice the preponderance of dotted figures in the first movement, partly an inheritance from the Baroque but also part and parcel of Haydn's grand C major

---

<sup>80</sup> Wigmore, *Haydn*, 161.

<sup>81</sup> Landon and Jones, *Haydn: his life and music*, 88.

<sup>82</sup> Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1]*, 208.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

<sup>84</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 47.

<sup>85</sup> Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works*, 517.

courtly style'.<sup>86</sup> However, he soon praises similar elements as found in the Cello Concerto in C:

The first movement is in Haydn's grand C major style, with all its Lombard rhythms (end of the tutti), dotted patterns, syncopations and courtly atmosphere.<sup>87</sup>

Roeder also adds that the Cello Concerto in C displays 'the exuberance often associated with C major during this period, characterized by the opening motive with its many dotted notes'.<sup>88</sup>

Similar attitudes are found throughout the literature, originating with Tovey's complaints that Haydn's themes are clichéd. Jones goes on to claim that the Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11) is 'superior to its predecessors' in having 'highly distinctive and instantly recognizable thematic material throughout'.<sup>89</sup> He also claims that 'the opening ritornello is packed with interesting thematic material and Haydn's manipulation of these – wielding the open-ended themes together in different combinations, interpolating new material and developing the old – is very deft'.<sup>90</sup> These statements might just as easily apply to Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, as illustrated by the analysis of thematic usage above, or many of the other early-Esterházy concertos. A great deal of literature on Haydn's concertos therefore focuses upon criticizing elements of these works that are perceived to be 'conventional', whilst ignoring or painting in a positive light the same elements when they occur in a later work or one that is more

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 516.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 518.

<sup>88</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 173.

<sup>89</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 47.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 48.

popular. Tovey provides a fascinating discussion of conventionality in the course of his article on the Classical Concerto, concluding that:

This digression was necessary here, because all the concerto forms show an unusual number of constantly recurring features, and it is of great importance that we should never be misled into estimating these features as conventional merely because they are frequent.<sup>91</sup>

A more detailed examination of the early-Esterházy concertos ought to stem the tide of criticism directed at Haydn's 'conventional' concerto writing.

#### 2.14 Perspectives: Virtuosity

Virtuosity is one of the most contentious issues that relates to concertos in general. It is often seen as an essential, yet potentially detrimental and anti-musical element of the genre.<sup>92</sup> Two different criticisms are often leveled at Haydn in the course of surveys of his concertos: either they contain too little virtuosity or their virtuosity is not well integrated into the work as a whole.

This chapter has already explored how vital it is to distinguish between the pre- and early-Esterházy concertos. Written to be performed by Haydn himself during church services and on an organ without pedals, it is hardly surprising the early organ concertos

---

<sup>91</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 8.

<sup>92</sup> See, for example, Simon Keefe (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and Joseph Kerman, *Concerto Conversations* (London: Harvard University Press, 1999).

are not the most virtuosic works. The same might be said for the Violin Concerto in G (Hob. VIIa: 4), which is thought to have been written before Haydn's arrival at Esterházy, either for the leader of Count Morzin's orchestra or for himself to play at one of the court's musical parties.<sup>93</sup> Roeder complains that all but two of these concertos include solo parts that require 'no virtuosity',<sup>94</sup> and it is particularly dangerous when this theme disperses into more general comments on Haydn's concertos. Geiringer claims that 'the lack of technical brilliance noticeable in the keyboard concertos of Haydn's youth is to be observed in this [early-Esterházy] period too'.<sup>95</sup> Whilst this claim might be applied to the Keyboard Concerto in F (Hob. XVIII: 3), it makes no sense in relation to the rest of the early-Esterházy concertos. Geiringer himself alludes to the 'substantial technical skill' required in the Cello Concerto in C and states that the Violin Concertos in A and C offer 'a more gratifying task for the skill of the soloist'.<sup>96</sup> These are all works that require considerable virtuosity from the soloist, so must be clearly distinguished from the pre-Esterházy concertos in this respect.<sup>97</sup>

The other criticism relates to uncontrolled or poorly integrated virtuosity, which is often associated with the use of the 'conventional' sequences alluded to above. Wigmore puts the two together when he complains that Haydn's early works include 'old-fashioned

---

<sup>93</sup> See H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1]*, 518, for more details.

<sup>94</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 170.

<sup>95</sup> Geiringer, *Haydn*, 233.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 234-5. This is the issue referred to at the end of section 2.5. There is a disjunction here between Geiringer's general comment and his studies of individual works. His general comment regarding the virtuosity of the early-Esterházy concertos is clearly based upon the Keyboard Concertos in F and G (Hob. XVIII: 3 and 4) [although he even concedes that the G major Keyboard Concerto (Hob. XVIII: 4) contains a 'moderate amount of brilliance'].

<sup>97</sup> The virtuosity in the C major Cello Concerto has been explored in Chapter 1. See also the dramatic skips, rapid passages and double-stops in the Violin Concertos in A and C (Hob. VIIa: 1 and 3), or the complicated lipping and range required by the Horn Concerto in D (Hob. VIIId: 3).

Baroque sequences and reams of freewheeling virtuosity’,<sup>98</sup> whilst Tovey somewhat sarcastically claims that Haydn’s concertos ‘give remarkable scope for the art of the virtuoso player’.<sup>99</sup> Attempts are made to use this factor to differentiate Haydn’s earlier works from the later concertos, with Jones claiming that ‘fluid, inventive keyboard-writing’ differentiates the Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11) from its predecessors.<sup>100</sup> Landon praises the use of virtuosity towards the end of a work, claiming that the Trumpet Concerto was advanced in this respect: ‘Although it was usual for the first movement of concertos to be technically the most difficult part of the work – Mozart’s K. 503 is a typical case in point – Haydn had a different ideal for his Trumpet Concerto’.<sup>101</sup> The Cello Concerto in C provides a conspicuous example of Haydn’s early use of such a technique and the work as a whole remains a considerable challenge to cellists today, with brilliant cello writing which is expertly tailored to the work itself.<sup>102</sup> The Violin Concertos in A and C (Hob. VIIa: 1 and 3) both integrate virtuosity effectively, and the Horn Concerto in D (Hob. VIIId: 3) is regularly praised for its ingenious instrumental writing. In the light of the rediscovered early-Esterházy concertos, it must be considered that the effective handling of virtuosic writing is apparent from the start of Haydn’s employment at Esterházy, and not an element to be particularly associated with his later works.

---

<sup>98</sup> Wigmore, *Haydn*, 157.

<sup>99</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 62.

<sup>100</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 47.

<sup>101</sup> H. C. Robbins Landon, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 4], Haydn, the years of ‘The Creation’, 1796-1800* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977), 222.

<sup>102</sup> See Chapter 1 for further details.

## CHAPTER THREE

### The Classical Concerto: Historiography and Perspectives

Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos have suffered from the distorted perspectives on the Classical concerto found in musicological literature in English. This chapter will explore the major works in English on the Classical concerto since the turn of the twentieth century and explore some of the perspectives that emerge. This is a mixed body of literature, ranging from general accounts of the Classical concerto to works that touch upon specific composers, concertos, or other aspects of the subject. There are two primary strands of research: those influenced by Tovey's seminal article on the subject and those focused upon eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists. All of these works display a pronounced emphasis upon Mozart's concertos that will be explored over the course of the chapter. Coupled with an emphasis upon first-movement form, this approach has provided a limited overview of concertos from the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Haydn's Cello Concerto in C provides an important example of a work that does not fit into traditional perspectives of the Classical concerto, and new approaches are required in order to incorporate a wider range of works and aesthetic preferences from this period. The aim of this chapter is not to challenge the elevated status that Mozart's concertos enjoy, but simply to illustrate the extent of this emphasis and encourage a more inclusive approach with regard to Haydn and his contemporaries.

### 3.1 Perspectives: The 'Classical Concerto'

Haydn's concertos are regularly reviewed within the context of the 'Classical concerto'. This study will not include an etymology of either of the term's constituent words – 'Classical' and 'concerto'<sup>103</sup> – and neither will it attempt to provide a conclusive definition of the 'Classical concerto'. The term is used in a variety of ways by musicological literature in English, and it is therefore important to consider some of the most prevalent contexts in which the term appears. The phrase 'Classical concerto' most commonly refers to concertos written during the Classical period of music from c.1750 to the start of the nineteenth century, often focusing upon the canonic triumvirate of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven. It is common practice for studies of the Classical concerto to address the most influential Classical composers and explore their concerto outputs, rather than identifying leading writers of concertos from the Classical period. Beethoven is considered a link between the Classical and Romantic periods of music, and is therefore usually excluded or marginalized from discussions of the Classical concerto. This will be the approach in this study, since Beethoven wrote his first concertos during the mid 1790s, over thirty years after Haydn's Cello Concerto in C. Of Mozart and Haydn, it was the former who wrote considerably more concertos. The emphasis on Mozart in studies of the Classical concerto will be explored below, but it is useful to understand that for many writers the term 'Classical concerto' refers almost exclusively to Mozart's concertos. Haydn, alongside composers such as J. C. Bach and C. P. E. Bach,

---

<sup>103</sup> The reader will no doubt be familiar with both, or may examine the wealth of literature that refers to them.

is identified as an important precursor to Mozart, but it is Mozart's concertos that are presented as exemplars of the 'true' or 'mature' Classical concerto. D. F. Tovey's seminal essay on the Classical concerto will be explored below, but it is helpful to introduce his ideas at this stage. Tovey defined the Classical concerto in a somewhat unusual manner, ascribing the term only to concertos that he considered worthy of the title. He therefore applies his own aesthetic criteria in deciding what constitutes a Classical concerto, referring primarily to the works of Mozart, Beethoven and Brahms.<sup>104</sup>

The following table includes some sample definitions of the term 'Classical concerto':

TABLE 3.1: Sample Definitions of the Term 'Classical concerto'

- Concertos written during the Classical era: c.1750 to the early 1800s.
- Concertos written in the 'Classical style'.
- Concertos written in 'Classical concerto form', fusing ritornello procedures with the 'sonata forms' of the Classical era.
- The concertos of Mozart.
- Concertos from C. P. E. Bach and J. C. Bach up to or including those of Beethoven.
- Concertos deemed by various criteria to deserve the title.

This is clearly a somewhat vague and potentially misleading term, yet remains useful nevertheless. Studies of the concerto form's development reveal the impact of sonata elements on the mid eighteenth-century concerto and the new paths forged by Beethoven and his contemporaries at the turn of the nineteenth century. The 'Classical concerto' provides a loose framework within which to study the concertos written in between, and

<sup>104</sup> See Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 3–27.

this chapter will focus specifically upon the years that separate Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos from Mozart's concertos of the 1780s. This period is crucial to our understanding of how Haydn's concertos have been perceived in relation to the concept of the Classical concerto as a whole.

### 3.2 Historiography: Introduction

The subject of the Classical concerto is dominated by an opinionated article written by Donald Francis Tovey, entitled 'The Classical Concerto' (1903).<sup>105</sup> It is remarkable that over a hundred years since this article was written, Tovey's work remains the most influential contribution in English on the subject. His theories are represented in the majority of Classical concerto literature in English, often accompanied by quotations of his eloquent prose.

Histories of the concerto inevitably touch upon the Classical concerto, including Abraham Veinus's *The Concerto* (1948), Michael Thomas Roeder's *The History of the Concerto* (1994), *A Companion to the Concerto* (1998) edited by Robert Layton, the recent *Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (2005) edited by Simon Keefe, and Michael Talbot's contribution to the 'Concerto' entry in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2001).<sup>106</sup> These include the most substantial sections on Haydn's concertos; two of which were addressed in the course of Chapter 2. The general level of these studies obliges them to take a stance on Haydn's concertos, whether it be to provide an exploration of these works or to make a specific decision to pass over them.

---

<sup>105</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 3–27.

<sup>106</sup> Michael Talbot, 'The Concerto', in Stanley Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London: MacMillan, 2001).

Literature exploring the ‘Classical style’ in music often includes a separate chapter on the concerto, including prominent examples such as Charles Rosen’s *Sonata Forms* (1980) and Leonard Ratner’s *Classic Music: Expression, Form and Style* (1980). These works offer useful insights into the development of the Classical concerto, but struggle to generalize what is often a convoluted and complicated form of music. Neither author refers specifically to Haydn. Charles Rosen’s *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (1971) includes an important chapter on the concerto, casting only a cursory glance at Haydn before exploring Mozart’s piano concertos in detail.

Major articles have touched upon aspects of the Classical concerto, with prominent examples by Jane R. Stevens (1971, 1974, 1983), Susan McClary (1996) and Simon Keefe (1998, 2001 and 2005). These offer a refreshingly different approach to the Classical concerto that largely escapes Tovey’s influence. Joseph Kerman’s *Concerto Conversations* (1999) offers another format, insightfully writing about the Classical concerto on various occasions in the course of a book that brings together a series of lectures given during the late twentieth century.

There is a vast body of work devoted exclusively to Mozart’s concertos, which will be examined in more detail below. Literature relating to other Classical concertos includes Rachel Wade’s *The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (1981) and general accounts of Classical composers that include sections on their concertos, but these are dwarfed by the quantity of literature on Mozart’s concertos.

### 3.3 Historiography: Tovey on the Classical Concerto

Tovey's article on the Classical concerto is just 27 pages long, yet is quoted, referred to and footnoted in the vast majority of the literature above. It is a fascinating and important contribution to our understanding of the concerto form, which remains enjoyable and stimulating reading to this day. His style is unusual in modern times: Tovey adopts the pose of the connoisseur, sharing his opinions with readers whom he treats as fellow 'connoisseurs' or intellectual peers, in opposition to the style of writing associated with the theory textbooks used in the music colleges of his day. Tovey expects his reader to aspire to his 'natural taste' and 'long familiarity with all that is purest in art',<sup>107</sup> and Kerman warns that 'unfortunately, students may be put off by his famous eccentricities of style – long digressions, sharp arguments with shadowy opponents, and provocative dogmatic assertions made without full support or explanation; *The Classical Concerto* has numerous examples'.<sup>108</sup> Tovey writes particularly brilliantly on a number of issues, including this much-quoted description of the duality between orchestra and soloist that lies at the heart of his section entitled 'The Concerto Principle':

Nothing in human life and history is more thrilling than the antithesis of the individual and the crowd; an antithesis which is familiar in every degree, from flat opposition to harmonious reconciliation, and with every contrast and blending of

---

<sup>107</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 3.

<sup>108</sup> Joseph Kerman, *Mozart Piano Concerto in C major, K 503*. Norton Critical Score. (New York: Norton, 1970), 137.

emotion, and which has been of no less universal prominence in works of art than in life.<sup>109</sup>

Other notable digressions include the fascinating section on ‘conventionality’ and the extended discussion of opening ritornellos that have already been quoted in Chapter 2.

Tovey’s approach to the Classical concerto is idiosyncratic, yet his article appears to have determined the compass of the subject’s debate. It is remarkable for a twenty-first-century reader to consider that the majority of Mozart’s concertos were little known or performed during the nineteenth century, with the exception of the Piano Concerto in D minor (K.466), and it would appear that Tovey’s article is partly intended to assist in the revival of these works. The article was initially written to accompany Tovey’s performance in 1903 of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in C (K. 503) and the premiere of his own Piano Concerto in A (Op. 15). Grayson states that:

The essay is thus as much a defense of Mozart as a justification of Tovey’s own compositional effort, for he considered the ‘classical’ concerto a category that transcended the eighteenth century and represented a continuous, living tradition encompassing both Mozart’s concertos and his own.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 6.

<sup>110</sup> David Grayson, *Mozart, Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K. 467* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 11.

Tovey describes about thirty works as being in ‘true concerto form’, of which ‘a good two-thirds have been contributed by Mozart, whose work has for the last fifty years been treated with neglect and lack of intelligent observation’.<sup>111</sup> Tovey adds:

The name of concerto is assumed by literally hundreds of works that have not even an academic connection with the classical idea of concerto form and style; while of the very small collection of true concertos, those of Mozart, are ignored, and the remainder not nearly so well understood as any classical symphony.<sup>112</sup>

Tovey is using a personal set of aesthetic criteria in order to decide what might be considered a ‘true classical concerto’, primarily selecting concertos by Mozart, Beethoven and Brahms. This exclusion of Haydn’s concertos from the central article, accompanied by Tovey’s damning programme note on the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIIb: 2) that was referred to in Chapter 2, has had a lasting impact upon perceptions of Haydn’s concertos. Despite the popularity enjoyed by many of Haydn’s concertos and the number of concertos that have reappeared over the course of the twentieth century, these works remain overshadowed by the Mozart-emphasis that Tovey adopted.

The second half of Tovey’s ‘The Classical Concerto (1903)’ explores Mozart’s Piano Concerto in C (K. 503) in more detail. He works through the concerto for ten pages rather in the style of a programme note but expanding some aspects of his argument. In the collected volume, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol. III, Concertos* (1936), this article is then followed by 35 pages of programme notes for other Mozart concertos, largely

---

<sup>111</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 3.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

offering descriptive accounts of the works and quoting selected themes. This analytical approach certainly offers insights into Mozart's works, but seems arbitrary and unsatisfactory in relation to discussions of the Classical concerto as a whole.

Nevertheless, the style and proportions of his approach are shared by the majority of twentieth- and twenty-first-century writers on the Classical concerto. Tovey usually spends a great deal of time discussing R1 and S1: six of the ten pages in the case of K. 503. The rest of the movement is then dealt with in two pages, before the last two movements of the work are discussed in a cursory final two pages. Tovey attempts to justify these strange proportions, writing:

It is unnecessary to give a full account of the other movements; concertos, as they proceed, naturally use, like all sonata-works, more sectional forms, in which solo and orchestra alternate more simply than in the first movement. This is further necessitated by the fact that it can no longer be effective to lay such tremendous emphasis on the entries of the solo, now that it has so gloriously won its way into friendship with the orchestral crowd.<sup>113</sup>

This emphasis upon first movements is a particularly common trait within literature on the Classical concerto and will be explored in more detail below.

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 24.

### 3.4 Historiography: Literature on Mozart's Concertos

The largest body of literature in English relating to the Classical concerto consists of works devoted to Mozart's concertos. It is not within the scope of this study to explore these works in detail, but they include insightful writing on the Classical concerto and illustrate the extent of the subject's emphasis upon Mozart. Key examples have been referred to below in relation to their general comments regarding the Classical concerto. The first two books of lasting influence are those by Cuthbert Girdlestone (1948) and Arthur Hutchings (1950). These authors betray the influence of Tovey both in their footnotes and in the scheme and manner of their arguments, with Hutchings openly describing the extent of his debt:

Had theorists or performers mended their ways, there would be no need to write an essay which adds nothing to Tovey's, but since untruth is repeated in text-books, and people applaud the artistic untruth of vulgarity, it is still a duty to spell out Tovey slowly.<sup>114</sup>

Further literature on Mozart's concertos has followed, including the analytical approaches of Hans Tischler's *A Structural Analysis of Mozart's Piano Concertos* (1966) and Denis Forman's *Mozart's Concerto Form* (1971). More recent large-scale projects include David Grayson's *Mozart: Piano Concertos Nos 20 and 21* (1998), John Irving's

---

<sup>114</sup> Arthur Hutchings, *A Companion to Mozart's Piano Concertos* (2nd edn., London: Oxford University Press, 1950), 6.

*Mozart's Piano Concertos* (2003) and the vast collection of papers edited by Neal Zaslaw: *Mozart's Piano Concertos: Text, Context, Interpretation* (1998).

Potentially the most important work to have emerged in recent years is James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006). This large work provides an extremely thorough and informative examination of Mozart's piano concertos. It provides a radical alternative to generalized descriptions of concerto form, attempting instead to incorporate and illuminate as many sonata-form 'deformations' as possible. This gives a much better understanding of the options and choices available to composers, whilst also indicating which boundaries they were not prepared to cross. Chapter 1 has examined some of these aspects in relation to Haydn's Cello Concerto in C, but our understanding of Haydn's concertos would benefit enormously from the more detailed approach provided by a study of this nature. Hepokoski and Darcy's large-scale approach also enables the authors to deal much more successfully with the second and third movements of concertos, which include a greater variety of movement-types and 'deformations' than found in first movements. This provides a contrast to the overwhelming emphasis upon first-movement structure that is found throughout the rest of the Classical-concerto literature.<sup>115</sup>

Some studies of Mozart's piano concertos include brief attempts to justify Mozart's elevated status, but none engage significantly with other Classical concertos.<sup>116</sup> It is therefore important to step back from this literature in order to have a better perspective upon the Classical concerto as a whole.

---

<sup>115</sup> See 3.7 Perspectives: First Movements, below.

<sup>116</sup> Other concertos are usually only considered in their capacity to influence Mozart's development. See, for example, Jane R. Stevens's article about the influence of C. P. E. Bach's concertos: 'The Importance of C. P. E. Bach for Mozart's Piano Concertos' *Mozart's Piano Concertos, Text, Context, Interpretation* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1996), 211–238.

### 3.5 Historiography: Jane R. Stevens and an Alternative Approach to the Classical Concerto

There is one popular approach to the Classical concerto that is considerably less influenced by Tovey's work. Jane R. Stevens, with her article 'An Eighteenth-Century Description of Sonata Form' (1971), began a tradition of research focused upon the work of musical theorists contemporaneous to the composers concerned.<sup>117</sup> Stevens focuses her attention on Heinrich Christoph Koch (1749–1816) and his comprehensive *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* (1782). This work includes a detailed account of the late eighteenth-century concerto, and Koch's ideas are now found throughout much late twentieth- and twenty-first-century writing on the subject. Particularly influential is the following description of the concerto, written by Koch but quoted from the Stevens article:

'I imagine the concerto,' he [Koch] says, 'to be somewhat like the tragedy of the ancients, where the actor expressed his feelings not to the audience but to the chorus, which was involved most sparingly in the action, and at the same time was entitled to participate in the expression of the feelings'. There is 'an emotional relationship of the solo player with the orchestra accompanying him; to it he displays his feelings, while it now beckons approval to him with short interspersed phrases, now affirms, as it were, his expression; now it tries in the

---

<sup>117</sup> Jane R. Stevens, 'An 18th-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Spring, 1971), 85–95.

Allegro to stir up his exalted feelings still more; now it pities him in the Adagio, now it consoles him'.<sup>118</sup>

His approach is attractive because it combines eloquent writing with a firm grasp of the concerto forms of his day. In this respect his approach is similar to Tovey's, providing well-executed descriptions of some of the key elements of the Classical concerto.

Tovey's description of being *on* the dominant during Ritornello 1, rather than *in* it, has already been quoted in the course of Chapter 2, and Koch offers a clear description of the same phenomenon:

The first ritornello is also formed in such a way that the harmony is clearly led into the key of the fifth, and after the half cadence a principal melodic phrase is presented in this key. Directly thereafter, however, without closing formally in this key, the harmony is led back again to the tonic and the ritornello closes there.<sup>119</sup>

Koch is writing about no particular concerto, however, whereas Tovey deals specifically with Mozart's Piano Concerto in C (K. 503), and Koch therefore follows the prescriptive textbook style that Tovey resists. Koch's implication is that concertos generally follow a standard scheme, whereas in fact, as Hepokoski and Darcy illustrate in relation to Mozart's concertos, most composers were continually experimenting with the many choices available.

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 94.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 89.

Stevens's work on eighteenth-century theorists has sparked a number of other articles related to the Classical concerto. These have included further articles by Stevens (1974, 1983) and other notable contributions by Shelley Davis (1983), Scott Balthazar (1983), Joel Galand (2000) and Simon Keefe (1998, 2001 and 2005). Keefe has not only edited the *Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, but also contributed the article entitled 'The concerto from Mozart to Beethoven: aesthetic and stylistic perspectives' that is mentioned in Chapter 2.<sup>120</sup> Koch remains a primary source for these articles, but Quantz, Riepel, Kollmann, Czerny and others are also referred to.

There is a certain amount of filtering applied to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sources in order to affirm traditional perspectives on the Classical concerto. Beethoven's fascination with Mozart's work is well documented, and this is reflected by early nineteenth-century interest in Mozart's concertos amongst theorists. Keefe's studies of Kollmann and the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* of Leipzig therefore lead him to assert that Mozart and Beethoven's 'status as pre-eminent concerto practitioners of the period was enshrined right from the outset'.<sup>121</sup> He continues:

The die had been cast: writers firmly established Mozart and Beethoven as the supreme composers of their era during the first two decades of the nineteenth-century and bequeathed a powerful legacy to generations of performers, critics and composers.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> Keefe (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, 70–92.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 70–71.

This assertion is not especially convincing given that most of Mozart's concertos promptly fell out of favour during the nineteenth century.<sup>123</sup> Keefe is using a specific series of writings from the turn of the nineteenth century to affirm the canonic status of these composers and corroborate the Mozart-emphasis that Tovey adopted.

Stevens ends her study by stating that 'Koch's analysis should help to dispel some of the confusion which has often surrounded the Classic concerto'.<sup>124</sup> The subject of the Classical concerto certainly benefits from the inclusion of these new sources and it is intriguing to explore the aesthetic values that theorists of the day aspired to and praised, but they do not necessarily explain the complex forms of the concerto any better than twentieth- and twenty-first-century approaches. This whole body of literature also offers few insights into Haydn's pre-1770 concertos. These concertos often fit the models expounded by eighteenth-century theorists, but do not seem to have been known outside the Esterházy court. None of the works alluded to above refer specifically to Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos and most reflect the same Mozart and first-movement emphases that will be explored below.

### 3.6 Historiography: General Accounts of the Classical Concerto

General accounts of the Classical concerto since Tovey display an overwhelming emphasis upon Mozart's concertos. These works, as represented by Veinus (1948),

---

<sup>123</sup> Tovey complains that Mozart's 'work has for the last fifty years been treated with neglect and lack of intelligent observation' [Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 3], whilst Matthews adds that in a survey of nineteenth-century concerts 'the Mozart Clarinet Concerto was played only once. Even the piano concertos were rarities, with the D minor and C minor heading the list, the A major, K. 488, unheard until 1900, the majority completely neglected' [Denis Matthews, 'Mozart and the Concerto', in Robert Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 101].

<sup>124</sup> Stevens, 'An 18th-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form', 95.

Roeder (1994), Layton (1998), Talbot (2001) and Keefe (2005), are all set out in a similar manner.

The first stage consists of a general survey of Classical concertos other than those by Mozart. Veinus sets the trend by providing just six pages on the Classical concerto in general, describing J. C. Bach and C. P. E. Bach as ‘among the transitional composers who bridged the gap between Bach and Mozart’.<sup>125</sup> Layton’s *Companion* includes a chapter by H. C. Robbins Landon at this point, entitled ‘The Pre-Classical Concerto and the Classical Concerto Parallel to Mozart’, whilst Roeder includes a chapter entitled ‘The Emergence of the Classical Concerto’. Talbot, Roeder and Landon explore European countries in turn, describing which concerto writers were working there during the latter half of the eighteenth century and briefly stating the nature of their contribution to the genre. In all cases this is a somewhat superficial treatment that offers little to our understanding of these works or the Classical concerto as a whole. Kerman’s comment regarding Layton’s *Companion* seems rather appropriate here, describing it as ‘one of those depressing if necessary manuals that deliver scraps of fact and opinion about hundreds of artworks’.<sup>126</sup> Separate sections on Haydn, C. P. E. Bach and J. C. Bach are common, but these are always small in comparison to the section on Mozart that follows.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> Abraham Veinus, *The Concerto* (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1948), 69.

<sup>126</sup> Joseph Kerman, *Concerto Conversations* (London: Harvard University Press, 1999), 67.

<sup>127</sup> Veinus devotes just 6 pages to the Classical concerto in general, before studying Mozart’s concertos for 30 pages. Matthew’s chapter on Mozart’s concertos from Layton’s *Companion* is twice as long as the general article by Landon that precedes it. Similarly, Roeder’s Mozart chapter is twice as long as his general account of the Classical concerto, although he does include the separate section on Haydn that was explored in Chapter 2 of this study. Talbot’s article from the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* and Keefe’s article from *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* also devote the most substantial sections of their articles to Mozart’s concertos.

The second and third stages relate exclusively to Mozart's concertos. Layton's *Companion* includes a separate chapter by Denis Matthews at this point, whilst the other studies clearly designate a section devoted to Mozart's concertos. In all of these works there is an introductory section, which usually explores influences upon Mozart's concertos. Grayson notes that:

For reasons largely unrelated to documented influence, attention has focused on north Germany and the most prominent members of the Bach family, Johann Sebastian, and his 'pre-Classical' sons, Carl Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christian.<sup>128</sup>

Tovey presents this approach in his smaller article entitled 'Concerto',<sup>129</sup> describing a path from Johann Sebastian Bach, via his sons Carl Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christian, to Mozart, and then on to the further developments of Beethoven, Brahms and others. Haydn is not mentioned at all in this brief history of the concerto genre, though this is perhaps not surprising given how few of Haydn's works Tovey knew at the start of the twentieth century. Much is made of the arrangements in concerto form that Mozart made of sonatas by J. C. Bach and others in his early years. This section usually attempts some justification for the heavy emphasis on Mozart, but without any detailed comparison with his contemporaries.

The final stage consists of exploring Mozart's concertos in more detail. This is almost always done chronologically, focusing upon selected concertos from Mozart's large

---

<sup>128</sup> Grayson, *Mozart, Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K. 467*, 7.

<sup>129</sup> See Donald Francis Tovey, 'The Concerto' *The Forms of Music: Musical Articles from the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), 14–18.

output. Some commentaries look at all the concertos, but most emphasize the ‘great’ or ‘mature’ works, as defined by the author’s own aesthetic criteria. The style of analysis is usually similar to Tovey’s, taking each work in turn and describing a selected number of features. Veinus attempts to justify this approach by writing that Mozart’s ‘total accomplishment cannot be given in a single descriptive summary’.<sup>130</sup>

Mozart’s concertos represent an extremely important part of the Classical concerto repertoire, but this standard scheme places an overwhelming emphasis upon them. With the exception of Roeder and Keefe’s sections on Haydn, which both focus their attention on Haydn’s later concertos, there is no serious attempt to engage with Classical concertos other than those by Mozart. Haydn, especially in the case of his early-Esterházy concertos, and his contemporaries would benefit from a more balanced approach to the subject.

### 3.7 Perspectives: First Movements

Literature on the Classical concerto displays a disproportionate emphasis upon the study of first-movement concerto form. One of Tovey’s quotes on the matter has already been referred to above, but he goes on to claim that:

Only the analysis of individual works can adequately show the later developments of the true concerto form. These chiefly concern the first movement; for the other

---

<sup>130</sup> Veinus, *The Concerto*, 73.

movements are not much prevented by the special conditions of concerto form from growing on ordinary lines.<sup>131</sup>

In his introduction to the *Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, Keefe explains that ‘the most popular topic in critical discourse on concertos – especially those of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries – is first movement form’,<sup>132</sup> whilst Webster also alludes to ‘our tendency to give opening movements – the most sonata-like ones – the lion’s share of attention’.<sup>133</sup> The majority of the articles listed in the bibliography below refer to aspects of first movements, whilst the monographs are dominated by Tovey’s approach of looking in detail at first movements before offering cursory glances at second and third movements.<sup>134</sup>

The implication is often that the more important dialogue between orchestra and soloist occurs in the first movement. It is certainly the case that an audience is usually used to the duality involved by the time the opening movement is over, but this offers a limited view of the genre. In reality, first movements are the most commonly referred to because they provide a wide range of designs within a relatively straightforward and consistent framework, whilst second and third movements are presented in range of different forms. As Grayson refers to in relation to Mozart, comparing first movements is

---

<sup>131</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 26.

<sup>132</sup> Keefe (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, 15.

<sup>133</sup> James Webster, ‘Are Mozart’s Concertos “Dramatic”? Concerto ritornellos vs Aria Introductions in the 1780s’ *Mozart’s Piano Concertos, Text, Context, Interpretation* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1996), 112.

<sup>134</sup> Tovey’s article (‘The Classical Concerto’) explores the first movement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in C (K. 503) for eight pages, before looking at the second and third movements for just two pages. Rosen’s (*The Classical Style*) exploration of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in Eb (K. 271) takes a similar approach, devoting fifteen pages to the first movement and just four to the second and third movements combined. Ratner’s (*Classic Music*) chapter on the concerto includes just one page that refers to movements other than the first. As a more contemporary example, Keefe’s (*Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*) exploration of Haydn’s concertos refers briefly to the second movement of the Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII:11), but otherwise explores only the first movements of these works.

therefore a much simpler procedure because ‘Mozart used a variety of forms for his slow movements, but the same for first movements’.<sup>135</sup> As a result, only expansive studies such as Hepokoski and Darcy’s are able to grapple successfully with the greater variety of options offered by second and third movements.

Webster notes that ‘the recurrence of specific dialogic procedures across Mozart’s three-movement cycle is a standard feature of his piano concertos’.<sup>136</sup> The same may be said for Haydn’s concertos, which often display a correlation between movements. As described in Chapter 1, Haydn is particularly careful how he introduces the solo part in each movement, employing his conspicuous *messa di voce* pedal-C entry at the start of both the second and third movements of the Cello Concerto in C. He also reserves the soloist’s most singing and virtuosic passages for the later movements, along with his most daring harmonic moves and dynamic orchestral writing. In this work, as in many Classical concertos, the intensity increases rather than decreases throughout the work. It is also important to note that Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C uses what is often referred to as ‘first movement concerto form’ as the basis for all three movements of this concerto. This enables Haydn to initiate the listener with a given structure, before altering elements of it at crucial moments.

It is clear that studying the Classical concerto by dealing only with opening movement of each concerto is a limited approach. This is particularly important in the case of Haydn’s concertos, which are often criticized for having weaker first movements. In Jones’s damning appraisal of Haydn’s early concertos, he concedes that:

---

<sup>135</sup> Grayson, *Mozart, Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K. 467*, 19.

<sup>136</sup> James Webster, ‘Dialogue and Drama in Mozart’s Three-Movement Concerto Cycles’ *Mozart’s Piano Concertos* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), 158.

In fairness, however, the weakness of the mid century concerto was most apparent in first movements. There were many beautiful and highly effective slow movements written during the middle decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and a number of exciting finales.<sup>137</sup>

Studies of the Classical concerto would benefit from a more thorough approach in relation to their later movements.

### 3.8 Perspectives: The Classical Concerto from 1750 to 1775

The overt Mozart-emphasis found in literature on the Classical concerto since the start of the nineteenth century has provided a distorted perspective upon concertos from the third quarter of the eighteenth century. Complications regarding the use of the term ‘Classical concerto’ have already been alluded to at the start of this chapter, but they are particularly appropriate in this case. Concertos written over the period from c.1750 to c.1775 are generally considered to be ‘Classical concertos’, but studies focused upon Mozart’s concertos usually present these works as weaker precursors. This is particularly apparent in the titles alluded to above: Landon’s ‘The Pre-Classical Concerto and the Classical Concerto Parallel to Mozart’ and Roeder’s ‘The Emergence of the Classical Concerto’. The implication is that Mozart’s concertos and those from the last quarter of the eighteenth century represent the ‘true’ or ‘mature’ Classical concerto form, a stance that Tovey certainly presents in his article on the Classical concerto. Rosen takes a similar

---

<sup>137</sup> Jones (ed.), *Haydn*, 45.

approach in *The Classical Style*, focusing on Mozart's concertos after 1775 and concluding that Mozart 'perfected as he created the form of the classical concerto'.<sup>138</sup>

The *Cambridge Companion* approaches this problem in an interesting manner, presenting an article on the concerto until 1770 and therefore dealing with J. C. Bach and C. P. E. Bach in the same section as Handel and J. S. Bach, rather than as precursors to Mozart's concertos.<sup>139</sup> Significantly, Haydn's concertos only appear in the following section entitled 'The concerto from Mozart to Beethoven: aesthetic and stylistic perspectives', even though the majority of his concertos were written before 1770. An overall review of literature in English on the Classical concerto reveals this period from 1750 to 1775 to be somewhat under-researched. Whilst Chapter 2 has alluded to the favourable critical reception that Haydn's Cello Concerto in C has received, there has been little attempt to explore this work's place within the development of the concerto over the course of the eighteenth century. It is a similar scenario with regard to C. P. E. Bach's concertos, despite a certain amount of interest in these concertos over recent years. Stevens writes that:

Until we know more about other concertos from the third quarter of the century, we can say only that C. P. E. Bach's concertos can be of inestimable value in helping us to uncover that tradition.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), 263.

<sup>139</sup> David Yearsley, 'The Concerto in Northern Europe to c.1770' *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, 53–69.

<sup>140</sup> Jane R. Stevens, 'The Importance of C. P. E. Bach for Mozart's Piano Concertos' *Mozart's Piano Concertos, Text, Context, Interpretation* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1996), 234.

The same might be said for Haydn's early-Esterházy concertos. Concertos from the third quarter of the eighteenth century are yet to be studied on their own terms, rather than as mere precursors to the Mozart concertos that follow.

### 3.9 Perspectives: Mozart and Haydn

Attempting to isolate Mozart's achievements without providing a detailed comparison with any of his contemporaries is a common theme throughout literature on the Classical concerto. In Layton's *Companion*, Landon writes that 'Our aim has been to isolate Mozart, both historically and splendidly',<sup>141</sup> whilst in the following chapter Matthews adds that 'Mozart's total achievement in the concerto form had no remote parallel'.<sup>142</sup> Isolating Mozart in this manner not only affects perspectives of the Classical concerto, but also hinders attempts to contextualize Mozart's achievements. Zaslav notes that:

We will never fully grasp what Mozart was up to: where he got his ideas, what he regarded as the boundaries of the genre to be, what his original contributions were, where he remained conventional, and what can be taken for granted in the way of context, interpretation, and performance practices.<sup>143</sup>

In relation to Haydn, Rosen writes that 'Mozart's most signal triumphs took place where Haydn had failed: in the dramatic forms of the opera and the concerto'.<sup>144</sup> There is

---

<sup>141</sup> Robert Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 57.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

<sup>143</sup> Neal Zaslav (ed.), *Mozart's Piano Concertos* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 8.

<sup>144</sup> Rosen, *Classical Style*, 185.

no attempt to engage directly with Haydn’s concertos however, and Rosen immediately goes on to devote the rest of his ‘concerto’ chapter from *The Classical Style* to Mozart’s concertos. There has been no attempt to provide a detailed comparison between the concertos of Haydn and Mozart in the Classical-concerto literature, or to clearly correlate their respective periods of concerto writing (see also the categorization of Haydn’s concertos in Chapter 2):

TABLE 3.2: Haydn and Mozart Periods of Concerto Composition	
1750-1760	<b>Haydn:</b> Pre-Esterházy Organ Concertos.
1760-1770	<b>Haydn:</b> Early-Esterházy Concertos (inc. Cello Concerto in C).  <b>Mozart:</b> Early piano concertos derived from other composers sonata movements.
1770-1780	<b>Haydn:</b> Possibly none, although the keyboard concertos in D and G (Hob. XVIII: 3 and 4) might have originated from the early 1770s, and the Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11) might have been as early as the late 1770s.  <b>Mozart:</b> Early piano concertos, all the string concertos, and the concertos for flute and bassoon.
1780-1790	<b>Haydn:</b> Piano Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII: 11), if not before, and Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2).  <b>Mozart:</b> Horn concertos, Vienna piano concertos and Clarinet Concerto (K. 622).
1790-1800	<b>Haydn:</b> Trumpet concerto (Hob. VIIe:1).

The majority of literature on Mozart’s concertos focuses upon his late Vienna piano concertos and Clarinet Concerto (K. 622), whilst Chapter 2 has already explored the emphasis placed upon Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1) and the concertos in D for cello and piano (Hob. VIIb: 2 and XVIII: 11). Around twenty years separate Haydn’s

early-Esterházy Concertos from Mozart's Vienna piano concertos, not to mention very different circumstances. Whilst Haydn was writing within a relatively conservative court, Mozart wrote the majority of his Vienna piano concertos for the subscription concert series at which he would perform them. This was a very successful stage in Mozart's life, during which he thrived upon writing and performing these works for a reasonably cosmopolitan and initiated audience. A clear understanding of these differing dates and circumstances is crucial if these composers' concertos are to be usefully compared.

### 3.10 Perspectives: Galantry

Concerto writing inevitably developed and altered over the course of the second half of the eighteenth century, yet the literature's focus upon Mozart's concertos continues to result in a distorted perspective upon concertos written during the early stages of this period. Mozart's Vienna piano concertos are usually described as being in a 'mature' Classical form, whilst earlier concertos are disparagingly described as 'pre-classical' or 'galant'. 'Galantry' accounts for the prevailing taste for clarity of expression at the start of the Classical era. Roeder writes that 'music of the Classical era was first and foremost designed to entertain and please its audience, an audience that valued clarity, elegance and balanced proportions'.<sup>145</sup> Voltaire adds that 'Being *galant*, in general, means seeking to please'.<sup>146</sup> There is therefore often a negative connotation to the term, implying that if something is galant then it is simple and superficial in some sense. Veinus warns that with Mozart's Bassoon Concerto, 'the superficial grace and glitter known as the "galant"

---

<sup>145</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 103.

<sup>146</sup> Daniel Hertz and Bruce Alan Brown, 'Galant', in Stanley Sadie (ed.), 'Volume 6: Claudel to Dante' *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London: MacMillan, 2001), 250.

style began to encroach perceptibly on his music',<sup>147</sup> and Einstein also uses the word in a negative context, writing 'we shall not concern ourselves with the purely galant Concerto for Three Pianos'.<sup>148</sup>

Disapproval for works in this style has extended to many of Mozart's early concertos, which have generally received a negative critical reception on account of the differences between them and the later, more 'mature', piano concertos. Rosen, for example, with the exception of the Piano Concerto in Eb (K. 271) and Sinfonia Concertante (K. 364), is critical of all but the Vienna piano concertos and the Clarinet Concerto (K. 622). He presents his case as follows: 'Before K. 271, his concertos had naturally shown his melodic genius and his grace of expression, but they had not broken, except in small details, with the common sociable style of his contemporaries'.<sup>149</sup> Rosen goes on to claim that the violin concertos have 'none of the dramatic force of K. 271 and the later piano concertos', that the two-piano concerto (K. 365) is 'amiable, brilliant and unimportant', the flute concerto (K. 285c) is 'hackwork', and that the horn concertos are 'slight and often perfunctory'.<sup>150</sup> It is interesting to note that many criticisms of Mozart's early concertos correspond to those leveled at Haydn's early concertos, with Matthews complaining about the 'ungainly passage-work' with 'arbitrary exercises across the strings' and 'mechanical sequences of arpeggios' in Mozart's Violin Concerto in Bb (K. 207).<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> Veinus, *The Concerto*, 76.

<sup>148</sup> Alfred Einstein, 'The Synthesis: The Clavier Concerto' *Mozart Piano Concerto in C major, K 503*. Norton Critical Score. (New York: Norton, 1970), 107.

<sup>149</sup> Rosen, *Classical Style*, 214.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 214.

<sup>151</sup> Matthews, 'Mozart and the Concerto', in Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto*, 91.

It is important not to assume that the term ‘galant’ is necessarily derogatory however. Ratner uses the term in a positive context in reference to Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto (K. 622): ‘Together with the Bb major Piano Concerto, K. 595, and the Eb Quintet, K. 614, also from 1791, this work represents the quintessence of the galant style, the final refinement and ultimate scope of its genre’.<sup>152</sup> Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C is galant in the best possible way, combining balance and directness of communication with carefully integrated moments of deviation. Haydn and Mozart’s earlier concertos offer audiences something different from the later ‘mature’ works, and it is important to distinguish between the two aesthetics. These works ought not necessarily be considered ‘prototypes’ for Mozart’s later concertos or examples of some ‘pre-classical’ form, but rather a style of concerto composition with its own set of aesthetic values. These concertos offer simplicity, but they also offer clarity. It is a musical balance that is possibly even more difficult to strike than that achieved by Mozart in the 1780s. The complexity of Mozart’s later concertos is potentially more forgiving than the crystalline appearance of Haydn’s early-Esterházy concertos. The luxurious sound-world of Mozart’s later concertos, with its greater harmonic scope and more sophisticated orchestration, is enough to maintain a listener through weaker or more flaccid points within the work. Earlier concertos rely on a tautness and simplicity of design that easily collapses if it is not extremely well-managed. Given the multitude of works that Haydn was producing whilst working for the Esterházy family, it is not surprising that a number of works failed to reach the heights of the Cello Concerto in C.

---

<sup>152</sup> Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form and Style* (London: MacMillan, 1980), 289.

### 3.11 Perspectives: Maturity

Musicological interest in ‘maturity’ has already been touched upon in Chapter 2, but it also helps to explain the Classical-concerto literature’s focus upon Mozart’s later concertos: the Vienna piano concertos and the Clarinet concerto (K. 622). There are two monographs devoted exclusively to Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto and a number of articles and monographs on Mozart’s later piano concertos, while more general accounts of the Classical concerto usually couple an exploration of the Clarinet Concerto with extensive praise for the his late piano concertos. Roeder states clearly that: ‘Mozart’s concertos are all of importance, but the mature piano concertos are of greatest importance. These are the fourteen written between February 1784 (K. 449 in Eb) and January 1791 (K. 595 in Bb)’.<sup>153</sup> Veinus, writing in the mid twentieth century, attempts to distinguish clearly between Mozart’s ‘galant’ and ‘mature’ works:

There are moments of self-conscious ‘gallantry’ in the concertos, just as there are moments of genuine tenderness. The elegance of the concertos is at no point a factor of shallowness of feeling, but a component of the mobile grace, the conscious sophistication which we associate with all that is youthful, living, and lovely. To be sure, the profound agitations and exalted sorrows of the G minor symphony, the D minor piano concerto, and great *Requiem*, will not be found in the five violin concertos, for such difficult emotions pre-suppose, in addition to a knowledge of the craft of composition, both the personal experience and the inner mastery of profound misfortune. Part of the groundwork for this was being laid in

---

<sup>153</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 127.

Mozart's service to the Archbishop of Salzburg, but at the moment this undercurrent of unhappiness had broken to the surface neither in his life nor in his music.<sup>154</sup>

Veinus adds that Mozart's Piano Concerto in D minor (K. 466) displays 'profoundly human maturity in every bar of the music, a serenity and a pathos which comes from something more than long experience of putting notes on paper'.<sup>155</sup> The twenty-first-century reader will be familiar with such biographical narratives and treat them with the necessary circumspection, but it is important to understand that it was narrative approaches of this nature that instituted Mozart's concertos in their current position as paradigms of the Classical concerto. More contemporary strategies, such as Hepokoski and Darcy's, provide alternative interpretations of Mozart's works, but have not sought to challenge the emphasis placed upon them.

Section 3.6 has already touched upon early nineteenth-century interest in Mozart's concertos, and it was the two minor key works in D minor (K. 466) and C minor (K. 491) that proved particularly popular. Irving writes that:

To judge from their reviews, the appeal of these minor key works evidently lay in their perceived emotional turbulence, speaking of a world that lay beyond ordinary experience, mysteriously encoding within the notes that Hegelian

---

<sup>154</sup> Veinus, *The Concerto*, 78.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

‘striving to become’ so central to the aesthetic of the early Romantic movement.<sup>156</sup>

The late eighteenth century may be characterized as a period of rapidly changing values and aesthetics that was heavily influenced by the emergence of Romanticism and other nineteenth-century ideals. It is therefore crucial to consider how these changes affected musical tastes and perceptions of the Classical concerto. Mozart’s later concertos are certainly more complex and sophisticated than Haydn’s early-Esterházy concertos, offering a style with more chromaticism, remoter keys, more sharply defined melodies, and considerably more complex solo/tutti relations than Haydn’s earlier works. Mozart’s later concertos suit Romantic ideals far more in this respect, but they are not necessarily more valuable or effective as a result. These concertos represent a different style of concerto writing, and appeal to a different aesthetic, than is found in Haydn’s Cello Concerto in C.

### 3.12 Perspectives: Musical Details

Attempts to explain in musical terms how Mozart’s concertos may be distinguished from those of his contemporaries only rarely appear in literature on the Classical concerto, but it is important to consider some of the points raised. Roeder writes that ‘whilst Mozart’s genius as a composer is already evident in his earlier essays in the form, it only comes to flower in the later works. His remarkable conception of the

---

<sup>156</sup> John Irving, *Mozart’s Piano Concertos* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), xvi.

concerto emerges in the mature compositions principally in four ways'.<sup>157</sup> Roeder goes on to briefly discuss virtuosity, orchestral writing, dramatic timing and melodic elements within Mozart's concertos. The following paragraphs will isolate some of these issues and relate them to Chapter 1's analysis of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C.

Classical concerto literature usually praises Mozart's writing of solo parts and his ability to integrate such virtuosity into the work as a whole. Ratner writes that 'the brilliance of the soloist' is particularly well displayed in the concertos of Mozart and Beethoven,<sup>158</sup> whilst Roeder adds that in Mozart's piano concerto the 'brilliant solo parts are thoroughly idiomatic' and that 'although the works are thoroughly virtuosic, the expressiveness of the music never suffers'.<sup>159</sup> Once again Mozart's earlier concertos are criticized, however, with Roeder adding that 'Mozart's violin concertos are not highly virtuosic works; the upper register is seldom called for and traditional technical devices, such as the use of double stops, are almost totally absent'.<sup>160</sup> In the Cello Concerto in C, and in the majority of his early-Esterházy concertos, Haydn displays an extraordinary control of virtuosity. In this respect, Haydn's Cello Concerto in C stands up very well in comparison with any of Mozart's concertos and Chapter 1 has already explored how effectively this virtuosity is integrated into the musical action. This is therefore not an effective way to distinguish Mozart's concertos from those by Haydn.

Mozart is often cited as the originator of various formal innovations in the Classical concerto. Lawson illustrates this common theme, claiming that Mozart 'developed a number of structural innovations in the four original concertos (K175, 238,

---

<sup>157</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 128.

<sup>158</sup> Ratner, *Classic Music*, 298.

<sup>159</sup> Roeder, *The History of the Concerto*, 128.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 137.

246 and 271)'.<sup>161</sup> In reality, Mozart continued to experiment with the various formal possibilities presented by the concerto form, most of which had already been explored by Haydn, C. P. E. Bach, J. C. Bach and others. Rosen, for example, writes about Mozart's use of the soloist at the start of the Piano Concerto in Eb (K. 271): 'At the age of twenty, with what may be considered his first large-scale masterpiece in any form, Mozart solved this problem in a manner as brutal and as simple as breaking the neck of the bottle to open it', before adding that 'it was a solution so striking that Mozart never used it again'.<sup>162</sup> The implication is that this was an original and remarkable choice, when in fact it had already been tried by earlier exponents of the Classical concerto.<sup>163</sup> Matthews writes that in his earliest years Mozart 'had already grasped the principles of good concerto writing, delaying vital key-changes until the entry of the solo, holding back secondary material, exploiting antiphony and repartee, and adding cadences and cadence themes'.<sup>164</sup> All of these elements may be found in Haydn's Cello Concerto in C and certainly do not distinguish Mozart's concertos from those of his contemporaries. Only a detailed study of Mozart's contemporaries will enable informed comparisons to be made.

Mozart's wind writing is extremely sophisticated and a key feature in his later concertos, but there is a disproportionate focus upon this element within his concertos. Talbot, for example, describes Mozart's 'generous orchestral writing' as his 'most significant development' in concerto writing.<sup>165</sup> Tovey writes that the orchestra employed by 'the masters of sonata form', 'uses wind instruments in every possible combination

---

<sup>161</sup> Colin Lawson, *Mozart: Clarinet Concerto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 60.

<sup>162</sup> Rosen, *Classical Style*, 198.

<sup>163</sup> See, for example, Giornovich's Violin Concerto No. 3 in G (1775). He repeats this procedure in his Violin Concerto No. 16 in G (1795).

<sup>164</sup> Matthews, 'Mozart and the Concerto', in Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto*, 76.

<sup>165</sup> Michael Talbot, 'The Concerto', in Stanley Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London: MacMillan, 2001).

with the strings, sometimes opposed in groups, as in the old concerto grosso, sometimes in solos, and constantly in perfect blending of tone with the strings as part of the compact chorus'.<sup>166</sup> This demand for independent wind writing in Classical concertos has distorted approaches to Haydn's works in this genre. Landon writes that Haydn's concertos are 'lacking the complexity and richness of interplay between soloist and orchestra of Mozart's great concertos'.<sup>167</sup> Veinus also refers specifically to Haydn in this respect, writing that in terms of orchestral involvement 'Haydn's contribution shows itself, therefore, as considerably less than Mozart's and somewhat more than J. C. Bach's'.<sup>168</sup> In reality, Haydn's Cello Concerto in C incorporates the wind players carefully and effectively over the course of the work, as illustrated in detail during Chapter 1. Wind playing improved considerably over the course of the eighteenth century and Mozart's concertos certainly take advantage of these developments, but this fact alone should not be used to assert their supremacy over the multitude of earlier Classical concertos that effectively handle smaller orchestras.<sup>169</sup>

Studies of the Classical concerto have generally failed to distinguish effectively between Mozart's concertos and those of his contemporaries. Rosen writes a fascinating section of his 'Concerto' chapter from *The Classical Style* devoted to Mozart's handling of tonal relations, but passages of this nature are rare.<sup>170</sup> There is also some excellent literature on Mozart's concertos, but none of these works attempt to comprehensively compare Mozart's concertos to those of Haydn or his other contemporaries. This has

---

<sup>166</sup> Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos*, 15.

<sup>167</sup> Landon, 'The Pre-Classical Concerto and the Concerto Parallel to Mozart', in Layton (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto*, 62.

<sup>168</sup> Veinus, *The Concerto*, 72.

<sup>169</sup> Haydn's later concertos also take advantage of eighteenth-century improvements in wind playing, featuring progressively more sophisticated wind parts in the concertos in D for cello (Hob. VIIb: 2) and piano (Hob. XVIII: 11), and particularly in the Trumpet Concerto (Hob. VIIe: 1).

<sup>170</sup> Rosen, *Classical Style*, 185–189.

resulted in distorted perspectives on the Classical concerto that remain unchallenged to this day, damaging the reputation of earlier Classical concertos and Haydn's Cello Concerto in C in particular.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1

Elements from the Second Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C			
Ritornello 1:	A: 1→7 B: 8→15	Solo 2:	(A): 57→58 A: 59→65 G: 66→72 <sup>3</sup> B: 72 <sup>3</sup> →79
Solo 1:	(A): 16→17 A: 18→24 (A): 25→26 A: 27 →34 D: 34 (Tutti) B: 35→46 E: 46 (Tutti) F: 47→50	Solo 2a: (Ritornello 3)	H: 80→88
Ritornello 2:	F: 51→56	Solo 3:	(A): 89→90 A: 91→97 D: 97 (Tutti) B: 98→111
		Ritornello 4:	B: 112→116

### APPENDIX 2

Elements from the Third Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C			
Ritornello 1:	A: 1→6 B: 7→14 C: 15→20 A: 21→24 D: 25→30 E: 31→34 F: 35→40	Ritornello 2:	E: 98→101 F: 102→106
Solo 1:	A: 41→48 G: 49→55 H: 56→59 I: 60→65 A: 66→70 J: 71→80 A: 81→84 D: 85→89 K: 90→94 L: 95→98	Solo 2:	A: 107→117 M: 118→128 N: 129→139 M: 140→146 D: 147→151 O: 152→156
		Ritornello 3:	A: 173→180 G: 181→189 H: 190→194 I: 195→205 A: 206→210 J: 211→223 A: 224→227 D: 228→233 E: 234→235 (Tutti) K: 236→242 L: 243→246 F: 247→250
			Ritornello 4:
			E: 251→253

# Appendix 3

Annotated score of the First Movement of Haydn's Cello Concerto in C

**KONZERT in C**  
Moderato  
Hoboken VIIb:1

**R1**

Oboe I  
Oboe II  
2 Corni in C  
Violino I  
Violino II  
Viola  
Violoncello  
Basso

1

11

**B**

**A**

© 1981 by G. Henle Verlag, München

Musical score for page 2, measures 1-8. The score consists of two systems of five staves each. The first system is marked with a 'C' and a 'T' above the first staff. The second system is marked with a 'D' and a 'T' above the first staff. The music features complex rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across all staves.

Musical score for page 3, measures 9-16. The score consists of two systems of five staves each. The first system is marked with an 'E' and a 'T' above the first staff. The second system is marked with an 'F' and a 'T' above the first staff. The music continues with complex rhythmic patterns and melodic lines.

1 G

Musical score system 1, measures 1-23. It features a grand staff with five staves. The top staff contains a melodic line with various ornaments and slurs. The lower staves provide harmonic accompaniment. A section marker 'SI A' is placed at the end of the system. Dynamics markings include *p* and *mp*. A 'Solo' marking is present in the lower staves.

Musical score system 2, measures 24-28. It continues the grand staff from the previous system. The melodic line in the top staff shows further development with slurs and ornaments. The accompaniment remains consistent in style. A section marker 'H' is located at the bottom right of the system.

SI A

C

Musical score system 3, measures 29-33. This system continues the grand staff. The melodic line in the top staff features a prominent slur and a fermata. The accompaniment consists of rhythmic patterns. A section marker 'C' is positioned at the end of the system. Dynamics markings include *p* and *mp*.

Musical score system 4, measures 34-38. This system concludes the grand staff. The melodic line in the top staff ends with a fermata. The accompaniment provides a final harmonic setting. A section marker 'H' is located at the bottom right of the system.

39

-I

35

F

39

-F

G

35

G

59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64

G

R2 A K

Tutti

65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70

D

p

**F** **G**

**S2** **A**

**C** **M**

Musical score for page 12, measures 70-75. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 70-72) includes a large handwritten 'N' at the end. The second system (measures 73-74) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 75-76) concludes the page with a double bar line.

Musical score for page 12, measures 77-82. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 77-79) includes a large handwritten 'N' at the end. The second system (measures 80-81) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 82-83) concludes the page with a double bar line.

Musical score for page 12, measures 84-89. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 84-86) includes a large handwritten 'N' at the end. The second system (measures 87-88) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 89-90) concludes the page with a double bar line.

Musical score for page 13, measures 91-96. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 91-93) includes a large handwritten 'F' at the end. The second system (measures 94-95) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 96-97) concludes the page with a double bar line.

Musical score for page 13, measures 98-103. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 98-100) includes a large handwritten 'F' at the end. The second system (measures 101-102) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 103-104) concludes the page with a double bar line.

Musical score for page 13, measures 105-110. The score consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 105-107) includes a large handwritten 'F' at the end. The second system (measures 108-109) continues the musical notation. The third system (measures 110-111) concludes the page with a double bar line.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

*pianiss.*  
*pianiss.*  
*pianiss.*  
*pianiss.*

P  
R3  
E

39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

**Q** **F**

**A**

*Solo* **p**

**C**

**H**

Musical score for page 18, measures 106-110. The score consists of five staves. A large 'R' is written vertically on the right side of the staves. The music includes various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across the staves.

Musical score for page 18, measures 106-110. The score consists of five staves. A large 'S' is written vertically on the right side of the staves. The music includes various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across the staves.

Musical score for page 19, measures 111-114. The score consists of five staves. A large 'T' is written vertically on the right side of the staves. The music includes various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across the staves.

Musical score for page 19, measures 111-114. The score consists of five staves. A large 'E' is written vertically on the right side of the staves. The music includes various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines across the staves.

118

119

120

121

F

G

J

[pp]

[p]

[pp]

[pp]

pianissimo.

124

125

126

127

G

A

E

[pp]

[p]

[pp]

[p]

[pp]

[p]

Der Quelle nachträglich von alter Hand hinzugefügt. Cadenza added to the source by another hand at an early date.

The image displays a musical score for page 22, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system (top) includes a grand staff with five staves. The top staff is a vocal line with lyrics, and the lower four staves are for piano accompaniment. The second system (bottom) also consists of five staves, with the top staff being a vocal line and the lower four being piano accompaniment. The score contains various musical notations, including notes, rests, and dynamic markings such as 'F' and 'G'. The notation is dense, with many notes and rests, and includes some complex rhythmic patterns. The page number '22' is located in the top right corner.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

BALTHAZAR, SCOTT L., 'Intellectual History and Concepts of the Concerto: Some Parallels from 1750 to 1850' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (Spring, 1983), 39–72.

CAPLIN, WILLIAM E., *Classical Form* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

CARRINGTON, JEROME, 'Cadential Trills: examining the 32 cadential trills in Haydn's cello concerto in C' *Strings*, Vol. 20, Issue 6:135, (2006), 40–45.

CLARK, CARYL (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

COLE, WILLIAM, *The Form of Music* (London: ABRSM, 1997), 67–79.

DAVIS, SHELLEY, 'H. C. Koch, the Classic Concerto, and the Sonata-Form Retransition' *The Journal of Musicology*, Vol. 2, No. 1, (Winter, 1983), 45–61.

ETHERIDGE, DAVID, *Mozart's Clarinet Concerto: the Clarinetists' View* (Gretna, La: Pelican Pub. Co., 1983).

FORMAN, DENIS, *Mozart's Concerto Form* (London: Hart-Davis, 1971).

GARLAND, JOEL, 'The Large-Scale Formal Role of the Solo Entry Theme in the Eighteenth-Century Concerto' *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 44, No. 2, (Autumn, 2000), 381–450.

GEIRINGER, KARL, *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music* (3rd edn., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).

GERLACH, SONJA (ed.), *J. Haydn: Konzert in C* (5<sup>th</sup> edn., Basel: G. Henle Verlag, 2004).

GEVEART, FRANÇOIS-AUGUSTE (ed.), *Joseph Haydn: Konzert in D* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel).

GIRDLESTONE, CUTHBERT M., *Mozart's Piano Concertos* (London: Cassell and Company Limited, 1948).

GJERDINGEN, ROBERT O., *Music in the Galant Style* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

GRAYSON, DAVID, *Mozart, Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and No. 21 in C major, K.467* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

HEARTZ, DANIEL, *Haydn, Mozart, and the Viennese School, 1740–1780* (New York: Norton, 1995).

HEPOKOSKI, JAMES and DARCY, WARREN, *Elements of Sonata Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

HUTCHINGS, ARTHUR, *A Companion to Mozart's Piano Concertos* (2nd edn., London: Oxford University Press, 1950).

IRVING, JOHN, *Mozart's piano concertos* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

JONES, DAVID WYN (ed.), *Oxford Composer Companion: Haydn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

KEEFE, SIMON (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

KEEFE, SIMON, 'Koch's Commentary on the Late Eighteenth-Century Concerto: Dialogue, Drama and Solo/Orchestra Relations' *Music & Letters*, Vol. 79, No. 3, (Aug., 1998), 368–385.

KEEFE, SIMON, *Mozart's Piano Concertos: Dramatic Dialogue in the Age of Enlightenment* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2001).

KEEFE, SIMON, 'An Entirely Special Manner': Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 14 in E Flat, K.449, and the Stylistic Implications of Confrontation' *Music & Letters*, Vol. 82, No. 4, (Nov., 2001), 559–581.

KERMAN, JOSEPH, *Concerto Conversations* (London: Harvard University Press, 1999).

KERMAN, JOSEPH, *Mozart Piano Concerto in C major, K 503*. Norton Critical Score. (New York: Norton, 1970).

KERMAN, JOSEPH, 'Mozart Piano Concertos and their Audience' *On Mozart* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 151–168.

KING, ALEC H., *Mozart Wind and String Concertos* (London: BBC, 1978).

LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 1], Haydn, the early years, 1732–1765* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980).

- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 2], Haydn at Esterhaza, 1766–1790* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1978).
- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 3], Haydn in England, 1791–1795* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976).
- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 4], Haydn, the years of 'The Creation', 1796–1800* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. [Vol. 5], Haydn, the late years, 1801–1809* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS (ed.), *The Collected Correspondence and London Notebooks of Joseph Haydn* (London: Barrie & Rockcliff, 1959).
- LANDON, H. C. ROBBINS, and JONES, DAVID WYN, *Haydn: his life and music* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988).
- LARSEN, JENS PETER and WEBSTER, JAMES (eds.), *Haydn Studies, proceedings of the International Haydn Conference* (New York; London: W.W. Norton, 1981).
- LAWSON, COLIN, *Mozart: Clarinet Concerto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- LAYTON, ROBERT (ed.), *A Companion to the Concerto* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- LEVIN, ROBERT D., *Who wrote the Mozart Four-Wind Concertante?* (Stuyvesant: Pendragon Press, 1988).
- MCCLARY, SUSAN, 'A Musical Dialectic from the Enlightenment: Mozart's 'Piano Concerto in G major, K. 453' *Cultural Critique No. 4* (Autumn, 1996), 129–169.
- RADCLIFFE, PHILIP, *Mozart Piano Concertos* (London: BBC, 1978).
- RATNER, LEONARD G., *Classic Music: Expression, Form and Style* (London: Collier MacMillan, 1980), 283–307.
- ROEDER, MICHAEL THOMAS, *The History of the Concerto* (Portland: Amadeus Press, 1994).
- ROSEN, CHARLES, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (London: Faber and Faber, 1971).
- ROSEN, CHARLES, *Sonata Forms* (New York: W. W. Norton, c1980), 71–97.

SIMON, EDWIN J., 'The Double Exposition in the Classic Concerto' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 10, No. 2, (Summer, 1957), 111–118.

SISMAN, ELAINE (eds.), *Haydn and his world* (Princeton, N.J.: PUP, c1997).

STANLEY, SADIE (ed.), *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., London: Macmillan, 2001).

STEVENS, JANE R., 'An 18th-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Spring, 1971), 85–95.

STEVENS, JANE R., 'Theme, Harmony, and Texture in Classic-Romantic Descriptions of Concerto First-Movement Form' *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 27, No. 1, (Spring, 1974), 25–60.

STEVENS, JANE R., 'Georg Joseph Vogler and the "Second Theme" in Sonata Form: Some 18th-Century Perceptions of Musical Contrast Author(s)' *The Journal of Musicology*, Vol. 2, No. 3, (Summer, 1983), 278–304

SUTCLIFFE, W. DEAN (ed.), *Haydn studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

TISCHLER, HANS, *A Structural Analysis of Mozart's Piano Concertos* (New York: The Institute of Medieval Music Ltd., 1966).

TOVEY, DONALD FRANCIS, *Essays in Musical Analysis, Vol III: Concertos* (7<sup>th</sup> edn., London: Oxford University Press, 1981).

TOVEY, DONALD FRANCIS, *The Forms of Music: Musical Articles from the Encyclopedia Britannica* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957).

VEINUS, ABRAHAM, *The Concerto* (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1948), 66–127.

WADE, RACHEL, *The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981).

WEBSTER, JAMES, *The New Grove Haydn* (New York: Macmillan, 2002).

WEBSTER, JAMES, *Haydn's "Farewell" symphony and the idea of classical style: through-composition and cyclic integration in hi instrumental music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

WIGMORE, RICHARD, *Haydn* (London: Faber and Faber, 2009).

ZASLAW, NEAL (ed.), *Mozart's Piano Concertos: Text, Context, Interpretation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).