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ABSTRACT

BRYAN PROKSCH: Cyclic Integration in the Instrumental Music of Haydn and Mozart  
(under the direction of Mark Evan Bonds)

Cyclic integration – the manner in which movements of a multi-movement cycle relate to one another – is a compositional device generally associated with music written from the nineteenth century onward, beginning with the works of Beethoven. It is most commonly perceived to be based primarily (if not exclusively) on thematic resemblances. The use of Beethoven’s works as a standard for evaluating the practices of other composers, and the limited number of compositions by Haydn and Mozart including thematic resemblances, have combined to create the perception that Haydn and Mozart ignored cyclic integration in the majority of their works.

This dissertation argues for a broader conception of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart by viewing it as a compositional device that can extend beyond thematic ideas to incorporate a variety of possible elements. These include harmony, texture, form, phrase structure, musical topics, rhythm, articulation, and other musical elements. An analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464, serves as a case study in demonstrating a methodology for eighteenth-century cyclic integration. A broad survey of their practices from c. 1770-c. 1800 evaluates the extent of their use of cyclic integration as a compositional device. The results of this survey indicate that Haydn and Mozart reserve their strongest connections for symphonies and string quartets, and that their practices changed over the course of time.
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INTRODUCTION

Any composer writing a multi-movement work must confront the issue of how to relate its various movements. Even in designating a group of movements as a single work, a composer implicitly relates movements and creates at least a trivial sense of cyclic integration among them. Convention often plays a part in some relationships across movements, through the expectation of a shared key, instrumental forces, and idiom. Approaches to other more involved connections vary widely over time. Renaissance composers frequently connected their mass movements using a single cantus firmus throughout.\footnote{For further discussion of the rise of the cyclic mass and views on this genre as foundational to cyclic integration see: Manfred Bukofzer, “Caput: A Liturgico-Musical Study,” in Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Music (New York: W. W. Norton, 1950), esp. 225-26; Andrew Kirkman, “The Invention of the Cyclic Mass,” Journal of the American Musicological Society 54 (2001), 1-47.} Late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century composers wrote variation-suites and choral cantatas where separate movements held a single melody in common. Beethoven linked the movements of his symphonies, string quartets, and piano sonatas using shared thematic material, and composers throughout the nineteenth century followed his example. Cyclic integration appears in the twentieth century as well, for instance in many serial works that use a single tone row across each movement.

Absent from this history of cyclic integration is the music of the Classical era. Beyond the limited scope of conventional connections, cyclic integration is seen as largely absent from or irrelevant to late eighteenth-century composition, a few patently unconventional works excepted. This viewpoint arose in part because of the reception of
Beethoven’s works as innovative and paradigmatic examples of cyclic integration, and remains prevalent today. E. T. A. Hoffmann, the first to address the role of cyclic integration in analytic prose, considered Beethoven’s music in detail and left Haydn and Mozart’s practice unexamined. Later nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century writers did not discuss cyclic integration in the late eighteenth century either, no doubt partly because the strong interest shown by composers in those later eras to use thematic connections to foster a sense of cyclic integration allowed earlier guises of cyclic integration to pass without explanation.

Without evidence to the contrary, a number of unfounded assumptions arose regarding cyclic integration in the Classical era. These include the notions that Haydn and Mozart’s practice ignored the issues of cyclic integration, that Beethoven invented cyclic integration, and that Beethoven’s works were paradigmatic in their use of cyclic integration. This was undoubtedly an outgrowth of Beethoven’s numerous other influences on nineteenth-century composers. Furthermore, these composers took an interest in cyclic form, something traceable to Beethoven’s practice, but not seen in Haydn and Mozart’s music.

The purpose of this dissertation is to reconsider cyclic integration in the instrumental music of the Classical era. As argued in chapter 1, a casual resistance to cyclic integration in the instrumental music of Haydn and Mozart has developed and remains in full force to the present. This is a phenomenon based upon the lack of a reception history for interpreting connections among the movements of their works, whereby posited connections are dismissed as weak at best, accepted only as exceptional in their oeuvre, or even ignored out of hand. Despite the close personal and chronological proximity of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, cyclic integration is readily accepted in Beethoven’s music and as readily ignored
or dismissed in Haydn and Mozart’s. A vicious circle of self-fulfilling prophecy has developed: Haydn and Mozart’s works do not have connections, therefore their works should not be examined for cyclic integration, Beethoven uses it, therefore his works should be examined for it. Thus there are very few accepted or even attempted analyses of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music. By contrast, the large number of analyses of cyclic integration in Beethoven’s music has lead to the assumption that he connected the movements of almost all his works.

A crucial problem in approaching Classical-era cyclic integration has been the expectation that nineteenth- and twentieth-century organic approaches to musical analysis (A. B. Marx, Hugo Riemann, Heinrich Schenker, etc.) should somehow work as well for entire works as well as they do for individual movements, and that they should work as well for eighteenth-century compositions they do for later works. Each of these theorists argue that organic connections permeate different musical levels, beginning with the motive and working up to an entire movement. However, none of these theorists addresses organic unity among movements. They thus have little bearing on the topic of cyclic integration aside from the lasting impact of organicism on cyclic integration. Organicism itself is at odds with the aesthetics of “unity in variety” promoted by late eighteenth-century music theorists (H. C. Koch, Francesco Galeazzi, A. C. F. Kollmann, etc). However, eighteenth-century theorists are as silent on matters of multi-movement relationships in this repertoire as their nineteenth-century counterparts. The absence of primary source material on cyclic integration, and the difficulties encountered when trying to apply nineteenth-century theories to eighteenth-century multi-movement works have together reinforced the view that Classical-era
composers did not use cyclic integration as a compositional approach in anything more than a small handful of works.

In light of the nineteenth-century focus on relating movements through shared themes, cyclic integration has been seen as an exclusively thematic/motivic phenomenon. The surviving primary source materials and later approaches to cyclic integration are examined in chapter 2. Because overt thematic connections in the Classical era are rare, most discussions of cyclic integration revolve around the question of what exactly constitutes a thematic connection. Other disputes have arisen because these approaches to cyclic integration are not tailored to address the compositional practice under examination.

Perspective can be the defining factor in determining one’s mindset towards cyclic integration in the Classical era. For example, musical topics are frequently accepted as present in multiple movements, as happens with the bird calls in Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird).² Yet these connections do not typically factor into a discussion of cyclic integration despite the implications. Instead they are downplayed as irrelevant or unrelated to cyclic integration, merely stylistic, part of a composer’s personal language, or worse yet ignored entirely. But if a clear relationship among movements such as appears in Op. 33/3 is not an instance of cyclic integration, what is?

A different methodology of cyclic integration is required for Haydn and Mozart’s music, one based on the observation of their practice rather than that of nineteenth-century composers. In chapter 3, I outline such a methodology by examining the role played by a wide variety of musical elements in fostering a sense of integration among the movements of a work. My approach emphasizes the manifold possibilities for cyclic integration by

² For a full analysis of this quartet see chapter 4, pages 142ff. and 197ff.
replacing the analytic assumptions typical of organicism (i.e. germinal cells, moment-by-moment growth, maximal continuity, etc.) with a new set of interpretive assumptions. Thematic resemblance can contribute to a sense of cyclic integration, but as one of many possibilities rather than the only one. In addition, I demonstrate that the strength of the musical elements of cyclic integration, and even the strength of connections from movement to movement, can vary within a continuum from very weak to very strong. An analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464, a relatively conventional Classical-era work with a large number of connections among its movements, stands as an example of this new methodology and its benefits.

The vast majority of Haydn and Mozart’s instrumental works have never been examined for connections between their movements. James Webster has discussed a handful of Haydn’s works, particularly those with run-on movements, while Ethan Haimo has analyzed a few of Haydn’s symphonies. Much less work has been applied to Mozart’s practice. To remedy this deficiency, Haydn and Mozart’s compositions in the major instrumental genres between c.1770-c.1800 (nearly 250 works) have been examined for connections among their movements. These works are surveyed in chapter 4, which includes both brief analyses and a catalog of instances in which certain cyclic elements appear. The goal of this chapter is to show both the variety and scope of Haydn and Mozart’s practice.

The results of the survey presented in chapter 4 are analyzed in chapter 5 and tabulated in the appendices. A significant percentage of the works examined have enough strong connections among their movements to warrant the label of “strongly” cyclically integrated, while only a relatively small number of their compositions have no connections beyond the conventional connections expected of a late eighteenth-century work (e.g. key,
tempo, and idiom). Most of these works include enough connections to be labeled as “moderately” cyclically integrated. The problems associated with determining the strength of connections and of the cyclic integration of entire works are also addressed in chapter 5. Additional sections discuss the influence of chronology and genre on Haydn and Mozart’s practice, and how Haydn and Mozart’s practices differ. I argue that symphonies and string quartets are those genres in which Haydn and Mozart made their strongest efforts to relate movements to each other, and that their practices underwent a significant change in the first half of the 1780s. Haydn’s interest in including extremely strong elements across movements wanes around 1780 in favor of a larger number of strong multiple elements. Mozart’s interest in using extremely strong musical elements to foster a sense of cyclic integration began around 1780, and his later works are integrated more strongly and frequently than his works in the 1770s. I conclude that Haydn and Mozart approached cyclic integration on a regular basis in their instrumental works, sometimes writing very strongly cyclically integrated works, but in a way distinct from the thematically-based practices of later eras.

The Terminology of Cyclic Integration

There is currently no consensus on terminology for the compositional approach this dissertation addresses. In fact, a surprising number of terms have been used at various points in time. Many if not all of these terms include ideological associations. In this dissertation I rely upon “cyclic integration” to discuss any use of one or more musical or extra-musical connections between two or more movements of a multi-movement work. This use of cyclic
integration follows the spirit of James Webster’s use of the term to refer to “aspects of [multi-movement] musical construction and technique [using] commonalities of material.”

There are a variety of reasons for my selection of cyclic integration over the use of other terms (cyclic coherence, cyclic organization, cyclic form, cyclic unity, formal unity, organic unity, unity in variety, unity, inter-movement connections, inter-movement relationships, motivic interconnection, thematic relationships, thematic resemblance, thematic unity, through-composition), or the invention of a new term. The strongest reason for my selecting cyclic integration is its neutrality towards issues of organicism, including notions of growth and unity. Another reason for my selection of this term is its allowance for the movements of a work to be connected at any degree of strength. “Coherence” by contrast, could be taken to imply the continual use of a feature, and more typically addresses connections from moment to moment within a single movement. I use “integration” in the sense of “to incorporate into a larger unit or group” rather than “to combine to form a more complete, harmonious, or coordinated entity” or “to unite (as a part or element) with something else.” I prefer the first of these meanings over the latter two due to its lack of associations with matters of aesthetic judgment or value, as implied in the second definition, or organicism and unity, as implied in the third.

The word “cyclic” itself has a number of implications that require clarification. I take cyclic to refer to a cycle of movements that make up a work, or as defined by the New Harvard Dictionary of Music: “The sequence or pattern of movements in a multi-movement

---

3 James Webster (Haydn's “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 7-8) sees “through-composition” and “cyclic integration” as separate and distinct terms that are nevertheless too closely related to be “meaningfully dissociated.” For a full discussion of Webster’s approach see chapter 2.

4 Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, s.v. “Integrate.”
work such as a symphony or suite.” I do not use the term with any implication of circularity or large-scale return of material, as is typically associated with “cyclic form.” More often than not, cyclic form and cyclic integration have been construed as synonymous, when in fact the two terms have very different implications. For example, neither the *New Harvard* nor the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* definitions of cyclic form distinguish between cyclic integration and cyclic form in any meaningful way:

Any musical form consisting of discrete movements in two or more of which the same or very similar thematic material is employed… Instrumental forms from the late 16th and early 17th centuries, such as the canzona, sonata, and suite, often exhibit thematic recurrence among movements, but [the] instrumental music of the 18th century does not in general employ cyclic forms (though some examples of suites, e.g., by Handel, carry forward the older tradition). The 19th century sees a steady increase in their use, however. Music in which a later movement reintroduces thematic material of an earlier movement is said to be in ‘cyclic form’. In its strict meaning such music returns at its end to the point whence it set out at the beginning, in the manner of the song “There’s a hole in my bucket,” to produce an endlessly rotating cycle; but in practice the simplest examples have been works like Haydn’s Symphony No. 31 in D (Hornsignal), Beethoven’s Serenade op. 8, Brahms’s Third Symphony and Elgar’s Second Symphony, whose finales all close with the material of the beginning of the work. More generally the term ‘cyclic’ describes those works where thematic links bind more than one movement; it is not properly applied to mere thematic resemblances. Examples may be found in many instrumental sonatas, suites and canzonas of the early 17th century (see Variations) and can be cited in a large number of sacred works, like Bach’s B minor Mass and Mozart’s Mass in C K. 317. But they are rare (except in Boccherini’s music) in the 18th century… Since the 19th century cyclic form has been adopted as a regular stock-in-trade of musical structure.

No dictionary offers a definition of cyclic integration, only adding to the confusion in distinguishing between the meanings of all of these terms. Both dictionaries describe a sudden lack of connections among the movements of instrumental works in the Classical era

---


followed by a sudden renewed interest in the early nineteenth century. This dissertation does not take a stance on cyclic form in the late eighteenth century, but it does argue for the presence of cyclic integration in a large number of works by Haydn and Mozart.

I also make use of the phrase “element of cyclic integration” throughout this dissertation. By “element,” I refer to any type of gesture or device, musical or extra-musical that in some way fosters a sense of cyclic integration among two or more movements of a work. Another frequently encountered term in this dissertation is “thematic resemblance,” which will here refer only to the use of similar thematic material (i.e. similarities of melody, motive, etc.) in multiple movements, without any implication of growth, development, or “thematic transformation.” Finally, “thematic recall” will refer only to those instances of verbatim repetition in later movements (for example as happens when part of the third movement reappears in the finale of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony).
CHAPTER 1
THE CASUAL RESISTANCE TO CYCLIC INTEGRATION IN
THE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC OF HAYDN AND MOZART

Each of Haydn and Mozart’s multi-movement instrumental work cycles have, if nothing else, one connection among their movements: the composer’s designation of them as single, discrete works. Further connections among their movements build upon this basic connection either through similarity or contrast. An analyst’s perception of these additional connections depends a great deal upon the assumptions used to examine the music. In the case of Haydn and Mozart’s music, there is a casual resistance towards cyclic integration – an assumption that their works are not connected until proven otherwise. The opposite perception applies to Beethoven’s music, where analysts presume the existence of a strong degree of cyclic integration in practically every work. This difference in perception exists despite the close chronological and (in the case of Haydn and Beethoven) personal proximity of the composers, to say nothing of Beethoven’s knowledge of and interest in Haydn and Mozart’s music.

A variety of preconceptions lie beneath these overarching assumptions. The reception history of these works, for instance, grants precedence to Beethoven as virtually the inventor of cyclic integration, and the first to conceive of his works organically. His works and practice are seen as paradigmatic, with the underlying belief that Haydn and Mozart’s works fall short of his ideal. Taken as a whole, such assumptions discourage even considering the
issue of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music, as to do so is to challenge Beethoven’s stature. By examining these preconceived notions and their influence on our analytic perspective, a clearer view of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music becomes possible.

**The Paradigm of Beethoven’s Practice**

Scott Burnham begins his book on Beethoven’s heroic style by noting the primacy of this composer’s music as a paradigm: “The values of Beethoven’s heroic style have become the values of music…indeed Beethoven is treated as the embodiment of music, the indispensable authority on the question of how music ought to go.”

This is nowhere more true than in the realm of cyclic integration. The casual resistance to cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart derives in large part from the reception of Beethoven’s music as paradigmatic.

The key assumptions in the reception of Beethoven’s cyclic integration are the widespread belief that the vast majority of his works, from the very earliest to latest, have strong and overt connections among their movements, and that the use of cyclic integration in itself was one of Beethoven’s many innovations. Another facet of these perceptions is Haydn and Mozart’s apparently haphazard practice, where “convincing” connections appear rarely, and then only in “special” or “unconventional” works. William S. Newman, for example, argues from these positions in his book on the Classical-era piano sonata:

> An interesting question is the extent to which the movements of the Classic sonata are united by factors [melodic or other stylistic relationships, programmatic continuity, and structural interconnections] over and above consistency of key and idiom. On the whole, none of these can be called a major factor in the unity of the Classic sonata. We shall be finding more instances of melodic relationships between movements in the pre- and late-than in the high-Classic Era, those in Beethoven being the most notable…

---

Mozart’s sonatas reveal only occasional, tentative melodic relationships between movements. About a fourth of Haydn’s sonatas, chiefly from his earlier output, contain possible interrelationships. But these are very tentative too… Beethoven’s use of this unifying device is more tangible and more frequent than has generally been recognized. Moreover, there can be no doubt that he used it consciously [discussion of Op. 106]… Actually the interrelationships are even clearer and more numerous in the earlier [Beethoven] sonatas…

But Beethoven often discloses still other ways to bind the movements of a sonata. Whereas the corresponding movements in many, though not the most important and individual, sonatas by Haydn or Mozart could be transposed and interchanged without conspicuous effect on the unity of the cycle, the movements in Beethoven’s sonatas generally reveal textural and stylistic affinities that would be missed through any such interchange…

Beethoven also comes to mind before any other Classic composer as regards the binding of movements through programmatic unity… Mozart and Haydn showed no interest in programmatic content in their sonatas. 2

Although Beethoven’s oeuvre is assumed to be replete with paradigmatic examples of cyclic integration, only a limited number of his compositions are regularly cited for their inter-movement connections. That is, a relatively small number of his works stand as the foundation of evidence for Beethoven’s supposedly consistent use of cyclic integration: the Third, Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth Symphonies, the Piano Sonatas in F minor, Op. 57 (Appassionata), and E major, Op. 109, and the String Quartet in C-sharp minor, Op. 131. 3

The cyclic integration of each of these works has been either treated in great detail or been specifically cited as paradigmatic. 4 These are the most readily identifiable examples of cyclic integration of Beethoven’s sonatas.

---


3 The Piano Sonata in A major, Op. 101, might seem a likely candidate for this list, but most analyses of this work, including those by A. B. Marx and Heinrich Schenker, pass over the return of the work’s opening theme in the finale with little or no discussion.

integration in Beethoven’s output; they are the benchmark against which all other examples of cyclic integration are compared. Beethoven’s other works are only occasionally evaluated for cyclic integration, and then only in comparison to these paradigms.⁵

The presumptions of Beethoven’s use of cyclic integration rest primarily upon the shoulders of this handful of paradigmatic works. The analysis of cyclic integration in the remainder Beethoven’s oeuvre becomes less clear-cut and receives much less attention by comparison. When these other works are addressed, the arguments are couched in terms that show the connections as only a secondary compositional concern, skillfully hidden, or “latent.” Similarly their elucidation takes much more time, space, and analytic effort. In fact, the few attempts at analyzing large segments of Beethoven’s output for connections often

rely on relationships that appear quite weak in comparison to Beethoven’s paradigmatic works.6

The idea that nearly all of Beethoven’s works are strongly cyclically integrated is nothing more than an assumption based upon the observation of these paradigms and the language used to analyze them. This language often includes covert aesthetic judgments, namely that a work is somehow “better” for having connections among its movements. The implication that these are his most important works means that the remainder of Beethoven’s works either must be assumed to be strongly integrated or viewed as aesthetically deficient in this regard. In fact the degree of cyclic integration in the majority of Beethoven’s works is probably comparable to that of Haydn and Mozart’s works.

All of the techniques of cyclic integration found in Beethoven’s paradigmatic works can be found in earlier works by Haydn. This itself indicates that their practices are not as far removed from each other as they are typically assumed to be. For example, the pervasive thematic resemblances seen in the Third and Fifth Symphonies are quite similar to Haydn’s practice in his Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione).7 The continuous run-on movements of Op. 131 find precedents in the run-on movements of Haydn’s piano sonatas and his Symphony No. 45 in F-sharp minor (Farewell). In addition, the verbatim recall of the third movement in the finale seen in the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies is identical to Haydn’s practice in his Symphony No. 46 in B major.8 Finally, the programmatic aspects of cyclic integration in the Third and Sixth Symphonies are not far removed from some of Haydn’s

---

6 As seen for example the examination of Beethoven’s piano sonatas in Weisel, “Thematic Unity.” For a more balanced examination of a large group of works by Beethoven see Brown, Symphonic Repertoire, 555-56.

7 For my analysis of this work’s thematic connections see chapter 4, pages 157ff.

8 Thematic recall in Symphony No. 46 is discussed in chapter 4, pages 153ff.
programmatic works (e.g. Symphonies Nos. 6-8 [Le matin, Le midi, and Le Soir], 26 in D minor [Lamentatione], and the *Seven Last Words of Christ*).\(^9\) Beethoven’s use of these integrative techniques tend to be more immediately apparent or more pervasive than Haydn’s, but in each instance a precedent for Beethoven’s use can be found in one or more works by Haydn.

Beethoven’s practice has a reception history that encourages the analysis of cyclic integration. There is a framework for addressing the integration of Beethoven’s movements extending back to E. T. A. Hoffmann that does not exist for Haydn and Mozart’s works. In addition, there is a tradition of seeing Beethoven as the first composer to conceive of his movements organically, leaving but a small step to organic cyclic integration. Without this reception history, analyses of the compositions of Haydn and Mozart must either give a full analysis from scratch or ignore the topic entirely.

This difference is most evident in the general biographical writings on each composer, where analytic space is at a premium and where technical language tends to play a limited role. Maynard Solomon can address cyclic integration in the Ninth Symphony in his biography of Beethoven partly because the connection is immediately apparent and partly because there is a tradition of discussing the topic.\(^10\) He does not need to give a lengthy analysis to prove his point; he can assume a general level of knowledge on the part of his audience. His biography of Mozart, on the other hand, includes no discussion of cyclic integration.

---

\(^9\) Burnham (\textit{Hero}, 60) in particular has criticized attempts to explain the cyclic integration of the Third because he sees its finale as problematic programmatically (how can there be a hero after a funeral march?). He also feels that the finale does not really resolve the work in any typical sense. Given this, the Third might be considered more akin to the programmatic content of some of Haydn’s symphonies than to later Beethoven works such as the Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth Symphonies. Haydn’s \textit{Seven Last Words of Christ} were cited for their programmatic integration by A. C. F. Kollmann in 1799, see chapter 2, page 37ff.

integration, as it would require a level of analysis impractical in a biography. There is no tradition, no set of accepted paradigmatic works for cyclic integration in Mozart’s oeuvre for Solomon’s reference.

The reception histories of cyclic integration for Beethoven’s music and that of Haydn and Mozart’s works have qualities that reinforce the assumptions given to each composer’s practice. As examples of Beethoven’s cyclic integration are cited, more are presumed to exist. The comparative silence on cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s works encourages the perception that their works are not cyclically integrated. In The Classical Style, for instance, Charles Rosen addresses the nature of cyclic integration at some length, including a brief acknowledgement of its presence in the music of Haydn and Mozart. He attempts to demystify these connections as common, “traditional,” and present even in the works of less frequently cited composers such as J. C. Bach. Yet when it comes time to argue that thematic relationships only went “underground” between 1750 and 1825, he cites Beethoven’s Op. 57: “Quite often, particularly in Beethoven from the beginning of his career on, it [the use of a central motive as the basis of a composition] becomes explicit; if we do not feel the ‘second’ theme of the Appassionata Sonata as a variant of the opening, we have missed an important part of the discourse.” By not citing a work by Haydn or Mozart, and by using such strong language for Op. 57, Rosen creates the impression that cyclic integration really only disappeared from 1750-1800. Without a paradigmatic example from

---


12 This example refers to connections within a single movement, but the comment is made in the context of cyclic integration and the examples of Schumann’s Carnaval and Berlioz’s Symphonie Fantastique. This is actually a good example of the conflation of nineteenth-century single-movement organicism with the separate topic of cyclic integration (see the introduction for more information). Charles Rosen, The Classical Style, expanded ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997), 37ff.
Haydn or Mozart’s output, and because of the assumption that cyclic integration was one of Beethoven’s many innovations, Rosen has little choice but to rely on a work by Beethoven.\textsuperscript{13}

**Cyclic Integration as Beethovenian Innovation**

The desire to promote Beethoven’s practice over that of his immediate predecessors is a standard trope in nineteenth-century musical writings.\textsuperscript{14} The list of writers arguing for the innovative nature of his music in comparison to that of his immediate predecessors includes such notables as E. T. A. Hoffmann, Hector Berlioz, A. B. Marx, Richard Wagner, and Vincent d’Indy, among others. Each of these writers has, in their own way, contributed to creating an image of Beethoven as musical “genius,” “revolutionary,” “innovator,” and “hero.” While Newman notes that this “Beethoven mystique” had run its course by the beginning of World War I, the arguments made on Beethoven’s innovations in cyclic integration have had a much longer-lasting impact.\textsuperscript{15} The role of cyclic integration in this image of Beethoven is seen most clearly in the writings of Hoffmann and d’Indy, and to a certain extent in those of Wagner.

\textsuperscript{13} The only works by Haydn or Mozart that could potentially be considered paradigmatic (i.e. those works with a lengthy reception history encouraging its cyclic integration) are Haydn’s Symphonies Nos. 104 in D Major (London) and 45 in F-sharp minor (Farewell). Symphony No. 45’s reception history extends only back to 1991 with James Webster (Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991]), so this work has only recently been elevated to the status of a paradigmatic work. In fact its status has recently been put into perspective by Scott Burnham (Hero, 64). Symphony No. 104 is the exception that proves the rule. Its thematic resemblances have been the subject of a number of specific analyses (cited in the survey of thematic resemblance provided in chapter 4, page 179), but these connections go unmentioned in the more general literature. Brown (Symphonic Repertoire), Karl Geiringer (Haydn: A Creative Life in Music, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982]), and Rosen (Classical Style), for example, ignore the thematic connections, while Webster (Farewell, 199-200) mentions the connections briefly by questioning the conclusions of two articles on the topic. The earliest reference to cyclic integration in this work appeared in 1975.

\textsuperscript{14} For a complete discussion see Burnham, Hero, 66-146.

Beethoven’s application of cyclic integration to his works may have been one of the earliest facets of his growing influence on the course of nineteenth-century music. In his 1810 review of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, E. T. A. Hoffmann essentially argues that Beethoven’s integration goes far and above the practice of Haydn and Mozart.\textsuperscript{16} He makes the short statement that Haydn or Mozart used cyclic integration to a certain extent saying, “in Haydn and Mozart this unity prevails everywhere,” but quickly moves on to demonstrate the manifold new ways in which Beethoven integrates the movements of the Fifth so that a single mood prevails throughout the work.\textsuperscript{17}

The importance of Hoffmann’s review cannot be overestimated. It was he, after all, who formulated the classic programmatic interpretation of the Fifth as struggle leading to victory.\textsuperscript{18} Equally important is the very existence of the review: Hoffmann provides clear evidence that cyclic integration was a consideration in the aesthetics of Beethoven’s time and is the first to create a reception history that treats Beethoven’s cyclic integration as different from and preferable to that of Haydn and Mozart.

Part of the strength of Hoffmann’s argument is undoubtedly his own innovative style of music analysis. This review is the first detailed analysis of a work to include cyclic integration as a criterion of investigation. Hoffmann cites specific examples of integration in the Fifth Symphony like no one before him: “Apart from the inner construction, the instrumentation, etc., it is primarily the intimate relationship that the individual themes have

\textsuperscript{16} For a more extended treatment of Hoffmann, see chapter 2, pages 41ff.

\textsuperscript{17} Hoffmann, “Review,” 657; tr. Wallace, \textit{Reception}, 110: “In Haydnscher und Mozartscher Musik herrscht diese Einheit überall.” For a good example of a typical invocation of Hoffmann’s review see Rosen (\textit{Classical Style}, 37), who notes Hoffmann’s citation of Haydn and Mozart, but immediately moves on to Beethoven’s music.

to one another that produces that unity that holds the listener’s soul firmly in a single mood.”

Hoffmann provides the first tangible evidence in writing for cyclic integration as a compositional concern.

Prior to 1810, music theorists had for the most part avoided discussing issues of musical composition beyond the individual movement. When arriving at the point where a discussion of large-scale composition is expected, these theorists exhort the reader to examine the works of the masters but say no more. This lack of discussion in late eighteenth-century sources has been taken to indicate that late Haydn and Mozart had little interest in the issues of multi-movement musical construction, which in turn has led to charges of anachronism. More critically, the lack of discussion has deprived Haydn and Mozart’s music of a reception history similar to that provided to Beethoven by Hoffmann. “Unity” or “unity in variety” were guiding aesthetic principles in the late eighteenth century, but they were explicitly discussed only within the confines a single movement. Composers such as Haydn and Mozart did not leave any evidence to the contrary either. Surviving letters and those quotations and anecdotes preserved in early biographies make no reference to how movements could, should, or did relate to each other.

In essence, Hoffmann’s review has been to use it as a terminus post quem for cyclic integration, as well as a means for focusing attention on the innovative nature of Beethoven’s practice. Hoffmann refers to unity (Einheit) in the music of Haydn and Mozart to show how

---


20 A full discussion of eighteenth-century writings appears in chapter 2, pages 31ff.

21 Mark Evan Bonds (Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991]: 26-8) argues that their avoidance of large-scale compositional practice was actually a result of the problems associated with translating their generative theories of musical phrases to larger sections of music.
Beethoven was rooted in the practice of his predecessors, but he fixates on Beethoven’s innovations. Hoffmann explicitly argues that Beethoven moves beyond the practice of his predecessors in the realm of cyclic integration, and from there it is but a small step to the assumption that Haydn and Mozart avoided cyclic integration while Beethoven relished in it.

Richard Wagner and Theodor Uhlig take this step in an effort to relate Wagner’s ideas of music drama to Beethoven’s practice.²² They argue that Beethoven showed the symphony in the process of becoming an outmoded form (in favor of music drama) through the dramatic linking of movements seen in the Fifth Symphony. Wagner uses this argument of Beethoven’s breaking down the boundaries between movements to propose continuous recurring leitmotivs as a dramatic ideal. By emphasizing Beethoven as the turning point for the symphony as a genre, where cyclic integration forwards dramatic progress, Wagner tacitly relegates Haydn and Mozart’s practice to one unconcerned with such issues.

The most detailed codification of Hoffmann’s precedent appears in the writings of Vincent d’Indy in the late nineteenth century. Beethoven’s role as innovator shines through in his analyses of every instrumental genre, and cyclic integration plays a central part in distinguishing Beethoven’s practice from Haydn and Mozart’s. D’Indy ignores cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music, giving complete priority to Beethoven’s practice. His history of the piano sonata divides into three eras: pre-Beethoven sonatas, Beethoven’s sonatas, and cyclic sonatas (the sonate cyclique). Beethoven’s cyclic integration takes on an epochal status here, as every later sonata includes Beethoven’s sense of cyclic integration (by

definition) and was “written under the influence of Beethoven’s genius.” Furthermore, d’Indy’s analyses of Beethoven’s sonatas includes a complete section on unity (unité) in them and a listing of thematic affinities (affinités des themes) in multiple movements. No mention of connections appears in the parallel analyses of Haydn or Mozart’s sonatas. D’Indy covers the string quartet in similar terms, as the section “Unité du Quatuor Classique” makes no mention of Haydn or Mozart. 

D’Indy’s language shows a preference for Beethoven even when Haydn employs similar integrative techniques. He points out a the thematic recall in the finales of both Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony and Haydn’s Symphony No. 46 in B major, for example, but characterizes them in much different terms. Beethoven’s thematic recall is a “cyclic combination” of the movements and a precedent for César Franck, while Haydn’s is only one of his “usual” quirks, a “little ‘surprise’ for the listeners.”

There can be little doubt as to the continuing influence of the reception history of Beethoven’s cyclic integration in the twentieth century. In fact, if anything, Hoffmann and d’Indy’s positions remain as strong and prevalent as ever. Joseph Kerman, for example, opens his book on Beethoven’s String Quartets by downplaying the role of cyclic integration


in Haydn and Mozart: “The interrelationship and the quality of the sequence among the 
movements of the classic cyclic work was the subject of one of Beethoven’s most far-
reaching reinterpretations of the Haydnesque or Mozartian conception. This is a well-known 
fact, which the reader may fairly expect to see traced extensively in any account of the 
Beethoven quartets.” Kerman follows Hoffmann in giving priority to Beethoven. His “well-
known fact” began as one of Hoffmann’s opinions offered in passing as an attempt to justify 
Beethoven’s practice. It takes Kerman only one sentence to invoke notions that took d’Indy 
multiple volumes to argue. Kerman’s purpose in invoking the “fact” of Beethoven’s practice 
is clearly stated: it justifies the examination of cyclic integration in all of Beethoven’s string 
quartets. Left unstated by Kerman is the logical result of this “fact,” namely that there is a 
covert and tacit acceptance that similar analyses of Haydn and Mozart are unjustified or 
unwarranted.

Kerman, like Hoffmann and d’Indy before him, presents Beethoven as an innovator in 
the realm of cyclic integration in a way that invokes the notion of Beethoven as hero and 
genius. In fact, a virtual culture of Beethoven analysis has developed around cyclic 
integration in his works. As Scott Burnham puts it, “one must now show how musical works 
[by Beethoven] are integral and inviolate, self-generating and self-sustaining systems.”

Cyclic integration is thus a crucial component in perpetuating the inherited image of 
Beethoven as innovator. In the same way, the casual resistance to cyclic integration in Haydn 
and Mozart’s music is partly a defense of that image. Burnham criticizes this trend in 
Beethoven scholarship, but he is fighting an uphill battle.

27 Kerman, Beethoven Quartets, 20.
28 Burnham, Hero, 157-58.
Organicism and the Separation of Haydn and Mozart from Beethoven

As another of Beethoven’s innovations relating to cyclic integration, organicism serves as an additional interpretive boundary between his music and that of Haydn and Mozart. Burnham’s terms “inviolate,” “self-generating,” and “self-sustaining” all refer to the tenets of organicism, and organicism continues to be viewed as the superior mode of integration. Since Haydn and Mozart worked under a different set of aesthetic premises (unity in variety rather than organicism), and since most analytic approaches using organicism are based on Beethoven’s practice, the application of organicism to Haydn and Mozart’s music will always be problematic or limited in scope.

Hoffmann’s review of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony not only provided a foundational analysis for cyclic integration and a precedent of preference for Beethoven’s cyclic integration over that of Haydn and Mozart’s, it also began an aesthetic transformation in music from the late eighteenth-century notion of “unity in variety” to that of nineteenth-century organicism. Shortly after Hoffmann’s analysis, A. B. Marx promoted Beethoven as the composer of a new era dedicated to organicism, one in which the objective or scientific modes of music criticism gave way to a more subjective and interpretive approach to criticism.29 D’Indy’s cyclic form also participates in this tradition. Over the span of the nineteenth century, the concepts of cyclic integration and organicism became conflated and, to this day remain practically synonymous, despite their very different implications.30

Ruth Solie, who gives the best description of organicism and its use in musical analysis, notes that organicism implies a wide variety of concepts, including maximal

---


30 These implications are discussed in the terminology section of the introduction and in the survey of nineteenth-century theorists in chapter 2, pages 45ff.
integration between part and whole, a reciprocal relationship between part and whole, a transcendence of the finite, indivisibility, growth, development, evolution, and teleological growth.\(^\text{31}\) Each of these implications involves applying an additional level of interpretation above and beyond what is normally expected of an analysis of cyclic integration. In fact, none of these notions are implicitly a part of cyclic integration, though the terms have been conflated to such an extent that separating the two can be difficult.\(^\text{32}\)

Practically speaking, organicism and cyclic integration can overlap. In fact, in most cases an analysis of organicism in a work of art uses simple points or similarity or single elements of structural integration as a starting point. Leibniz for example, approached organicism as the incorporation of integrative elements at every level of a work of art.\(^\text{33}\) There is thus a difference of degree implied by the terms organicism and cyclic integration. When integration reaches a critical mass, typically that of constant reiteration and transformation, a work of art can be perceived as organically conceived. A more abstract


\(^{32}\) Webster (*Farewell*, 7-8), for example, attempts to distinguish between through-composition (a term he defines using the terminology of organicism) and cyclic integration, but in the end notes that these “domains cannot be meaningfully dissociated, and the reader must not expect total consistency of usage.”

\(^{33}\) James Benzinger (“Organic Unity: Leibniz to Coleridge,” *PMLA* 66 [1951]: 45-6), notes that “Leibniz believed that all things happen both organically and mechanically… [and states] that organicism is mechanism *ad infinitum*.” The parallel in musical analysis would be that organicism is integration *ad infinitum*. 
The distinction between organicism and cyclic integration is the difference between “organic” and “mechanical” connections. Both terms approach similarities of material, however whereas mechanical features are those elements that are similar without the application of further interpretation, organic features had an added degree of interpretation, one where traits of growth, development and resolution are applied.

The implications of these distinctions are evident in, for example, James Webster’s analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 in F-sharp minor (Farewell). Webster takes as a starting point the large number of what could be termed “mechanical” affinities among the movements of that work (i.e. the run-on movements, motivic connections, etc.). He in fact argues for so many connections that he in essence justifies the application of an organic interpretation of the piece. He then applies a variety of organicist interpretations to the music, including Schoenbergian and Schenkerian analyses, to the work, arguing that some of the mechanical affinities grow, develop, and resolve. These efforts result in an analysis that argues for connections at every level of the work, including among movements. Yet at its heart, Webster’s analytic approach is founded upon a basis of a handful of static shared elements of cyclic integration.34

The problem presented by organicism, and the reason why it has aided the casual resistance to cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart, is the very fact that the application of an organicism to music is a creation of the nineteenth century based on Beethoven’s practice and designed to analyze nineteenth-century music. All indications from the musical treatises of the late eighteenth century indicate that “unity in variety” rather than

---

34 For a summary of Webster’s analysis, and his points on organicism and cyclic integration see: Webster, Farewell, 368ff.
organicism was the aesthetic operating principle under which Haydn and Mozart worked.\textsuperscript{35} Unity in variety functions at the level of structural or mechanical affinities, without the added interpretive level of organicism. Organicism works so well on Beethoven’s music in part because it offers a plausible explanation for how he wrote some of his most influential works. Interpreting the opening of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony as the motive from which the entire work grows makes analytic sense because of the motive’s pervasiveness and simplicity. Yet one could analyze the cyclic integration of this work without resorting to organicism, just by pointing out that the shared musical elements among the movements foster a sense of connection.

The organic analysis of Beethoven’s music does not always yield such convincing results as that of the Fifth Symphony, however, and often works benefit from an analysis of their cyclic integration instead of their organicism. Burnham has argued that organic approaches to the first movement of the Third Symphony have a permanent stumbling block in the patently new theme that appears at the opening of the development. By trying to connect this new theme to earlier themes, organicists destroy the theme’s programmatic raison d’être as a dramatic turning point.\textsuperscript{36} By separating organicism from cyclic integration, a more useful set of analytic parameters can be applied to specific works. In the case of Beethoven’s Fifth, organicism may prove more useful, while in the case of the Third, cyclic integration is more appropriate to interpreting “new” theme as an element of variety with potential parallels in later movements.

\textsuperscript{35} See chapter 2, pages 31ff., for a discussion of eighteenth-century theorists.

\textsuperscript{36} Burnham, \textit{Hero}, 13.
Organicism has two especially problematic aspects apart from the above distinctions. First, musical organicism places emphasis on thematic material (thematic resemblances, motivic connections, thematic recall, etc.), specifically the similarity (as opposed to the contrast) and continuity (moment to moment throughout a work) of thematic material. Because these connections are less common in the music of Haydn and Mozart than in that of the nineteenth century, a focus on thematic material as prerequisite to other connections often excludes their music from consideration. Second, even some of the most ardent organicists have sometimes questioned the presence of organic connections in the music of Haydn and Mozart, undoubtedly because of a perceived lack of moment-by-moment connections growing from the smallest level, the fundamental requirement of an organic work.

Perception, Reception, and the Casual Resistance to Cyclic Integration

The imperative of Beethoven’s organic cyclic integration serves as a double-edged sword for analyses of integration in Haydn and Mozart’s works. When 1960s musicologists worked to demonstrate latent connections among the movements of their works, they were in a sense attempting to reconcile Haydn and Mozart’s practice with Beethoven’s. The benefit of this work was the allowance for examining the music of the late eighteenth century in these terms where previously it had been excluded. However, the liberties taken by these analysts as part

---

37 This emphasis on thematic affinities appears even in Webster (Farewell, 368), who goes so far as to argue that “thematicism, both within and among movements, is a fundamental aspect of Haydn’s art; it is a chief basis of coherence in Symphonies 15, 46, 49, and Op. 74 No. 3.” The problematic aspects of limiting the analysis of cyclic integration to thematic elements extends to the music of every era, not just the eighteenth century. For an argument considering the problems of thematic resemblance in a paradigmatic example of nineteenth-century cyclic integration (Berlioz’s Symphonie Fantastique) see: Paul Banks, “Coherence and Diversity in the ‘Symphonie fantastique’,” 19th-Century Music 8 (1984): 37-43.

38 For one organicist who is somewhat skeptical of such connections in Haydn’s music see the discussion of Rudolph Réti in chapter 2, pages 54ff.

39 See chapter 2, specifically the sections on Rudolph Réti and Hans Keller on pages 54-63.
of their organicist approach only strengthened the casual resistance by making it appear as though most connections among the movements of Haydn and Mozart’s works were weak or suspicious at best.

In the wake of the analytic practice of the 1960s, attempts to argue for connections in Haydn and Mozart have met with stiff resistance, in part as a reaction against that practice and in part as a defense of Beethoven’s iconic status. A strong reception tradition still flourishes in Beethoven’s use of cyclic integration. At the same time, the validity of the analytic approaches of the 1960s have been questioned to the point where there is a general reluctance to accept anything but the most apparent instances of cyclic integration. Since many of these analyses argued in favor of the integrative aspects of Haydn and Mozart’s music, the reception of more recent analyses has been all the more skeptical.

Without a doubt Beethoven’s cyclic integration differs from that of Haydn and Mozart’s, primarily in the obviousness and pervasiveness of thematic connections across movements. However, perception and reception play a more important role in exaggerating the differences and downplaying the similarities than has been recognized. This is true even of some of the most recent writings on the topic. From the outset, analyses concerned with cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart undergo a much stricter level of scrutiny and criticism than similar approaches to Beethoven’s efforts. In reaction to this negative atmosphere, analysts who posit connections between the movements of Haydn and Mozart’s works typically fashion their arguments in a defensive way uncharacteristic of similar analyses of Beethoven’s music. In tandem, these issues make Haydn and Mozart’s connections seem weaker or less apparent than they actually may be.

---

40 The level of scrutiny given to Haydn and Mozart’s music is addressed in chapter 2, pages 63ff., in the discussion of Jan LaRue’s views on thematic resemblance.
Each of these issues comes to the fore in most discussions of cyclic integration in the music of any of these three composers. In essence, there is a tradition of reception that encourages approaching the music of these three composers in very different ways. The distinct pattern consists of four steps: (1) briefly (typically in one sentence) proposing a potential connection in Haydn or Mozart in a defensive or tentative way, (2) questioning the connection’s validity by labeling it as weak or dubious, (3) demonstrating that weakness through comparison to a stronger, tacitly paradigmatic, example of a connection in one of Beethoven’s works, and (4) dismissing the connection in Haydn or Mozart’s music by moving on to a detailed discussion of Beethoven’s practice.

This pattern appears, for example, in Newman’s assessment of the Classical-era piano sonata quoted at the beginning of this chapter.\footnote{Newman, \textit{Classic era}, 138-41.} He notes a thematic connection between the outer movements of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in B flat major, K. 333/315c, but takes a defensive posture by labeling it “tentative,” giving it only one sentence of space, and by not providing a musical example. Newman then goes on to note thematic connections in “about a fourth” of Haydn’s piano sonatas, without reference to a specific sonata. Here his language becomes even more defensive, as the Haydn connections are not just tentative but “very tentative,” meaning that they are on the whole even weaker than K. 333/315c. By adding the word “too” to the end of the statement on Haydn (he says “but these [connections] are very tentative \textit{too}”) he revises his position on K. 333/315c’s connection, making it also seem very tentative in retrospect.\footnote{Ibid., 139. Emphasis mine.} The stricter scrutiny given to Haydn and Mozart is evident when he turns to Beethoven, whose “use of this unifying device is more tangible and more frequent
than has generally been recognized.” Newman’s defensive tone disappears – there is nothing tentative in the extended analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C major, Op. 2/3, that follows.⁴³ Beethoven’s practice gets two pages of analysis while Haydn and Mozart receive a total of two sentences between them.

Newman also assigns functional superiority to Beethoven’s practice and aesthetic preference for works that have a strong sense of cyclic integration. He states that the movements of most of Haydn and Mozart’s piano sonatas are interchangeable, with the exception of their “most important” ones. The circular aesthetic burden of cyclic integration is immediately manifest here: the important sonatas have connections, while connections only appear in the important sonatas. This interchangeability of movements disappears in Beethoven’s sonatas, where every movement has certain “textural and stylistic affinities” with the work that make all of the movements interdependent.⁴⁴ This whole section implicitly questions the notion of the work in the late eighteenth century. He argues that the typical Beethoven sonatas is, in essence, a coherent whole while the typical Haydn or Mozart sonata is little more than a pastiche of essentially unrelated movements. By distinguishing between Haydn and Mozart’s “most important” sonatas and the rest of their output based on cyclic integration, he in essence promotes Beethoven’s sonatas as better aesthetically.

Newman partakes of the analytic tradition of casual resistance, a tradition of treating cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s defensively and with deference to Beethoven’s practice. There are in fact many examples from the musicological literature that follow this same pattern. It appears in more recent writings as well, as for example A. Peter Brown’s

⁴³ Ibid., 139-40. Newman is used here primarily as an example of a tendency of course. He himself recognizes the tendency to extol Beethoven above other composers, and traces a history of this perception throughout the nineteenth century in idem, “Mystique.”

⁴⁴ Newman, Classic era, 140.
2002 survey of each of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert’s symphonies. Brown, like Newman, openly acknowledges a rift in perception between the music of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: “Whereas symphonies by Haydn and Mozart were made up of individual movements mostly united by key and character, for Beethoven, the cycle additionally gained its coherence through patterns of tonality, rhythms, motifs, and anything else that his logical imagination could draw upon.”

Elsewhere he notes that Haydn was “concerned with a degree of cyclic coherence,” implying that Haydn’s practice falls short of a more strongly integrated ideal.

A close examination of the language used by Brown in these statements reveals a variety of subtle assumptions lurking beneath these generalizations that fuel the predisposition of skepticism towards cyclic integration in the works of Haydn and Mozart. First, Brown portrays Beethoven’s practice as an evolutionary step superceding the practice of Haydn and Mozart. This argument follows along the lines of Hoffmann, Wagner/Uhlig, d’Indy, and Newman. Second, the types of musical elements ascribed to Haydn and Mozart’s practice are general and conventional (key and character), while Beethoven’s connections are systematic (since they follow a “logical pattern”) and therefore intentional (since they could not follow a pattern otherwise). This tacitly implies a depth and complexity to Beethoven’s cyclic integration far removed from the conventionalities of Haydn and Mozart’s mere use of key and character. In addition, the statement implicitly questions Haydn and Mozart’s concept of a single work created out of individual movements rather than movements haphazardly thrown together in a work because of a similarity of key. In all, Brown’s


46 Ibid., 231.
argument on Haydn and Mozart’s symphonies essentially follows Newman’s position on cyclic integration in the Classical-era piano sonata.

Brown occasionally mentions in passing specific instances of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s symphonies, and this itself is a step beyond previous efforts. However, his consistently defensive language reveals the ways in which he differentiates Haydn and Mozart’s practice from that of Beethoven. For example, his discussion of the thematic resemblance among the movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione) elicits only a brief statement: “Landon has recognized that the first three movements of this symphony use the same pitch series at the start and that with minimal manipulation, they are also present in [the opening] of the Finale. Such similarities of pitch may or may not be of significance, but they do not contribute to a work’s inherent power.”

As will be shown in a detailed analysis in chapter 4, this particular thematic connection is one of the strongest in all of Haydn’s output, as a similar, pitch-specific theme opens each of the four movements, as shown in example 1.

---


48 For an analysis of the thematic resemblances among the movements of this work see chapter 4, pages 157ff.
Brown’s language indicates that he is uncomfortable with the thematic connections in this work. He labels the connections as “similarities of pitch” and as a “pitch series” rather than as a similarity of motivic or thematic material. This implies a weakness in the connection, as a similarity of pitch could be a coincidence or fluke occurrence resulting from the limitations of the tonal language. In addition, he remains non-committal at best as to the significance of this thematic connection. Had he labeled it as a proper thematic resemblance, Brown would have tacitly ascribed musical significance to it; instead he essentially dismisses the connection as insignificant by actively calling the reader’s attention to the problem of significance. He also makes no effort to note the uniqueness of the similarity, which might have been expected in a large survey of works. Finally, Brown distances himself from the statement by directly citing H. C. Robbins Landon up-front and in-text rather than in a footnote.\footnote{Landon, it should be noted, describes this connection as an “astonishing tour de force of thematic, or perhaps better, motivic unity.” Landon, Eszterháza, 290.} It is Landon’s argument; Brown is just a reporter. Brown does not include a
musical example either, even though he frequently includes musical examples throughout the book. The end result is a half-hearted and ambivalent statement that reduces one of the strongest thematic resemblances in Haydn’s output to the level of an accident.

When it comes to discussing Beethoven’s works, Brown participates in a much different reception tradition and his approach changes perceptibly. The double standards of this reception tradition’s language, predisposition, and reception are at work here. As he nears the end of his analysis of Beethoven’s Eighth Symphony, for example, Brown desperately scrounges the work for connections: “Some may be perplexed by the Eighth’s comparative lack of organic unity in the manner of the Seventh. However, the Eighth’s two outer movements are particularly striking in their presentation of [the secondary thematic material] in unexpected keys; this gesture generates an important shared aspect of the two movements.” Brown’s language here starkly contrasts with the language used in discussing Haydn. Haydn deals in “similarity” while Beethoven strives for “organic unity.” Beethoven’s connection in the Eighth Symphony is patently weaker than Haydn’s (he does not even use the same remote key in both movements after all), yet Brown sees Beethoven’s unexpected key choices as “striking” and an “important shared aspect” of the movements. Finally, the lack of connections in Beethoven’s music leaves Brown’s audience “perplexed,” especially in the context of the preceding discussions of cyclic integration in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Symphonies. That is, this work runs counter to the assumption that Beethoven consistently integrates the movements of his works to a very high degree, though Brown attempts to avoid this conclusion as far as possible.

50 Brown, Symphonic Repertoire, 530.
The assumption that every work by Beethoven has at least one strong element that fosters a sense of cyclic integration reveals the exaggerated ways in which analysts perceive that Beethoven connects his movements. In reality, it is much more likely that, as with Haydn and Mozart, only a handful of Beethoven’s compositions include an extremely strong connection among all the movements (such as those listed in the above section). Many more works fall into the same category as Beethoven’s Eighth Symphony, weakly connected at best, but clothed in the rhetoric of factual strength.

Another aspect of the casual resistance to cyclic integration in recent analyses is a reluctance to state that similarities among the movements of Haydn and Mozart’s works are in fact related. This skirting of the issue appears, for example, in Robert P. Morgan’s analysis of Haydn’s String Quartet in D minor, Op. 76/2 (Fifths). The stated purpose of Morgan’s article is to argue in favor of musical unity, which he does at the movement level but avoids at the work level. In essence he is predisposed to a skeptical view of cyclic integration even while he argues in favor of unity in an individual movement by Haydn.

Morgan criticizes an analysis of the first movement of this string quartet that focuses on the unexpected “minor outburst” at m. 32 as “lacking coherence” simply because it is unexpected and unprepared (see example 2). He argues that unexpected moves to minor “typify classical-period music” and so this gesture does not interfere with the movement’s unity. He continues by noting that the remaining three movements use a similar juxtaposition

---


of modes: “One need go no further than the three subsequent movements of this quartet, all in D and all featuring abrupt juxtapositions of major and minor.”

Example 2: The “minor outburst” in Haydn’s String Quartet in D minor, Op. 76/2/i

Morgan betrays his casual resistance by ascribing these juxtapositions observed in each of the movements of Op. 76/2 to conventional practice instead of cyclic integration. It seems hardly coincidental that all four movements of this work are in the same key and include the same abrupt contrast of modes. Morgan points out the specific juxtapositions in each movement and argues that they are similarly conceived. All that was left for him to do was write a single sentence crediting this element as one that fosters a sense of integration in Op. 76/2, a statement that would have strengthened his own argument for the unity of the

first movement. But in the end Morgan chooses to view these connections as “common” (i.e. insignificant) occurrences in Haydn’s music.

**In the Wake of Webster and Haimo**

Studies by James Webster and Ethan Haimo in the 1990s began to reverse the resistance to cyclic integration in the works of Haydn by providing the beginnings of tradition of reception that included cyclic integration.\(^{54}\) In his analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 in F sharp minor (Farewell), Webster argues that cyclic integration is indeed a critical factor in understanding the work, especially for interpreting the role of the so-called “Farewell” movement. Similarly, Haimo argues that a handful of symphonies by Haydn include first movements with compositional issues left unresolved until a later movement.\(^{55}\) In the wake of their books, a limited set of works by Haydn could be seen as having connections among their movements. However, the majority of his output remained ineligible due to a lack of run-on movement pairs or the absence of disruptive musical gestures. At the same time, however, Mozart’s use of cyclic integration continues to be ignored, with the exception of a single piano sonata examined by Michael Tusa.\(^{56}\)

The absence of a systematic analysis of Haydn and Mozart’s practice, paired with the ever-increasing number of examinations of cyclic integration in Beethoven’s music, reveals that the casual resistance to cyclic integration in the works of Haydn and Mozart remains prevalent today. It also stands as evidence that overcoming this casual resistance requires more than a few example works from the time period in question. Had the only problem been

---

\(^{54}\) Webster and Haimo’s approaches are treated in detail in chapter 2, pages 76ff.


\(^{56}\) Tusa, “Factors.”
a need to overcome a lack of evidence for cyclic integration in works by these composers, Haimo and Webster’s studies would have been sufficient to open the door for a number of examinations of Classical-era cyclic integration in a wide range of works.

As seen in the preceding section, it is now possible to address cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music, which itself is an important change. However, Beethoven’s practice continues to dominate the discourse. Burnham argues that the reasons for this may be the dramatic differences between their practices: “The ‘Farewell’ Symphony may now replace Beethoven’s Fifth as the *locus primus* of the through-composed symphony but surely not as the *locus classicus*. For the story that the Beethoven work is heard to tell is more directly consequential.”\(^{57}\) The continuing sway of the Wagner/Uhlig argument for Beethoven’s primacy as a dramatic composer remains prevalent in a way that no analytic approach to Haydn and Mozart’s music can hope to overcome. Yet even if one subscribes to this as a critical difference in practice, reason remains to give a full and complete investigation into Haydn and Mozart’s practice: “The precedence of some of the material features of Beethoven’s heroic style in the works of Haydn permits us to give a more defined shape to what is truly unprecedented in Beethoven.”\(^{58}\) As chapters 3 and 4 will argue, Beethoven’s cyclic integration is clearly preceded, and in much greater variety, with more consistency, and in a much larger number of works than has been recognized.

\(^{57}\) Burnham, *Hero*, 64.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 65.
CHAPTER 2
CONCEPTIONS OF CYCLIC INTEGRATION IN THE MUSIC OF THE CLASSICAL ERA

Cyclic integration has never been thoroughly defined, nor has a methodology of the phenomena been forwarded. Discussions of cyclic integration in the Classical era approach the phenomena with nineteenth-century premises, including a focus on thematic resemblance as a foundational musical element and an interest in organicism, but even nineteenth-century compositions are approached on a case-by-case basis. No means of evaluating the strength of a given thematic resemblance exists, nor is there any formula for determining the critical mass for how many similarities among the movements of a work it takes to foster a sense of cyclic integration.

In place of a rigorous definition and a thorough methodology, a number of assumptions and analytic conventions have formed in patchwork fashion around the topic. For instance, many authors have argued for and against a variety of parameters used to evaluate cyclic integration. The discussion below sorts out the established positions as a necessary foundation for the re-examination of the nature of cyclic integration and its characteristics in the instrumental music of the Classical era. Over the course of the past half-century, scholarly thought has polarized into the extremes of belief and skepticism. “Believers” approach cyclic integration with the mindset that strong connections await discovery in any given work. “Skeptics,” on the other hand, have the mindset that most purported instances of cyclic integration, aside from the most blatant examples, are dubious
or overstated. Because analyses of cyclic integration necessarily rely upon circumstantial
evidence (neither composer ever mentioned connections between the movements of one of
their works either in writing or anecdote), these extreme predispositions often make for
unconvincing arguments and analyses. The end result has been an absence of a dialogue or
consensus on the topic.

Many of the problematic aspects of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and
Mozart stem from the dearth of analyses and discussions of multi-movement composition in
eighteenth-century treatises. What follows is a survey of the primary sources in an attempt to
uncover exactly what late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century theorists were saying
about integration, both within and between movements.

Unity in Variety c. 1780-1810
Analyses of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music have been open to attack on a
number of fronts, but the charge of anachronism is one of the most common, if most
overstated. While there is no “smoking gun” in the primary sources that either confirms or
denies the presence or use of cyclic integration in the music of the late eighteenth century,
the notion of integration in a work of art has been an aesthetic ideal since Aristotle and part
of musical practice since the earliest cyclic masses.\(^1\) Theorists of the late eighteenth century
all speak of “unity of idea” as an aesthetic principle, indicating that consistency and
similarity were aesthetic concerns at the time, but they almost never venture beyond the
bounds of a single movement.

---

\(^1\) For a summary of the problems of ignoring cyclic integration on the basis of anachronism see:
discussion of Aristotle’s *Poetics*, including his role in developing the notions of organicism and unity in variety
On the cyclic mass as a musical genre see: Andrew Kirkman, “The Invention of the Cyclic Mass,” *Journal of
the American Musicological Society* 54 (2001), 1-47.
The value given to primary sources by musicologists varies widely, and this is especially true in the realm of cyclic integration. On the one hand, primary sources can be ignored as insignificant or seen as secondary to actual musical practice. From this perspective, the music itself acts as a primary source of potentially greater significance than written statements, for example. On the other hand, primary sources can be held up as an impassable borderline that prohibits certain lines of musicological inquiry. Primary sources have been given far more weight in discussions of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart relative to other approaches to their music. This has generally been true of other areas of inquiry into their music as well, as seen for example in the continuing debates over eighteenth-century sonata form, which stem partly from the vagueness of the primary sources and partly from a perceived discrepancy between the primary sources and observed musical practice. Cyclic integration continues to be viewed as problematic even when other analytic approaches with similar problems in the primary sources have been accepted.

The concept of “unity in variety” dominates music aesthetics throughout the eighteenth century. In the 1780s and 1790s Heinrich Christoph Koch, Francesco Galeazzi, and other theorists developed the early eighteenth century concept of “unity in variety,” which called for the linking of musical statements within a single movement using similarity for intelligibility but also incorporating contrasting elements to maintain the listener’s interest. In 1799, Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann elaborated on this theory by calling for an affinity of “character” among the movements of a composition, a step beyond the one-movement discussions that preceded him. Only with Ernst Theodor Amadeus Hoffmann’s influential review of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony (1810) did organicism begin to replace unity in variety in the realm of music aesthetics.
The concept of “unity in variety,” an aesthetic precursor to cyclic integration that examines connections only within a single movement, already appears at the center of music aesthetics in the writings of Jean-Jaques Rousseau. His definition of “Design” (Dessein) in the *Dictionnaire de Musique* (1768) briefly summarizes the roles of unity and variety in way that would be adapted and developed by late eighteenth-century theorists. His views on unity and variety rest upon an overarching idea that connects smaller contrasting ideas:

> The whole must have reference to one general idea [idée commune], which unites it. The difficulty is to associate these precepts with an elegant variety, without which the whole becomes tedious. Doubtless, the musician, as well as the poet and painter, dares everything in favor of this charming variety, provided, that under pretext of contrasting, we have not given to us some broken, murdered music composed of shattered pieces the connection of which makes a complete opposition, instead of a well conducted work.

Rousseau’s call for similarity as a necessary prerequisite for intelligibility and contrast as a necessary feature for maintaining interest persisted throughout the remainder of the eighteenth century and even (with the added implications of organicism) well into the twentieth century. His formulation on the roles of unity and variety hold true as guiding aesthetic factors throughout the eighteenth century.

---


3 Jean-Jaques Rousseau, *Dictionnaire de musique* (Paris, 1768), 142-43, “Dessein”; trans. adapted from William Waring, *A Complete Dictionary of Music* (London, 1770), 116-17: “Il faut que tout cela se rapporte à une idée commune que le réunisse. La difficulté est d’associer ces precepts avec une élégante variété, sans laquelle tout devient ennuyeux. Sans doute la Musicien, aussi bien que le Poète & le Peintre, peut tout oser en faveur de cette variété charmante, pourvu que, sous prétexte de contraster, on ne nous donne pas pour des ouvrages bien dessinés, des Musiques toutes hachées, composées des petits morceaux étranglés; & de caractéres si opposés, que l’assemblage en fasse un tout monstrueux.”

4 The role of unity in creating an intelligible musical statement was especially important to serial composers of course, and the twentieth-century notion of unity had additional associations with organicism. For an excellent example of unity as a compositional aesthetic in the twentieth century see: Anton Webern, *The Path to New Music*, ed. Willi Reich, trans. Leo Black (Bryn Mawr, Penn.: Theodore Presser, 1963), 40ff.
In his 1773 treatise, Johann Friedrich Daube makes a short comment that adequately represents the German adaptation of “unity in variety.” He states that if “one were to go through those pieces which have won general approval, one would surely find that their fame rests not on the diversity of many thoughts, but rather much more on a good arrangement of a few melodic motives, and the way they are fragmented and used in the appropriate place.”

He notes that certain compositions use what later musicologists have dubbed _thematische Arbeit_ or motivic development, a trait associated with single movements rather than entire works. Daube calls for the development of a few motives in a single movement, emphasizing unity over variety in a way typical of later theorists. His language is vague, in that he may or may not be addressing multi-movement works, but it seems more likely that his comment refers to individual movements or single-movement compositions rather than multi-movement works. Yet Rousseau’s focus on overarching unity in conjunction with “elegant” variety remains prominent in Daube’s formulation.

Heinrich Christoph Koch (1787) offers the most detailed discussion of unity and its relationship with variety by calling for the use of both similarity and contrast within a single movement. The date of his treatise places Koch squarely at the height of Haydn and Mozart’s compositional careers. His discussion elaborates on Rousseau’s unity and variety as well as Daube’s _thematische Arbeit_, and would in turn be influential later theorists such as Galeazzi, Kollmann, and A. B. Marx.

---


6 The term is coined in Adolf Sandberger, “Zur Geschichte des Haydnschen Streichquartetts,” _Altbayersiche Monatshefte_ 2 (1900): 41-64; Rev. in idem, _Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Musikgeschichte_, vol. 1 (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921), 224-65.
Koch opens with the aesthetic goal of unity (Einheit) in conjunction with variety (Mannigfaltigkeit) in a general sense. He gives preference to unity, as he points out that “unity and symmetry” (Einheit und Symmetrie) are “still more necessary” (noch nöthigere) than contrast. Without an underlying unity, Koch notes, a piece of music becomes purposeless and essentially unintelligible.

It is well known that every movement [Tonstück], be it short or long, must have unity but also variety. Now if, in order to give such a short piece sufficient variety, four melodic sections entirely different from one another were connected, then this variety would be achieved in such a way that it would destroy a still more necessary characteristic of the composition, namely, its unity and symmetry. Four different melodic sections joined into a period can indeed contain a complete plan for a larger composition; never, however, can they make up a complete whole by themselves without fragmentation and manipulation of ideas. For what would preserve the unity of such a composition when no section of it would be repeated in another connection or given a new turn? And if this does not happen, the sections are connected without any purpose and make up no self-sufficient whole. For this whole has then no modification of ideas, no coherence, and one cannot see the purpose of such a display of thoughts.

The unity of such a short piece thus requires a closer correspondence of sections and at least one of them needs to be repeated in another connection or in a different turn, etc.

I would deviate too far from my true purpose if I were to pursue this subject further. I hope that it will be enough for the attentive beginner when, through brief observations on the examples, I later give him the opportunity to reflect on this matter further and to learn to study models of the masters from this point of view. ⁷

---


Die Einheit eines solchen kleinen Ganzen verlangt daher eine nähere Übereinstimmung der Theile; sie verlangt, daß wenigstens einer der vorhandenen Theile in einer andern Verbindung oder Wendung wiederholt werde, u.s.w.
However, Koch limits his discussion to the movement level, at least in the practical sense. His example of four contrasting “melodic sections” (*melodische Theile*) cannot be mistaken for anything more than four sections within a single movement. The discussion surrounding his remark is also limited to a single movement, typically a very short minuet. This explains his mention of a “closer correspondence of sections” towards the end of the remark.

Koch’s discussion implies the universality of unity and variety as an aesthetic value in musical composition. His tone, as well as the placement of this discussion in a “remark” section rather than in the text proper, indicates that he speaks from an aesthetic rather than practical perspective. He therefore includes no musical example to support his comments. Even his statement that the idea of unity in variety is “well known” implies that he does not address the issue in full. Unfortunately, as he notes at the end of the remark, he cuts his discussion short despite having more to say on the topic.

In his 1796 discussion of form, Francesco Galeazzi, like Koch, calls for the “unity of ideas” (*Unità delle idee*) as an aesthetic goal in musical composition. Galeazzi states his aesthetic principle plainly: “The fundamental rule for the conduct [of a *composizione*] consists in the *unity of ideas*.“8 He gives some specific examples of unity in the context of sonata form. Slow introductions, for example, should be connected to the main body of a movement: “It is good practice that the Introduction (if there is one) be sometimes recalled in

---

the course of the composition [Melodia], so that it should not seem a detached section and be entirely separated from the rest.”⁹ Yet he undeniably confines himself to single movements.

Even though Galeazzi confines his discussion to a single movement, his view of unity pervades different levels of a composition. For example, on the small scale he notes how the development section can open with ideas taken from the exposition and how the coda of a movement works best when the opening theme returns one last time.¹⁰ At the large scale he defines the Motivo as the basis of the “whole composition” (tutta la Composizione). He states, “The Motive, then, is nothing but the principal idea of the composition [Melodia], the subject, the theme, one might say, of the musical discourse, and the whole composition must revolve upon it.”¹¹ Composizione probably only refers to a single movement work, as his discussion never mentions multiple movements. However, Galeazzi seeks unity at both local (phrase) and global (movement) levels, and his terminology is loose enough to perhaps allow for multiple movements as well. By recognizing different levels of unity, Galeazzi argues that unity can be more than a moment-to-moment phenomenon. In this way he takes a step beyond Koch and Rameau.

A.F.C. Kollmann (1799) was the first writer to argue explicitly that the movements of a multi-movement work can interact with each other.¹² In the section relevant to cyclic integration, “Character of a Piece,” he cites works by C. P. E. Bach, Haydn, Benda, Kollmann, An Essay on Practical Musical Composition (London: 1799), 6-7.

---

⁹ Ibid., 191 adapted: “E’ bene, che il Preludio (qualora ve ne sia uno) sia talvolta richiamato nel decorso della Melodia, acciò non comparisca un pezzo staccato, e separato interamente dal resto…” Churgin translates “Melodia” as “melody.” Galeazzi refers to a single movement only.

¹⁰ Ibid., 195-96.

¹¹ Ibid., 191 adapted: “Il Motivo poi non è altro che l’idea principale della Melodia, il Soggetto, il Tema, dirò così, del discorso Musicale, e su di cui tutta la Composizione aggrir si deve.” Churgin again translates “Melodia” as “melody.”

Clementi, and himself as examples of how an affinity of “character” can create a sense of connection among the movements of a work. At the same time his passing comments on variety reveal a knowledge of the writings of his Continental counterparts.

A piece may be composed, either in a certain prescribed character, or its character may be optional. But in both cases it ought to have some general character, which receives its shades and lights from particular characteristics. Of the former sort, or of a prescribed character, are: … Haydn’s Seven [Last] Words of Christ… Also characteristic overtures; and all those vocal pieces, in which the music properly expresses the words.

Of the latter sort, or of an optional character, are all well composed sonatas, symphonies, concertos, [etc]. …

When a piece consists of two or more movements, a previous calculation must be made of the variety as well, [sic] as the relation of character between those movements, [as shown previously through mode, key, meter, rhythm, subjects, modulation, imitation, variation, and instrumentation]; so that one general character may be found in the whole, and yet particular characteristic in every movement, to set each other off by a judicious variety.  

Kollmann’s notion of character revolves around an underlying “idea” in a work. His “prescribed character” is a character predetermined by the text or programmatic title, hence his citation of Haydn’s Seven Last Words of Christ. Kollmann’s “optional character” appears to be a character chosen by the composer and left unstated. He divides character into two categories, “general” and the “particular.” His particular characteristics are synonymous with program music and texted works (they refer to specific extra-musical things), while he describes his general characteristics using references to emotions, for example a “degree of Graveness or Vivacity… and the movement and measure, subjects, air and harmony of the piece must be calculated accordingly.”

---

13 Ibid., 6-7. Italics original.
14 Ibid., 7. Kollmann’s notion of general character is thus in line with E. T. A. Hoffmann’s notion of Charakter (see discussion below) as well as the 1813 description of character given by Anton Reicha, Traité de mélodie (Paris, 1813); trans. Peter M. Landey, Treatise on Melody (Hillsdale NY: Pendragon Press, 2000), 106-7.
In his discussion of variety, Kollmann’s shows his roots in the ideas of earlier theorists. He notes that works need an underlying character but movements need variety: “When a piece consists of two or more movements, a previous calculation must be made of the variety as well, as the relation of character between those movements... so that one general character may be found in the whole, and yet particular characteristics in every movement, to set each other off by a judicious variety.”\textsuperscript{15} Kollmann’s statement is essentially that of Rameau’s \textit{idée commune} and Galeazzi’s \textit{motivo} unequivocally applied to multiple movements instead of single movements or sections of movements.

Kollmann is the only late eighteenth-century theorist to discuss multi-movement composition in specific. His treatise stands as evidence that the issues of multi-movement composition were at the very least a growing concern during Haydn’s lifetime. In applying the prevalent ideas on unity in variety to entire works, he takes a step beyond Koch and Galeazzi, but essentially argues that their earlier ideas are as applicable to entire works as they are to single movements.

Georg August Griesinger’s 1810 biography of Haydn provides a direct connection between the aesthetic positions on unity found in Koch and Galeazzi and Kollmann’s notion of character with the composer himself. Griesinger presents a quotation in which Haydn gives an account of his compositional process for single movements that follows Galeazzi closely.

“I sat down, began to improvise, sad or happy according to my mood, serious or trifling. Once I had seized upon an idea, my whole endeavor was to develop and sustain it in keeping with the rules of art. Thus I sought to keep going, and this is where so many of our new composers fall down. They string out one little piece after another, they break off when they have

\textsuperscript{15} Kollmann, \textit{Essay}, 7. Italics original.
hardly begun, and nothing remains in the heart when one has listened to it.”

The *Idee* used by Haydn seems to refer to a musical theme or motive, hence his concern with sustaining an idea and coherent development over the course of a movement. Haydn asserts that his movements are based on a single musical idea, just as Galeazzi says a composer should. In addition, his reference to improvising according to mood and emotional state falls in line with Kollmann’s notion of connecting works through a general character. At the very least Haydn was aware of consistency as a guiding aesthetic principle as well some of the other issues seen in the theoretical sources.

The primary sources most relevant to the music of Haydn and Mozart leave a mixed picture of the status of cyclic integration in the late eighteenth century. Only Kollmann explicitly approaches the issues involved in creating multi-movement compositions, and his discussion revolves chiefly around programmatic rather than purely musical considerations. Nevertheless, unity in variety (a unity of ideas combined with contrast to maintain interest) as well as a consistency of musical material, emotional state, and character were regularly cited aesthetic goals throughout the eighteenth century. More importantly, Kollmann in particular demonstrates how the notion of unity in variety can be expanded to encompass multiple movements. Because no discussion of multi-movement composition appeared until 1799, however, there is admittedly no evidence (beyond the music itself) for cyclic

---


integration as a compositional practice in the repertoire examined throughout this dissertation.

**E.T.A. Hoffmann’s Analysis of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony**

E.T.A. Hoffmann’s 1810 analytic review of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony is undoubtedly the most important primary source in the history of cyclic integration. Hoffmann here presents the first complete analysis of how the movements of a work specifically and generally relate to each other. His review has been used to justify the analysis of cyclic integration in all of Beethoven’s music, including works composed much earlier than the Fifth Symphony. It has also been used to prohibit inquiries into Haydn and Mozart’s music as a sort of *terminus post quem* for cyclic integration. Hoffmann’s review influenced many later writers, set a new tone for musical analysis, and shaped the very nature of Beethoven’s reception throughout the nineteenth century.  

In his review, Hoffmann follows in the footsteps of Kollmann, Galeazzi, and Koch, but moves beyond them by dealing with the specific ways in which the movements of the Fifth Symphony relate to one another. He notes general connections in much the same way as Kollmann, for example, by arguing that the work has a single shared character (*Charakter*) throughout.  

---


19 For more on the role of character in early nineteenth-century thought see: Dahlhaus, *Beethoven*, 121-42.
Beethoven’s compositional practice, the pertinent sections of Hoffmann’s review do not portray the composer as using a radically new compositional approach in this symphony. In fact he notes that Beethoven’s inter-movement relationships remain rooted in the practice of Haydn and Mozart. Yet he argues that Beethoven took a decisive step forward by connecting his movements so strongly.

Hoffmann dedicates the bulk of his essay to describing how each movement relates to the character of the work as a whole. Here he participates in the theoretical dialogue of the late eighteenth century, as seen for example in Kollmann’s notes on character. Hoffmann sees the specific connections as supporting the affinities of character. He focuses heavily upon how Beethoven preserves a single emotion throughout the work: “a deeper relationship, which cannot be demonstrated in this manner [i.e. through analysis], is often only expressed from the spirit to the spirit, and it is this relationship that prevails among the passages of both Allegros and of the minuet.”

Hoffmann cites a number of specific musical connections used by Beethoven to create an affinity of character among the movements, including thematic resemblance. The thematic connections among the Fifth Symphony’s movements receive the most attention from Hoffmann. However, his concluding statements make it clear that Hoffmann sees character as the root cause behind all the affinities of thematic or rhythmic material, and the driving force behind the power of the Fifth Symphony:

Beethoven has retained the customary succession of movements in the symphony. They appear to be put together in a fantastic way, and the whole rushes past many people like an inspired rhapsody: but the soul of every sensitive listener will certainly be deeply and closely gripped by a lingering

---

feeling, which is precisely that unnamable, foreboding longing, and sustained in it until the final chord. Indeed for many moments after it, he will not be able to depart from the wonderful spirit kingdom where pain and joy surround him in musical form.

Apart from the inner construction, the instrumentation, etc., it is primarily the intimate relationship that the individual themes have to one another that produces that unity that holds the listener’s soul firmly in a single mood. In Haydn’s and in Mozart’s music, this unity dominates everywhere. It [the unity of Beethoven’s Fifth] becomes clearer to the musician when he then discovers a fundamental bass that is common to two different passages, or when the connection between two passages reveals it; but a deeper relationship, which cannot be demonstrated in this manner, is often only expressed from spirit to spirit, and it is this relationship that prevails among the passages of both Allegros [Mvts. I and IV] and of the minuet, and magnificently announces the master’s presence of mind and genius.21

Similarity of material, for Hoffmann, supports a shared character; thus Beethoven includes these connections because he is interested in sustaining a single mood (Stimmung) throughout the work. In addition to thematic material, he notes the occasional instance of other elements of cyclic integration. For example, he cites the second movement’s tonal motion as a connection to a similar passage in the first movement: “The very progress of this theme [of the second movement], which goes through [various listed keys] before first returning to A flat, the continual juxtaposition of the major tonalities A flat and C, the chromatic modulations, express once again the character of the whole, and by virtue of this the Andante is a part of that whole.”22


Ausser der innern Einrichtung, der Instrumentirung usw. ist es vorzüglich die innige Verwandtschaft der einzelnen Themas untereinander, welche jene Einheit erzeugt, die des Zuhörers Gemüth in einer Stimmung festhält. In Haydnescher und Mozartscher Musik herrscht diese Einheit überall. Sie wird dem Musiker klar, wenn er den, zweyen verschiedenen Sätzen gemeinen Grundbass entdeckt, oder wenn die Verbindung zweyer Sätze sie offenbart: aber eine tiefere Verwandtschaft, die sich auf jene Art nicht darthun kann, spricht oft nur aus dem Geiste zum Geiste, und diese Verwandtschaft ist es, welche unter den Sätzen der beyden Allegros und der Menuett herrscht und die besonnene Genialität des Meisters herrlich verkündet.”

22 Hoffmann, “Review,” 642; tr. Wallace, Reception, 105: “… aber selbst der Gang dieses Thema’s, welches …[various keys listed]… durchläuft und dann erst ins As zurückkehrt, das stete Aneinander-Rükken
Throughout the review Hoffmann shows a deep concern for connecting Beethoven’s practice to precedents set by Haydn and Mozart. This drives him to note that the unity seen in the Fifth is similar to that seen in many works by Haydn and Mozart, hence his statement that in the music of Haydn and Mozart this “unity dominates everywhere.” He is also preoccupied with Beethoven’s genius as the instigating factor behind the Fifth Symphony’s connections (as appears at the end of the quotation above). Even at the outset the review Hoffmann notes how Beethoven’s genius is “unconcerned with the form and selection of its ideas, gives itself over to its own fire and to the momentary promptings of its imagination. Nevertheless, in regard to presence of mind, he deserves to be placed on the very same level as Haydn and Mozart.”

Twice Hoffmann equates Beethoven’s genius and “presence of mind” to Haydn and Mozart’s, both times in the context of compositional procedure and once in the context of cyclic integration. He undoubtedly sees Haydn and Mozart as interested in integrating the movements of their works, though not as pervasively or obviously as Beethoven. That is, these composers do not sustain a single mood in the same way as Beethoven, so their integration is perhaps less effective or less overt.

Hoffmann’s review of the Fifth Symphony has been seen as the earliest primary source supporting the analysis of cyclic integration. However, Hoffmann remains rooted in the music of Haydn and Mozart to the point of arguing that Beethoven’s practice in the Fifth Symphony is an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary step. Hoffmann couches his terminology in the late eighteenth-century ideas as well, as is seen in his focus on a shared der harten Tonarten As und C, die chromatischen Modulationen – sprechen wieder den Charakter des Ganzen aus, und eben deshalb ist dies Andante ein Theil desselben.”

character as the goal of musical connections among movements. Hoffmann’s analysis may have influenced later writers to the point of crediting Beethoven with a compositional revolution in organic unity, but he takes great care to root Beethoven’s practice in the music of Haydn and Mozart.

**Cyclic Integration After Hoffmann**

In light of the significant amount of attention given to organic unity in the individual movements of Beethoven’s works in the writings of A. B. Marx, Hugo Riemann, and Heinrich Schenker, it might come as a surprise that analysts say very little about cyclic integration in the span of time from 1811-1960. As will be seen, their concepts of organic unity encompass every level of a movement but did not extend beyond the movement level. This is true even in cases with very apparent connections across movements, such as Beethoven’s Fifth and Ninth Symphonies. Vincent d’Indy, whose thoughts are outlined in chapter 1, is in many ways the exception to the rule. However, his division of music history based upon the rise of cyclic form out of Beethoven’s practice had the distinct agenda of promoting the practice of certain French composers over others, namely Cesar Franck over Claude Debussy.24 Similarly Wagner examined some of Beethoven’s cyclic relationships in the hopes of showing that Beethoven’s symphonies pointed to a future dominated by the Wagnerian music drama.25

The typical analysis from 1811-1960 ignores issues of cyclic integration in favor of connections within individual movements. For instance, Hector Berlioz’s treatment of

---


Beethoven’s symphonies mentions the Fifth Symphony’s run-on movements only in passing, and completely ignores the return of the third movement in the finale. He occasionally finds it difficult to see how even individual movements cohere, as happens for him in the slow movement of the Ninth Symphony.

George Grove gives cyclic integration in this repertoire a more detailed discussion, but he does not mention anything beyond the most obvious connections in Beethoven’s symphonies. For example, he lists two “innovations” in Beethoven’s Fifth, the run-on movements and the recall of the third movement in the finale, but also cites Haydn’s Symphony No. 46 in B major as a precursor. Unlike d’Indy, Grove notes that Haydn’s thematic recall is indistinguishable from Beethoven’s. He also avoids assigning any programmatic or teleological significance to these returning segments. In addition, Grove does not discuss further connections in the Fifth Symphony, perhaps because he knows Hoffmann’s review and has nothing further to add. In the cases of the Seventh and Eighth Symphonies, Grove goes so far as to reject programmatic interpretations that encompass all four movements. For example, he sees Wagner’s view on the Seventh as the “apotheosis of the dance” as an overstatement that focuses too heavily upon the fact that this work is “throughout perhaps more markedly rhythmical than any other of the nine [symphonies].”

He notes the recall of earlier themes in the Ninth Symphony’s finale, but sees this section as

---


29 Ibid., 176.

30 Ibid., 244-45, 280-81.
more of an introduction to the movement than an integral part. The finale does not “begin in earnest” for Grove until the new theme appears at m. 92.  

The writings of the most important theorists of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries address the role of organicism in the music of Haydn, Mozart, and especially Beethoven, but avoid any mention of inter-movement relationships. For instance, the role of formal unity is prevalent in the writings of A. B. Marx, who argues that form is “processive and organic, rather than static and mechanical.” Marx chiefly concerns himself with the role of moment-by-moment coherence, and how seemingly contrasting sections of music (especially Beethoven’s music) can appear in succession and still be intelligible. Connections between Sätze (a term he uses to denote a variety of levels, from the motive up to the complete movement, but not among movements) are central to Marx’s theory. Thematic material creates form by developing and growing to completion. Thus he can approach coherence as if through magnifying glasses of different strengths. This has led to the general belief that cyclic relationships are a part of Marx’s theory, as a larger-scale manifestation of relationships he points out within single movements. However, nowhere does Marx argue that his conception of musical form extends beyond a single movement.

31 Ibid., 373.


33 Burnham, Hero, 72.
Marx’s organic outlook stands in contrast to the eighteenth-century view of thematic material, as seen in Koch for example. Where Marx sees form as dramatic and progressive outgrowth of an incomplete opening idea, Koch sees form as static and unrelated to other factors. In addition, Koch and his contemporaries emphasize “unity in variety,” not organicism. Where organicism links sections, phrases, and sub-phrases, unity in variety allows for contrasting or unrelated sections.

In any case, Marx does not concern himself with cyclic integration: he does not consider how the processes of growth might work across movements. None of his analyses argue that the growth of a musical form progresses past the double bar line, nor does he point out specific instances of cyclic relationships beyond vague programmatic interpretations. For example, he refers readers to E. T. A. Hoffmann for connections in the Fifth Symphony and avoids addressing connections among the movements of Beethoven other symphonies in his article on Beethoven’s output in the genre. Even in his more extended discussions of multi-movement composition, for example his description of the sonata, he notes only connections of a strictly programmatic nature and then only with vague generalizations designed to explain the contrasting nature of conventional sonata movements.

---

34 Ibid., 79. Koch, for example, notes how continuity at the phrase, section, and movement levels fosters a sense of unity, but not across movements. For the role of formal unity at the movement level in Koch’s treatise and his relationship with nineteenth-century thought see: Carl Dahlhaus, “Der rhetorische Formbegriff H. Chr. Kochs und die Theorie der Sonatenform,” Archiv für Musikwissenschaft 35 (1978): 155-77.


In much the same way as Marx, the theories of Hugo Riemann do not apply to cyclic integration. Riemann argues that the eight-bar period is the basic unit of composition, and that it is stretched and expanded organically as the basic unifying element in individual movements. His periods can appear at any level of a movement, from an actual eight-bar phrase, down to a short motive or up to an entire movement. Organic unity is implied in these various levels in much the same way as in Marx’s writings. However Riemann, like Marx, does not extend his analyses beyond the movement level: his period stops when the movement ends.

The sway of connections at various levels is even more obviously present in the work of Heinrich Schenker. However, he too avoids addressing connections across movements in his published works. In his analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A major, Op. 101, for example, he bridges the work’s run-on movement pair with separate Urlinien of their own instead of giving the pair a single overarching Urlinie. He repeats this procedure in his

---


38 Riemann’s notion of “eight true downbeats” (Taktschwerpunkte) is useful in understanding his notion of organic unity, see: Waldbauer, “Periodization,” 336. This article also includes a useful discussion of the similarities and differences between the theories of Koch and Riemann.


analysis of the run-on movements in the Fifth Symphony.\textsuperscript{41} Here Schenker grants closure to the third movement through an arrival on the tonic scale-degree supported by a tonic chord. This is followed by a contrapuntally independent transition that leads to a fresh \textit{Urlinie} in the opening of the finale. Schenker’s skepticism of cyclic connections is also evident elsewhere. For example, he has reservations about the programmatic viability of the returning themes in the opening of the Ninth Symphony’s finale.\textsuperscript{42}

It is difficult to assess the reasons behind the apathy shown towards cyclic integration in the music of Beethoven as well as Haydn and Mozart in the approximately 150 years following Hoffmann’s review. There are two plausible explanations: the problems of applying organicism to multiple movements by these composers, and musical practice in the nineteenth century after Beethoven. The first of these explanations is the inherently problematic aspect of applying the organic theories of form created by A. B. Marx, Schenker, and Riemann to multiple movements. Marx’s forms grow throughout the movement but always reach a conclusion at the movement’s end. Similarly Riemann does not attempt to extend his periods over the silence separating movements, nor does Schenker extend his \textit{Urlinie} past the double bar line. It was easier to focus on coherence at the movement level than to attempt an argument for inter-movement connections.

The second possible explanation for the shift away from discussing cyclic integration in the music of Beethoven and his predecessors may be that contemporary music provided equally, if not more, fertile ground for examination. Many nineteenth-century composers used more obvious and pervasive means of connecting movements than even Beethoven.

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
One of the best examples of this change in practice is Robert Schumann’s Fourth Symphony.\textsuperscript{43} Mark Evan Bonds has argued that Schumann thought that Beethoven had not gone far enough in integrating the movements of the Fifth Symphony. He therefore actively connected the movements of the Fourth Symphony more strongly than his Beethovenian model.\textsuperscript{44}

In 1832, Schumann himself recognized the rising importance of cyclic integration in the compositional practice of the first half of the nineteenth century:

> To unite three units into a whole is, in my opinion, the goal of composers of sonatas, as well as of concertos and symphonies. Earlier composers did this more externally in shape and tonality; more recent composers have expanded the individual units through sub-units and discovered a new internal movement, the scherzo. One no longer persisted in developing a thematic idea within only one movement; one concealed this idea in other shapes and modifications in subsequent movements as well. In short, one wanted to integrate historical interest into the whole (do not laugh, Eusebius!) and, as the age became more poetic, dramatic interest as well. Lately, composers have tied the movements still closer together and connected them through momentary transitions from one to the next.\textsuperscript{45}

He notes that cyclic integration is a goal of composition and also recognizes that 1830s composition involved a much stronger degree of cyclic integration than during Beethoven’s life.

As an important topic in contemporary composition, there was no reason to analyze Classical-era music beyond those works used as models, such as the Fifth Symphony.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{43} For a detailed discussion of this work, Schumann’s views on its cyclic integration, and the Fourth Symphony’s relationship with Beethoven’s practice see: Bonds, \textit{Beethoven}, 109-137.
\item \textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 120.
\end{itemize}
Grove’s analyses of the Fifth and Ninth Symphonies thus fit into a larger context, as does d’Indy’s division of music history into Beethoven’s works and cyclic works written in Beethoven’s wake. This is the most plausible explanation for why so little is said about Classical-era cyclic integration by these nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writers, despite their intense interest in matters of organic unity at the movement level. In fact, a renewed interest in cyclic integration in the music of Beethoven, and to a lesser extent that of Haydn and Mozart, would wait until the work of Rudolph Réti in the 1960s.

This is not to say that no one was interested in examining the cyclic integration of the Classical era, from 1811-1960, however. Arnold Schoenberg shows an interest in Classical-era cyclic integration as part of his effort to root the practice of the Second Viennese School in the music of the First Viennese School. Unfortunately, his analyses were left incomplete and unpublished in the so-called “Gedanke” manuscripts upon his death. They were unknown until late in the twentieth century and therefore had little direct influence on other analysts. Schoenberg appears to have been prepared to argue for thematic connections across the movements of Mozart’s String Quartets in C major, K. 465 (Dissonance) and D major, K. 499 (Hoffmeister) and Haydn’s Symphony No. 104 in D major (London). Had he completed and published these analyses they may have given Haydn and Mozart the beginnings of a reception history for cyclic integration. They may have also given the 1960s writers a standard of analysis upon which to rely, and have preempted the development of the casual resistance to cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s music, or have changed the course of later analyses.

---

As they are, Schoenberg’s incomplete notes do not indicate to what extent he would have argued that the thematic affinities seen in Haydn and Mozart’s music were a result of organic connections, let alone it he saw them as distinct from Beethoven’s practice. Schoenberg’s closest student, Anton Webern, provides a complete and detailed discussion of thematic unity at the movement level, indicating the importance of organicism to the Schoenbergian tradition, but he avoids all multi-movement analysis in favor of unity as a means to intelligibility under the rubric of the twelve-tone system.\textsuperscript{47} Schoenberg however did inspire another of his students, Rudolph Réti, to include a number of analyses of organic connections among the movements of Mozart and Beethoven’s works in his arguments on thematic connections as an element of cyclic integration.

\section*{Modern Approaches to Late Eighteenth-Century Cyclic Integration}

The reception of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart polarized in the 1960s, and since that time has oscillated like a pendulum between belief and skepticism. The constantly changing evaluation of cyclic integration has fed the casual resistance to cyclic integration, as nearly every viewpoint has been briefly accepted and then attacked. Rudolph Réti, Hans Keller, Meir Wiesel, Karl Marx, James Webster, and Ethan Haimo approach cyclic integration as believers, each arguing for a unique position in favor of cyclic integration with varying degrees of success. Similarly, Jan LaRue and Leonard Meyer take skeptical positions, each responding to the arguments of a specific believer in an attempt to show the problems of applying that approach to cyclic integration to this repertoire.

\textsuperscript{47} Anton Webern, \textit{The Path to New Music}, ed. Willi Reich, trans. Leo Black (Bryn Mawr, Penn.: Theodore Presser, 1963), esp. 18, 22, 35ff., 40ff.
• **Rudolph Réti’s “Thematic Process”**

Rudolph Réti, a student of Arnold Schoenberg, was seemingly the first to make cyclic integration an issue in the music of the Classical era. He approaches the music of Mozart and Beethoven from the perspective of organic unity by focusing on the melodic interval as the basic building block of any quality composition; he only rarely considers other musical elements or voices beyond the melodic line.48 His argument focuses on the use of an interval or group of intervals as a “motivic cell” to generate the musical material that follows. He terms this use of motivic cells the “thematic process in music”:

> Every musical composition on a high structural level contains several motivic cells from which its structure is formed. These cells need not necessarily be identical with the concrete motifs. In some compositions the cells may not even be visible in their literal form. The motifs, and subsequently the themes, are developed from the cells; the cells, however, usually represent the essence of the motifs rather than the motifs themselves.49

Réti contends that motivic cells are carried across the movements of a composition so that from the smallest level upward a multi-movement work is composed as a single, organically unified work.

Réti’s analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C minor, Op. 13 (Pathétique) typifies his approach. He sees this work as growing from two motivic cells: a rising minor third and a


49 Réti, *Patterns*, 17.
three-note “concluding motif” (see example 1).\textsuperscript{50} He identifies the minor third as the primary motivic cell in the case of this sonata because he sees it as a pervasive building block for the opening theme. These intervals are disassociated from their harmonic and rhythmic settings under Réti’s method, and many of his analytic manipulations of the musical material make use of twentieth-century serial techniques.

Example 1: Réti’s analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C minor, Op. 13 (Pathétique)\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Prime Cell}
\begin{align*}
\text{(original form)} & \quad \text{(inversions)} \\
& \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{and} \\
\text{or}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Concluding Motif}
\begin{align*}
\text{(original form)} & \quad \text{(inversion)} \\
\end{align*}
\end{center}

The Sonata’s Opening Phrase

 Following the identification of the prime cell of a work, Réti attempts to “uncover, voice by voice and bar by bar, the material from which the opening period is built” in order to show how a given work grows from that single idea.\textsuperscript{52} Unlike his nineteenth-century precursors, however, this includes scrutinizing later movements for connections as well. Réti sees the opening of Beethoven’s second movement as a “mirroring” of the prime cell and


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{51} Réti, \textit{Patterns}, 18-19.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 19.}
concluding motif of the first movement (see example 2). He notes the differences here as variations that nevertheless retain the structural substance of the first movement.

Example 2: The opening of Op. 13/ii as variation of motivic cells from the first movement

Réti analyzes the organic unity of both Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F minor, Op. 57 (Appassionata) and Fifth Symphony in similar terms. He sees the prime cell of Op. 57 as a chromatic upper neighbor (C-D flat-C). In this case Réti ascribes a large-scale significance to the cell, as he argues that the D flat middle movement is a movement-level upper neighbor to the prominent Cs seen in the outer movements (as the fifth scale degree of F minor). Réti’s analysis of the Fifth Symphony shows a rare instance of his looking beyond intervallic content. Here, he notes a number of points throughout each of the work’s four movements where various melodic ideas appear three times in exact repetition. He labels this three-repeat process the “beat motif,” and connects it to the three repeated notes that open the symphony (see example 3).

Example 3: The “beat motif” in the opening of the Scherzo of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony

---

53 Ibid., 60. Analytic brackets are mine but based on his prose.

54 Ibid., 102ff. and idem, Process, 171ff. As Burnham (Hero, 104ff.) already offers a detailed discussion of these two analyses, I mention them only in passing.

55 Réti, Patterns, 112.

56 Réti, Process, 171. Réti’s example includes excerpts from all four movements.
Besides the openings of both the scherzo and trio of the third movement, Réti points out the beat motif’s presence in the second theme of the first movement (mm. 63-74), the end of the second movement’s opening phrase (mm. 6-12), and the opening phrase of the finale (mm. 8-12). He elsewhere addresses the cyclic integration of this work in dramatic terms, ascribing the role of “hero” to the work’s opening theme and tracing its appearance throughout each of the four movements.\(^{57}\)

While he goes to great lengths to argue that Mozart and Beethoven founded the thematic process, Réti takes an ambivalent stance towards Haydn’s music. He feels that the music Haydn’s wrote before the death of Mozart does not really use the thematic process, and that it was only late in his career (around the time when Mozart died) that Haydn got the idea to use the principle from Mozart’s.\(^{58}\) Réti’s only published analysis of a thematic connection in Haydn, that of the outer movements of Symphony No. 103 in E flat (Drumroll) differs substantially from those of Mozart and Beethoven (see example 4).

**Example 4: Réti’s analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 103 (Drumroll)\(^{59}\)**

He notes that the “melody, rhythm, tempo, and appeal” of these two themes are “different in every way,” until transposition reveals an inherent affinity. There is no argument for growth from a motivic cell in this example, nor is there an attempt to show any effort at thematic

---

\(^{57}\) Ibid., 136. For more on this analysis see: Burnham, *Hero*, 109.


\(^{59}\) Ibid., 278. Brackets mine.
transformation. This, his most detailed examination of a Haydn composition, shows Réti avoiding organicism in favor of a more strictly conceived notion of cyclic integration. He is content to show a connection without further explanation because he does not feel that Haydn’s music works in the same way as Mozart or Beethoven’s.

The flexibility and versatility of his motivic cells allows Réti to apply his method to nearly any composition from any era, despite his caution towards applying his method to Haydn’s works, and to those works written prior to Haydn. J. S. Bach is a notable exception, and Réti’s examines his works relatively often. However in the end, Réti sees Mozart and Beethoven as foundational composers in their use of motivic cells, and he occasionally points out a resemblance between their movements to prove his point.

- **Hans Keller’s “Unity in Variety”**

  The cornerstone of Hans Keller’s formulation of cyclic integration is his notion of “unity in variety.” He adopts the term used in the writings of Koch and other eighteenth-century theorists, but uses it in a much different way. Although he never specifically lays out a concise definition of his use of unity in variety, he seems to believe that composers such as Haydn and Mozart based their multi-movement compositions on a single idea while simultaneously varying and distorting it to the point where the similarities fade to a background behind superficial contrasts. His analysis of multiple movements goes beyond his eighteenth-century models, as does his focus on “latent” connections. Keller argues that while at the surface level the movements of a Classical-era work may seem unrelated or even starkly contrasting, a latent unity or affinity remains because everything in the composition is
based upon a single pervasive idea.\textsuperscript{60} Eighteenth-century theorists do not use the term “unity in variety” to examine hidden or latent relationships, but instead use the term as a general aesthetic ideal or guide. Keller’s use of the term, though rooted in eighteenth-century aesthetics, thus has a distinct meaning from that of these earlier theorists.

Keller portrays himself as skeptical of Réti’s analytic practice, and he typically avoids the bar-by-bar style of analysis favored by Réti.\textsuperscript{61} Instead of examining motivic cells Keller focuses on the underlying relationships between melodic phrases, an adaptation of nineteenth-century analytic practice, as seen in A. B. Marx for example. His avoidance of motivic cells is a result of his focus on surface-level contrast as an effort to distort underlying latent connections. As he puts it, “my analysis, then, aims at ascertaining the latent elements of the unity of manifest contrasts.”\textsuperscript{62} Keller is a staunch organicist who looks to show how the various parts of a musical work relate to its opening moments despite seemingly obvious differences on the surface.

None of Keller’s prose analyses discuss cyclic connections. A fundamental part of his analytic practice is his so-called “wordless analysis,” in which he composes interludes that sometimes reveal inter-movement similarities. His wordless analyses focus heavily on the development, growth, and transformation of ideas over the entire course of a work. More to the point, his newly composed interludes also show his intense interest in moment-to-moment coherence, including between the end of one movement and the beginning of the


\textsuperscript{61} Hans Keller (“The Unity of Contrasting Themes and Movements – I,” Music Review 17 [1956]: 50) cites Oskar Adler and Arnold Schoenberg as his primary influences and notes he has “certain reservations” about Réti’s analyses.

\textsuperscript{62} Keller, “Unity,” 50.
next. This more than anything else shows Keller as heavily invested in organic unity and in demonstrating that seemingly contrasting themes and movements are actually quite similar.63

Although Keller never discusses a specific instance of cyclic integration in his prose analysis, his approach to unity within a single movement should suffice in demonstrating his thoughts. Like Réti, Keller takes an interest in both intervalllic structure and pitch-specific relationships. He sees the rising octave as a unifying gesture in Mozart’s String Quartet in G major, K. 387 (see example 5). This connection exists, Keller argues, despite numerous superficial differences (such as pitch, dynamics, rhythm, and etc). His “unity in variety” is at work: the divided octaves give the different themes an underlying connection despite the differences in how the octave is divided in each case (either a fifth or sixth).

Example 5: Keller’s analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in G major, K. 387/i64

Keller reveals his organicist outlook throughout this analysis: “every note [of K. 387] is over-determined, and everything springs from the basic motif.” His use of the term “over-determined” has particular significance in that he views each development of the basic motif as acting as an “antecedent” to a later “consequent” event. He sees the work as “evolving” from the opening octave leap. Mozart uses diminution, retrograde, and other contrapuntal

---


64 Keller, “Unity,” 103-4.
techniques to create this sense of evolution. The work thus forms from a “rich and intensive variegation of the basic idea.”  

Keller often goes beyond Réti’s focus on melodic material in his analyses. He takes an interest in uncovering an interval’s function and musical significance within the work, and calls upon other musical elements in his search. By looking for similarities of harmony and rhythm, for example, he departs from and expands upon Réti’s method. In his analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in G major, K. 156, for example, Keller argues that the supposedly new theme appearing at the opening of the first movement’s development is actually closely related to the main theme of the movement (see example 6). He begins by pointing out the similar intervallic structure of the themes, but justifies the connection by noting a number of secondary similarities. Here he breaks down the function of each pitch in relation to harmonic and rhythmic connections: “(1) dominant [pitch and harmony] (stressed by ‘sustainment’), (2) mediant, (3) tonic (stressed by repetition and shake), and (4) leading note.” Were Réti to analyze these same passages he would probably focus on the pitch similarities (B falling to G followed by a descending second) instead.

65 Ibid., 104.
66 Réti does this on occasion (e.g. Patterns, 35), but Keller makes these musical elements an integral part of his analyses.
68 Ibid., 96.
Example 6: Keller’s analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in G major, K. 156/i

Keller’s approach to organic unity allows for a broad range of elements to foster a connection between movements, depending upon the circumstances of the work at hand. In fact, in a few instances Keller analyzes connections without reference to pitch material. For example, the affect of solo texture on metric perception plays a crucial role in his analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464. He argues that the sudden appearance of triplets within the first movement’s transition stems from the metrically ambiguous solo eighth-note section of the opening theme (see example 7). Keller feels that the metric ambiguity of the unaccompanied opening violin line presents Mozart with the opportunity to use triplets later and still maintain, or possibly strengthen, the movement’s sense of organic unity. The superficial differences of pitch, texture, and formal function in the transition’s opening share the crucial connection of metric ambiguity found in the movement’s opening measures.

Example 7: Keller’s analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464/i

---

69 Ibid., 95-6.
70 Ibid., 126.
Keller shows himself at his most extreme in the analysis of K. 464: the only connection he identifies between these phrases is the possibility that the opening phrase could be notated using triplets while the later phrase actually uses triplets. Yet, his predispositions and basic assumptions, namely the maximal integration characteristic of organicism, and his insistence upon latent connections in the face of superficial contrasts, lead him into finding a connection here.\(^71\) The uncovering of connections is an analytic imperative for Keller: “One corollary of my theory of unity against which I check my more intuitive observations is that every rhythm, too, however ‘new’ on the descriptive level, must be implicit in the basic idea.”\(^72\) His latent unity can be very latent indeed if necessary. On the other hand, in examining musical elements besides pitch and motive he is quite innovative, as at the time analyses of cyclic integration and organic unity hardly ever considered musical elements outside of pitch.

- **Jan LaRue’s Skepticism**

Jan LaRue takes a skeptical view of organic unity and cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart. He argues that many of the connections favored by Réti and Keller in their analyses are little more than coincidences. Although his discussion focuses primarily on intertextual relationships – a similarity of themes in different works – he also applies his points to cyclic connections as well.\(^73\) LaRue feels that most connections between eighteenth-century works and movements are coincidental or insignificant due to the limited

\(^71\) This and other implications of organicism are presented in chapter 1, pages 14ff.

\(^72\) Keller, “Chamber Music,” 125.

number of motivic gestures available at the time, or as he puts it, “the greater homogeneity of thematic material in the Classical repertory produces a host of general family resemblances.”

Most connections in the period, by this line of thought, are accidentally connected because of the limited vocabulary of the style, and are therefore insignificant.

LaRue argues that superficial resemblances do not really offer any strong sense of cyclic integration or organic unity. He then offers a variety of criteria for determining which connections are more than coincidental. For example, he notes a potential thematic resemblance between the first and final movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 23 in G major, but wants to determine if the connection is a coincidence of style or a significant element of cyclic integration (see example 8). LaRue notes two distinct aspects of these incipits that could create a sense of thematic resemblance: an opening leap downward from G, and a concluding conjunct descent from E to B.

Example 8: LaRue's analysis of the openings of the outer movements of Haydn's Symphony No. 23 in G major, showing potential melodic connections with an “X”

LaRue immediately takes issue with the format of the musical example. Here he attacks in particular Réti and Keller’s use of musical examples consisting of only brief melodies. He prefers a full musical example so that a proper evaluation of the theme’s context is possible. He also takes issue with the brevity of the musical examples, noting that both movements’ themes continue for a number of measures after the examples cut off. This deceives readers into thinking that the connections are more concentrated and pervasive than

---

74 LaRue, “Significance,” 224.

75 Ibid., 231.
they might appear. Finally he notes that the Xs bring out similarities between the incipits in a way that diverts attention away from what he feels are insurmountable differences between these themes.

Having attacked the format of the example, LaRue moves on to criticize the conclusions implied by the example. The similarities noted by the Xs pale in significance compared to the number of differences between the themes. For example, the repeated notes are different in the two (D in the opening movement and G in the finale). In addition, the middle measure of the finale has nothing to do with anything in the first movement, and the interval of the opening leap differs. He also notes that there are significant rhythmic differences as well. For example, the finale’s first three eighth notes are not really part of the theme or even melodic in any way, but part of opening tutti chords. This means that the finale’s theme does not begin on a strong downbeat with the decent from G, but on a weak upbeat.

Even more important to LaRue’s criticisms is the nature of the connections themselves. The connections are separated by contrasting middle material, for example. This implies that LaRue sees audibility as an issue, something virtually ignored by Réti. In addition, the leaps use different intervals, weakening the power of that particular gesture to create a connection. Finally, the stepwise descending fourths seem related, but such descents are too common in tonal music to make for a convincing connection. He feels that the fourths are not distinctive enough to create a significant sense of thematic resemblance in a meaningful way.

For a thematic connection among movements to be convincing in LaRue’s eyes, it must have more than a superficial resemblance and have more than latent or hidden
connections. In his opinion, thematic connections must have functional and structural affinities and be connected for more than a brief moment. For example, he dismisses the potential connections between the outer movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 36 in E flat major as visually appealing but structurally unconvincing (see example 9).

Example 9: LaRue’s examination of potential thematic similarities between the outer movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 36 in E flat major

LaRue points out five critical differences between these themes that cast doubt on their similarity: (1) Downbeat vs. upbeat beginning; (2) Different basic contour; (3) Different harmonic progression (not shown as example of a faulty musical example); (4) Different concluding notes; (5) Accent on G and A flat in IV, but not in I. Thus these melodies share an interest only in their use of triadic motion followed by a stepwise descent – qualities that are too generic to foster a connection.

In the end LaRue briefly notes only two examples of what he believes are convincing connections between the themes of two movements or sections of music: the introduction and exposition of Haydn’s Symphony No. 103/i, given in example 10, and the introduction and exposition of the first movement of a work by Rosetti. In both cases, the composer includes a note-for-note, interval-for-interval connection that lasts for a minimum of seven pitches with similar functions, rhythms, and metric settings.

---

76 Ibid., 233.
77 Ibid., 232.
Example 10: LaRue’s analysis of thematic connections in the opening movement of Haydn’s Symphony No. 103 in E flat major

If we take his two examples as his minimum requirement for a convincing thematic resemblance, LaRue in essence sets an impossible standard for cyclic connections. He practically demands exact repetition before he will grant connections significance. He also questions even those works that seem meet his standards, thereby betraying skepticism towards the concept of cyclic integration for the music of this era in general.

- **Karl Marx’s Thematic Approach**

The musicologist Karl Marx argues for thematic connections among movements based on the overall outline and pitch-specific connections of the themes of a given work.\(^{78}\) One of the most common criticisms of Réti or Keller’s analytic approach is the perception that they dilute their motivic connections to the lowest common denominator and thereby point out mere coincidences. Marx creates an analytic approach that he feels responds to LaRue’s

---

criticisms by improving upon the inadequacies of Réti and Keller’s analyses. Marx brokers a compromise between these extremes for thematic resemblances across movements.

In many ways Marx’s methodology reevaluates the standard used to determine thematic connections by taking a more strict position than Réti and Keller, but a more lenient one than LaRue. Where Réti and Keller focus on short, malleable, intervallic connections, Marx tends to examine entire phrases. Marx also avoids many of the pitfalls of organicism by shunning bar-by-bar analysis. That is, he does not see the need to relate every moment of a work to its opening measures. In addition, he only examines themes located at important formal junctures in the hopes of focusing on the most important connections and of eliminating the identification of coincidental relationships. Finally, Marx does not apply a LaRue-like standard to his connections, but tries to find the common ground between Réti and LaRue in the length and specificity of thematic resemblances among movements. At the behest of LaRue, he also takes functional, rhythmic, and metric similarities into consideration.

Marx’s analysis of the outer movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 102 in B flat major typifies his approach (see example 11). First, he argues for a thematic connection between the introduction and exposition of the first movement. The lines in the example below, typical of Marx’s analyses, provide reference to pitch-specific connections between each segment. In all, he identifies twelve points of similarity between the two sections. He then goes on to note points of similarity between the first movement and the opening theme of the finale. He notes eight points of connection at the pitch level. In addition, he points out
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79 Marx (“Londoner Symphonien,” 3) addresses LaRue’s arguments.
a similar rising triadic motive used in both the first and final movements (marked with a bracket and “x”).

Example 11: Marx's analysis Haydn's Symphony No. 102 in B flat major

The number of connections identified by Marx and their prominent placement at the openings of the outer movements and the beginning of the first movement’s exposition respond to LaRue’s criticisms (compare examples 9 and 10 with example 11). His inclusion of the triadic “x” motive is an adaptation of Réti’s motivic cells also designed to meet LaRue’s demands. The motive appears prominently in the theme, but Marx does not push his point through inversions or transformations like Réti. Beyond this, his pitch-by-pitch connections follow Réti and Keller’s approaches rather closely.

Marx’s method has received a mixed reception. This seems to be due in part to a lack of precise analytic commentary to accompany his musical examples, leading to the perception that he is really not responding to LaRue’s underlying complaints, but instead is
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80 It is unclear why he does not include the themes of both the minuet and trio of the third movement in his example, as they also seem to meet his standards for positing a connection.

81 Marx, “Londoner Symphonien,” 14 ex. 16.

82 Webster (Farewell, 200-02) recognizes Marx’s attempts at “methodological sophistication,” but notes that Marx’s analyses range from “eye opening” to “dubious.”
just creating a more convincing musical example. For example, a follower of LaRue might point out that the only connection Marx has identified between the first and final movements of Symphony No. 102 is a stepwise descent from G or E flat. This closely resembles the analyses LaRue attacked, just in different trappings. That is, Marx has examined an entire phrase at an important point in each movement, but has not identified anything that is more than dubiously significant from a point of view such as LaRue’s.

- **Meir Wiesel’s Criterion**

Meir Wiesel, like Karl Marx, recognizes the inherent problems in a Réti-style analysis and attempts to salvage the analytic method by creating rules to help determine when connections are and are not significant. His approach is typical of music theory in the 1970s, which took an interest in rule-based systems of analysis, drawn from linguistics. Wiesel finds Réti’s intervallic analysis useful, but feels that Réti’s analyses do not consider anything beyond intervallic structure. In response, Wiesel stresses the importance of considering musical function and prominence when evaluating thematic connections. In stressing prominence, he adopts one of Marx’s arguments, while his examination of musical function follows Keller’s ideas in many ways. What distinguishes Wiesel from these writers is his attempt to codify the specific ways in which proposed thematic relationships can be considered significant.

Wiesel begins by arguing that Réti-style analyses examine music too abstractly by focusing on intervals at the expense of the flow and sound of the music. What Wiesel would
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like is an analysis that “agree[s] with the musical essence of the phrase in question.” Audibility thus plays a larger role in his approach than it does in that of previous musicologists. For example, he sees the crucial interval of the opening theme of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata Op. 13 in C minor, (Pathétique) as the minor second, not as the third singled out by Réti. He notes that the rhythmic stress falls upon the first and last notes of each sub-phrase, not the suspended pitch that forms a minor third. He faults Réti for selecting abstract pitches that confirm an analysis rather than selecting pitches for their musical importance.

In an attempt to overcome what he perceives to be faulty analysis, Wiesel sets up a number of criteria for judging which thematic connections are legitimate. In theory these criteria strictly limit the possibilities for thematic connections: 1) transformation/development of a motivic idea between the two proposed themes; 2) the motivic idea in question must be “sufficiently distinct” from similar themes in other works; 3) if the connection is too generic to be “sufficiently distinct” then the significance of the connection depends upon the intensity of the relationship, the number of movements included in the connection, and the degree to which the relationship corresponds to the “characteristic qualities” of the theme.

In practice, Wiesel’s criteria do not seem to interfere with or negate the typical Réti-style analysis. This is because the criteria themselves are in many ways already a part of Réti’s method. For example, Réti argues that Beethoven both continually develops motivic cells and writes them in such a way as to be distinct from the motivic cells of other works. Wiesel disagrees with Réti’s analytic conclusions, but cannot find a way to objectify his criticisms. His argument runs into problems when he cannot figure out how to select pitches
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85 Wiesel, “Presence,” 78.
that are “significant” and “structural,” for example. His main problem, in essence, is that he has no way of demonstrating that his analytic choices are actually “better” or even more musically based than Réti’s.

In fact, many of Wiesel’s analyses seem to be as tentative as those for which he attacks Réti. For example, he argues for a thematic resemblance between two movements of Schumann’s Symphony No. 4 in D minor (see example 12).

Example 12: Wiesel’s analysis of Schumann’s Symphony No. 4 in D minor

He notes the possibility that the scalar motion “may well be just casual,” meaning that he must turn to his predetermined objective rules to see if the connection is significant. The formal and functional similarities fulfill his criteria for significance: both excerpts appear in the opening moments of their respective movements, and the “linear function (passing notes) and the rhythm” are “identical.” The connection is, according to his rules, significant and the themes are therefore related. However, one might as objectively argue that the rhythmic functions are not identical (half of the left example theme is an anacrusis while the right example’s anacrusis is not a part of Wiesel’s connection) and that the pitches involved are quite different in their harmonic implications (the first includes a leading tone, implying a strong dominant downbeat while the second has a strong tonic downbeat and no leading tone whatsoever).

Like many of his predecessors, Wiesel limits himself to thematic connections. His forceful rejection of the significance of other musical elements to fostering a sense of cyclic
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86 Ibid., 87. Dashed bracket mine.
integration is, however, unique. That is, he not only ignores these elements, but also explicitly argues that they should not figure into the analysis of thematic connections. He notes that, “the effect of meter, tempo, tonality, texture, instrumentation, articulation, phrasing and dynamics on thematic relationships is sufficiently small to be ignored.” In taking this stance he rejects a number of LaRue’s criticisms and Keller’s points. Furthermore, Wiesel’s insistence on “thematic transformation” rather than simple resemblance seems to follow Réti’s organicism more than he himself recognizes.

Nevertheless, one of Wiesel’s strongest points is his recognition that thematic connections appear at different degrees of strength. This is a departure from the rhetoric of Réti, Keller, and even Marx, each of whom see cyclic connections as either strongly present or absent entirely. It is also a step away from organicism, which implies maximal connection throughout. Wiesel recognizes that the relationship between similar themes in multiple movements can have varying degrees of strength, that not every movement need include a connection, and that the prominence of a thematic connection can reduce or strengthen the significance of a proposed connection. In the end then Wiesel is a believer who disagrees with many of Réti and Keller’s specific analyses: he is inclined to see connections but is wary of abstract analyses that ignore what he sees as musically significant elements.

- **Leonard Meyer’s Evaluation of Stylistic Gestures**

In his book on musical style in the Classical era, Leonard Meyer argues that certain perceived connections among the movements of a work are most likely coincidences arising from musical style, not significant cyclic relationships. His arguments follow in the footsteps of
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LaRue in many respects, but he focuses on the role played by clichéd gestures in the music of Haydn and Mozart rather than on short motives and intervals. By addressing cyclic integration within the context of a stylistic discussion, Meyer refines LaRue’s arguments while criticizing those of Réti, Keller, and to a certain extent Marx. However, Meyer also argues that under certain conditions stylistic figures can foster a sense of cyclic integration among movements, a departure from LaRue.

Meyer notes that many works by Haydn and Mozart use certain gestures (including turns, suspensions, and appoggiaturas) in multiple movements on a regular basis. He attempts to determine which of these works, if any, gain a sense of cyclic integration through the repeated use of these figures. For example, Meyer points out that Haydn focuses on a conventional turn as a possible element of cyclic integration in his Symphony No. 100 in C major (Military) (see example 13). Normally Classical-era composers use this figure cadentially, but Haydn here uses it as an opening gesture.

Example 13: The turn in the second movement of Haydn's Symphony No. 100 in C major (Military)

Meyer goes on argue that this turn figure fosters a sense of cyclic integration with the first movement, where Haydn also includes a prominent turn figure at mm. 38-39, here as a typical cadential gesture.

Meyer’s argument raises the question of musical style and its role in fostering a sense of cyclic integration. Part of LaRue’s criticism of Réti was the perceived pervasive presence of certain elements throughout the music of the Classical era. Connections such as the turn in


90 Ibid., 29.
Symphony No. 100, LaRue would conclude, cannot be significant factors in cyclic integration because they are stylistic commonalities. Meyer counters this line of reasoning by pointing out the ways in which Haydn calls attention to the turn, in this case through a switch of rhetorical function and placement within a phrase. Only in the first movement does it appear in its cliché form. In the slow movement Haydn uses the turn uncharacteristically, as an opening idea rather than a closing gesture. This occurs in the third movement as well, granting further significance to the connection (see example 14).  

**Example 14: The turn in the opening of Symphony No. 100 iii**

With the turn used in a distinctive, unconventional manner in two movements, and characteristically in another movement, this nominally clichéd gesture in fact fosters a sense of connection among all three movements. Overall, Meyer thus argues against the broad scope of LaRue’s argument while upholding some of LaRue’s specific contentions.

In a more recent publication, Meyer portrays himself as much more skeptical of the value of organicism in specific and cyclic integration in general. Here he criticizes the analysis of motivic relationships as taxonomic and unable to explain how motives grow over time. Thus, his line of reasoning runs, the analysis of cyclic integration is essentially meaningless since it does not involve a sense of growth, while organicism would be meaningful only if it were explicable. Even more importantly for analyses of Haydn and Mozart’s music, he essentially denies the presence of cyclic integration in any significant

---

91 Meyer overlooks the third movement; the following example and argument of this further connection is my own.

form in the music of the Classical era: “In the eighteenth century…such relationships were understood and explained in terms of conventions of form and genre. For instance, the relationships among the different movements of a symphony were taken for granted by both theorists and composers as being in the nature of the genre.”\textsuperscript{93} In the end and in his most recent formulation, Meyer attributes cyclic integration to the nineteenth century and relegates eighteenth-century cyclic integration to conventional connections dictated by style and convention alone. However, given the increasing attention given to musical topics in the music of the late eighteenth century, one might counter Meyer’s argument by noting the significance of conventional gestures in creating musical meaning. This meaning, as shown in Meyer’s own analysis of Symphony No. 100, can be shared across movements as an element of cyclic integration.

- **James Webster’s Through-composition**

  James Webster takes “through-composition” as the starting point for his analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 in F sharp minor (Farewell) as a cyclically integrated work.\textsuperscript{94} The term through-composition derives from Schoenberg’s \textit{Gestalt} principles, including the notion of developing variation.\textsuperscript{95} Through-composition links movements primarily by means such as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 242.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Webster, \textit{Farewell}.
\end{itemize}
“run-on movements, recalls, unresolved instabilities, and lack of closure.” As might be inferred from this definition, his approach to cyclic integration differs from other approaches in scope: he examines a number of musical elements, including rhetorical and dramatic elements, not just thematic connections. He analyzes Haydn’s music from a modified organicist perspective by tracing the progression of musical ideas throughout a work more as an unfolding dramatic plot rather than as continuous growth from an opening motivic cell.

Webster never rigorously defines through-composition, but he nevertheless provides ample information to create a general sense of how he uses the term. Through-composition is a set of functional relationships across the movements of a work. For Webster each movement of a work has a specific function in relation to every other movement, as well as to the work as a whole. Works incorporating through-composition use prominent features (he lists “musical ideas, tonal relations, destabilizing pitches and gestures, discontinuities of texture and topic, and so forth”) that have implications for events later in the movement or work. Through-composition thus appears in works where a musical idea grows, progresses, and develops from one movement to the next over time. The most easily recognizable feature of through-composition for Webster is the run-on movement pair – a group of movements connected through an attacca stipulation.

The terms through-composition and cyclic integration are not interchangeable for Webster, but neither does he offer a rigorous definition of the two terms or how they specifically differ (despite his use of both terms in the book’s subtitle: Through-composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music). He readily admits to the inherent
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96 Webster, Farewell, 7. His definition of a run-on movement is a set of two movements temporally linked either through attacca or through composing two individual movements as a single movement in the manner of the scherzo-finale of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony.

97 Webster’s most succinct discussion appears in ibid., 5.
difficulties of separating these terms: “the reader must not expect total consistency of usage.”  

Cyclic integration, for Webster, is limited to “aspects of musical construction and technique (commonalities of material, tonal relations, and the like).”  

Through-composition, on the other hand, maintains a temporal aspect absent from cyclic integration. Works using through-composition fall under the rubric of organicism, which Webster’s notion of cyclic integration avoids: any notion of growth or development would necessitate a temporal relationship and would therefore be an aspect of through-composition.

Webster typically begins his analyses by pointing out the most basic types of connections between movements and then moves on to more complex relationships. For instance, he uses the physical joining of two movements through the run-on movement pair as an opening to discuss further connections among the movements. The run-on movement pair provides a foundational guise of cyclic integration that opens the door to a more detailed examination of the music for connections such as the drive to a single final cadence, the resolution of harmonic and tonal problems, and the resolution of other musical elements.

Conventional elements, those things expected of an eighteenth-century work, do not play a role in Webster’s conception of through-composition because he sees them as essentially stylistic. His discussion of conventional tonality is most telling: “A merely conventional use of tonality cannot organize the cycle [a multi-movement work] in this sense [cyclic integration]; to be effective, it must be unusual, difficult, destabilizing. No eighteenth-century symphony is ‘unified’ merely because all its movements stand in closely-related keys and, internally, modulate to the dominant… To count, a harmonic progression or
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juxtaposition must go beyond these conventions, and must do so in a striking, memorable manner. In this way he essentially accepts LaRue’s argument and sets a high standard for what types of connections can foster a significant sense of cyclic integration.

After run-on movement pairs, Webster focuses primarily upon thematic connections as evidence for the presence of through-composition. Thematic connections are, for him, a critical prerequisite to more important connections among the movements of a work. He appreciates the value of Marx’s approach to thematic resemblance, but prefers a Schoenbergian Gestalt approach using developing variation and motivic complexes, all of which encourage organic notions of growth, development, and resolution. He avoids Réti’s intervallic approach to cyclic integration, but adopts an only slightly modified approach to motivic material. At the same time Webster includes a good deal of Schenkerian analysis to support his cyclic arguments. He often points out how Haydn’s voice leading leaves the Urlinie unresolved at the end of a movement, forcing the composer to resolve the line in a later movement. Webster bases his approach to harmonic connections on resolution by connecting unconventional moments of harmonic ambiguity or instability from movement to movement to their eventual resolution. He also notes the value of musical topics and
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101 Ibid., 25-7. Webster’s three-page list of motives in Symphony No. 45, for example, is virtually indistinguishable from many of Réti’s analyses. This is not in itself surprising, as both writers were heavily influenced by Schoenberg’s theories.

102 This adaptation of Schenker’s notion of the imperfect close is closely related to the ideas of Allen Forte (Compositional Matrix [Baldwin, NY: Music Teachers National Association, 1961]), and has since been applied to cyclic integration in Beethoven by Nicholas Marston (Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E, Op. 109 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995], 8).

103 Webster, Farewell, 204-12.
programmatic titles in fostering a sense of cyclic integration among the movements of a work.\textsuperscript{104}

In addition to his application of Schoenbergian and Schenkerian analyses, Webster occasionally cites other instances where non-thematic elements play a role in the cyclic integration of a work. For example, he notes that three of the movements of Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (Bird) begin with off-tonic phrases and therefore are related to one another.\textsuperscript{105} He most frequently cites rhetorical, dramatic, and harmonic connections as prevalent non-thematic connections, usually by noting how Haydn leaves these unresolved in early movements so that he can resolve them later in the work for an enhanced sense of closure.

Webster’s work takes a significant step forward from the arguments presented in the 1960s and 1970s. He responds to LaRue by setting a very high standard for what constitutes a connection between movements, yet he also incorporates some of the more controversial aspects of Réti and Keller’s approaches, including certain aspects of organicism. By addressing the music of Haydn at length and in specific detail, he opened the door to later analyses of cyclic integration in the music of the late eighteenth century.

- **Ethan Haimo’s Notion of “Disruption”**

Ethan Haimo appropriates Webster’s approach to through-composition as a starting point for his own approach to cyclic integration.\textsuperscript{106} Haimo attempts to codify those musical elements that act to foster a sense of cyclic integration by setting up rules for determining a connection

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid., 225-247.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 210-12.

between movements. His approach differs from Wiesel’s in that Haimo provides for a variety of possible musical connections, not just thematic resemblance.

Haimo distinguishes his approach to cyclic integration from that of the typical organicist by invoking what he terms Haydn’s “unity principle.” He argues that as a movement progresses fewer and fewer new ideas may appear, so that by movement’s end all material somehow relates backward to earlier statements.107 Thus “new” material may appear within a movement or work, giving Haimo a way around applying organicism to Haydn’s music.

Like Webster, Haimo is heavily indebted to Schoenberg’s Gestalt principles. However, where Webster latches on to Schoenberg’s developing variation, Haimo instead attaches himself to Schoenberg’s concept of the “tonal problem,” a problematic gesture or instability (typically a chromatic pitch) found near the opening of a musical work that propels the music forward and requires eventual resolution.108 For example, Haimo downplays the role the relevance of thematic resemblance as an integrative feature, a key ingredient in developing variation.109 Yet he consistently seeks out “disruptive” elements in Haydn’s music, elements closely related to Schoenberg’s notion of the tonal problem. Disruptive elements for Haimo include any musical element that is odd, unresolved, or somehow “violate[s] norms.”110 They can include things such as abrupt modulations, the use of remote key areas, the presentation of unexpected thematic material, and the distortion of form.
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107 Ibid., 5. This presents an appealing solution to the problem of the new theme that opens the development of the first movement of Beethoven’s Third Symphony. See chapter 1 page 17.

108 For an elucidation and summary of the various aspects of Schoenberg’s Gestalt principles see: Schoenberg, ed. Neff, Second String Quartet, 125ff.


110 Ibid., 39, 66.
Haimo focuses on disruption to a much greater extent than Webster, who views thematic resemblance and development as a prerequisite to other elements of cyclic integration. This in turn gives Haimo’s approach a more restricted scope than Webster. Haimo favors the organicist concepts of rhetorical and dramatic progress over the more structural aspects of cyclic integration, such as run-on movements, as seen in many of Webster’s analyses.

Haimo feels that the inherent subjectivity of analysis, especially that of intermovemental relationships (his preferred term for cyclic integration), requires a method for properly determining the strength of a cyclic relationship. He therefore formulates a set of four principles to aid in determining the validity of a proposed cyclic connection:

“(1) the extent to which the anomalous events are disruptive within the movement… (2) the centrality of the event(s) to which they relate in the other movements… (3) the extent of the similarity between the events… [and (4)] the extent to which a movement (particularly a later movement) can be seen to respond to (that is resolve) the disruption of intermovemental norms.”

The concept of disruption dominates each of his principles. Composers call attention to a gesture through disruption, create a need for resolution, and offer an opportunity to resolve the gesture in a later movement. There is no room for “conventional,” “stylistic,” or non-disruptive gestures in Haimo’s formulation of cyclic integration.

Haimo favors disruptive elements that can be traced through three or more movements, not just between two movements. He argues that the instabilities of the first movement of a work lend themselves to through-composition through their later resolution. For example, in Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione), he views the “surprising” retransition and a “weak” dominant that needs bolstering as elements of cyclic
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integration from the first movement that require eventual resolution later in the work.\textsuperscript{112} He then points out instances in later movements where Haydn gives the dominant special attention as repeated efforts to resolve this lingering tension.

Thematic resemblance plays a limited role in Haimo’s formulation of cyclic integration. Generally speaking, he takes a skeptical stance towards thematic resemblance in Haydn’s symphonies. It seems that he feels thematic connections appear occasionally in the Classical era, but he thinks modern analysts are blind to them because of the “very obviousness of the cyclical relationships in works by Beethoven and later composers.”\textsuperscript{113} He does not deny the presence of thematic connections in Haydn’s music, but nor does he argue in favor of any. This defensive posture avoids a number of potential criticisms, but further limits the elements available to his approach. It seems that Haimo, by focusing on disruption, takes a purely functional approach to cyclic connections in this era where others have been strictly thematic (e.g. Réti and Marx) or have mixed thematic and functional approaches (e.g. Webster, and to a limited extent Keller and Meyer).

A final noteworthy facet of Haimo’s approach is his willingness to evaluate the gray areas of cyclic integration – gestures that seem related but in a seemingly intangible way. He argues that some of these gestures should be considered connections that foster a sense of cyclic integration and sets up his four principles in the hopes of finding a more objective means of determining the means used to create the connection.

Despite his strict standards for examining connections that foster a sense of cyclic integration, Haimo considers a larger number of Haydn’s works than Webster. This

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 73ff.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 275.
numerical superiority arises primarily because he does not limit his discussion to works with run-on movement pairs like Webster. He also analyzes a number of Haydn’s more conventional symphonies where Webster considers a limited cross-section of unique works by Haydn. Yet the scope of Haimo’s study is limited to Haydn’s symphonies, unlike Webster, who analyzes run-on movement pairs from a number of genres.

**A Critique of Previous Notions of Cyclic Integration**

No matter which approach to cyclic integration is used or preferred, state of mind and disposition will inevitably play a crucial role in the reception of an analysis of cyclic integration. There is, after all, no way to say that an accurate analysis is definitively “wrong” or absolutely “right;” there are only degrees of persuasiveness. Each of the above approaches to cyclic integration have inherent strengths and weaknesses that affect just how convincing any analysis using that approach can be.

One of the most pervasive criticisms of the different approaches to cyclic integration is that resemblances of pitch unsupported by other elements are frequently unpersuasive. This concern can be exaggerated, as happens with some of LaRue’s musical examples. However, there is a clear desire to limit or quantify the minimum requirements for a persuasive thematic resemblance in all of the writers examined above. Undoubtedly this desire has arisen in response to Réti’s rather extreme take on thematic connections. Despite the formulation of criteria and rules by writers such as Wiesel and Haimo, a working set of guidelines has yet to gain acceptance, and probably never will. The variety of thematic resemblances present in the music of the Classical era is too great to make any set of rules practical on a regular basis. Only a case-by-case examination can properly evaluate thematic resemblance in this repertoire.
A skepticism towards the analysis of thematic resemblances lies at the heart of the disputes over cyclic integration, and each writer sets his bar for finding a connection convincing at a slightly different height. This is most apparent in Wiesel’s criticisms of Réti and Webster’s criticisms of Marx. Wiesel and Webster both cite thematic connections in their analyses but find the connections cited by Réti and Marx questionable. More difficulties arise when trying to disprove a thematic resemblance: Wiesel cannot formulate a cogent explanation for why he finds some of Réti’s analyses unconvincing, so he resorts to saying that Réti’s analyses do not agree with the music. Similarly Webster apparently finds Marx’s methods acceptable for the most part, but disagrees with the results on occasion. His only recourse is a footnote stating the dubious nature of some of Marx’s analyses in general. Thus at best one can find a particular analysis “convincing” or “unconvincing,” not right or wrong.

The fine line between seeing a thematic resemblance as “significant” or relegating it to a “stylistic coincidence” moves depending upon the assumptions and dispositions of each individual. LaRue’s article instigated this debate, and scholars since have grappled with his contentions. Others have expanded upon LaRue’s basic ideas to the point of essentially discrediting Réti’s style of thematic analyses. Meyer’s approach to the function of clichéd gestures is the most current argument in this line of thought. Yet his approach leaves a number of unanswered questions. First, what are the clichéd gestures of the Classical era? He cites the turn but does nothing else. Second, do these figures really appear with such
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115 These include Nicholas Temperley, who calls for a more objective way of evaluating thematic connections (“Testing the Significance of Thematic Relationships,” Music Review 22 [1961]: 177-80), and R.A. Sharpe ("Two Forms of Unity in Music," Music Review 44 [1983]: 274-86), who notes that Réti’s analyses look at such basic musical ideas that they can be found in any movement, thus encouraging an “over-easy” confirmation of inter-movement connections.
frequency as to be expected in more than one movement of every work from this era? Generally speaking these gestures may not seem significant, but (as Meyer himself argues) in specific works they often can be. In fact, some of the strongest examples of thematic resemblance involve generic ideas. For instance, the turn motive that opens Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione) appears prominently in all four movements and creates a clear connection, despite its being, in the end, a turn figure.116 The repeated-note opening of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony also falls under this classification, especially in the third movement where the falling third disappears and only the rhythm remains. Finally, even if Haydn and Mozart use clichés frequently, might they not still foster a sense integration more than if they were absent? A weak connection is still a connection after all. That is, these figures might be clichéd but their presence is not required by convention, and therefore they may play a significant role in the cyclic integration of a work.

When a posited connection between two or more movements is patently unconventional, and therefore probably not a coincidence, a slightly different criticism is invoked: intention. LaRue formulates the question best: “If Haydn had intended us to observe a connection here, would he not have related these themes more closely to each other than to themes in entirely different works?”117 Similarly, Haimo asks why Haydn or Mozart would write a work with a weak or hidden sense of cyclic integration without offering a clear answer as to why they would include connections that were less than obvious.118 Intention cannot really enter into the argument; it is a red herring because it is impossible to prove or
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116 For a complete analysis of this work and its thematic connections see the discussion chapter 4, pages 157ff. This reception of the thematic connections in this work are also examined briefly in chapter 1, pages 23ff.


118 Haimo, Logic, 40n. On intention see also LaRue, “Significance,” 233.
disprove. As used by skeptical scholars then, intention is really nothing more than a superficial criticism leveled against unpersuasive analyses.

One area of intention that is open to question is the motivation and mindset of the analyst. A person desiring a cyclic connection in a work might find any argument persuasive, while a person opposed to cyclic integration might refuse to be convinced. Réti and Keller, for example, seek cyclic connections for aesthetic reasons: “In a great piece, there are always the elements of unity, not of diversity, because a great piece grows from an all-embracing idea. Great music diversifies a unity; mere good music unites diverse elements.” If the motivic cells of a given work are not related, that work might perceived as aesthetically deficient, a less-than-ideal take on the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven to be sure. It seems that the supporters of cyclic integration naturally react to such an analytic challenge by attempting to prove the point at all costs, especially in those works they feel are most important or written by the most important composers. They presume a cyclic connection and set out to demonstrate its existence, often leading to an argument in favor of an ultimately unpersuasive analysis.

By the same token, LaRue’s skeptical mindset leads him to the opposite conclusion. His article begins as an attack on questionable intertextual relationships, but ends up as one on cyclic integration. He questions how a particular theme in Haydn can be intertextual when there are so many potential intertexts, and ends up asking how a theme can be a cyclic element if it is so generic as to be found in many other works.

Webster takes a less ideological position on cyclic integration: he wants to know how Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 works as a single artistic statement, what the purpose of the odd

---

D major section of the first movement is, how the “Farewell” movement functions, and how that movement is related to the fourth movement beyond the run-on stipulation.\textsuperscript{120} Similarly Haimo takes an interest in Haydn’s compositional approach by “attempting to recreate Haydn’s specific ideas of form.”\textsuperscript{121} Neither Webster nor Haimo sets out to analyze a work for cyclic connections as an end; instead each uses cyclic integration as a means to an end, to explain how a specific work functions. They have removed an aesthetic burden and a potential area of contention by approaching the music with a different mindset than Réti, Keller, or LaRue.

Despite the strengths of Webster’s methodology, his approach has a rather limited scope. At best only a small percentage of Haydn’s works are through-composed, so although through-composition works appears in a specific set of works, it cannot account for Haydn’s more conventional works. Haydn uses the run-on movement pair in symphonies and piano sonatas in the 1770s, a number of piano trios in the 1780s and 1790s, and two string quartets, but this leaves gaping holes in his output.\textsuperscript{122}

By focusing on run-on works, Webster privileges a group of abnormal compositions by Haydn rather than addressing the composer’s output as a whole.\textsuperscript{123} Webster’s position could lead to the belief that Haydn was interested in cyclic integration only in works with

\textsuperscript{120} Webster, \textit{Farewell}, xv-xvii.

\textsuperscript{121} Haimo, \textit{Logic}, viii.

\textsuperscript{122} See the tables in Webster, \textit{Farewell}, 188 and 192. While he has a long list of piano trios and piano sonatas with run-on movements, he fills the majority of table on the symphonies and string quartets with works where a single movement changes tempo (as in the finale to the String Quartet in C, Op. 54/2). Run-on movements appear in two separate categories, only one of which has a direct and obvious bearing on cyclic integration: the actual \textit{attacca} movements. Even including the broader definition of run-on movements, Webster only lists 31 works by Haydn in the major genres, slightly more than 10\% of the works examined in this dissertation’s final two chapters.

\textsuperscript{123} This criticism was first leveled by Julian Rushton’s review of Webster, \textit{Farewell}, in \textit{Music and Letters} 76 (1995): 442.
attacca movements, or that attacca works are necessarily more strongly cyclic than conventional works. Mozart’s works also suffer when examined with this premise, as he almost never uses attacca movements. Webster’s through-composition can therefore say little about Haydn’s approach to cyclic integration in his “normal” works.

In using disruptive factors as the primary means of fostering a relationship among the movements of a work, Haimo, like Webster, privileges Haydn’s style over Mozart’s in a way that could lead to the belief that Mozart was uninterested in cyclic integration. Relatively few of Mozart’s works seem to include disruptive traits, and Mozart’s notion of disruption seems to be rather different from Haydn’s in technique and application. In addition, by requiring a sense of disruption, Haimo raises the question of what exactly constitutes disruption. In his attempts to strip away subjectivity by providing rules, Haimo actually adds an additional layer of interpretation, as the traits and guises of disruption will vary from person to person. He simply switches the question away from asking what constitutes a significant element of cyclic integration to asking what constitutes disruption.

What is needed is a methodology capable of overcoming the skepticism shown towards each of these previous approaches to cyclic integration. In chapter 3 I will propose a methodology that focuses upon the ways in which a variety of musical elements can cooperate to foster a sense of cyclic integration. Previous writers have focused on a single aspect of cyclic integration, whether thematic content, run-on movements, or disruption. Considering multiple elements can make a more convincing case: certain elements might be deemed unconvincing, but the analysis as a whole could remain convincing. My method also cites the importance of considering cyclic integration on a work-by-work basis. No general theory of cyclic integration in the Classical era exists because the integrative means used by
Haydn and Mozart vary a great deal from work to work. Finally, my methodology allows for varying degrees of connection among the movements of a composition. Most of the approaches to cyclic integration examined above have rested upon a binary formulation: either the piece is a single cyclically integrated work at a very high degree or it is deemed as a dubiously integrated collection of movements. In my formulation, every work is coherent at the conventional level, simply through conventional elements such as tonality and the composer’s intent that a group of movements be placed in succession as a single work. Connections above and beyond the conventional can be of any degree of strength, from very weak to very strong.
CHAPTER 3
A RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF CYCLIC INTEGRATION IN THE CLASSICAL ERA

As shown in chapter 2, neither a distinct methodology of cyclic integration nor even a precise definition of what constitutes cyclic integration exists. There have been numerous approaches cyclic integration in the music of the eighteenth century, and a good deal of debate over thematic resemblance, but in each instance certain constraints or interpretive limitations have been applied. Run-on movements and disruptive musical elements limit the applicability of James Webster and Ethan Haimo’s approaches to a small set of unconventional works. The desire to find growth and resolution for some elements of cyclic integration pose further problems, particularly in cases where organicism is taken as an analytic starting point. In fact, as mentioned in chapter 1, cyclic integration is not synonymous with organicism, but is actually a prerequisite of any organic interpretation, though these terms are often conflated.

In its purest sense, cyclic integration seeks relationships among movements without any implication of growth or development. Thus it need not be given the narrative or teleological function often attributed to Beethoven’s organicism. It seeks connections through both similar and contrasting musical elements. Cyclic integration appears at varying degrees, beginning with mundane, stylistic, or conventional connections of key, mode, instrumentation, and the composer’s designation of a group of movements as a single work. More significant levels of connection appear through a host of shared elements, including for
example thematic material. These appearances of cyclic integration are the basis upon which other methods (such as organicism, dramatic process, unity in variety, tonal problems, etc.) are applied. Cyclic integration queries the musical reasons for why a composer has grouped together movements as a single work. Similarly, cyclic integration does not necessarily deal with matters of aesthetic judgment, such as determining the value or artfulness of a piece of music.

Most of the approaches to cyclic integration surveyed in the first two chapters of this dissertation involve organicism to a certain extent. Rudolph Réti argues that Beethoven wrote entire compositions from the growth of small “motivic cells.” Arnold Schoenberg’s “developing variation,” Webster’s “through-composition,” and Haimo’s “disruptions” and “required resolutions” all refer to organic notions such as growth and resolution. Each approach in its own way limits the scope of what constitutes cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart by forcing their works to conform to a template. As argued in chapter 1, this template has been fashioned using a set of paradigmatic works based on Beethoven’s practice rather than that of the late eighteenth century. A new definition of cyclic integration’s parameters is required; one that does not rely upon the musical practices and paradigms of the nineteenth century.

**A Theory of Cyclic Integration**

A work can be considered cyclically integrated to a degree above the conventional when one or more connections, beyond those fostered by style and genre, foster a relationship between two or more of its movements. Any type of element can create the connection, musical or non-musical. Elements can also work in tandem to strengthen a work’s sense of cyclic integration by joining to form a fluid matrix of elements that may or may not be present in
each movement. Thus cyclic connections can be of any strength, from very strong to insignificant, they can involve a single strong element or a variety or combination of elements of different strengths, and they can involve any number of movements, each of which may be connected at any degree of strength.

There are essentially two types of connections in the works of Haydn and Mozart: conventional and extra-conventional. Conventional connections are those relationships that are “expected” of a work. Extra-conventional connections vary from work to work, and might be thought of as “optional” connections that give the movements of a work an affinity above and beyond the similarities generated by conventional connections. Practically every work by Haydn and Mozart has a conventional sense of cyclic integration, while most of their works have at least one extra-conventional element that fosters a greater degree of integration.¹

Conventional cyclic integration appears in every multi-movement musical work by Haydn and Mozart, but typically these types of similarity pass unnoticed precisely because they are expected. To begin with, multi-movement works have this minimal sense of cyclic integration through the composer’s designation that the movements are part of a single work. Additional conventional elements include connections created through key, mode, instrumentation, and idiom. For instance, the conventions of the Classical era are such that one can reasonably expect at least two movements, and possibly three or four movements, of a multi-movement instrumental work to be in the same key. Similarly one can reasonably expect that each movement of a string quartet will use the same four stringed instruments, or that a piano sonata will use a solo piano in each movement. Such connections are of trivial

¹ See chapter 5 for a discussion of the scope of their practice.
importance, but they foster a weak relationship between movements nevertheless. These similarities make the cycle conform to conventional expectations just as conventional contrasting elements, such as movement type and meter, maintain the interest of the listener through variety. Haydn and Mozart include conventional elements of cyclic integration in their works to fulfill expectations and to promote intelligibility.

Extra-conventional elements of cyclic integration give movements a stronger sense of cyclic integration than the minimal affinities of conventional connections. Typically these elements offer specific insights into the musical reasons for why a composer places movements together as part of a single specific work. Shared themes, the focus of most previous analyses of cyclic integration, are but one of many extra-conventional cyclic elements. Chapter 4 addresses this variety of elements in detail. In fact, nearly any musical element can foster a sense of cyclic integration, not just themes and motives. Yet not all extra-conventional cyclic elements necessarily give a work a strong sense of cyclic integration; more often than not, individual elements create a moderate sense of cyclic integration. A spectrum of possibilities for cyclic integration appears in table 3.1.

Table 3.1: A spectrum of strengths for elements of cyclic integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional</th>
<th>Trivial</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connections expected of a work such as key, mode, and instrumentation</td>
<td>Connection beyond conventional considered too general or vague to be relevant</td>
<td>Possible relationship lacking prominence and support</td>
<td>Clear relationship but may rely upon the support of other elements</td>
<td>Prominent relationship not requiring the support of additional elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trivial elements of cyclic integration are those that are seemingly typical of the language, too generally defined, or too isolated or weakly used to be very convincing or of much interest. Weak elements go beyond conventional expectations and the trivial, but still
seem somewhat problematic or insignificant. Moderate connections often appear too similar to be coincidental but may not be overly apparent. They may also be otherwise convincing connections lacking in prominence in some way. Strong connections are those that are undeniable in their similarity and prominence. Any cyclic element can appear at any degree of strength or relevance, depending primarily upon the degree of similarity and the prominence of the connection. These categories are not hard and fast either, as there are gradations of strength in each (a connection might be “very strong” or “extremely strong,” etc.). In some cases, elements can be of differing strengths depending on the movements under consideration. Two movements might share a strong cyclic element, while a third movement might use the same element but at a lesser degree of strength.

The prominence of a musical element plays a central role in the strength of a connection between movements. An element that appears briefly in the middle of one movement and towards the end of another movement may not be very prominent and thus fosters a weaker sense of cyclic integration than a similar element placed in similar formal positions. The opening of a movement is the most prominent position available to the composer, so connections appearing in the openings of two or more movements, or in similar positions (section breaks, formal areas, etc.) in multiple movements, will be very prominent and therefore more significant to a work’s sense of cyclic integration.

Another factor useful for determining the strength of a musical element of cyclic integration is the cooperation and appearance of one or more other elements in close proximity. Generally speaking, the relative strength of a cyclic element can be raised when acting in conjunction with other cyclic elements as part of a matrix. Suppose for instance, that two movements have triadic themes. Without further connections this would probably be
a trivial connection. However, if these triadic themes appeared in similar formal positions using a distinct texture, dynamic level, rhythm, and metric placement, the connection would be much more plausible. The more connections such gestures share, the more convincing the connection will be.

Extra-musical elements can also influence the degree of a work’s sense of cyclic integration. For example, Haydn and Mozart wrote a number of works with a specific virtuoso performer in mind. Such precompositional considerations are extra-musical by nature but still foster a sense of cyclic integration, often through musical means. For example, as will be seen in chapter 4, Mozart emphasizes the cello part in multiple movements of the String Quartet in D major, K. 575, presumably because his dedicatee was a cellist.²

In addition, cyclic integration does not necessarily require a sense of similarity, only a sense of connection. This means that contrast can foster a sense of cyclic integration in much the same way as similarity. For example, Haydn used very remote key areas for the middle movements of some of his later works. In these works, harmonic contrast rather than similarity seems to be the operating factor in creating a relationship. In some cases the remote key also appears in other movements – in these cases both contrast and similarity cooperate to foster a sense of cyclic integration.³ Contrast as a significant relationship among movements can be difficult to detect, however, because the conventions of the Classical era mandate a certain amount of contrast between movements. That is, there is often no way of

---

² This is also true of the other “Prussian” quartets, but need not always be the case of course. W. Dean Sutcliffe (Haydn: String Quartets Op. 50 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 66-7.) has argued that Haydn’s “Prussian” string quartets, dedicated to the same man as Mozart’s, do not really feature the cello per se beyond the opening measure of the first quartet of the set.

distinguishing between a conventionally contrasting element and a contrast more significant to a work’s sense of cyclic integration. For this reason, cyclic connections due to similarity will be the focus of my examination of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart.

Cyclic integration exists in a continuum, in which connecting elements can appear at any degree of strength, and where individual movements may or may not participate in a given connection. This is a critical distinction between organic unity and cyclic integration, as organic unity presumes the strongest degree of integration from one phrase to the next and among all the movements of a work. A weak or moderately strong connection, or the absence of such an element from a movement, would inhibit or destroy the organic unity of a piece of music. This is not the case for cyclic integration, however, as weak and moderate connections still offer possible explanations for why certain movements are placed together as part of a work.

Finally, any musical element, and even extra-musical elements, can foster a sense of cyclic integration. Traditionally, thematic resemblance has been the primary focus of analyses. Organicism has influenced this limitation, partly as growth, development, and resolution are easily applied to thematic material, and partly because nineteenth-century music emphasized this approach to composition. Other musical elements are not as easily interpreted in organic terms, and therefore have been ignored for the most part. Cyclic integration identifies connections among two or more movements regardless of the element used to create the connection. Texture, harmony, rhythm, phrase structure, form, dynamics, and thematic resemblances must all be taken into consideration if a full picture of a work’s cyclic integration is to be obtained.
A Case Study of Cyclic Integration: Mozart’s String Quartet in A Major, K. 464

The following analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464 presents a detailed examination of the cyclic elements shared among the movements of this work. As noted above, my reconceptualization of cyclic integration rests two key tenets. First, the strength of a work’s cyclic integration as well as the connections shared by movements exist in a continuum ranging from very weak to very strong. Second, any element can foster a sense of cyclic integration, not just thematic material. This analysis of K. 464 puts my reconceptualization of cyclic integration into practice.

• **The Opening Phrases of K. 464/i, ii, and iv**

Mozart composed the opening phrase of K. 464, using a number of discrete musical elements that reappear in later movements (see example 1). Melodically, he works using short phrases set apart by rests in each voice. These moments of silence break up the phrases and give the melody a chance to breathe. Mozart also uses a chromatic pitch (D sharp) right away as his third note. The D sharp sticks out in this tonic section, especially as not enough time has passed to solidify the tonic. It also contrasts with the D natural of m. 2 and creates a motive of sorts. Another musical element that distinguishes this opening phrase is Mozart’s tendency to switch textures rapidly. He opens with an alternation of homophony and a solo voice, and then moves to all four instruments in unison at m. 9. The phrase then cadences using a more conventional quartet texture. Dynamics are another musical element used by Mozart in this movement; he continually and frequently alternates between piano and forte. Mozart’s carefully constructed opening phrase structure is also notable. The m. 1 statement is followed by a reiteration down a step at m. 4, while the statement at m. 8 is repeated up a step at m.10.
Finally, Mozart uses a fair amount of contrapuntal workings in this opening section: the transition opens with imitative entries of the primary theme at m. 16.

Example 1: Musical elements in the exposition of K. 464/i
These individual elements do not startle the listener or seem particularly unusual from a stylistic point of view, though the imitative transition is notable. The combination of these elements creates a musical matrix that gives K. 464’s first movement its distinguishing qualities and character. In later movements this matrix of elements becomes the distinct, recognizable, unit that makes K. 464 a single, cyclically integrated work and not a collection of four unrelated movements.

The Minuet opens with the same elemental matrix as the first movement (see example 2). The opening phrase divides neatly into short utterances separated by silence. The texture switches from an opening unison to a homophonic continuation and eventually to imitative solos at m. 13. Mozart contrasts dynamics even more closely here than in the first movement: now they switch twice within the first four measures. His phrase structure is also cast from the same mold as that of the first movement. Mozart transposes the motive of the first two measures up a step and moves the motive of mm. 5-6 down a step. Mozart’s contrapuntal techniques reappear in the minuet as well. In fact this movement has an extraordinary amount of contrapuntal artifice considering its conciseness. The opening theme consists of two distinct motives, labeled X and Y in example 2. Mozart combines X and Y in m. 9. Immediately afterward, Mozart presents X imitatively. At m. 17 he presents Y in close imitation with its inversion.
Example 2: The elements of cyclic integration appearing in the opening of K. 464/ii

A look at the opening of K. 464’s finale reveals the same musical matrix found in the earlier movements (see example 3). Rests divide the subject into short distinct sections, though the polyphonic texture belies total silence. The motivic contrast between D sharp and D natural moves to the fore as the most distinctive part of the theme. The texture alternates between solo and homophonic settings. Mozart manages to retain much of his phrase structure as well, by sequencing the opening subject down a step at m. 5.
Example 3: The musical elements of the opening phrase of K. 464/iv

Mozart’s approach to counterpoint in this movement is a culmination of the ideas begun in the first movement. The subject/countersubject opening is followed by a number of contrapuntal techniques later in the movement, including close imitation (mm. 28ff.), melodic and thematic inversion (m. 54 and mm. 86-112 respectively), augmentation (mm. 117-20) and even triple counterpoint (mm. 103ff.). The brief reference to species counterpoint from the first movement (mm. 250-53) also returns within the finale’s development (mm. 114-21). Once again Mozart uses underlying elements to connect the movement to the others while maintaining a sense of contrast in other areas such as harmony and rhythm.

K. 464 is strongly cyclically integrated without the need for an overt thematic resemblance. The various cyclic elements work together to create a convincing matrix of connections among the work’s movements. However, as shown in example 4, there seem to
be a few thematic connections throughout this work as well. The thematic connections in this work do not seem overly apparent, but when considered in conjunction with the numerous similarities observed above, they have enough strength to be plausible. The opening two phrases of the first movement have counterparts in the second and fourth movements.

**Example 4: Thematic similarities in K. 464**

To be sure, K. 464’s thematic connections are not as blatant or pervasive as those seen in Beethoven’s Fifth, but neither are they so subtle that they requires an undue amount of analysis to elucidate. The critical factor in making these thematic connections plausible is the overwhelming strength of the other cyclic elements noted above. The thematic connections are made more plausible by the other cyclic elements, not the other way around as is typical of most approaches to cyclic integration. Were only the themes of this work pointed out in isolation, one might find the thematic connections unconvincing. By incorporating a broad range of musical elements into the analysis of a work’s cyclic integration, not just thematic connections, a fuller, more convincing, picture of the relationships among a work’s movements is possible.
• A Continuum of Strengths: K. 464/iii

The pervasive use of organically based approaches to cyclic integration has led to the presumption that only very strong connections between movements can foster a relationship. In addition, organicism emphasizes the opening moments of movements as the most likely place to find connections. Cyclic integration is not so simple a phenomenon, however, because no two movements, indeed no two elements, have connections with the same degree of strength. The prominence and strength of a particular element relies partly on its placement (i.e. stronger elements appear at openings), but moderately strong connection can appear at any point in a movement. In the case of K. 464, for example, the third movement seems less strongly connected to the work than the other movements, mostly because its opening section has few of the connecting elements noted in the other movements.

The third movement may be less connected than the others, but this in no way diminishes the strong connections among the other movements. The first two movements have a number of strong connections, no matter what appears in the remaining movements, since the complete elemental matrix of the first movement appears in the opening moments of the second movement. A useful comparison can be made here to Beethoven’s Fifth. In that work the slow movement is unquestionably more weakly integrated to the other movements than the other three movements, but the slow movement in no way weakens or reduces the strong relationship among the other three movements.4

Each of the musical elements in K. 464 varies in strength from movement to movement. Mozart’s contrapuntal interest is much more obvious in the minuet and finale

4 Analysts typically take this as a challenge to examine the slow movement in detail in an attempt to show “hidden” or “latent” connections. This, in turn, weakens their argument and offers a reason to be skeptical of the entire argument. In Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, for example, a typical argument is to note the A-flat harmonic connection between the end of the first movement and the beginning of the second, a weak substitute for the much less prominent use of the rhythmic motive in the second movement.
than in the first movement because of its prominence. Conversely his interest in the contrast between D-sharp and D-natural is more subdued in the minuet than in the outer movements. Individually, the various strengths of each element might go unnoticed, but their combination forges a strong bond that makes the three movements an integrated part of the work.

This is not to say that each of the movements exudes similarity, as in many nineteenth-century works. The cyclic connections in K. 464 do not interfere with the contrasting elements one might expect in a Classical-era composition. The rhythms of each movement contrast starkly, for example, even though the first two movements are both in triple meter. Mozart consistently uses an anacrusis gesture in the first movement, but none appears in the entire second movement, at least not at the measure level. The rhythms of each movement differ as well, with meandering eighth notes in the first movement, rigid half notes in the second movement, and quarter notes in the finale. The third movement’s similarities and contrasts exist within the context of a number of similarities and differences across all of the movements.

As it turns out though, the third movement of K. 464 has certain connections with the other movements. To be sure, Mozart does not include many cyclic elements in its opening phrase. The only elements present in the theme are its D sharp/D natural motive, which is transposed to the new key (to G sharp/G natural) and reiterated three times, and its anacrustic opening, which is a weak connection without the support of other elements (see example 5). The overall weakness of the elements in this movement’s opening phrase reduces the connection between this movement and the rest of the work. Nevertheless, certain connections appear as the movement progresses, meaning that this movement has a moderate sense of connection to the other movements of the work.
Despite the opening phrase’s lack of cyclic elements, Mozart connects K. 464/iii to the work by using the theme and variations setting to explore many of his cyclic elements. For example, the varied textures used throughout the movement act as a natural extension of the textural variation found in the other movements. Other connections are less conventional to the theme and variations setting. In Variation I, Mozart closely juxtaposes loud and soft dynamics. Variation V features close imitation and contrapuntal combination, a continuance of his interest in contrapuntal devices (see example 6).

Example 6: Cyclic elements in the variations of K. 464/iii (Variation I left, Variation V right)

The third movement has very strong individual connections to the finale in addition to these other relationships (see example 7). In Variation VI at m. 114 Mozart uses a turn figure imitatively in alternating registers. The violins play the turn in close imitation and are
followed by the viola and cello. This set of elements also returns in m. 25 of the finale, as a similar turn figure played by the violins in close imitation is imitated by the viola and cello.

Example 7: Elements of cyclic integration in K. 464/iii
a) The turn figure in imitation in K. 464/iii Variation 6

b) The turn figure in imitation in K. 464/iv

Altogether the third movement of K. 464 shares a moderate number of connections with the work as a whole, and a number of fairly strong connections to the finale. Mozart walks a tightrope in that he tries to find a way to maintain a balance between similarity and contrast among the movements. He connects the movements while avoiding an overbearing number of connections that would make his writing predictable, repetitive, or one-dimensional. The result is that each movement has its own unique connection to the others, each with its own individual degree of strength.
In the same way that some of the work’s key cyclic elements are not present in the slow movement, other musical elements are present in only a pair of K. 464’s movements. These elements foster a sense of cyclic integration, though in a weaker way than if they had been more prominent or present in more than two movements. The first and second movements share two distinct traits not found in other movements: an emphasis on the repeated note driving towards the downbeat, and contrasting articulations (see example 8). These connections get overshadowed by the much stronger relationships discussed above, but they nevertheless reinforce the strong connection between the two movements.

Example 8: Additional elements of cyclic integration in K. 464/i (left) and ii (right)

- Cyclic Integration Beyond the Opening Phrases of K. 464

A useful tool in assessing the strength and importance of certain elements of cyclic integration can be examining the ways in which those elements are used throughout each individual movement. The more often a given element appears within a movement, the greater its significance. However, even without further use in a movement, a given connection may still foster a strong sense of integration. In fact, some elements cannot appear more than once per movement, for example a run-on movement pair or, in the case of K. 464,
an imitative transition. By investigating these additional instances of connections among the movements, the full scope of each element’s relevance can be determined.5

An overview of each of K. 464’s movements reveals that there is virtually a continuous interest in presenting some of the cyclic elements. Mozart includes some of the cyclic elements in the secondary key area of the first movement (see example 9).

**Example 9: Elements of cyclic integration in the secondary key area of K. 464/i**

He separates the phrases by rests and uses contrasting textures in much the same way as in the opening phrase of the movement. Similarly a section using imitation follows the

---

5 Other potential benefits of investigating the movements in full include the possibility of applying other interpretive frameworks to the music, for example notions of growth, disruption, or resolution. These approaches stem from organicism and are therefore not, strictly speaking, cyclic integration in the sense used in this dissertation. They will therefore not be addressed here. For more on the differences between organicism and cyclic integration, see chapter 1, pages 14ff.
appearance of this theme, much as the imitative transition follows the opening theme. The D-sharp/D-natural contrast is not here, but there is a prominent B-sharp/B-natural contrast that might potentially be related to the opening phrase.

The remainder of the movement incorporates the elements of cyclic integration to varying degrees. Imitation, for example, is Mozart’s main developmental device. The most intense moment of textural contrast appears in the movement’s coda, where imitation (mm. 236ff.) gives way to homophony using the “bound style” topic (mm. 250-53), which itself becomes a solo texture (mm. 254-55) and eventually a quasi-hocket section (mm. 260-62) before the final homophonic closing phrase (mm. 266-70). These contrasts in texture are accompanied by contrasting dynamics in each case, making for eight alternations between forte and piano in the span of just under thirty measures. The D sharp/D natural contrast also appears throughout the work, as it is an integral part of the work’s main theme. It last appears just before the end of the movement in the bass (m. 264). Here the contrast appears to be divorced of its thematic context.

The minuet and trio is so brief and compact that the analysis of it presented above in example 2 covers nearly the entire movement. Yet there are a few points of connection that show a continued interest in the elements presented in its opening phrase. For example, rests appear prominently in the minuet’s b section, breaking up the phrases to an even greater extent than in the movements opening phrase (see example 10). A full measure of rest appears at m. 33, and nearly another complete measure of rests occurs at m. 43. At m. 33 Mozart seemingly breaks off the phrase midway.

---

6 The bound style is a topical reference to species counterpoint or the “learned” style. For more on this particular topic see Wye J. Allanbrook, *Rhythmic Gesture in Mozart* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 18.
Example 10: The use of rest in the b section of K. 464/ii

The contrast between D sharp and D natural appears prominently in the minuet section as well (see example 11). At m. 54, immediately preceding the return of the a phrase, the second violin plays these pitches in a solo texture.

Example 11: A prominent contrast of D-sharp/D-natural in K. 464/ii

The finale, like the previous movements, uses many of the cyclic elements throughout. Practically the entire movement uses imitation, for example, and the chromatic nature of the opening theme makes for many instances of contrasting D sharps and D naturals. Another perhaps less expected connection is the quickly alternating dynamics and textures near the end of the exposition. At m. 59 Mozart uses a solo violin, and passes through the bound style at mm. 62-64 and another quasi-hocket section before arriving at a
more conventional texture at m. 67 (see example 12). Over the course of these measures the dynamics decrescendo from forte to piano and then alternate once more.

Example 12: Textural and dynamic contrasts near the end of the exposition of K. 464/iv

The opening of the development section also includes some of this work’s elements of cyclic integration (see example 13). Here Mozart combines the fragments of the movement’s two themes contrapuntally, much as in the second movement. In addition, he separates the first

---

7 The bound style (see footnote 6) appears more prominently and for a more prolonged period of time at mm. 114-21. These two appearances could be taken as a specific element of cyclic integration with the first movement, or could be attributed to Mozart’s overall interest in contrapuntal devices in this quartet.
phrase of the section from its continuation by using a rest with fermata. Finally the textures and dynamics contrast on either side of the rests.

Example 13: Shared elements in the opening of the development of K. 464/iv

Some of the elements of cyclic integration also appear in the closing moments of the finale. Mozart separates his musical utterances into two-measure segments separated by rests on either side beginning at m. 251 and continuing until the end (m. 262, see example 14). Contrapuntal inversion is used throughout, as the opening theme appears above and below a counter subject repeatedly. Finally, the contrast between D sharp and D natural is quite prominent. This is especially true of the final measure, where the falling chromatic motive is recast as a closing gesture and as part of a perfect authentic cadence. Prior to this m. 257, the motive had always appeared as an opening gesture.
Example 14: Shared elements at the end of K. 464/iv

In all, the elements of cyclic integration identified in the opening phrase of the first movement have a relationship with a number of points throughout each of the work’s movements, not just the beginnings of, or a single point within, each following movement. This might be expected, considering that consistency of material in single, individual, movements written by Haydn and Mozart have been taken for granted since the time of their composition.\(^8\) Nevertheless, the pervasive nature of these elements demonstrates the very strong degree of integration that appears in among the movements of K. 464.

\(^8\) Koch and Galeazzi, among others, both argue for unity within Haydn’s individual movements, see chapter 2, pages 34ff.
Concluding Notes on the Methodology Outlined Above

Critics of cyclic integration in the eighteenth century have argued that similarities between movements can be found whenever they are sought because those connections are merely stylistic coincidences. This generalization exaggerates the situation. While it might be possible to construct a weak or trivial relationship, as had been done for some of the connections criticized by LaRue, convincing connections cannot be manufactured. In much the same way the question of intention is irrelevant: whether or not Mozart (or for that matter Beethoven in the Fifth Symphony) intended to relate the movements, the connections are there. The overall number of connections in K. 464 (and again in the Fifth Symphony) defies coincidence, but cannot, and need not, address intention.

By approaching cyclic integration as a multi-faceted compositional approach existing within a continuum rather than an organic phenomenon based principally upon thematic connections, a more complete and more convincing picture of Haydn and Mozart’s cyclic integration is possible. An adjustment in preconceptions is necessary for this to succeed. Cyclic integration is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon, but instead exists in a continuum where connections can be moderately strong, or where a number of moderately strong connections can cooperate to foster a strong bond among movements.

The ideal analysis of cyclic integration posits plausible explanations for why the composer placed a set of movements together as a single work by examining the ways in which its movements are related to one another. The movements may be complementary through similarity or contrast, through conventional or extra-conventional connections, or through a mixture of all of the above. Each work will feature different connections of varying

---

9 LaRue, “Significant,” 224-34.
strengths. In the next chapter, the variety of possibilities for cyclic integration will be presented in detail. By adjusting the parameters used to evaluate cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart, and by reevaluating our assumptions and preconceptions, it is possible to see the full variety of elements and strengths used by these composers to foster, or at least exploit, a sense of cyclic integration among their movements.
CHAPTER 4
A SURVEY OF CYCLIC ELEMENTS

My reconceptualization of cyclic integration as laid out in chapter 3 rests on and requires a preponderance of supporting evidence. The casual resistance to cyclic integration in the music of this era is strong enough to ignore an isolated analysis such as that of K. 464, but the bulk of evidence provided in this chapter demonstrates that the movements of a large number of works by Haydn and Mozart have connections that foster a sense of cyclic integration. In addition, there has never been a broad survey of cyclic integration in Classical era, so this chapter offers a number of new insights into these composers’ practices. This chapter also includes a large variety of ways in which the movements of their works are connected to each other, a direct result of changing the parameters, assumptions, and preconceptions used to analyze their cyclic integration. An overview of the results of this survey, including the role of genre and chronology on cyclic integration at during the period of time examined is given in chapter 5.

In all, 247 works written by Haydn and Mozart from c. 1770-c. 1800, including their symphonies, concertos, string quartets, string quintets, piano trios, piano quartets, and sonatas, have been examined. These works are listed in table 4.1.
Table 4.1: Works examined for evidence of cyclic integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haydn (171 works)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quartets (Op/No.): 9/1-6, 17/1-6, 20/1-6, 33/1-6, 42, 50/1-6, 54/1-3, 55/1-3, 64/1-6, 71/1-3, 74/1-3, 76/1-6, 77/1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonies: 26, 41-104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concertos: Cello 1 &amp; 2, Trumpet, Piano 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonatas Hob XVI: 18, 33-44, 46, 48-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trios Hob. XV: 5, 7-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart (76 works)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quintets: K. 406/516b, 515, 516, 593, 614, Clarinet K. 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonies: 26-31, 33-36, 38-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Concertos: Clarinet K. 622, Horn K. 447, 495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonatas: K. 279/189d, 280/189e, 281/189f, 282/189g, 283/189h, 284/205b, 309/284b, 310/300d, 311/284c, 330/300h, 331/300i, 332/300k, 333/315c, 457, 533, 545, 576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trios: K. 496, 502, 542, 548, 564, Clarinet Trio K. 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartets: K. 478, 493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For reasons of space and conciseness, the analyses given here are not complete analyses of individual works, but rather short discussions of how one particular use of a musical element fosters a sense of cyclic integration. These analyses have been divided based upon the general musical element involved into seven sections: “Beginnings and Endings,” “Distinctive Formal Characteristics,” “Harmony,” “Thematic Material,” “Rhythm, Meter, and Phrase Structure,” “Musical Topics,” and “Texture.” Each section includes a number of individual analyses. At the end of each section, under the “Section Summary” headings, I provide a list of other works in which Haydn and Mozart use a given musical element to foster a sense of cyclic integration. The works included in these summaries offer what I feel to be the strongest examples where each element is used to foster a connection among movements. Citations of others’ analyses have also been included whenever possible. The
lists include only enough information to find the relevant passage. This is partly out of a concern for space and readability, and partly because a short or incomplete analysis of each work would be unconvincing and might be mistaken for a haphazard attempt at a complete one. I have not included weak instances of cyclic integration in the lists, as these would require a full analysis to be convincing. A cross listing of these elements indexed by work appears in appendix 1 for easy reference.

Two of the analyses given in this chapter are exceptions to the above criteria. First, I have given a full analysis Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione) under the heading “thematic resemblances” on pages 157ff. Given that thematic resemblance is the most frequently examined and the most scrutinized element of cyclic integration, a complete analysis seemed warranted. Second, I have given a lengthy analysis of Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 76/4 (Sunrise) under the heading “distortion of meter” on pages 186ff. This complete analysis has been provided as an additional example to the analysis of Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464 in chapter 3, if for no other reason but to show that Haydn’s oeuvre includes compositions whose cyclic integration functions in essentially the same manner.

**Beginnings and Endings**

This section examines musical elements that appear at parallel points in multiple movements (e.g. similar gestures at the ends of two or more movements) as well as elements that appear near the juncture of two movements (such as the end of one movement and the beginning of the next). When similar elements appear at parallel points in multiple movements, the strength of the connection increases. When a movement begins using material taken from the
closing moments of the immediately preceding movement, the music picks up where it left off and maintains a line of thought that fosters a sense of cyclic integration.

- **Parallel Opening Gestures: See Various Analyses Throughout**
  When musical elements appear in the openings of multiple movements, they can foster a very strong sense of cyclic integration simply through their placement in each movement’s most prominent section. Because a large number of works discussed in this chapter have parallel musical elements in the opening moments of two or more movements, I have omitted a sample analysis of parallel opening gestures. For the best examples of this type of cyclic integration, see the analysis of K. 464 in chapter 3 (especially the discussion of the importance of connections at the opening of movements in contrast to at various other points under the heading “A Continuum of Strengths: K. 464/iii”), the analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 below under the heading “thematic resemblance,” and his String Quartet Op. 76/4 below under the heading “distortion of meter.”

- **Parallel Closing Gestures: Haydn’s Piano Sonata in D major, Hob. XVI: 51**
  When the closing moments of two or more movements of a work parallel each other, as in the two movements of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in D major, Hob. XVI: 51, the similarities foster a sense of cyclic integration. The conventional gestures of closure (cadence, tonal stability, etc.) do not in themselves provide a sense of cyclic integration, since they are necessarily present in nearly every movement. In Hob XVI: 51, Haydn goes beyond these basic necessities by including a prominent B flat (scale-degree flat 6), a tonic pedal tone, and the constant repetition of melodic and harmonic patterns (see example 1). In addition, the movements both end on a third, rather than a complete chord, and are voiced in a similar manner. Indeed the two endings have only the most superficial differences.
Example 1: Similarities in the closing moments of the two movements of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in D major, Hob. XVI: 51

a) The ending of Hob. XVI: 51/i

Haydn tailor-makes these endings to fit together in tandem. In both cases the sustained D pedal tone lasts for a number of measures, the B flat appears in an inner voice and resolves downward to A, and the two phrases focus on the repetition of a short motive and accompanimental pattern. The use of thirds instead of complete chords at the very end may be a fairly conventional gesture, but in light of the other similarities between these endings, this voicing takes on a greater degree of significance.\(^1\)

b) The ending of Hob. XVI: 51/ii

Connections at the Juncture of Movements: Haydn’s Symphony No. 95 in C minor

Haydn bridges the gap between movements using a number of different means, each of which has a variety of potential strengths. Those connections that make use of the *attacca* stipulation have already been examined by Webster, though he does not distinguish between

\(^1\) Note: For further examples of this approach to cyclic integration (and for each subsequent example), please refer to the section summary given at the end of each heading.
the different kinds of *attacca* connections used by Haydn. In each case Haydn forces the listener to hear harmonic motion across the double bar line. The most common method at his disposal is the use of a half cadence to close a movement, as for example in the Piano Sonata in E flat major, Hob. XVI: 38 (see example 2a).

**Example 2: The varieties of run-on movement connections**

a) Run-on connection using half-cadence close with *attacca* stipulation in Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E flat major, Hob. XVI: 38/ii-iii

The strongest *attacca* designations are those that include a modulation to a distantly related key area, as happens in the Piano Trio in A flat major Hob. XV: 14 (see example 2b). Here, the E major second movement modulates across the double bar-line back to the tonic A flat of the finale. The listener must hear the resolution across movements because of the modulation. Similarly, given the remoteness of the two key areas, Haydn must make a conscious effort to make the connection function properly.

---

2 James Webster, *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 186-94. He offers a detailed discussion of how run-on movements, those places where a composer directly links one movement to the next, foster a sense of cyclic integration. For further discussion of Webster’s approach, see chapter 2.
b) Run-on connection involving modulation to a remote key area in Haydn’s Piano Trio in A flat major
Hob. XV: 14/ii-iii

In a third approach, Haydn closes a movement with a half cadence of some sort before beginning the next movement in an unexpected but closely related key. The rhetoric of a harmonic connection remains, but without the implied resolution. This occurs in his Symphony No. 45 in F sharp minor (Farewell), where the fourth movement ends with a half cadence in F sharp minor before the fifth movement opens in A major, and the Piano Trio in E flat major Hob. XV: 30, where the second movement closes on a tonic half cadence in C major, before the next movement begins in E flat (see example 2c). In these cases he removes temporal gap between movements with the *attacca* stipulation and a half cadence, but maintains a harmonic break by moving to an unexpected key.

---

3 A single pitch (C sharp) in Symphony No. 45 creates this half cadence, while Hob. XV: 30 includes a complete chord.
c) Run-on connection using half cadence in one key followed by movement in closely related key in Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 in F sharp minor (Farewell) Mvts. iv-v

Attacca stipulations and half cadences do not comprise the complete spectrum of possibilities for bridging the juncture between movements, however. Haydn connects the end of the second movement with the opening of the third movement of his Symphony No. 95 in C minor, for example, without resorting to run-on movements (see example 3). Instead of a run-on connection, he uses a similarity among other musical elements. The second movement of this symphony concludes with isolated pairs of eighth notes and alternating dynamics. The minuet begins where the previous movement left off: by using two-note pairs at a quiet dynamic. To strengthen this connection Haydn opens the minuet without a clear tonic, meter, or tempo, clouding the break between movements. The G that opens the minuet in the violins is a common tone with the end of the slow movement, despite the difference of key. The fast-
A similarity of elements is not necessarily required to foster a sense of connection between one movement’s end and the next movement’s beginning. In Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E flat major, Hob. XVI: 52, musical elements reduce the jarring harmonic contrast between the E major ending of the second movement and the E flat major opening of the finale (see example 4). He reduces the dynamic level to piano at the close of the movement.
and continues similarly in the next movement’s opening. Rather than open the finale with an E-flat chord, Haydn commences with a single repeated pitch (G). By ending the second movement in a low register, he used the piano itself as a means of making the move less jarring, as the lower register with a complete triad muddies the sound. Finally, the use of this repeated pitch creates a brief thematic resemblance with the second movement’s ending moments, which also features a repeated pitch (E).

Example 4: The relationship between E major in the close of the Piano Sonata in E flat major Hob. XVI: 52/ii and E flat major in the opening of the finale

a) The ending of Hob. XVI: 52/ii

b) The opening of Hob. XVI: 52/iii

The five ways in which Haydn uses run-on movements as discussed above are listed in table 4.2. Three of these use *attacca* stipulations, and are distinguished by the harmonic relationships involved between the two movements (identical, closely related, distantly related). Thematic connections and the smoothing of harmonic contrast across movements do not involve *attacca* stipulations but nevertheless connect the end of a movement to the movement following.
Table 4.2: The various means used by Haydn to connect the end of one movement to the opening of the next

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of connection</th>
<th>Element(s) used</th>
<th>Example work(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modulation across the bar line to a remote key</td>
<td>Harmony and \textit{attacca} stipulation</td>
<td>Piano Trio in A flat major, Hob. XV: 14/ii-iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half cadence resolved in closely related key across bar line</td>
<td>Harmony and \textit{attacca} stipulation</td>
<td>Piano Sonata in E flat major, Hob. XVI: 38/ii-iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half cadence resolved to unexpected key</td>
<td>Harmonic implication (thwarted) and \textit{attacca} stipulation</td>
<td>Symphony No. 45/iv-v; Piano Trio in E flat major, Hob. XV: 30/ii-iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>Thematic resemblance</td>
<td>Symphony No. 95/ii-iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing of contrast</td>
<td>Harmony, thematic resemblance, dynamics</td>
<td>Piano Sonata in E flat, Hob. XVI: 52/ii-iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Use of Opening Gesture as Closing Gesture: Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 33/2 (The Joke)**

Leonard Meyer has pointed out the importance of musical function in determining the significance of certain proposed connections among movements, as noted in chapter 2. With its use of opening gestures to end the first and final movements, Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 33/2 (The Joke) stands as an excellent example of musical function as an element of cyclic integration.

The first movement opens with a two-note anacrusis (see example 5). As the opening phrase progresses, Haydn continually emphasizes the anacrusis, first through repetition, then through development. Throughout the movement Haydn treats this anacrusis as the most important motivic material in the movement. Haydn emphasizes the dual function of the anacrusis by using it to close the movement: it now functions as a closing gesture, the last statement of the movement, the exact opposite of its original function as the quartet’s first idea (see example 5b).
Example 5: The transformation of opening gestures into closing gestures in Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 33/2 (The Joke)

a) The anacrusis as opening gesture in Op. 33/2/i

b) The anacrusis as closing gesture at the end of Op. 33/2/i

The infamous false endings of the finale, which have given the quartet its inauthentic name, incorporate the same switch of functions seen in the first movement. The opening theme of the finale becomes the work’s closing statement in dramatic fashion. In this case,
Haydn presents only the very opening of the theme at the end of the movement, making for a very unresolved ending to the work. Haydn fosters a sense of cyclic integration in Op. 33/2 by using a change in function to construct the endings of both outer movements in the same way.

c) The opening theme of Op. 33/2/iv closes the movement

- **Section Summary**

Works in which parallels between the opening sections of movements foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn

Symphonies
- 44 (unison openings all and open fifth endings I, II, IV)
- 56 (opening contrast of texture and dynamics in I, III, and IV)

String Quartets
- 17/5 (opening phrase closes II and IV)
- 76/4 (opening ranges of all mvts. unfold to high B♭ in the vln.)
Mozart
Piano Concerto K. 414/385p (quiet openings in all mvts.)
String Quartet K. 590 (the opening textures of I, II, and III, gradually unfold from simple [unison or homophonic] to more complex [imitation, etc.] in addition, the opening themes of I and II are sequenced up by step while III’s theme is sequenced down a third)
String Quintet K. 593 (quiet openings to all mvts.)
Piano Sonata K. 279/189d (opening bass figure near the end of III)
Piano Trio K. 542 (all mvts. open with a piano solo)

Works in which parallels between the closing sections of movements foster a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
79 (I and IV have identical endings)
97 (loud tutti chords separated by rests close I, II, and IV)
String Quartets
17/3 (very dissonant chord near the end of mvts. I m. 98, II m. 27, IV mm. 63-4)
50/6 (“understated” endings in all mvts.)
64/4 (“understated” endings in all mvts.)
Piano Sonatas Hob. XVI
46 (cadence at end of I distinctly similar to the cadence at the end of II and esp. mm. 27-8)
51 (use of B♭ at ends of movements; see discussion above)
Piano Trios Hob. XV
13 (similar endings including dynamic contrast, running sixteenth-notes, and full, rolled final chord)
31 (mvts. have loud, triadic, and repeated triplet endings)

Mozart
Piano Sonata K. 533 (arpeggios end I and II)

Works in which there are connections at the junctures of two movements in a way that fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphony 95 (see discussion above)
String Quartets
17/2 (each movement begins with a gesture taken from the end of the previous movement)
77/2 (III ends and IV opens with similar sustained chords)
Piano Sonata Hob. XVI
52 (smoothing of contrast between mvts. in E and E♭; see discussion above)

Piano Trio Hob. XV
31 (I ends with fast-paced notes as if speeding up to the tempo of II)

Mozart
Symphony 27 (p octave leaps in ending of II reappear in opening of III)
Piano Trio K. 502 (use of “Beethoven’s Fifth” rhythm in ending of I and opening of II)

Works in which some other means of connecting opening and closing sections fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
String Quartets
33/2 (opening phrase closes I and IV, see discussion above)
76/1 (endings of III and IV very similar to opening of I)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 15 (opening phrase closes I and III)

Mozart
Piano Trio K. 548 (opening of I and close of III use unison triadic motion)

Works with run-on movements:

Haydn
see lists in Webster, *Farewell*, 18, 192.

Mozart
Symphony 26\(^5\)

**Distinctive Formal Characteristics**

In and of themselves, the forms used by Haydn and Mozart are too conventional and pervasive to foster even a weak sense of cyclic integration. The use of sonata form in two or more movements of a work by these composers, for instance, is nothing worthy of comment. However, because form is so malleable, composers have the option of applying anomalous, distinctive, or otherwise unexpected formal characteristics to more than one movement, thereby fostering a sense of cyclic integration. The pieces examined in this section include

---

\(^5\) Although they lie beyond the stated scope of this study, one might contend that Haydn and Mozart’s the three-part overtures warrant inclusion in this section. There is reason to distinguish their use of run-on movements from those listed in this section, however, since the run-on movements of a three-part overture are necessarily a conventional aspect of the genre. It would therefore be difficult to argue that these connections foster anything above a conventional sense of cyclic integration in those works.
formal devices such as unexpected harmonic devices in parallel formal sections and a thwarting of formal expectations in multiple movements.

- **Parallel Formal Anomalies:** Mozart’s Piano Sonata in F major K. 332/300k, Symphony No. 30 in D major, K. 202/186b, Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 50/1 and Symphony No. 85 in B flat major (La Reine)

Mozart constructed the sonata-form expositions of the first and last movements of his Piano Sonata in F major, K. 332/300k, using a similar and unusual formal template. The outer movements include a parallel harmonic layout for the transition section as well as a similarly constructed thematic layout for the primary key area.

The transitions of the first and last movements of K. 332/300k begin with abrupt motion to the minor submediant (vi) and continue with motion to the minor dominant (v) that becomes the major secondary dominant (V/V) through augmented sixth motion at the end of the transition (see table 4.3 and example 6). The primary key area also participates in the formal cyclic integration of these movements as this section in both movements includes two distinct, thematic ideas. These three elements lie outside of the typical expectations of an exposition section and thus produce a sense of cyclic integration. The middle movement also participates in this work’s formal cyclic integration to a certain extent, as it too moves through the minor dominant at mm. 5-8 before completing its first modulation.

| Table 4.3: Related formal gestures in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in F major, K. 332/300k |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Mvt. I                          | Mvt. III        |
| Two distinct thematic sections in the primary key area | mm. 12-22       | mm. 14-32       |
| Transition opens with direct motion to vi | mm. 23ff.       | mm. 39ff.       |
| Transitional motion through v, then modulation by augmented sixth | mm. 30ff.       | mm. 50-64       |
Example 6: Similar approaches to form in K. 332/300k

a) The exposition of K. 332/300k/i

Another noteworthy approach to musical form as cyclic element is the use of an added or extraneous section. In the first, third, and final movements of his String Quartet in B flat major Op. 50/1, for example, Haydn consistently gives these movements “false endings” complete with a seemingly final cadence. After a brief pause, the music continues with a restatement of the opening theme before quickly coming to a close (see example 7). Because the formal requirements of each movement have been completed at an earlier point, the final return is seemingly extraneous to the formal plan of the movements. This added coda section
is all the more anomalous considering that these movements use no distinct secondary themes; Haydn risks overstating his thematic material for the sake of including this compositional device.

A “final” cadence in the first movement sounds at m. 150, but the cello holds a pedal B flat for two measures before the opening theme reappears. The movement ends shortly afterwards.

Example 7: False endings and extra thematic iterations in Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 50/1/i, iii, and iv

a) The false ending in Op. 50/1/i

In the third movement Haydn adds a brief codetta ending to the a’ section of the minuet that restates the main theme (a’ mm. 25-31; final iteration mm. 32-35), a highly uncharacteristic event for a Haydn minuet.

b) The false ending in Op. 50/1/iii
In the finale, the most extreme example of an extraneous thematic repetition in the work, Haydn includes a false ending gesture that turns out to be a two-measure grand pause (m. 223) before one final iteration of the main theme. This return of themes in the outer movements does not seem to be related to the recapitulation in any meaningful way, as the closing material of the section has already passed.

c) The false ending of Op. 50/1/iv

In his Symphony No. 30 in D major, K. 202/186b, Mozart includes both a new theme at the opening of the development and an added coda section based upon this unexpected theme within the first, second, and fourth movements (see example 8). While the addition of a separate coda in Mozart’s sonata forms may be seen as too common to foster a sense of cyclic integration, the use of a “new” theme taken from the development is unconventional. Mozart creates a moment of confusion for the listener: is this a coda or another iteration of the development?

Example 8: The form used by Mozart for the second half of the first, second, and fourth movements of his Symphony No. 30 in D major, K. 202/186b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Theme</td>
<td>Th I and Th II</td>
<td>Dev. Th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(illusion of extra repetition of development)
At m. 197 of the first movement, Mozart cadences and the recapitulation ends. In the following measures he includes a short ten-measure coda using a theme from the opening of the development. This might go unnoticed; in fact it sounds like a regular coda except for his choice of thematic material. The second movement also includes a similar ending after the repeat sign (mm. 67-74) using material from the second half of the movement’s theme. In the finale, Mozart mimics his first-movement treatment once again by adding a coda (mm. 206-18) that includes material only heard at the opening of the development.\(^6\)

An additional means of using formal anomalies to foster a sense of cyclic integration is the abnormal extension of a formal section. This appears, for example, in Haydn’s Symphony No. 85 in B flat major (La Reine), where the composer extends the retransition sections well beyond the bounds of normal expectations in each of the four movements. The first movement’s retransition begins at m. 198 and seemingly reaches its goal four times before the recapitulation finally begins fourteen measures later. Haydn includes the usual retransitional gestures (pedal, repeated short ideas, decrease of dynamics, pairing down of texture, etc.), but at each point where the listener expects the recapitulation, Haydn finds a way to avoid fulfilling the expectation (marked in example 9 with an asterisk “*”).

Ironically, the first movement’s extended transition comes to an end one note too soon. When the recapitulation finally arrives at m. 212, Haydn uses a gut-wrenching major second, rather than the expected passing motion through two minor seconds to get back to the tonic. The effect of this small change is to further play with the listener’s expectations by

\(^6\) Besides these formal connections, other elements connect the three movements, including a falling grace note from A in the first two movements (c.f. Mvt. I mm. 44ff. and Mvt. II mm. 5ff.) and the layout of the opening themes of the outside movements. Even though the outer movements use a fairly clichéd triadic gesture, the ideas are distinctly similar because the finale’s motive sounds like it begins on a downbeat before a metric context has been set. These connections among the three movements only make the relationship among the formal anomalies of each movement’s coda stronger.
making the constantly extended retransition seem to end unexpectedly and slightly too early.

Finally, Haydn also ends the development too early by proceeding directly from V/vi to the tonic recapitulation without the customary circle of fifths motion. There is thus a harmonic aspect to the premature, yet unusually delayed, recapitulation.

Example 9: Unusually extended retransition gestures in Haydn’s Symphony No. 85 in B flat major (La Reine)

a) The retransition of Symphony No. 85/i

In the second movement, Haydn again inserts material to delay the expected return of important thematic material, now within the theme of the movement itself. In this theme and variations movement, he delays the close of the theme and the parallel point in each variation
by inserting one measure immediately before the cadential gesture. The added measure presents a twist in the theme itself that maintains interest, while its repetitions highlight Haydn’s efforts to force the listener to wait in expectation, just as in the first movement.

b) The extra measure added to each iteration of the theme in Symphony No. 85/ii

![Image of musical notation]

Besides this small-scale effort, Haydn also includes large-scale delaying tactic in this movement. At m. 64, between the second and third variations, he inserts an eight-measure extension that, as in the first movement, unexpectedly delays the return of the theme. Haydn also falsely implies that the movement is near its conclusion by beginning the ensuing variation with the theme in its original form. However, two full variations and a coda still remain.
The third movement’s retransition is so long that it has been described as “ludicrously exaggerated.” At the point in the trio where the return of the trio’s main theme is expected, Haydn instead inserts a seventeen-measure retransition. The proportions are highly irregular, since the theme itself is only eighteen measures long. As in the first two movements, Haydn forces the listener to wait in expectation for the return of the opening theme.

c) The 17-measure insertion before the return of the trio in Symphony No. 85/iii (melody and bass given)

\[\text{Melody} \quad \text{Bass} \]

\[\text{Return of trio “A” phrase} \]

The retransition of the finale nearly duplicates the parallel section in the first movement. Once again Haydn sets up a seemingly regular retransition (m. 146), but twelve measures into it (m. 158) the music takes a turn away from resolution. He now inserts an additional four measures. Haydn also takes the added step of inserting rests and even a rest

with a fermata immediately before the recapitulation to prolong the resolution further. For the last time in the work the listeners must wait for the fulfillment of their expectations that the opening theme will return.

d) The extended retransition of Symphony No. 85/iv

[Music notation]

- **Section Summary**

*Works in which a distorted, unusual, or unexpected forms and formal events foster a sense of cyclic integration:*

Haydn

Symphonies
- 45 (use of interludes in I and V)\(^8\)
- 85 (extended retransitions; see discussion above)

String Quartet 54/2 (uncharacteristic forms used for II and IV)

Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 18 (deceptive cadences extend expositions of both I mm. 34-5 and II mm. 30-1)\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) Webster, *Farewell*, 39, 111-112.
Mozart
Piano Sonatas
  K. 280/189e (expected cadences temporarily avoided, similar to Haydn Sym. 85, in I mm. 8-13 and II mm. 5-8)
  K. 309/284b (new thematic material extends phrases/formal sections in I mm. 15ff. and III mm. 16ff.)
  K. 332/300k (harmonic progression of transitions of I and III; see discussion above)
  K. 457 (very short/problematic transitions in I mm. 19-22 or 19-35, II m. 7, and III m. 45)

Works in which false endings foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
  Symphony 101 (I m. 319, II mm. 98-9, and IIItr mm. 147-48)
  String Quartet 50/1 (see discussion above)

Mozart
  Symphony 30 (similar to 50/1 in I m. 197, II m. 66, and IV m. 210; see discussion above)

Works in which false recapitulations foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
  Symphonies
    42 (in I and II)
    53 (in I and IV “B”)
  String Quartets
    20/1 (in I and false reprise in II)
    33/1 (in I and IV)

Works in which some other formal element fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
  Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 43 (brief written-out adagio just before cadenzas in I mm. 98ff. and III mm. 211)

Mozart
  Symphonies
    29 (each formal break concludes using a solo or unison texture)
    41 (development sections of I and IV open with similar progressions)\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) Haydn includes an additional deceptive cadence in the recapitulation of the first movement, mm. 112-13 to further extend the work.

Approaches to Harmony

The following section examines the variety of ways in which harmony can foster a sense of cyclic integration. Next to thematic resemblance, analysts frequently cite harmonic motion as the second most important element of cyclic integration – particularly when multiple movements of a work move to the same distantly related key area. While the majority of harmonic ideas in the Classical era are too common to have any significance for cyclic integration, anomalous or odd harmonic ideas, ambiguous or modally ambivalent passages, and modulations to remote keys frequently foster a sense of connection among the movements of a work.

- **Chordal Inversion and Phrase-level Harmonic Motion: Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird) and Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C major, K. 545**

In his String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird), Haydn uses harmonic ambiguity within the opening sonority of multiple movements together with a specific harmonic progression from phrase to phrase to foster a sense of cyclic integration (see example 10). The first movement begins with a first-inversion C chord (I\(^6\)), leaving the question of the tonic momentarily open to debate. Only with the entry of the bass at m. 4 does Haydn establish C major as the tonic. After the first phrase, Haydn immediately transposes the opening phrase up a step to D minor. Upon completing the second phrase, he then transposes the phrase yet again, now to G minor at m. 13.

---

11 Webster, *Farewell*, 16, for example, discusses the use of D major in Haydn’s Symphony No. 45. Ethan Haimo (“Remote Keys and Multi-Movement Unity: Haydn in the 1790s,” *Musical Quarterly* 72 [1990]: 242-268) argues that many of the remote-key middle movements found in Haydn’s late instrumental works help forge a coherent whole from distinct movements and have implications for resolution and closure.

12 For a discussion of musical topics as an additional element of cyclic integration in this work see the discussion on pages 197ff. under “Musical Topics.”
Example 10: Harmonic motion as an element of cyclic integration in Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird)

a) Harmonic elements in the opening of Op. 33/3/i

The harmonic features of the opening of the second movement nearly match the elements observed in the first movement’s opening phrase. The movement commences with a C major chord in first inversion (I₆). After completing the movement’s initial phrase Haydn again immediately transposes the phrase up by step to D minor (m. 5). The only difference between these two movements’ opening phrases is the lack of the final, G minor, transposition in the second movement.

b) Harmonic elements in the opening phrase of Op. 33/3/ii
The chordal and harmonic elements of cyclic integration in Haydn’s Op. 33/3 have a smaller-scale parallel in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C major, K. 545 (see example 11).\(^{13}\) In this work Mozart opens the first two movements with harmonic motion from I to IV\(^6\), including a prominent rising melodic major sixth. Less unusual musical elements reinforce the connection between these two movement openings. For example, both employ an Alberti bass, two-measure antecedent-consequent phrases, and rests on the final beats of mm. 2 and 4.

Example 11: Motion to IV\(^6\) as cyclic element in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C major, K. 545

a) The opening of K. 545/i

b) The opening of K. 545/ii

- **Plagal Motion: Mozart’s Symphony No. 36 in C major, K. 425 (Linz)**

In his Symphony No. 36 in C major (Linz), K. 425, Mozart uses plagal motion in the primary key areas of the outer movements in a way that creates a harmonic sense of cyclic integration between the two movements. Plagal motion appears in three distinct guises in this work (see

example 12). First, there are a number of prominent plagal motions. Second, the subdominant is an important tonal area in this work. Finally, the two movements’ expositions begin with prominent motion from a tonic chord to a IV$^6$ chord. The relative infrequency of plagal motion in the works of this period makes Mozart’s use of them to encourage a sense of cyclic integration all the stronger.

Mozart features all three plagal elements in the primary key area of the first movement. In the first seventeen measures of the exposition Mozart uses plagal motion six times, five of which sound in succession. The first two measures of the theme move from an opening tonic chord to IV$^6$ using a pedal bass before the first plagal motion. The next phrase opens with a prominent V$^7$/IV – IV motion. Finally, before ending the primary key area, Mozart tonicizes IV with an imperfect authentic cadence at m. 39.

Example 12: Plagal Features in Mozart’s Symphony No. 36 in C major, K. 425

a) The primary key area of K. 425/i (only melody and bass given)

The opening of the finale includes the same features seen in the first movement. Pedal motion through IV$^6$ appears in the second measure of the movement, and a strong plagal motion closes the section at m. 38. Note that the plagal motion at m. 38 has a tutti orchestration using the same voicing and register used by Mozart for first movement’s plagal
cadences (except for the second violin). The moments preceding the two plagal gestures are quite similar as well: both have ascending sixteenth-note motion leading to contrasting melodic leaps. In addition, A. Peter Brown has noted the prominence of the perfect fourth in the melodic ideas of the finale, an interval closely linked to the plagal motion found throughout the finale. The rhythmic placement of this fourth gives the motion to IV seen at m. 2 and m. 10 added emphasis.

b) The opening of K. 425/iv (only melody and bass given)

![Sheet music image]

- Modal Contrast: Haydn’s Piano Sonata in C sharp minor, Hob. XVI: 36

In Haydn’s Piano Sonata in C sharp minor, Hob. XVI: 36, the sense of mode becomes increasingly uncertain as the work progresses. The tricks Haydn plays with modal expectations in this sonata foster a strong sense of cyclic integration. Modal ambiguity appears most strongly in the second and third movements. In the middle movement, modal ambiguity appears under the guide of cadences on unisons rather than on complete chords (see example 13). This provides Haydn with an opportunity to change modes at any given

---


15 This movement uses the same theme as the first movement of another work by Haydn, the Piano Sonata in G major, Hob. XVI: 39. In that movement the unison cadences and modal switches remain, but it is not a double theme and variation, so the modal ambiguity is limited by comparison.
cadence point without the need for a modulation. For example, the opening theme begins in A major and cadences on a unison E at m. 8. Haydn probably expects the listener to hear this as a conventional modulation to the dominant, E major, as G sharps appear in mm. 6 and 7. But when confronted with choosing the mode for the next section of music he chooses E minor despite the previous hint at E major.

Example 13: Modal ambiguity in Haydn’s Piano Sonata in C sharp minor, Hob. XVI: 36

a) The opening of Hob. XVI: 36/ii

This harmonic idea appears frequently throughout the second movement. The second theme of this double theme and variations movement has the same embedded modal ambiguities as the first. After the movement’s A minor beginning, Haydn cadences on a unison C natural (m. 22). The most conventional hearing of this would be as an ordinary modulation to the mediant, but the following measure begins in unison in what could either be A minor or C major (and turns out to be A minor a measure later).
b) The second theme of Hob. XVI: 36/ii

The modal ambiguity is most obvious in the third and final movement’s trio. The minuet opens in C sharp minor, and the move to C sharp major for the trio is conventional. But at m. 40 in the trio, at what should be the first cadence in the new key, Haydn cadences for a brief moment in C sharp minor rather than C sharp major. Haydn seemingly forgets his mode for a brief moment and implies that he has already come back to the minuet section when in fact the trio has only just begun. The next time that the melody approaches the problematic scale-degree 3, in the trio’s b section, Haydn glosses over the pitch by writing an unaccompanied chromatic scale, thus leaving the mode ambiguous for three full measures.

c) Modal ambiguity in the Trio of the Finale of Hob. XVI: 36
• **Section Summary**

**Works in which a specific harmonic progression fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

**Haydn**

**Symphony**

103 (V/vi – i motion in I mm. 39-40 and IV mm. 263-64)\(^{16}\)

**String Quartet**

76/4 (openings of I and II move to ii)

**Mozart**

**Piano Concerto K. 503** (prominent motion using ii\(^{2}\) in I and II and using IV\(^{6}\) in III; similar to K. 545)

**Piano Sonata K. 545** (prominent motion using IV\(^{6}\); see discussion above)

**Works in which a general or typical harmonic progression fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

**Haydn**

**Symphony 43** (prominent fifths sequences in I, II, and IV)

**String Quartets**

17/1 (prominent fifths sequences just before or after important reprises I mm. 68ff. II mm. 31ff., IItr mm. 61ff., III mm. 57ff., IV mm. 98ff.)

50/3 (inclination towards flatward motion)\(^{17}\)

**Piano Sonatas Hob. XVI**

18 (deceptive cadences extend expositions of both I mm. 34-5 and II mm. 30-1)\(^{18}\)

35 (motion towards the subdominant in I mm. 16ff. and 72ff., II is set in IV, and III mm. 40ff.)

**Mozart**

**Symphony 36** (plagal gestures; see discussion above)

**Piano Sonata K. 533** (deceptive motion/cadences)\(^{19}\)

**Piano Trio K. 564** (prominent minor fifths sequences in I mm. 42ff. and III mm. 45ff.)

**Works using an augmented sixth chord in a way that fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

**Haydn**

**Symphony 42** (+6 used at important cadences in II, III, and IV)

**String Quartets**

---

\(^{16}\) These are important formal junctures. In Mvt. I, V/vi is the last chord of the slow introduction. In Mvt. IV, V/vi is the last chord of the development.


\(^{18}\) Haydn includes an additional deceptive cadence in the recapitulation of the first movement, mm. 112-13 to further extend the work.

\(^{19}\) Neumann/Schachter, “Two Versions,” 1-31.
20/4 (Ger+6 used to quickly leave distant key areas in I m. 40, II m. 16, IV m. 100)
74/3 (+6 used prominently in openings of I and II and appear in III m. 69 and IV m. 79)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 7 (+6 in D minor sections of II mm. 19-20 and III mm. 23-4)

Mozart
Piano Concerto K. 415/387h (prominent +6 chords in I m. 39, II m. 38, and III m. 53)
Clarinet Trio K. 498 (+6 in I mm. 32ff., II mm. 14ff., and III mm. 161ff.)

Works in which some other kind of local harmonic gesture fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphony 48 (developments based on descending scalar bass lines I and IV esp., II to lesser degree)
String Quartets
  33/2 (prominent opening gesture to 6 in I mm. 2-3, II m. 2, III m. 12, IV mm. 4-5)
  33/3 (openings of I and II on a first inversion chord with transposition; see discussion above)

Works in which a prominent diatonic key area in a way that fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  51 (IV [E, major] in I and IV and tonic of II)
  87 (vi [F# minor] in I and IV)
  96 (IV [G major])
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 27 (VI [A major])

Mozart
Symphony 36 (IV [F major] in I mm. 39ff., key of II, and IV mm. 144ff.)
Piano Sonata K. 311/284c (IV [G major] in I mm. 62ff., key of II, and III mm. 139ff.)

Works in which a prominent non-diatonic key area (in relation to the tonic of the movement at hand) fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  82 (III in IIItr, and IV)
  84 (v in I, II, and hint in IV mm. 58ff.)

---


21 Ibid., 247-54.

22 Works in which the parallel mode fosters a sense of cyclic integration are listed variously under the modal categories.
98 (Ⅶ in II m. 29, III m. 25)  
Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 50 (v in I mm. 54ff. and III mm. 69ff.)

Mozart  
String Quartet K. 589 (Ⅲ in I mm. 84ff., III m. 67, and IV mm. 70ff.)

Works in which a specific tonality (regardless of an individual movement’s tonic) fosters a sense of cyclic integration

Haydn  
Symphonies  
78 (D major [N] in I and II)  
86 (E minor [ii] in I and II)  
String Quartet 77/2 (D major and minor [VI and vi] in I m. 66 and remote key of III including move to parallel minor at m. 60, and IV m. 93)

Mozart  
Piano Concertos  
K. 453 (E major [VI] in I mm. 49ff. and II mm. 95ff.)  
K. 467 (G minor [v] in I mm. 109ff. and II mm. 58ff.)  
Piano Trio K. 496 (A major [N] in I mm. 97ff. and II mm. 30ff.)

Works in which a general harmonic tendency fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn  
Symphony 100 (prominent flat keys in I mm. 14 and 239, II m. 61, and 161, and IV mm. 146 and 245)  
String Quartets  
64/6 (prominent flat keys in I m. 84, II m. 40, and IV m. 160)  
74/1 (various distantly related keys in I mm. 57 and 132, II m. 63, and III mm. 15, 19, and 61)  
74/3 (various distantly related keys in I m. 14, II m. 30, III tr m. 46, and IV m. 61)

Mozart  
Symphony 39 (prominent sharp keys in II mm. 96ff. and IV mm. 115ff.)  
Piano Concerto K. 595 (various distantly related keys in I mm. 184ff., II mm. 66ff., and III mm. 163ff.)  
String Quintet K. 593 (prominent flat keys in I mm. 107ff., II mm. 39ff. and 90ff., and IV mm. 113ff. and 238ff.)

Works in which modal contrast at the sub-movement level fosters a sense of cyclic integration (parallel tonic major/minor unless otherwise noted):

Haydn

23 Brackets “[ ]” indicate that key’s relationship with the overall tonic of the work at hand.
Symphonies
95 (I opens in minor and closes in major, II in major with a minor variation, III in major with a minor trio, IV in major with a large section in the recapitulation in minor at mm. 153ff.)
101 (I has minor introduction and major body, II in major with large minor section at mm. 36ff., IV in major with large minor middle section at mm. 139ff.)

String Quartets
42 (I ends with Picardy third, II in major with minor trio, IV in minor with prominent use of major in the development)
50/4 (I in minor with major ending, II alternates between major and minor, III in major with minor trio, IV in minor)\textsuperscript{24}
54/3 (major and minor in conflict throughout I and II, IIItr’s mode remains ambiguous for extended period, IV has prominent use of minor at mm. 195ff.)
55/2 (I switches between minor and major, II in minor with a major ending, III in major with minor trio)
64/5 (prominent use of tonic minor in II mm. 17ff. and 35ff., IIItr, and IV 29ff.)
76/2\textsuperscript{25}

Piano Trio Hob. XV: 25 (prominent use of minor in I mm. 22ff. and III “Gypsy” mm. 67ff.)

Mozart
Symphonies
31 (brief modal switch in I mm. 254ff., III mm. 65ff., and II (alt.) mm. 27ff.
36 (prominent use of minor in I mm. 9ff., II mm. 22ff. and IV mm. 106ff. and 170ff)
41 (prominent use of tonic minor in I m. 81, II m. 127)\textsuperscript{26}

Works in which large-scale modal contrast as a cyclic element (parallel tonic major/minor unless otherwise noted):

Haydn
Symphony 70 (I in major, II in minor with sections in major, III in major, IV minor with major ending)

String Quartets
54/2 (I in major, II in minor, III in major with minor trio, IV in major with prominent minor section)
74/3 (I and IV open in minor and end in major, III in major with a minor trio)

Piano Sonatas Hob. XVI
33 (II set in tonic minor, and prominent use of tonic minor in III at mm. 17ff.)\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{24} Sutcliffe, \textit{Op. 50}, 89.

\textsuperscript{25} Robert P. Morgan, “The Concept of Unity and Musical Analysis,” \textit{Music Analysis} 22 (2003), 20. He notes that all four movements of this work have abrupt juxtapositions of major and minor but avoids arguing that this fosters a sense of cyclic integration in the work. For more information see my discussion of Morgan’s analysis in chapter 1, pages 26ff.

\textsuperscript{26} Sisman, \textit{Jupiter}, 37.
34 (I in minor with significant use of tonic major at mm. 46ff., II in major with
*attacca* to minor-mode III which itself includes prominent use of major at
mm. 77ff.)
37 (similar to Hob. XVI:33)

**Works in which mode plays some other role in fostering a sense of cyclic integration:**

**Haydn**
- String Quartet 77/1 (modally ambivalent melodies open I, II, and IV)\(^{28}\)
- Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 36 (motion contrary to implied mode; see discussion above)

**Mozart**
- String Quartet K. 590 (the opening melodies of I, II, and III all appear first in major and then
  are immediately sequenced to minor)

**Thematic Material**

This section examines Haydn and Mozart’s use of thematic material as an element of cyclic
integration. The “traditional” approach to thematic material, that of thematic resemblance, is
covered in the detailed analysis of Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione).

Other guises of thematic resemblance examined here include thematic recall (the exact
repetition of part of an earlier movement), the use of an underlying idea behind thematic
choices, and the consistent use of particular motivic gestures such as motto statements.\(^{29}\)

- **Thematic Recall: Haydn’s Symphony No. 46 in B minor**

Perhaps the most obvious means of fostering a sense of cyclic integration in a piece of music
is a large-scale verbatim repetition of a section of music from an earlier movement in a later

---

\(^{27}\) This particular connection is reinforced by Haydn’s use of the *attacca* stipulation between these two
movements, creating the effect of a constant alternation of mode throughout the work as a whole. Haydn uses
the exact same approach in another D major Piano Sonata, Hob. XVI: 37.

\(^{28}\) Mvt. I opens with a melody using \(^5^\) and avoiding \(^3^\) over a pedal \(^6^\) chord. Mvt. II opens with a *tutti*
unison that sounds more like C minor than E\(^5^\) major. The prominent and persistent use of C\(^5^\) in the melody of
the finale give the theme a distinctly Lydian sound.

\(^{29}\) Note that for the purposes of this discussion, “thematic resemblance” refers to a similarity between
two distinct themes while “thematic recall” refers to the note-for-note repetition of a theme from a previous
movement.
movement. This kind of connection in a sense incorporates every possible musical element, ranging from themes to textures and even rhetorical or programmatic connections. So strong is the bond formed by this kind of repetition, its presence in Haydn’s Symphony No. 46 in B minor should be all that is required to demonstrate that this composer took an active interest in fostering a sense of cyclic integration among the movements of his works (see example 14). However, as noted in chapters 1 and 2, some analysts have set this symphony’s thematic recall apart from similar instances in Beethoven’s works, including the Fifth Symphony.

At m. 152 of the finale of Symphony No. 46, Haydn includes a full measure of rest in every voice. The recapitulation has ended, and seemingly all that remains is for Haydn to resolve the hanging dominant chord to the tonic through a brief coda section. Rather than simply cadence, however, Haydn states an exact note-for-note repetition of the b and a’ sections from the third movement, beginning mid phrase. He even goes so far as to include a written-out repetition. In addition, he reverts to the third movement’s tempo, meter, and texture to reenact the earlier movement in the finale. After this brief statement, Haydn elaborates on the material and extends the twelve-measure repetition into a 35-measure section before he returns to the finale’s material (including a switch back to the original thematic material, meter, and tempo) for the final cadence.
Example 14: Thematic recall in Haydn’s Symphony No. 46 in B minor

a) Symphony No. 46/iii
b) The recalling of Symphony No. 46/iii in Symphony No. 46/iv (some repeated measures cut to save space)
Thematic Resemblance: Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione)

Although there is no single accepted methodology for determining what constitutes a thematic connection, or any other kind of connection for that matter, the sheer number of published analyses dealing with thematic resemblance has sparked a good deal of debate over thematic connections in Haydn and Mozart’s music. Scholarly consensus has followed a slightly more lenient adaptation of Jan LaRue’s viewpoint, for the most part.\footnote{See chapter 2.} In essence, LaRue argues that potential thematic connections must have something to distinguish them from “clichéd” or “stylistic” figures and that similar melodic outlines are insufficient without the inclusion of other connections such as affect, harmonic motion, or phrase structure.

The four movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione), all open with essentially the same four-note motive. The shared motive consists of double neighbor motion from C up a half step to D flat, then down to B flat. In certain cases the B flat moves back to C, completing the neighbor motion, while in others the B flat moves down to A flat.\footnote{The first to note these connections was H. C. Robbins Landon, \textit{Haydn: Chronicle and Works}, vol. 2, \textit{Haydn at Eszterháza} (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976), 290. In chapter 1, pages 23ff., I discuss the language of a more recent analysis of this work: Brown, \textit{Repertoire}, 555-56. However, no one to my knowledge, has ever noted Haydn’s inclusion of this motive beyond the opening bars of each movement, nor has anyone argued that the motive has two distinct forms with specific accompanying cyclic elements.} When C is the final note (labeled as form “a” in example 15), Haydn typically includes a voice in parallel thirds together with a pedal tone in the bass and/or horns. These elements thus combine to form a matrix in much the same way as seen in K. 464. When A flat is the finale note (labeled as form “b” below), Haydn usually keeps the voice in parallel thirds but substitutes a stepwise rising bass for the pedal tone.
The first movement of Symphony No. 49 opens with both forms “a” and “b.” Form “a” appears in the first violins in mm. 1ff. with parallel thirds in the second violins and pedal tones in the horns, bassoon, and cello. Form “b” appears in the second phrase at mm. 8ff. in the second violin with parallel thirds in the viola and a stepwise rising bass line.

Example 15: Thematic resemblance in Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione)

a) Symphony No. 49/i

![Music Example]

Motive in form "a" with parallel thirds and pedal F

Motive in form "b" with parallel thirds and stepwise rising bass line
The second movement opens with the motive in form “b” together with a rising stepwise bass line. Haydn uses two devices to make this reuse of the opening movement’s motive somewhat less than obvious. First, he breaks up the motive by placing the notes on consecutive downbeats to help incorporate the *Sturm und Drang* topical reference used. Second, he uses octave displacement by placing the B flat an octave above its expected location and the final A flat an octave below the first two pitches.

**b) Symphony No. 49/ii**

Haydn includes form “b” of the motive in the opening bars of the third movement. The violins and oboe play the motive, while the cello, bass, and bassoon provide a rising stepwise bass line. There is a slight mixing of the elements of forms “a” and “b” in this opening phrase as well, since the horns play a pedal tone.
c) Symphony No. 49/iii

The third movement’s trio also commences with the motive, now in form “a” together with voices in parallel thirds and a pedal tone in both the horns and bass instruments. Haydn embellishes the motive somewhat in the first oboe and first violin, but leaves the parallel voices unadorned.

d) Symphony No. 49/iii m. 53, the opening of the Trio
The finale begins with the motive in form “a” in the first violins with parallel thirds in the second violins and pedal tones played by every remaining instrument. Haydn obscures this particular iteration of the motive, much as in the second movement. The openings of the first and third measure move up by half step from C to D flat, while the pitch B flat could appear on the third beat of m. 3 (or possibly the final upbeat of m. 5). The importance of the matrix of elements, over and above that of a single element (the thematic resemblance in this case), can be seen here. The motive might be obscured, but the use of parallel thirds and pedal tones includes all of the gestures Haydn has included in previous iterations of the motive. Even if this particular iteration is too weak a connection for some ears to tolerate, Haydn includes the motive in form “b” together with form “a” in retrograde, including parallel thirds and rising stepwise bass line only moments later at mm. 12ff.

Haydn incorporates this work’s elements of cyclic integration at a number of points throughout each movement, often in conjunction with the full matrix of other elements noted above. The first movement’s development section opens with the motive in form “a” in retrograde immediately followed by the motive in form “b.” Haydn includes the viola in parallel thirds and a pedal tone with the “a” iteration, and switches to a rising stepwise bass line without parallel thirds for the “b” iteration.
e) Symphony No. 49/iv

Motif in form "a" with parallel thirds and pedal tone

f) The opening of the development of Symphony No. 49/i

Motif in form "a" (retrograde) and "b"
with parallel thirds and stepwise rising bass "b"
Haydn also inverts the “a” version of the motive for use in a prominent position: immediately preceding the recapitulation. Here the motive is set apart from its surroundings through brief pauses on either side.

g) The end of the retransition of Symphony No. 49/i

Haydn’s approach to the shared motive over the course of the second movement is similar to that of the first movement. In the transition, for example, the motive in form “a” appears in inversion in the oboes, once again together with parallel thirds (inverted as sixths) and a pedal tone in the bass. In this case, the motive is also rhythmically augmented in relation to its value in the movement’s opening.
h) The transition of Symphony No. 49/ii

Shortly following this iteration of the motive, the secondary key area introduces a new theme that turns out to be based upon the motive in form “b.” This is one case in which none of the expected supporting elements is present, a potential problem were the motive not so prominent. The best explanation for the lack of supporting elements is the imitative texture of the passage.

i) The opening of the secondary key area of Symphony No. 49/ii
With its two most important themes based upon similar motives, the remainder of the movement relies upon the motive heavily.

Perhaps the most interesting appearance of the motive is in the closing moments of the finale. Here, Haydn breaks the motive up into two sections just before the final perfect authentic cadence. The motive is in form “a” and includes, as expected, a pedal tone. There is motion by parallel thirds as well, at least for the first two notes of the motive. In addition, the *Sturm und Drang* leaps associated with the opening of the second movement reappear. Given its placement and prominence, this final use of the motive could be interpreted as a final “resolution” that aids in bringing closure to the symphony. This interpretation might also explain why the penultimate note of the motive has been changed into a leading tone. The motive can now cadence on its own using a half step, whereas previously the final whole step required a continuation.

**j) The final cadence of Symphony No. 49/iv**

In all, the motive first appears in the opening of the first movement together with its accompanying musical elements. It then reappears in prominent positions over the course of
each of following movements and in the concluding moments of the work. The movements share additional connections related to this motive, including occasional alterations to facilitate a *Sturm und Drang* affect, the application of superficial embellishments to incorporate a sense of variety, and the use of a variety of contrapuntal devices such as inversion, retrograde, and imitation. Each of these elements play a supporting role in giving Symphony No. 49 a strong sense of cyclic integration, by helping to make the thematic connections throughout this work more evident than they might otherwise be.

- **The Anacrusis as Clichéd Gesture: Haydn’s Symphony 88 in G major**

As pointed out in chapter 2, the significance of thematic connections in fostering a sense of cyclic integration has been questioned by Leonard Meyer and others on the grounds of style.\(^{32}\) In essence, Meyer argues that gestures that appear frequently in Classical-era works (e.g. turn figures, neighbor notes, appoggiaturas, etc.) are too common to create a meaningful connection. While this argument seems sound in the abstract, certain works use these clichéd figures so pervasively as to make a connection seem likely. This is the case in Haydn’s Symphony No. 88 in G major, for example, in which every theme commences with an anacrusis, a common thematic option in the Classical era. Haydn uses an anacrusis for the two major themes of the first movement, the opening theme of the second movement, the themes of both the minuet and trio of the third movement, and for the opening theme of the fourth movement (see example 16).

Example 16: The anacrusis as cyclic element in the themes of Haydn’s Symphony No. 88 in G major

The anacrusis appears too frequently and too consistently in this work to be a coincidence of convention. Had it appeared in only one or two places, it might have fostered only a trivial sense of connection in this work. As one of the defining features of every significant theme in this work, however, the anacrusis helps to foster a much stronger sense of cyclic integration.

One might be tempted to argue to the contrary nevertheless, perhaps by showing that a number of other works in this repertoire also make prominent and consistent use of the anacrusis. However, the fact of the matter is that only a very limited number of works by Haydn and Mozart use the anacrusis as consistently as Symphony No. 88: Haydn’s String Quartets Op. 33/1, 33/2, 50/3 and Mozart’s Piano Concerto K. 537. That is only 2% of the works examined in this dissertation. Were the anacrusis a stylistic coincidence instead of a potentially significant element of cyclic integration, one might expect more works to have this connection across most of their movements. In the end then, the status of a particular element as a stylistic cliché does not necessarily exclude it from fostering a strong sense of cyclic integration, especially when it is used prominently and consistently throughout a work.
• Use of a Processive Motto: Haydn’s Symphony No. 93 in D major

Although mottoes are most commonly associated with nineteenth-century concert overtures, Haydn uses a simple motto, the *tutti* statement of the pitch D in open octaves, in his Symphony No. 93 in D major to connect the work’s movements to one another (see example 17). He begins the symphony with a sustained *forte* D played by every instrument, an introductory gesture similar to a number of other late symphonies with slow introductions (e.g., Symphony No. 104). The difference between Symphony No. 93 and Haydn’s other works lies in the prominent return of this motto in subsequent movements.\(^{33}\)

The motto appears prominently in the third movement, as the main theme of the trio section. At m. 46 the trio opens with a forte, unharmonized, D played by the woodwinds. Haydn uses the motto a total of four times in the trio on the pitch D. He also develops the motto, transposing it to different pitches midway through the trio (c.f. mm. 64-77).

\(^{33}\) The use of the tonic pitch without harmonization can also be seen to affect the modal stability of the work. That is, D major and D minor struggle for prominence in this work in a way reflected by the lack of harmonization of this pitch throughout.
Example 17: The D “Motto” as element of cyclic integration in Haydn’s Symphony No. 93 in D major

a) The motto statement at the opening of Symphony No. 93/i

\[\text{Adagio} \quad \text{D “Motto” statement: tutti, unharmonized, fortissimo, & set apart by rests}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{Flute} & : \\
\text{Oboe} & : \\
\text{Bsn.} & : \\
\text{Horn} & : \\
\text{Tpt.} & : \\
\text{Tymp.} & : \\
\text{Vln. I} & : \\
\text{Vln. II} & : \\
\text{Vla.} & : \\
\text{Cello} & : \\
\end{align*}
b) The motto statement at the opening of the trio of Symphony No. 93/iii

In the finale the motto reappears in two distinct guises. Just before the recapitulation, at m. 169, Haydn includes the motto in its original (tutti, unharmonized, fortissimo, and separated by rests) form. In the recapitulation he also uses a somewhat altered form that is still tutti, forte, and separated by rests, but now harmonized with the third (oboe I, trumpet, and horn) and the fifth (oboe II, violin II, and viola) at mm. 267-68. By using the motto in its original form and then later by harmonizing it, Haydn could be seen to resolve the modal ambiguity of the motto in a way that gives the work a sense of closure. Even without this added layer of interpretation, however, each of the movements has a basic connection through the recurring motto statements on an unharmonized D.
c) The motto in original and altered forms in Symphony No. 93/iv

The motto as here presented still includes the expected accompanying elements, including its being set

The low register used just before the motto statement in the finale of Symphony No. 93 recalls an odd moment in the work’s second movement. The motto does not appear in the second movement of the work in its normal form. Instead, Haydn mocks the motto by altering the pitch to C natural and having the two bassoons play the pitch alone in a low register and at a forte dynamic in what is otherwise a very quiet section of music. He essentially reduces the strong motto on D that opened the work to a grotesque fart. The motto as here presented still includes the expected accompanying elements, including its being set
apart by rests, its use of a loud dynamic (fortissimo directly following a pianissimo), and its being unharmonized (in this case a solo pitch).\(^{34}\)

d) The motto as altered in Symphony No. 93/ii

\[\text{\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{\begin{tabular}{c}
\text{The "Motto" as reduced to a fart (still set apart by rests, using loud dynamic, and unharmonized)}
\end{tabular}}
\end{tabular}}\]

- Intervallic Relationship: Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C minor, K. 457 and String Quartet in G major, K. 387

The pros and cons of the interval as cyclic element have been examined in chapter 2 (cf. discussions of Réti, Keller, and Temperley). Because of previous excesses in intervallic

\(^{34}\) To add another layer of interpretation to this analysis, it might be possible to argue that the low C sharps in the cellos directly preceding the appearance of the motto in the finale recall the bassoon’s low C in the slow movement and resolve it.
analysis, any argument using intervals as a connection between the movements of a work will be approached with more than the usual amount of skepticism. Intervals can nevertheless act to foster a sense of cyclic integration, especially when working in conjunction with one or more additional musical elements. In Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C minor, K. 457, for example, the diminished seventh acts as a cyclic interval together with other musical elements (see example 18). The leap between B natural and A flat defines the themes of this sonata’s outer movements.

Example 1: The diminished seventh as an interval fostering a sense of cyclic integration in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C minor, K. 457

a) The opening measures of K. 457/i

The strength of the diminished seventh as interval fostering a sense of cyclic integration is enhanced by a number of additional factors. First, both movements use the same pitches (B natural and A flat). Second, Mozart prepares these leaps with triadic melodies based on the tonic C minor triad. Finally, in both cases the pianist’s left hand plays an accompaniment in parallel thirds in the treble-clef range, creating a similarity of register.
The criticisms of intervallic relationships intensify when common diatonic intervals are identified as cyclic. The general consensus is that diatonic intervals can only have a weak influence on cyclic integration, while unusual or non-diatonic intervals can have a stronger effect. The idea is that “regular” intervals such as the perfect fourth or fifth are simply too common to be of any cyclic value. In practice this does not always hold true however. For example, Mozart uses overlapping leaps of perfect fourths and fifths in the themes of his String Quartet in G, K. 387. The intervals may be commonly used, but by placing these two intervals in multiple voices in very close proximity Mozart distinguishes his use from normal practice.

The first movement commences with overlapping fourths and fifths in the first violin. Texture plays an important role in highlighting the interval in this movement, as K. 387 opens with three voices using the intervals in quasi-imitation (see example 19). The solo first note also calls attention to the interval. Interestingly, the one voice normally associated with motion by perfect fourths and fifths, the bass, does not use either interval. The absence of these intervals from the cello’s bass line sets Mozart’s practice apart from other more clichéd applications of these intervals.

35 A notable exception to this is the analytic tradition of Haydn’s Symphony in D No. 104 “London,” which is widely accepted to have been constructed on the rising fourth and its inversion the falling fifth. There have been at least four published essays on the work, and no criticism has yet been raised against the cyclic nature of this interval in the work (in contrast to LaRue’s criticisms of relationships in other Haydn symphonies). See footnote 39 in the section summary for a full list of analyses of cyclic integration in this symphony.

36 A somewhat similar argument on the intervals of this work has been forwarded by Hans Keller, “The Chamber Music,” in The Mozart Companion, ed. H. C. Robbins Landon and Donald Mitchell (New York: Norton, 1969), 103-13. Keller does not discuss interlocking fifths and fourths however, as he focuses on the less convincing case of the rising octave.
Example 2: Interlocking fourths and fifths as interval fostering cyclic integration in Mozart’s String Quartet in G, K. 387

a) The opening of K. 387/i

The opening of the minuet also features these intervals. The first violin begins with a solo descending fourth, and then continues with chromatically filled-in fourths. The chromatic scales end with a falling fifth, while the theme continues full-texture with a fourth at m. 8. The falling fourth G-D in m. 1 also connects with the falling fifth D-G of mm. 6-7 in register and texture after the solo chromatic motion of mm. 3-6. Note that the imitative aspect of the first movement appears in this phrase as well, as the bass uses the inversion of the chromatic line at m. 7.

b) The opening of K. 387/ii

Mozart incorporates fourths and fifths at a number of different levels in the opening measures of the quasi-fugal finale. At the surface level, he includes a leap of a fourth in the theme itself. At a higher level, the five-note opening theme is essentially an embellished
rising fifth. At the highest level, each entry of the theme occurs at the same pitch level as the previous entry ended – a fourth or fifth away from the previous entry. All of these fourths and fifths combine to form a tightly knit opening based upon interlocking fifths and fourths. Note that the countersubject also features interlocking fourths and fifths (e.g. violin II mm.5ff. with D down a fourth to A then up a fifth to E then down a fourth to B).

c) The opening of K. 387/iv

While the use of common isolated intervals as elements of cyclic integration may be suspect, intervals can still foster a strong sense of cyclic integration when used in a distinctive way, as seen in K. 457 and K. 387. In these works various elements cooperate to create a unique matrix of musical elements. Without the presence of other supporting elements, the analysis of intervals as an element of cyclic integration in this repertoire becomes rather problematic.

- **Use of Silence or Rest: Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 50/2**

As noted in chapter 3, Mozart uses rests in K. 464 to give the music a distinctly un-lyrical quality. Rests can serve a number of different functions, however, and in his String Quartet in C major, Op. 50/2, Haydn uses rests to isolate phrases and articulate formal sections in the first and third movements. These rests work differently from those in K. 464, since in Op.
50/2 they do not impact the lyricism of the individual themes. Instead they serve a larger rhetorical function.

Rests serve two purposes in Op. 50/2. On some occasions they isolate important thematic material, while on other occasions they articulate a formal break. Haydn concludes the opening phrase of the first movement with a falling third isolated by two beats of rest on either side at mm. 9-11 (see example 20). The rests call attention to this motive by setting it apart from the remainder of the theme.

Example 3: The role of rests in fostering a sense of cyclic integration in Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 50/2

a) Rests isolating thematic material in the opening phrase of Op. 50/2/i

As it turns out, the falling third is less important to the movement than the two beats of rest used to separate it from the remainder of the theme. The rests take on a formal role throughout the movement and the work on the whole. In all the two-beat silences appear at each of the important formal junctures of this movement: the beginning of the transition (m. 21), the end of the exposition (m. 106), the end of the retransition (m. 175), the beginning of the fugato section in the recapitulation (m. 195), within the second key area in the recapitulation (m. 236), and in the closing measure (m. 290). The rests give Haydn’s form a particular sense of clarity and order.
Haydn again uses rests as formal markers in the third movement, but now they obscure his form by creating false or unfulfilled expectations. At m. 19 Haydn writes three beats of rest in a gesture that implies the return of the opening phrase to complete the rounded binary form. Instead of bringing the opening phrase back, however, Haydn continues the b section with the opening phrase at the wrong pitch. Only at m. 25 does the a-section material return.

b) Rests create a false formal expectation in Op. 50/2/iii

In the trio section of the movement, Haydn uses rests to isolate melodic material in the a’ section of his rounded binary form. This is in keeping with his use of rest in the opening phrase of the first movement. The a’ section commences at m. 66, but Haydn inserts three beats of rest at mm. 68-69 and a complete measure of rest at m. 72 to emphasize the fragmented nature of his melodic idea.
c) Rests isolate thematic material in the trio of Op. 50/2/iii

\[ \text{[Menuetto Allegretto]} \]

\[ \text{Rests isolate thematic material} \]

\[ \text{\begin{figure*}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Rests isolate thematic material.}
\end{figure*}} \]

- Section Summary

Works in which thematic resemblance near the opening of multiple movements acts as an element of cyclic integration:

Haydn

Symphonies

- 49 (openings of all mvts.; see discussion above)
- 58 (vln. & bass at openings of I and III)
- 59 (openings of II and III)
- 80 (themes of I and III)
- 104 (I m. 17 and openings of II and IV)

Cello Concerto No. 2 (openings of I and II)

Piano Concerto Hob. 3 (every themes use four stepwise descending sixteenth-notes)

String Quartets

- 17/3 (openings of I and IV)
- 33/5 (opening of I presented in inversion in opening of II)
- 50/3 (openings of I and IV)

37 Brown, Repertoire, 113.

38 Ibid., 205, argues that the theme of the minuet is a conglomerate of the m. 1 and m. 25 themes of the first movement but does not include a musical example to clarify his argument.

64/2 (openings of III and IV)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 16 (openings of II and III)

Mozart
Symphonies
27 (openings of I and III)
30 (openings of I and IV)
Piano Concertos
K. 414/385p (opening of I and II m. 9)
K. 537 (prominent repeated leaps to A in the openings of II and III, perhaps I m. 39 also related)

String Quartets
K. 421/417b (chaccone bass in openings of I and III)
K. 464 (openings of I, II, and IV; see discussion in chapter 3)
K. 575 (opening themes of I and IV)
String Quintet K. 614 (openings of I, III, and IV)
Clarinet Quintet K. 581 (openings of I and IV)
Piano Sonatas
K. 282/189g (openings of I and Minuet II)
K. 311/284c (turn figure in openings of all mvts.)
K. 330/300h (rising cadential gesture in opening phrases of all mvts.)

Works in which thematic resemblance in other locations acts as an element of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
56 (III mm. 68ff. and IV mm. 25ff.)
76 (I mm. 63-5, II mm. 1-3, III mm. 31-33, and IV mm. 1-3)
89 (I m. 43, openings of II, III, and IV m. 3)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 15 (prominent 3-7-1 motion in I mm. 1ff. and III mm. 60ff. with solo right-hand texture)

Mozart
Symphony 29 (opening of III inverted at IV mm. 23ff.)
Piano Concerto K. 467 (opening of II and III mm. 58)
Piano Trio K. 496 (ending of I [m. 192ff.] and opening of II)

Work in which verbatim thematic recall acts as an element of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphony 46 (III recalled in IV; see discussion above)

Works in which aspects of thematic construction act as an element of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
26 (use of chant melodies in I and II)\textsuperscript{40}
45 (short motives throughout)\textsuperscript{41}
93 (use of a motto; see discussion above)
103 (use of folksongs for themes of all movements)\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{Works in which anacrustic gestures foster a sense of cyclic integration:}

\textbf{Haydn}
\textbf{Symphonies}
53 (mvts. II and III)
88 (all mvts.; see discussion above)
\textbf{String Quartets}
9/5 (mvts. I, II, and IV)
33/1 (all mvts. including IItr)
33/2 (mvts. I, II, and IV)
50/3 (all mvts. including IIItr)

\textbf{Works in which a specific interval acts to foster a sense of cyclic integration:}

\textbf{Haydn}
\textbf{Symphonies}
68 ("ticking" thirds I m. 3, IItr, III opening accompaniment, IV mm. 228ff. and 256ff.)
69 ("horn" fifths I mn. 2-3, II m. 86, III mm. 5-6 and IV mm. 22-4)
104 (fourths/fifths in all mvts.)\textsuperscript{43}
\textbf{String Quartets}
50/2 (falling third)\textsuperscript{44}
55/3 (falling half step in bass in I mm. 1ff., II mm. 3ff., III 32ff.)
71/1 (prominent falling flattened half steps in I mm. 19ff. and 112, II mm. 5-6 and 12, III mm. 2-3, IV mm. 52-53)
76/1 (falling minor thirds in I mm. 2ff., II mm. 1-2, IV mm. 1ff.)
76/2 ("Quinten" fifths in openings of I and IV and arguably in II and III albeit to a lesser extent)
76/4 (Es-F rising half step in openings of I, II, IIItr, and IV)

\textsuperscript{40} Landon, \textit{Ezterh\'{a}za}, 293. The first two movements incorporate chants seemingly chosen as related in sentiment, but they do not have a purely musical connection between them aside from texture.

\textsuperscript{41} Webster, \textit{Farewell}, 24ff. These connections do not seem to me to be strong thematic resemblances as much as they are a consistent implementation of disjunct motion throughout the work.

\textsuperscript{42} Landon, \textit{England}, 598-605.


\textsuperscript{44} Sutcliffe, \textit{Op. 50}, 79.
Mozart

Symphonies
- 29 (prominent octaves in openings of I and IV)
- 40 (minor seconds)\(^{45}\)

Piano Concertos
- K. 488 (large melodic leaps used in openings of all mvts.)
- K. 537 (thirds in the openings of I and III)

String Quartets
- K. 387 (overlapping fourths and fifths; see discussion above)
- K. 465 (falling second/sigh figure in I mm. 1ff. and 23ff., II mm. 2ff. and esp. 26ff., III mm. 9ff. [inverted], and IV mm. 4ff.)

Piano Sonata K. 457 (sevenths; see discussion above)

Works in which the use of rests or silence give the music a distinctly unlyric or disrupted feel in a way that fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn

Symphonies
- 46 (unlyric phrases divided by rests in I opening and IV m. 29)\(^{46}\)
- 64 (unlyric rests in I opening, II mm. 74-5, and IV mm. 181-83)
- 65 (I opening, II mm. 95ff., and IV opening)
- 86 (openings of I, II, and IV)
- 96 (pauses/phrase extensions before onset of new sections in I, III, and IV)

String Quartets
- 50/2 (disruptive rests in I mm. 9-11, III mm. 19-20, and IV mm. 92-4; see discussion above)
- 54/2 (disruptive rests in I mm. 6 and 12 and IV m. 103)

Mozart

Piano Concerto K. 459 (unlyric rests in I mm. 16ff. and the opening of II)

String Quartet K. 464 (see discussion in chapter 3)

Works in which the use of rests or silence demarcate musical statements and thereby fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn

Symphonies
- 61 (written out silences in I m. 84, II mm. 32-3, and III mm. 40-1)
- 70 (demarcating phrases and sub-phrases e.g. I mm. 8 and 14, II mm. 8 and 16, III m. 10, and IV m. 16)
- 76 (demarcating phrases I m. 34 and dev., III mm.5-6 and 14, IV dev. and m. 99)

---


Rhythm, Meter, and Phrase Structure

As basic elements of music, rhythm, meter, and phrase structure, can be used to foster a sense of cyclic integration in any number of ways. For example, a constant rhythmic pulse can connect movements when it appears prominently or over a prolonged period of time in multiple movements. Meter typically does not foster any sense of connection among movements beyond the conventional, but an interest in distorting meter across movements can create strong inter-movement connections. Finally, as shown already in chapter 3 with K. 464, phrase structure and the specific ways in which a phrase is constructed can also play a role in cyclic integration.

- **Constant Rhythmic Pulse: Haydn’s String Quartet in G major, Op. 54/1**

In his String Quartet in G major, Op. 54/1, Haydn integrates the movements using a constant rhythmic pulse as one of his cyclic elements. This pulse gives the quartet a feeling of energy and drive that only abates in the closing moments of the finale. Part of the strength of this pulse lies in the long periods of time that include it: this is not an isolated pulse; it is rather a pervasive presence throughout the work.

Each movement features some type of pitch repeated at a fast pace relative to the melodic voice. In the first movement Haydn uses repeated eighth notes in the viola and cello up to m. 27 (see example 21). The pulse returns in the development and is also prominent during the movement’s closing moments.
Example 4: Rhythmic pulse as element of cyclic integration in Haydn’s String Quartet in G major, Op. 54/1

a) The opening of Op. 54/1/i

The rhythmic pulse makes an equally prominent appearance in the second movement. The pulse generally remains in the lower voices, though the second violin occasionally joins the others, as for example, at the movement’s opening.

b) The opening of Op. 54/1/ii

The rhythmic pulse changes to a certain extent in the minuet. The movement opens with repeated notes in the cello, and beginning at m. 4 the pulse moves to different voices. Haydn does not retain the strict notion of the repeated note throughout the movement. In the
b section he embellishes the pulse with an Alberti-like figuration. In the trio Haydn abandons even the Alberti figure, preferring instead to use constant bass motion as his rhythmic pulse.

c) The opening and b sections of Op. 54/1/iii

In the finale, Haydn opens with the Alberti bass embellishment of the pulse first seen in the preceding movement. About half way through the final movement, he begins to play with the rhythmic pulse in much the same way as Beethoven breaks his “clock” in the second movement of the Eighth Symphony. By breaking the grip of the rhythmic pulse, Haydn also finds an ingenious way to conclude the work. The steady pulse becomes erratic and then fades to nothingness with a decrescendo to pianissimo in a very high register.
d) The progression of the pulse over the course of Op. 54/1/iv

- **Distortion of Meter: Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 76/4 (Sunrise)**

Distortion of meter plays a significant role in the cyclic integration of Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 76/4 (Sunrise), as he temporarily suspends the meter through a moment of stasis in each of the first three movements. The “Sunrise” gesture, which gives this quartet its inauthentic nickname, begins the work without a clear sense of meter or tempo, creating a sense of temporal stasis or ambiguity (see example 22). Without the score, one could think this is an unmeasured opening cadenza of some sort until the arrival of the quarter notes at mm. 6-7. This stasis appears in conjunction with a number of other musical elements found in later movements, creating a matrix of elements similar in many respects to the connections
in K. 464. Haydn’s cyclic elements here include the use of E natural, a dissonant non-diatonic pitch that starkly contrasts with the consonant tonic B-flat chord beneath it, and the range of the violin line, which strives upward through an octave and a half to B flat above the staff. A juxtaposition of contrasting elements also fosters a sense of integration in this work.

In the opening of the first movement Haydn alternates articulations between legato and staccato, switches between a static metric setting and a strictly defined meter, changes from oblique motion to contrary motion, and quickly changes harmonic orientation from the stable opening B flat tonic chord to a tenuous arrival in C minor at m. 6.

Example 5: Metric stasis in Haydn’s String Quartet Op. 76/4 in B flat major (Sunrise)

a) The opening of Op. 76/4/i

The opening of the second movement incorporates nearly all of the musical elements seen at the beginning of the first movement. Haydn’s fermatas in mm. 2 and 4, complete with hairpin dynamic markings, break up the phrase rhythm and temporarily suspend the music’s meter. Thus there is no rhythmic or metric context for hearing the first four measures, just as in the first movement. The slowness of the movement, marked Adagio, further adds to the effect. In addition, the first violin and cello open the movement with contrary motion as part
of a cadential gesture, first in the tonic E flat and then in F minor, minor ii, at mm. 3-4. The harmonic motion, voice leading, and cadential elements appear in tandem, just as in the first movement. At m. 4, the pitch E natural also makes an early appearance in the movement, now as part of a move to F minor, ii, the same harmonic motion seen in the opening movement. Finally, the violin melody gradually unfolds up to a soaring B flat at m. 9.

b) The opening of Op. 76/4/ii

The juxtapositioning of elements seen in the first movement becomes only slightly less prominent in the second movement. The opening metric stasis is overturned in m. 6 with the meter-defining sixteenth notes and the following eighth note motion. The contrast of harmony is evident in the strong cadences in the tonic and then in ii, F minor, followed by a strong cadence back in the tonic in m. 8.

Metric stasis, along with a number of other elements from this work’s matrix of elements, returns prominently in the third movement. Haydn begins the trio section with a sustained pedal in the viola and cello above which the two violins play a melody in octaves. This pedal, along with the syncopated entry of the violins, the sustained B flat of m. 55, and the sustained F of m. 58, creates a sense of stasis where the music is temporarily freed from the meter. In addition, Haydn’s use of E natural in m. 53 conforms closely to its use in the
first movement as a local dissonance. There is a contrast of voice leading in this section as well: the oblique motion of mm. 50-54 stands in contrast to the parallel unison motion of mm. 55-57.

c) The trio of Op. 76/4/iii

A temporary suspension of meter also appears prominently in the finale. In this movement Haydn removes a sense of metric progress before both returns of the opening phrase, as well as before the accelerated coda section. Besides those instances in the example below, similar moments of stasis also appear at mm. 94ff. and 137ff.

d) Metric stasis at three points in Op. 76/4/iv (cont’d on next page)
The finale’s opening phrase, despite the absence of any hint of metric stasis, includes a number of the elements seen in the previous three movements. Contrary motion appears prominently throughout the phrase, as does the juxtaposition of legato and staccato articulations. The phrase also moves gradually upward, first to G above the treble clef staff, then to high B flat just before the cadence. Even the first movement’s E natural makes brief
appearances in mm. 2, 6, and 7. Although these E naturals are less prominent than in previous movements, they are more pervasive than earlier.

e) The opening phrase of Op. 76/4/iv

Some of the elements also make a prominent appearance in the closing moments of the work. At m. 167, E natural makes its final appearance, as Haydn sets up the final dominant pedal point. Moments later the first violin plays an upward triadic gesture to high B flat that is rather similar to the opening gesture of the first movement. This is immediately followed by a different use of B flat at m. 171, where it appears as the top note of a perfect authentic cadence. This is the high B flat’s first use as a cadential note, as opposed to its previous role of opening up new tessituras. Finally, the sustained whole note at m. 167 starkly contrasts with the pervasive eighth-note motion before it, perhaps creating a final temporary sense of metric stasis.
• **Connections Between Phrases: Mozart’s Piano Sonata in B flat major, K. 333/315c**

Haydn and Mozart use a variety of means to connect phrases and sub-phrases, including short pauses, connecting ideas, elision, etc. Normally they vary these means across movements, but on occasion they connect their phrases using the same gestures in such a consistent manner as to foster a sense of cyclic integration. This is the case in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in B flat major, K. 333/315c, for example, in which Mozart connects many of his phrases and sub-phrases using a solo flourish in the right hand.

The opening phrase of the first movement includes three prominent right-hand flourishes (see example 23). The first two occur within the phrase as cadential preparations.
The third flourish, mm. 10-11 connects complete phrases. Similar flourishes appear at mm. 31, 35, 64 (the opening of the development), 83, 88, 93-94 (retransition), and parallel sections in the recapitulation.

Example 6: Solo right-hand phrase connections in Mozart’s Piano Sonata in B flat major, K. 333/315c

a) The opening phrase of K. 333/315c/i

The right-hand flourishes return in the middle movement. Here they connect gestures within phrases and bridge the gap between sub-phrases. The half cadence at m. 4 is followed by a large flourish connecting antecedent and consequent. Another solo right-hand flourish appears in this movement directly preceding the reprise at m. 51.

b) The opening phrase of K. 333/315c/ii

Mozart’s solo right-hand phrase connections are most systematic in the finale. The joint between the first two four-measure sub-phrases receives a short flourish, while the eight-measure phrase itself receives a lengthier flourish at m. 8. Other connecting flourishes appear throughout the movement as well. In fact, the pattern seen in the opening phrase of
the finale holds true at larger levels in the movement. Before the return of the opening material at m. 41, for example, Mozart uses a two-measure flourish. The final return of the opening material at m. 200 is preceded by a full-blown cadenza in the right hand.

c) The opening of K. 333/315c/iii

The use of the solo right-hand flourish might seem like an inevitable connection given the genre, but this is not the case in Mozart’s piano sonatas. While these phrase connections appear with a certain amount of regularity in Mozart’s first movements, only a small number of his piano sonatas use similar connections in later movements. Fewer still have the same connection in every movement as with K. 333/315c.

• Section Summary

Works in which a rhythmic gesture or figure fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  85 (“Scotch Snap” in I and III)
  86 (repeated staccato eighth notes I mm. 26ff., III mm. 4ff, IV opening)
  87 (“Beethoven’s Fifth” I opening and esp. mm. 78ff., II opening horns, IV mm. 27ff.)
Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 35 (persistent dotted rhythms in opening themes of all mvts.)
Piano Trios Hob. XV
  8 (2 quarter notes followed by a rest)
  23 (use of double dotted rhythms in the openings of I and II)

Mozart
Double Piano Concerto K. 365/316a (“Beethoven’s Fifth” in I mm. 4ff., II mm. 4ff., and opening of III)
String Quintet K. 406/516b (syncopated sigh figures in I mm. 5ff., II mm. 3ff., III mm. 9ff., and IV mm. 57ff. and esp. 241ff.)
Piano Sonata K. 330/300h (rhythm in opening themes)
Piano Trio K. 564 (sixteenth-note or fast accompaniment at ends of all mvts.)

Works in which a constant rhythmic pulse fosters a sense of cyclic integration
Haydn
Symphony 101 (incessant accompanimental pulses in II [the “clock” idea] and IIItr)
String Quartet 54/1 (constant pulse; see discussion above)

Mozart
Piano Sonata K. 576 (constant sixteenth-/thirty-second-note motion in I after m. 10, II after m. 9 and esp. mm. 24ff., and III after m. 9)

Works in which heavy syncopation fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
String Quartets
64/5 (heavy or pervasive syncopation in I mm. 35ff., II mm. 7ff., IIItr mm. 50ff., and IV mm. 29ff.)
71/3 (heavy syncopation in I mm. 96ff., III mm. 5ff. and IV mm. 19ff.)

Mozart
Piano Quartet K. 478 (syncopation in openings of II and III)

Works in which the temporary suspension of meter or metric distortion fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
String Quartets
64/3 (distortion in the openings of I, III, and IV)
74/1 (suspension of meter in opening of I and II m. 147, and metric ambiguity in openings of II, III, and IV)
76/4 (suspension of meter; see discussion above)

Works in which metric ambiguity fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
65 (III mm. 7ff. and IV opening)
97 (openings of II and III)

Mozart
String Quartet K. 499 (ambiguous downbeats in the openings of I and IV, distortion in III mm. 13ff.)

Works in which some other facet of meter fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
String Quartet 20/6 (consistent off-beat accompaniment in openings of I, II, and IV, and III mm. 9ff.)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 23 (hemiola in I mm. 21ff. and III mm. 83ff.)

Mozart
Piano Sonata K. 330/300h (switch from duple to triple figures in expositions of I mm. 26ff. and III mm. 16ff.)

Works in which flourish figures foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphony 61 (vln. I used to connect phrases [similar to K. 333/315c] in opening of I, II mm. 34-5, and IV mm. 64ff.)
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 31 (pno. flourish [similar to K. 333/315c] in I mm. 24 and 158 and II mm. 24, 71, and 90ff.)

Mozart
Piano Sonata K. 333/315c (right-hand flourishes between phrases; see discussion above)

Musical Topics

Musical topics as used by Haydn and Mozart can be among the most readily apparent instances of cyclic integration among the movements of a work. At their strongest, they involve a similarity of conception behind the movements of a composition – sometimes to the extent of becoming a compositional gimmick of sorts.

---

• **Musical Topics: Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird)**

Each of the movements of Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 33/3 (The Bird) include thematic material designed to sound like birdcalls.\(^{48}\) By using the same rhetorical topic across every movement, Haydn fosters a distinctive sense of cyclic integration in this work, much as if he would have included a thematic resemblance across the movements. The opening phrase of the first movement opens with a “birdcall” in the first violin (see example 24).

**Example 7: Bird calls as rhetorical topic in the movements of Op. 33/3 (The Bird)**

a) The opening of Op. 33/3/i

\[\text{Allegro moderato} \quad \text{Bird-like theme}\]

\[\text{ Allegro moderato} \quad \text{Bird-like theme}\]

The first movement’s “birdcall” topic returns in the trio of the second movement as part of that section’s main theme. Presumably this instance is the source of the quartet’s inauthentic name. The range and trills combine with the duet texture to create a clear reference to birds.

---

\(^{48}\) For a discussion of harmonic elements of cyclic integration in this work see the discussion above under the heading “Chordal Inversion and Phrase-level Harmonic Motion.”
b) The opening of the trio of Op. 33/3/ii

The birdcalls reappear in the second phrase of the third movement, though less obviously than in the previous movements. The repetition of a nearly triadic theme using a number of repeated notes, combined with the incorporation of grace notes mimics the sound of a bird, despite the absence of trills. The solo violin at m. 19, complete with “Scotch snap,” reinforces the idea of a birdcall.

c) The second phrase of Op. 33/3/iii

The finale also opens with thematic material reminiscent of a birdcall. The oscillation between G and E in the first violin recalls the same rhetorical topic seen in the previous movements. The melody of the second phrase of this movement, with its grace-note turns around G, makes for a moderately strong connection. In addition, the tessitura, use of F sharp, and rhythm of the material at m. 9 creates a strong thematic resemblance with the first movement’s opening theme.
d) The opening of Op. 33/3/iv

- **Differing Topics Connected by Gestural Similarity: Haydn’s Symphony No. 82 in C major (L’Ours)**

Pedal tones and pedal tone-like gestures play an integral role in the themes of each of the four movements of Haydn’s Symphony No. 82 in C major (L’Ours). These pedal tones connect the movements as the defining feature of the topics in use in each case. The pedal appears in a number of different instruments and ranges, but in each case Haydn calls attention to it either through the use of a repeated grace note or through a sparsely orchestrated texture.

---

49 Brown (Repertoire, 221-25) notes that the grace-note laden pedal tone closing the second movement of the work (mm. 184ff.) foreshadows the raucous pedal-tone opening of the finale. He also briefly notes thematic and other cyclic connections in this work.
In the first movement, a pedal tone first appears at the beginning of the secondary key area in the bassoon as part of a musette topic (see example 25). Haydn’s scoring of the melody emphasizes the bassoon pedal tone, as both the cello (which would normally play in the same range) and the oboe (which has the same timbre as the bassoon) rest. The unison flute and violin melody combines with the bassoon pedal tone to make for a distinctive topical reference through texture.

Example 8: The pedal tone in musette and pastorale topics in Haydn’s Symphony No. 82 in C major (L’Ours)

a) The opening of the secondary key area of Symphony No. 82/i

The musette topic returns in each of the later movements, including the second movement. At m. 184 of that movement, the cello plays a pedal tone-like gesture beneath another unison flute and violin melody. The cello’s grace notes on the final beat of each measure call attention to the pedal point and add to the rustic affect.

50 On the Musette topic see Ratner, Classic Music, 21.
b) The pedal tone-like gesture in Symphony No. 82/ii

The pedal tone reappears in the trio of the third movement, but now under the guise of a new rhetorical topic. Instead of invoking the musette, Haydn uses pedal tones in the horns to invoke a pastorale topic. As in previous movements Haydn brings out the pedal tone through his scoring. The horns play in octaves as the lowest sounding instruments, below even the bassoon. Haydn thus links the musette and the pastorale topics through the use of a pedal tone and distinctive textures.

c) Pedal tones in Symphony No. 82/iii

The musette topic, together with pedal tone-like gesture is most evident in the opening of the finale. Haydn begins the work with the cellos playing the pedal alone. He includes grace notes much as in the second movement, while the violin melody without accompaniment casts the topic in a new texture from that of the previous movements.
The Distinctive Juxtaposition of Incongruous Elements: Haydn’s Symphony No. 83 in G minor (La Poule)

Haydn creates a sense of cyclic integration among the movements of his Symphony No. 83 in G minor (La Poule) by consistently juxtaposing serious musical statements full of tension with light and joking musical statements. The first movement commences with a Sturm und Drang style theme in G minor. The exposition continues with an equally serious tone until m. 45, when the light, mocking theme that gives this symphony its inauthentic nickname enters (see example 26, next page). Haydn’s use of grace notes reinforces the differences between the movement’s two themes. He also calls special attention to the contrast between these themes in the development section, where he states them in close proximity.

Later movements follow the precedent set by the first movement. The second movement opens quietly with a lyric melody and continues in a similar vein until m. 24. Here Haydn plays with the return of the opening theme by lowering the dynamic and using repeated notes similar to those found at the opening of the theme. At m. 28 he abruptly switches to a startling fortissimo dynamic and tutti texture. Two measures later a new theme enters that mocks the seriousness of the opening theme by its use of grace notes and a clichéd harmonic sequence.
Example 9: The contrast of serious and mocking themes in Haydn’s Symphony No. 83 in G minor (La Poule)

a) The opening and second themes of Symphony No. 83/i
b) The opening and second themes of Symphony No. 83/ii

The third movement mimics the first two movements in somewhat less dramatic fashion. Here the heavy, stately minuet theme contrasts with the light theme of the trio. Besides contrasting thematic material, the two sections also have contrasting dynamics and

![Music notation diagram](image-url)
textures. Finally, just as in the two previous movements, the later theme uses grace notes while the opening theme does not.

c) The minuet and trio themes of Symphony No. 83/iii

![Sheet music of Symphony No. 83/iii](image)

- **Section Summary**

Works in which musical topics or affect foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn

Symphonies

- 82 (musette and pastorale; see discussion above)
- 100 (Turkish style, military; see discussion below under texture)
- 102
- 103

String Quartets

- 33/3 (bird-like melodies; see discussion above)

---

51 Brown, *Repertoire*, 286, makes the case for an upbeat and happy affect in each movement.

52 Landon, *England*, 601. He describes this as a “folksong” symphony due to Haydn’s references to folksongs throughout the work.
76/2 (“Gypsy” music in I mm. 85ff., II mm. 66-7, III the so-called “Witch’s Canon,” and opening of IV [esp. m. 8])
Piano Trio Hob. XV: 21 (pastorale, in conjunction with C major, in opening of I [title, use of pedals, etc.], II mm. 40ff., and III [“rustic” or “peasantly” throughout])

Works in which a compositional principle or gimmick fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
83 (mocking phrases; see discussion above)
97 (overemphasis, repetition e.g. I mm. 17-21, II use of theme and variations form, III mm. 88-91, and IV mm. 158ff.)
String Quartets
33/4 (silliness or ineptitude)\(^{53}\)
76/4 (stasis; see discussion under “Rhythm, Meter, and Phrase Structure”)

Works in which a rhetorical device fosters a sense of cyclic integration:
Haydn
Symphonies
46 (interruption I m. 36 and IV mm. 29)\(^{54}\)
89 (moment of indecision in I mm. 101ff. and IV mm. 170ff.)
String Quartets
50/1 (extra thematic iteration before closings in I mm. 152ff., III mm 32ff., and IV 225ff.)
54/1 (disruptive gestures in I mm. 70ff., II mm. 35ff., III mm. 33ff., and IV mm. 16ff., 150, and 186ff.)
64/6 (urgency/difficulty in achieving cadence in I mm. 41ff. and ending, III mm. 32ff. and 53ff., and IV mm. 178ff.)
71/2 (variation as principle: new themes arise as variations of older themes in I mm. 1ff. vs. 21ff., II mm. 1ff. vs. 17ff., III mm. 1ff. vs. 11ff., and IV mm. 1ff. vs. 8ff.; use variation forms in II [sonata with varied reprise] and IV [theme and variation])
Piano Trios Hob. XV: 20 (fixation on short repeated ideas in II [ground bass] and III [\(\frac{3}{4}\) rhythm])

Mozart
String Quintet K. 515 (use of trills at important cadential points to counteract length of the mvt.s. in I mm. 303ff., II mm. 117ff., and IV mm. 491ff.)
Piano Sonata K. 310/300d (difficulty cadencing/lack of strong cadence in a minor in openings of I and III)


\(^{54}\) Bonds, Rhetoric, 202-3.
Texture

Texture plays different roles in existing approaches to cyclic integration. Some writers overlook it completely while others dismiss textural connections as insignificant coincidences. However, as the analyses below demonstrate, texture often provides compelling examples of cyclic integration. The following section discusses the variety of roles that texture can play in the cyclic integration of a work by Haydn or Mozart. This includes connections due to the intended performer, the use of dynamics, orchestration, instrumental effects, pedal tones, articulations, and the treatment of small groups of instruments in larger ensembles.

- The Use of Diverse Recurring Textures: Haydn’s Symphony No. 100 in G major (Military)

Texture frequently plays an important role in the cyclic integration of Haydn and Mozart’s symphonies. Nowhere is texture more at the forefront than in Haydn’s Symphony No. 100, in G major, (Military). Haydn uses a number of diverse and unique textures in multiple movements of this work in a way that fosters a strong sense of cyclic integration.

The textural connections in this work have already been a victim of the casual resistance to Haydn’s use of cyclic integration. Had Beethoven written this work, there would be no questioning the textural connections among the work’s movements. As it is, the use of texture in this work has been passed off as one of “Papa” Haydn’s compositional gimmicks, quirkily and inconsistently applied in only two movements. Tovey for example sees Haydn’s textures in this symphony as a distraction: “The ‘Turkish music’ appears only in the slow movement and finale… and in no way interrupts the development of Haydn’s
most characteristic forms.”\textsuperscript{55} In fact, far from interrupting the music, these textures are perhaps the most important facet of Haydn’s use of cyclic integration in this work.

Haydn uses diverse textures throughout each of the symphony’s four movements in an effort to connect them as part of a single, unique, work. The first unconventional texture used by Haydn in this work is the “wind band” texture that appears at the beginning of the opening movement’s \textit{allegro} section (see example 27). Here Haydn reveals his interest in the woodwinds as a freestanding section of the orchestra. The flute and \textit{divisi} oboes give the first presentation of the primary theme without additional accompaniment.

\textbf{Example 10: Diverse textures as element of cyclic integration in Haydn’s Symphony No. 100 (Military)}

\textbf{a) The “wind band” texture of Symphony No. 100/i m. 24}

The wind-band texture returns consistently throughout the first movement (mm. 75, 180, 200, 220, and 234). Later movements also feature the woodwinds prominently as a distinct textural color in Haydn’s palette (II mm. 8, 119, 168 and IV mm. 174, 312). These sections typically have topical associations with the march and the pastorale.

Another texture used frequently by Haydn in this symphony is the so-called “Turkish” percussion cited by Tovey. The triangle, cymbals, and bass drum that make up the percussion instruments in this symphony first appear in the slow movement at mm. 57ff., in tandem with a switch to the minor mode. Besides their prominence throughout this movement, the percussion instruments also return in the finale at m. 265 and play until the

\textsuperscript{55}Donald Francis Tovey, “Symphony in G major (‘Military’),” in \textit{Essays in Musical Analysis}, vol. 1, \textit{Symphonies} (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 159.
end of the work. This texture has topical associations of the march and, of course, the Turkish style. There is therefore a topical connection between the “Turkish” sections and the “wind band” sections through the use of the march topic, but the differences override this similarity as an element of integration in favor of the significant contrasts between these textures.

b) The “Turkish” percussion as distinctive texture in Symphony No. 100/ii

A third related but distinct texture used by Haydn in the symphony is the “military” texture, created partly by a trumpet solo and partly by a startling switch to a tutti texture. The
solo trumpet call in the slow movement ends with a sustained, *tutti*, fortissimo A-flat chord at m. 161. The military and *Sturm und Drang* topics predominate this section, meaning that it is distinct from the topical associations seen in the other two sections. Once again, contrast is as important as consistency for this work’s sense of integration.

c) The “Military” texture in Symphony No. 100/ii

At the end of the movement, a related *tutti*, forte, unison fanfare also appears. The military fanfare returns in the trio of the minuet at m. 68, where *tutti*, forte, homophonic dotted rhythms appear. This texture appears suddenly in each instance, unlike the Turkish texture. In
addition, the military texture consistently uses a very loud dynamic, and typically appears in conjunction with a harmonic shift to borrowed keys (vi in the slow movement, and v in the minuet).

Symphony No. 100 is unique in its use of striking textures and diverse topical associations throughout. Haydn fosters a sense of cyclic integration in this work by using each of these textures in multiple movements – the work as a whole systematically examines the widest variety of textures available in the late eighteenth century. While even a single texture could act as an element of cyclic integration, Haydn’s use of three distinct, recurring textures gives the work a very strong sense of cyclic integration. Haydn highlights textural changes beginning in the work’s opening moments and continually manipulates texture up to its closing measures.

- **Intended Performer as Textual Influence: Mozart’s String Quartet in D major, K. 575**

In spite of the disputed status of cyclic integration in the instrumental music of Haydn and Mozart, analyses of their music typically include a passing reference to the ways in which the intended performer(s) seemingly influenced certain aspects of the composition. That is, skeptics of cyclic integration typically make an exception for connections assigned to a stated extra-musical influence such as a specific performer or dedicatee. The presence of textural connections described in terms of their extra-musical impetus offers another type evidence of Haydn and Mozart’s interest in cyclic integration, even if in a less spectacular fashion than other connective elements.

In the realm of instrumental music, the intended performer most frequently influences a work’s texture. Discussions of virtuosic violin passages in Haydn’s works are said to be composed that way because of a specific performer, for example, the violinist Solomon
playing solo sections in Haydn’s “London” symphonies or because violin virtuoso Tost commissioned a set of string quartets.

In his String Quartet in D major, K. 575, Mozart goes to extraordinary lengths to feature the cello. His featuring of the cello has a fairly obvious goal: to please the cello-playing dedicatee of the work, Friedrich Wilhelm II of Prussia. The cello plays an important melodic role in each movement of K. 575, just as in most of the “Prussian” quartets, but Mozart places the cello in an extremely high register in K. 575. For example at mm. 23-24 of the first movement, the cello’s melody line sounds as the top voice and then participates in an imitative duet with the first violin (see example 28). The cello stays in a similar register throughout the secondary key area at m. 32, and again crosses voices at mm. 35-36, briefly becoming the highest sounding voice.

Example 11: The prominent cello part in Mozart’s String Quartet in D major, K. 575

a) High registered cello featuring in K. 575/i

Mozart treats the cello similarly in the remaining movements. In the second movement the cello ascends above the other instruments at m. 29. In addition, Mozart once again incorporates imitation with the first violin into his texture.
b) The cello in K. 575/ii

In the trio of the third movement the cello assumes a melodic role once again. In fact, it is the highest sounding instrument for more than half of the section.

c) The opening of the trio of K. 575/iii

The cello receives its most prominent featuring yet with the high-registered melodic line in the opening measures of the finale. In addition to register and instrumentation, this theme also bears a striking resemblance to the opening theme of the first movement. The combination of texture and register creates a strong sense of cyclic integration in the work, while the strong thematic resemblance only reinforces the connection.
d) The cello in K. 575/iv (left) and the thematic resemblance between K. 575/i and iv (right)

K. 575/iv was the second finale Mozart composed for this work. The first finale, left incomplete, opens with a melody in the violin that does not bear a thematic resemblance to the first movement. The revised finale thus incorporates two elements of cyclic integration that would not otherwise have appeared in K. 575: texture through the featuring of the cello and thematic resemblance.

Of course, like any other cyclic element, the intended performer need not exert an influence over every movement of a composition. Mozart’s original finale for K. 575 bears this out. Perhaps the best examples of a performer not exerting an influence are Haydn’s own “Prussian” quartets, Op. 50, also dedicated to Friedrich Wilhelm II and composed two years prior to Mozart’s set. Haydn gives the cello special regard at the opening of Op. 50/1/i, but he treats the cello normally throughout the remainder of the work, and the rest of the set.56

A secondary byproduct of the intended performer’s influence is the sharing of a cyclic element across entire sets of works. This is true of Mozart’s “Prussian” quartets (K. 575, 589, and 590), where the cello plays a central role in nearly all the movements of the set. In the end, the performer’s influence in this set of works generates a strong sense of cyclic

56 Landon (Eszterháza, 626) notes the opening cello line. Sutcliffe (Op. 50, 66-7) notes that the cello returns to its normal role after the opening measures of Op. 50/1/i.
integration through textual means in each work, though this influence is most strongly evident in K. 575.

- **Dynamics, Orchestration, and Obbligato Lines: Mozart’s Symphony No. 41 in C major, K. 551 (Jupiter)**

A number of textural elements combine to foster a sense of cyclic integration among the movements of Mozart’s Symphony No. 41 in C major (Jupiter), K. 551. Elaine Sisman has already noted the following connections:

1. Tutti portion of opening theme, leading to half cadence, followed by soft reiteration of opening theme: same in finale.

2. C-minor interjection at end of second group, bar 81: sudden C-minor outburst in second movement at beginning of transition (bar 19); a C-minor episode occurs in closing group of finale (bar 127); in addition, corresponding spots in recapitulations of first movement and finale both begin in F minor and go up to D flat major.

3. Second theme, bars 56, 244: texture recurs at beginning of minuet and at beginning of finale (first theme); moreover, the imitation in the bass of second theme also appears in finale.

4. Development section, dissonant ascending progression with chromatic bass line, on C-D-E, bar 171; in recapitulation of finale, after first theme there is a dissonant progression of C-D-E-D-C with chromatic wind line (bar 233)\(^57\)

Three additional connections among the movements of this symphony have received less attention. First, the openings of each movement include a contrast of dynamics similar in many respects to the use of dynamics observed in the discussion of K. 464 in chapter 3. Second, the dynamic contrasts appear in conjunction with a textural contrast between the full ensemble and the string section alone and between unison and harmonized statements. Finally, Mozart’s melodic strategy for the work includes the idea of appending obbligato lines to melodies upon their second appearance. When considered in the context of the

\(^57\) Sisman, *Jupiter*, 37-8
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work’s thematic resemblances and modal mixtures between tonic major and parallel minor, Mozart creates a very strong sense of cyclic integration in K. 551.

The first movement commences with a tutti, forte statement in unison contrasted with a piano melody-and-accompaniment statement in the strings (see example 29). After repeating the idea, Mozart introduces a new, forte, idea at m. 9, and the movement continues.

Example 12: Textural contrast in Mozart’s Symphony No. 41 in C major, K. 551 (Jupiter)

a) The opening of K. 551/i

The first movement’s opening strategy, with its use of contrasting textures and dynamics, reappears in the openings of later movements. The second movement opens with a solo violin at piano, but the tutti, forte interruption of m. 2, repeated again in m. 4, contrasts dynamics and texture. At m. 7 the music continues with the entry of a new melodic idea in most of the instruments at a forte dynamic, a formal and dynamic connection with m. 9 of the first movement.
b) The opening of K. 551/ii

The third movement uses the same basic strategy as the previous movements for the openings of both the minuet and the trio, though at a slightly larger scale. The quiet string-dominated opening eight measures contrast with the following eight loud, *tutti* measures. In the trio, beginning at m. 43, the woodwinds play alone at *piano* for nine measures before they are interrupted suddenly by a *forte*, *tutti* texture. In the trio this pattern continues. Its a section is *piano* and on only a few instruments while the b section is *forte* and *tutti*. The repeat signs as well as the a-b-a′ form of the trio reinforce the contrast.

The contrast of dynamics and textures is not as prominent in the finale, but the opening strategy remains related to Mozart’s ideas in the previous movements. The first eight measures are *piano* and for strings alone, while the new phrase at m. 9 is *forte* and *tutti*. 
Besides the dynamic and textural contrasts above, Mozart includes a third textural element in the cyclic integration of this symphony: the addition of obbligato lines to important melodies (see example 30). The melodies do not remain static in their presentation because he constantly adds new melodic lines to reiterations of important melodies. In effect the textures of each movement become more polyphonic as the work progresses.

In the first movement, Mozart begins the transition with the opening melody and a new obbligato accompaniment in the flute.

Example 13: Added obbligato lines in Mozart’s Symphony in C major, K. 551
a) The transition of K. 551/i (compare to example 29a)
He uses much the same strategy for the secondary key area. Here the imitative texture creates the illusion of an added obbligato line at mm. 56ff.

b) The imitative theme of the secondary key area of K. 551/i

In the second movement Mozart changes the melody in the recapitulation by inserting a cello interpolation (imitated by the violin) between the melodic statements at mm. 60ff. While this is a slightly different strategy than that used in the outer movements, the effect of adding new melodic lines remains a constant, as does the effect of creating a more polyphonic texture, in this case through imitation.

This interest in adding new melodic lines to restated melodic material culminates in the finale’s fugato section. Here Mozart takes the opening melody of the movement and adds a counter subject to create a complete fugal texture at mm. 36ff.
c) The added melodic line in the reprise of the opening theme in K. 551/ii (compare to example 29b)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Original melody of m. 1} & \text{Added melody in cello} & \text{Added melody treated Initiatively} \\
\hline
\text{WW} & \text{Horn} & \\
\text{Vln. I} & & \\
\text{Vln. II} & & \\
\text{Vla.} & & \\
\text{Cello} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Original melody} & \text{Added melody in octaves} \\
\hline
\text{Vln.} & \\
\text{Cello} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Added melody (counter subject)} & \\
\hline
\text{Vln. I} & \\
\text{Vln. II} & \\
\text{Vla.} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Original melody} \\
\text{Vln. I} \\
\text{Vln. II} \\
\text{Vla.} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Original melody} \\
\text{Vln. I} \\
\text{Vln. II} \\
\text{Vla.} \\
\end{array}
\]

In the end, texture influences this work’s cyclic integration at two levels. First, the contrasting \textit{tutti} and solo sections appear at the opening of each movement. Second, Mozart
consistently adds new obbligato lines to his original melodies, creating a polyphonic texture out of a much simpler texture.

- **Use of Special Instrumental Effects: Haydn’s Symphony No. 67 in B flat major**

In his Symphony No. 67 in B flat major, Haydn systematically explores the expressive possibilities of the stringed instruments in each of the work’s movements. This work is unique both in the consistent application of special string effects in all four movements and in the wide variety of effects called for by Haydn. The different sounds produced by the string section give the work a wide range of timbres and an experimental sound that fosters a strong sense of cyclic integration among the movements.

Haydn’s first use of a special instrumental effect appears at the close of the second movement, where he directs the strings to play *col legno dell’arco* (with the wood of the bow, mm. 118-122, see example 31). The *col legno dell’arco* designation in this movement is unique in Haydn’s output.

**Example 14: The use of special string timbres in Haydn’s Symphony No. 67 in B flat major**

a) The close of Symphony No. 67/ii

![Example of special string timbres in Symphony No. 67](image)

Haydn takes equally drastic measures to achieve a distinctive timbre in the third movement. In the trio, two violins play a duet where Haydn stipulates that both violins play “*sopra una corda, con sordino*” (on one string, with mute). In order to perform the second
violin part, that violin’s fourth string must be tuned to F, an additional requirement in the service of timbre.

b) The opening of the trio of Symphony No. 67/iii

Haydn temporarily returns to his “normal” string writing for the first 71 measures of the finale. At m. 72 however, he begins the slow middle section of the movement using only two solo violins and a solo cello in what amounts to a string trio. This string trio texture is also unique in his symphonic output, and is so out of place in his symphonic style that it participates in the timbral connections used in the earlier movements.

c) The opening of the slow middle section of Symphony No. 67/iv

Pizzicato plays an integral role in the texture of the first movement’s main theme that in retrospect connects to the more noticeable timbral elements seen in later movements. The work opens with a staccato first violin with pizzicato accompaniment in the other strings. The texture returns in the development (mm. 93ff.) as well as in the recapitulation (mm. 164 ff.) and coda (mm. 244 ff.). This pizzicato is not out of place or unusual in Haydn’s music,
but the textures later in the work show that its use here was just the first step in the exploration of string timbres in the following movements. By the work’s end, Haydn has used virtually every timbral possibility available on his string instruments.

- **Texture in the Entries of a Solo Instrument: Haydn’s Cello Concerto No. 1 in C major, Hob. VIIB: 1**

Haydn’s treatment of the solo cello in the second and third movements of his Cello Concerto No. 1 in C major, Hob. VIIB: 1, incorporates two distinct cyclic elements. The initial cello entries of the final two movements begin with a sustained note while the orchestra plays the incipit of the theme. The orchestra masks the cello’s initial entry so that the solo cello becomes apparent gradually. By using the sustained note, he gradually separates the soloist from the accompaniment (see example 32).

After its masked entry, the cello states the full opening of the theme as if the orchestra had not already played it during the sustained tone. This creates the effect of an “extra” iteration of theme’s incipit when compared to each movement’s opening gesture. By repeating the themes an additional time, Haydn features the cello and establishes it as the soloist. Besides these textural connections he also includes a moderate thematic resemblance between these movements. Both movements’ melodies, and that of the first movement as well, span a rising fourth with a sustained C moving up to a short F in their initial measure. These textural and thematic elements forge a strong cyclic relationship between the final two movements.

---

58 This work was composed in the first half of the 1760s and thus lies outside the stated scope of investigation for the dissertation. However, I feel that the strength and distinctiveness of this particular example warrant its inclusion.
Example 15: Masked entries and thematic resemblance in Haydn’s Cello Concerto No. 1 in C major

a) The initial entry of the soloist in Cello Concerto No. 1/ii

b) The initial entry of the soloist in Cello Concerto No. 1/iii

• Treatment of a Group of Instruments: Mozart’s String Quartet in E flat major, K. 428/421b

Mozart’s plan for the instrumentation of the finale of his String Quartet in E flat major, K. 428/421b, incorporates a sense of cyclic integration based on a focus on hocket-like sections where one or two of the instruments sound unsynchronized with the rest of the group. Typically, these out-of-sync moments appear in close proximity to very in-sync sections of music, creating a sense of contrast that also creates an affinity among K. 428/421b’s movements. For example, Mozart distorts the simple homophonic texture of the final movement’s opening theme, using a hocket-like texture to create the imbalance among instruments (see example 33). The hocket shows the instruments of the quartet at their most
Example 16: In- and out-of-sync textures in Mozart’s String Quartet in E flat major, K. 428/421b

a) The retransition and recapitulation of K. 428/421b/iv

Earlier movements show a connection to this idea in that Mozart frequently breaks up originally homophonic passages as if some of the performers were momentarily confused. The work opens with a four-measure unison passage followed immediately by a chaotic fifth measure. The violins play out of sync with the viola and cello as if there are two different downbeats. Even the cadence at m. 8 does not work out properly because the second violin plays through it as though unaware of the ensemble.

b) The opening of K. 428/421b/i
The second and third movements follow in a similar vein. At m. 15 of the second movement the close imitation between first violin and viola, in tandem with a very chromatic second violin, makes for two measures of dissonant writing before the voices come together momentarily for the cadence.

c) The opening of the secondary key area of K. 428/421b/ii

In the third movement the second violin is out of sync with the rest of the instruments. At m. 29 it enters with the disheveled return of the opening theme two measures early on the wrong pitch, immediately following a period of metrically ambiguous homophony.

d) The reprise of the opening theme in K. 428/421b/iii’s minuet section
Parallel Thirds as Recurring Texture: Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 20/1

Haydn’s prominent use of melodic material set in parallel thirds fosters a distinctive sense of cyclic integration in his String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 20/1. The parallel thirds seen in the opening measures of the first movement find close parallels in the main themes of each of the later movements. One might expect two movements to use parallel motion, in which case there would only be a weak cyclic connection, but here the prominence and pervasiveness of parallel motion used in the openings of this work’s movements goes beyond the conventional. In addition, each instance of parallel thirds appears in conjunction with a transparent texture that highlights their use.

The first movement opens with the violin and viola in parallel thirds over a sparse bass line (see example 34). The texture of the opening is not radical, as the parallel thirds are conventional (though Haydn’s use of the viola rather than the second violin for the parallel voice is somewhat odd). What makes this cyclic connection stronger than a conventional relationship is the consistency with which Haydn uses the parallel thirds in his main themes and the thin textures that make them prominent. In this case, his texture consists of parallel thirds over a pedal tone.
Example 17: Parallel thirds in sparse textures in Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat major, Op. 20/1

a) The opening of Op. 20/1/i

The parallel motion returns in full force in the opening phrase of the second movement. Here, the violins move in unison with the viola and cello in octaves a third lower. The lack of even a sparse accompanimental line, and the blatant contrast with the texture and dynamics of the previous measures draws further attention to the parallel thirds.

b) The opening of Op. 20/1/ii

The third movement also begins with a melody in parallel thirds. The pedal tone seen in the first movement also returns here, now with a pedal in both the cello and the first violin. The parallel thirds also return at mm. 6-7, again with the same sustained accompaniment.
c) The opening of Op. 20/1/iii

Parallel thirds make up the core of the finale’s melody as well. The first and second violins move in parallel thirds to open the movement and are echoed by the viola and cello shortly thereafter. In this movement Haydn presents the parallel thirds without any accompaniment at all, an even more sparse texture than the pedals seen earlier.

d) The opening of Op. 20/1/iv

In each of Op. 20/1’s movements melodies presented in parallel thirds with sparse accompaniments play a critical role and foster a sense of cyclic integration. This work’s parallel thirds go beyond the conventional and are unique in Haydn’s output due to their prominence and consistent application throughout.
Articulation: Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 64/1

Haydn uses contrasting articulations as an element of cyclic integration in his String Quartet in C major, Op. 64/1. The opening themes of each movement include prominent alternating sections of legato and staccato articulations. The first violin opens the work with two measures of legato, but staccatos interrupt this in the third measure. The eighth-note rests separating the staccato notes reinforces the contrast. The alternation of legato and staccato phrases continues throughout the first movement including, for example, the main theme of the second key area (mm. 26ff.).

Example 18: Contrasting articulations as element of cyclic integration in Haydn’s String Quartet in C major, Op. 64/1

a) The opening of Op. 64/1/i

The second movement opens with the contrasting articulations just as observed in the opening movement. Now both the melody and the accompaniment alternate articulations. The contrast of articulations continues throughout both the minuet and the trio sections of the movement. The articulations contrast most closely with each other at the cadential points of the movement, as is the case at mm. 7-8 below, as well as at the end of both the minuet and the trio.
b) The opening of Op. 64/1/ii

Similarly, the third movement commences with staccato notes and continues with legato articulations. The reinforcing rests seen in the first movement also return. As in previous movements, the articulations alternate throughout the movement.

c) The opening of Op. 64/1/iii

Haydn makes the contrasting articulations most evident in the finale by including a predominantly homophonic texture. He bases the opening theme on two-measure phrases using articulations as one of his distinguishing elements.
d) The opening of Op. 64/1/iv

Articulations, while a strong component of this work’s sense of cyclic integration, are only part of the picture of the connections among this work’s movements. Other elements of cyclic integration here include an opening anacrusis, usually in a solo voice, the opening of each movement except the third with one instrument tacet, the use of suspensions and appoggiaturas in each of the movement’s melodies, and also certain melodic and rhythmic resemblances. Each of these elements cooperate to make the contrast of articulations a more apparent element of cyclic integration.

- Section Summary

Works in which one or more contrapuntal devices foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies

47 (counterpoint in II [invertible used in variations] and III [crab minuet])
59 (brief uses of imitation in the openings of II and IIItr, and IV mm. 13ff.)
70 (counterpoint in opening of II [double], IV [triple] mm. 27ff., IIItr [melodic inversion] mm. 31ff., and briefly in I [canon] mm. 108ff.)
77 (imitation as developmental principal in I mm. 80ff. and II mm. 77ff.)
91 (echo effects/close imitation in I mm. 118-21, II opening, IIItr mm. 59ff, and IV Th II mm. 41ff.)
99 (close imitation in II mm. 16ff., imitation in III mm. 32ff., fugato in IV mm. 145ff.)

String Quartets

20/2 (triple counterpoint in I and IV)\(^{59}\)

33/1 (imitation in I opening and esp. development, II mm. 12ff. and 36ff., and IV development)
42 (voice exchange in I mm. 1-2, II m. 1, and IV mm. 76-81)
50/4 (fugato and close imitation in I, imitation in IIItr, and fugue in IV)
55/2 (invertible counterpoint in III and IV mm. 55ff. and quasi-fugal texture in II mm. 98ff.)
55/3 (inversion in I mm. 76ff., II mm. 5-6, and IV mm. 41ff.; fugato in II mm. 49ff. and imitation in IV mm. 41ff.)
64/4 (echo effects in I mm. 10ff., II mm. 8ff., and IV mm. 5 and 165ff.)
71/2 (inversion in I mm. 21ff., opening of III and mm. 29ff., and IV mm. 8ff. and imitation in I mm. 5ff., III mm. 11ff., and IV mm. 13ff.)
71/3 (imitation in I mm. 44ff., II mm. 81ff., and IV mm. 125ff.)
74/1 (imitation in I mm. 19ff., II mm. 133ff., III mm. 19ff., and IV mm. 50ff.)
74/3 (imitative themes in I mm. 11, IIItr, and IV mm. 28ff.)
76/6 (fugato in I mm. 145ff., II mm. 64ff., and III mm. 60ff.)
Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 37 (echo effects in I mm. 19ff., II mm. 2ff., and III mm. 8ff. and esp. 87ff.)

Mozart
Symphony 39 (imitation/echo effects in I mm. 26ff., II mm. 9ff. and 53ff., IIItr mm. 47ff., and IV mm. 54ff.)
Clarinet Concerto K. 622 (imitation in I and III)  
Piano Concerto K. 459 (imitation in I mm. 106ff., II mm. 44ff. and 103ff., and fugato in III mm. 33ff.)
String Quartets
   K. 421/417b (imitation in I mm. 19ff. and 54ff., II mm. 5ff., III mm. 1ff. and IV mm. 118ff.)
   K. 464 (see discussion in chapter 3)
String Quintets
   K. 593 (imitation in I [imitation] mm. 43ff., canon in III mm. 23ff., and fugato in IV mm. 55ff.)
   K. 614 (imitation in I mm. 19ff. and III mm. 16ff., inversion in II mm. 53ff. and III mm. 16ff., and fugato in IV mm. 111ff.)
Piano Sonata K. 533 (canon in I mm. 27ff. and 66ff., inversion in II mm. 47ff., and fugato in III mm. 153ff.)
Piano Trio K. 496 (imitation in I mm. 85ff., II mm. 13ff. and 97ff., and III Var. 1 mm. 4ff.)
Clarinet Trio K. 498 (imitation in I mm. 118ff., II mm. 13ff. and 77ff., and III mm. 36ff.)

Works in which a solo texture fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
   61 (solo vln. in opening of I, occasionally in II, and IV mm. 64ff.)
   95 (prominent cello solos in II mm. 11ff. and IIItr)

96 (prominent ob. solos before section breaks in I m. 17 and II m. 82, and an extended solo in IIItr)

String Quartets

9/1 (short solo violin passages in I m. 19, IItr mm. 35-6, III mm. 8-9, and opening of IV)
9/5 (solo violin in I var. 1 and 3, III mm. 25ff., and IV mm. 24ff. and 42ff.)
55/1 (vln. solos in I mm. 34ff., II mm. 28ff., IIItr mm. 44ff. and IV mm. 1ff.)
64/5 (vln. solos in I mm. 8ff., II mm. 62ff., and IV mm. 1ff.)

Piano Trio Hob. XV: 27 (solo pno. opens II and III)

Mozart

Piano Concerto K. 482 (solo woodwinds in all mvts.)

String Quintet K. 515 (vln. solos directly precede new or returning themes in I mm. 82ff., III mm. 60ff., and IV mm. 36ff. and 97ff.)

Piano Sonata K. 280/189e (solo-voice development openings in I m. 57, II m. 25, and III m. 78)

Piano Trio K. 542 (opening piano solo in all mvts.)

**Works in which unison textures foster a sense of cyclic integration:**

Haydn

Symphonies

- 44 (openings of I, II, and IV, and III esp. mm. 32ff.)
- 66 (transition sections in I mm. 16ff., II mm. 10ff., and III mm. 12ff.)
- 91 (lengthy segments in I mm. 159-67 and IV mm. 74-8)
- 97 (in conjunction with loud dynamics in I mm. 17ff., III mm. 23ff., IV mm. 4ff.)

String Quartets

- 20/2 (opening of II, III mm. 18-20 and 64-76, and IV mm. 156-61)
- 55/3 (openings of I and IV)
- 64/5 (loud and tutti in I mm. 96ff., III mm. 6ff., and IV mm. 103ff.)
- 71/3 (in I mm. 6ff. and IV mm. 16ff.)
- 74/1 (passages near ends of I mm. 149ff., II mm. 168ff., and IV mm. 270ff.)

Mozart

Symphony 35 (unison themes in openings of I and IV)

**Works in which a the use of a specific instrument or group of instruments fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

Haydn

Symphonies

- 48 (prominent hrm./tpt. themes in openings of I and III, and II mm. 8ff.)
- 51 (prominent hrms. in I mm. 10-11 and the openings of II and IIItr2)

---

58 (unusual strings-only texture in opening of I, the entirety of II, the entirety of IIItr, and IV mm. 37ff.)
62 (fl. parallels vln. melody in I mm. 8ff., II mm. 13ff., III mm. 1ff., and IV mm. 7ff.)
82 (prominent bsn. in all mvts.)
84 (prominent featuring of woodwinds at movement’s end in I mm. 237ff., and II mm. 65ff.)
85 (prominent woodwind solos/doublings of vln. in I [ob.] mm. 238ff., II [fl.] mm. 22ff. and 73ff., IIItr [bsn.] mm. 38ff., and IV [bsn.] mm. 1ff. and [ob.] mm. 62ff.)
102 (fl. added to themes upon repetition in I mm. 30ff. and 288ff., II mm. 6ff., IV mm. 28ff.)
103 (prominent timp. rolls in I m. 1, II mm. 187-92, and IV mm. 99-107)
Cello Concerto No. 1 (treatment of solo cello; see discussion above)
Trumpet Concerto (fl. as echo of trumpet in I m. 4, II mm. 30ff., and III mm. 68ff. and esp. 127ff.)

String Quartets

9/4 (virtuosic vln. displays in I mm. 19ff., IItr, III mm. 11ff., and IV mm. 21ff.)
50/5 (virtuosic vln. displays in I mm. 40ff., II throughout, III melodic role throughout, IV melodic role throughout and solo displays at mm. 56ff. and 74ff.)
54/3 (two instruments share opening melodies of I, II, and III without additional accompaniment)
Piano Sonata XVI: 34 (simple, highly repetitive left hand parts throughout all mvts.)

Mozart

Symphony 31 (full texture alternates with vln. only texture in openings of I and III) 63
Piano Concertos

K. 453 (melodic bsn. in I mm. 31ff., II mm. 9ff., and III mm. 68ff.)
K. 503 (wind band textures in I mm. 195ff., II mm. 17ff., and III mm. 129ff.)
Double Pno. Concerto K. 365/316a (prominent use of ob. in I mm. 34ff., opening of II, and III mm. 59ff. and 349ff.)

Works in which register or tessitura foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn

62 Note how Haydn plays with the flute texture as well. In the first movement at m. 184 Haydn gives the flute the solo opening theme, creating a false recapitulation.

63 Mozart specifically notes the inclusion of this textual contrast in the two movements in a letter to his father on July 3, 1778: “The Andante also found favor, but particularly the last Allegro, because, having observed that all last as well as first Allegros begin here with all the instruments playing together and generally unisono, I began mine with two violins only, piano for the first eight bars – followed instantly by a forte; the audience, as I expected, said ‘hush’ at the soft beginning, and when they heard the forte, began at once to clap their hands.” “Das Andante gefiel auch, besonders aber das letzte Allegro – weil ich hörte daß hier alle letzte Allegro wie die Ersten mit allen instrumenten zugleich und meistens unisono anfangen, so fieng ich mit die 2 violin allein piano nur 8 tact an – darauf kamm gleich ein forte – mit hin machten die zuhörer, wie ichs erwartete beym Piano dann kam gleich das forte – sie das forte hören, und die hände zu klatschen war eins.”
String Quartets
   17/4 (high opening tessituras expand downward in opening phrases of I, II, and IV)
   64/2 (vln. in extremely high register in I mm. 38ff. and 106ff., IIItr, and IV mm. 40ff. and 198)

Mozart
Clarinet Concerto K. 622 (juxtaposition of extremely high and low clarinet registers in I mm.
90ff., II mm. 41ff., and III mm. 61ff.)
String Quartet K. 575 (featuring of cello in high register; see discussion above)
Clarinet Quintet K. 581 (similar to K. 622 in I mm. 7ff. and 99ff., II mm. 16ff., III trio 2 mm.
8ff. and 44ff., and IV variation 1)

**Works in which an alternation or juxtaposition of two or more distinct textures fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

Haydn
Symphonies
   53 (tutti vs. string textures in openings of I, III, and IV version “A”)
Cello Concerto No. 2 (strings-only opening followed by *tutti*)
String Quartet 50/4 (minor sections get sparse texture, major sections get full texture)

Mozart
Symphonies
   33 (loud, *tutti*, opening chords contrast with quiet string textured continuations in I and IV and II to a certain extent)
   41 (*tutti* texture alternates with strings-only in openings of each mvt.)
Piano Concerto K. 467 (wind and string textures alternate in openings of I, II mm. 22ff., and III mm. 9ff.)
Piano Quartet K. 493 (juxtaposition of pno. and string textures in I mm. 6ff. and openings of II and III)

**Works in which scoring in parallel thirds fosters a sense of cyclic integration:**

Haydn
String Quartets
   20/1 (see discussion above)
   71/1 (viols in odd parallel thirds in I mm. 5-6 and IV mm. 20ff.)
Piano Sonata Hob. XVI: 49 (parallel thirds in left hand accompaniment in opening of I, II mm. 21ff., and III mm. 12ff., theme presented in parallel thirds at opening of development in I mm. 64ff. and III mm. ff. 24ff.)

Mozart
Piano Sonata K. 283/189h (prominent sus. chains in I mm. 45ff. and III mm. 18ff.)

---

64 Sisman, *Jupiter*, 37.
Works in which two voices predominate to foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  46 (two-voice texture in all mvts., and contrast of unison and polyphonic textures in all)\(^65\)
  55 (two-voice texture using two unison vlns. and unison cello and vla. in openings of I, II, IIItr, and IV)

Mozart
String Quartet K. 590 (melodic lines distributed to two voices in I [vln. mm. 4ff. and cello mm. 16ff.], II [cello mm. 16ff. and vln. mm. 23ff.], III [vln. 1 mm. 1ff. and vln. 2/vla. mm. 14ff.], and IV [vln. m. 1ff. and vla. mm. 8ff.])

Works in which some other distinctive texture fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  26 (setting of chant melodies in ob. and second vlns. with a obbligato line in the first vlns. in I and II)
  57 (sparse openings in I, II, and IV)
  67 (string timbres; see discussion above)
  93 (loud, tutti, chords as described in discussion above under “Thematic Resemblance”)
  100 (various unique textures; see discussion above)

String Quartets
  17/6 (hocket-like sighs of I m. 143 return at IV mm. 147-end)
  54/1 (homophonic and strictly metric openings to all mvts.)
  74/1 (themes presented in inner voices with obbligato line above in I mm. 119ff., II mm. 94ff., III mm. 49ff., and IV mm. 50ff.)
  76/6 (hocket-like textures in I mm. 37ff., III mm. 10ff. and 30ff., and opening of IV)

Piano Sonata Hob. XVI 50 (prominent rolled chords in openings of I and II and III mm. 75ff.)\(^66\)

Mozart
Symphony 41 (added obbligato lines; see discussion above)
String Quartets
  K. 428/421b (in- and out-of-sync textures; see discussion above)
  K. 575 (melodic lines distributed among all four voices in openings of I and IV and II mm. 19ff.)


\(^{66}\) Perhaps Haydn’s use of rolled chords in this sonata is related to place of composition and intended instrument. This sonata was written in London for English pianofortes, a louder, less crisp instrument than its continental counterpart. Rolled chords in general appear with greater frequency in Haydn’s late piano sonatas written in England than his earlier Continental works.
Piano Sonata K. 330/300h (prominent Alberti bass/repetitive bass lines in openings of I and III as well as III mm. 21ff.)

Works in which contrasting dynamics foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
- 44 (I, II, III, and to a limited extent in IV)
- 53 (opening phrases of I, both the minuet and trio of III, and both versions “A” and “B” of IV)
- 56 (openings of each movement)
- 57 (openings of I and IV)
- 64 (openings of I, II, and IV)
- 78 (openings of I, II, and IV)
- 82 (contrasting similar to K. 464 in openings of I, II, and III)

Cello Concerto No. 2 (quiet openings followed shortly after with tutti, f section in all mvts.)

Mozart
Symphonies
- 31 (openings of all movements)
- 36 (openings of I, II, and IV)
- 41 (related to contrasting textures; see discussion above)

String Quartet K. 464 (see discussion in chapter 3)

Piano Sonatas
- K. 280/189e (openings of all mvts.)
- K. 282/189g (openings of all mvts.)
- K. 284/205b (openings of all mvts.)

Works in which some other facet of dynamics fosters a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
- 42 (fading away to pp mid-movement in I mm. 137ff., II mm. 45ff., and IV mm. 86ff.)
- 57 (quiet openings in I, II, and IV)
- 79 (quiet openings and ff endings in I, II, and IV; III is the reverse, with implied f opening and pp ending)

Mozart
String Quintet K. 593 (quiet openings and generally quiet throughout all mvts.)

---

67 The dynamic connections in these works closely resemble the dynamics in K. 464 as discussed in chapter 3.

68 Contrasting dynamics do not appear in the alternate second movement.
Works in which a sustained melodic or accompanimental pitch foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  44 (horn in I, II and IV)
  54 (upper voice during themes of I m. 1, the presto, and the openings of II and IV)
  65 (melodic in I mm. 3-4, II mm. 8ff., IIItr. opening, IV opening horns)
  82 (horns in I mm. 8ff, and IIItr mm. 47ff. and 62ff., and in cello in the opening of
  IV; see discussion above under “Rhetoric”)

String Quartets
  54/2 (sustained accompanimental voices in openings of I and II, and IIItr mm. 50ff.)
  55/3 (sustained accompaniments in vlns. I mm. 45ff. and IV mm. 17ff. and 30ff.)
  76/4 (sustained accompaniments in openings of I and IIItr)

Works in which pedal tones or pedal tone-like gestures foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  48 (openings of I [vln. II], II [cello], IV vln. I and cello alternate])
  49 (pedals in openings of I, IIItr, and IV)
  81 (extended pedal tones in openings of I and IIItr, prominent pedals in IV mm. 12ff.)
  93 (see discussion above under “Thematic Resemblance”)

Trumpet Concerto (openings of all mvts.)

String Quartets
  9/6 (endings of I, III, and IV)
  17/5 (openings of I and IV)
  20/5 (F major sections in IItr, and III use pedals)
  50/2 (openings of I and II)
  54/3 (I mm. 8ff. and opening of IV)
  64/6 (openings of I and IV, II mm. 32ff., and III mm. 33ff.)
  74/1 (openings of I, III, and IIItr, II mm. 14ff. and 142ff., and IV mm. 43ff. and 75ff.)
  76/6 (I mm. 28ff., II mm. 106ff., opening of III and mm. 152ff., and IV mm. 132ff.
  and 160ff.)
  77/2 (opening of I and m. 37, opening of IItr, III mm. 121ff., and IV mm. 8ff.)

Piano Sonatas Hob. XVI
  40 (openings of both I and II)
  49 (openings of all mvts.)
  52 (openings of all mvts.)

Piano Trio Hob. XV: 30 (openings of I and III and II mm. 11ff.)

Mozart
Horn Concerto K. 495 (I mm. 17ff. and III mm. 60ff.)

Piano Concertos
  K. 451 (openings of I and II)
  K. 488 (openings of all mvts.)

String Quartet K. 499 (openings of I, II, and IV and III mm. 15ff.)
Works in which contrasting articulations foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  46 (contrasting staccato/legato in openings of I, II, and IV)
  98 (openings of I, II, and IV);
String Quartets
  64/1 (openings of I, III, and IV; see discussion above)
  76/4 (openings of I, III, and IV)
  77/1 (openings of II, III, and IV)

Mozart
String Quartet K. 464 (see discussion in chapter 3)

Works in which articulations in some other way foster a sense of cyclic integration:

Haydn
Symphonies
  80 (staccato accompaniments in openings of I, II, and III)
  84 (fz used in opening themes of II, IIItr., and IV)
CHAPTER 5
AN OVERVIEW OF CYCLIC INTEGRATION IN THE INSTRUMENTAL WORKS OF HAYDN AND MOZART

Haydn and Mozart used a wide variety of musical elements to foster a sense of cyclic integration in a large number of their compositions. When considered in totality, the specific connections listed throughout chapter 4 offer insights into trends in the output of these two composers. In fact, the genre and date of a given work seem to have played a significant role in the degree of cyclic integration included among its movements. What follows is a general summary of these trends based upon the research presented in chapter 4.

Degrees of Strength for Cyclic Integration in the Music of Haydn and Mozart

The arguments made in chapter 3 contend that cyclic integration of works and even of specific musical elements occur in a variety of strengths from conventional to very strong. Evaluating the strength of these connections and the overall landscape of cyclic integration in the music of Haydn and Mozart requires a work-by-work examination, which appears in the analyses and lists in chapter 4. Connections appear across the movements of these composers’ works on a regular basis, and these connections often foster a strong degree of cyclic integration.

Before making any generalizations on the strength of cyclic integration observed in the works analyzed, the strengths of the elements listed in chapter 4 must be evaluated in
more detail. Since moderate or weak elements of cyclic integration require a detailed analysis, these have been omitted from chapter 4. Instead, only those connections strong enough to convince without further analysis have been included. This means that the connections listed in chapter 4 are all in some sense “strong,” through each has its own relative degree of strength.

Haydn and Mozart achieved a strong sense of cyclic integration using a variety of elements in a continuum of strengths. They thus had many available options for creating a strongly integrated work. Mozart’s String Quartet in A major, K. 464, as shown in chapter 3, is a very strongly integrated work through the combination of a number of strong and moderately strong musical elements. The strength of cyclic integration in Haydn’s Symphony No. 49 in F minor (La passione) derives from a strongly apparent thematic resemblance as well as a number of other elements. Haydn’s Symphony No. 100 in G major (Military) includes only one element, a variety of contrasting textures, but is still strongly integrated because the textures are prominently placed and immediately apparent.

Because elements of cyclic integration appear along a continuum of strengths, even in gradations between strong and extremely strong, there is no simple way of boiling down cyclic integration into a strict mathematical equation. That is, it would be misleading to say that a work with only one listing in chapter 4 is necessarily more strongly integrated than a work with two or three. A work could be strongly integrated through a single element, as is the case in Haydn’s Symphony No. 26 in D minor (Lamentatione), for example. This work appears only once in the lists, but its single entry is for an element so strong that it alone fosters a strong degree of cyclic integration among the work’s movements. By contrast,
Symphonies Nos. 76 in E flat or 98 in B flat, both of which have two listings, seem much less strongly integrated.

Despite the difficulties, the number of listings in chapter 4 can serve as an indicator of relative strength if the continuum of strengths is kept in mind. A number of works stand out as strongly integrated through the presence of a single “extremely strong” element.\(^1\) An extremely strong element is an element in which the connection across movements is immediately apparent. After taking these extremely strong elements into account, the remaining entries in chapter 4 all have an approximately equal degree of strength classifiable as generically “strong.” For the purposes of a general evaluation, works with more of these strong connections are more strongly cyclically integrated than the works with fewer connections. All that remains is to determine how many of these connections it takes to foster a strong sense of cyclic integration.

My discussion below relies upon the presumption that the combination of three or more strong elements (as listed in chapter 4), or the inclusion of one extremely strong element, creates a strong sense of cyclic integration. Works with two elements in chapter 4 thus have a moderate sense of cyclic integration, while works with only one element fall into the category of weakly integrated. Works with no listings in chapter 4 are conventionally integrated.

Using this standard, the number of works by Haydn and Mozart with a strong degree of cyclic integration stands somewhere around one in four (25%) of those works examined. A slightly smaller number of the works examined, about one in five (20%), have no connections beyond the conventional. This means that over half (55%) of their combined

\(^1\) These works have been marked with an asterisk (*) in appendix 1.
output examined falls somewhere in between these two extremes, as either weakly integrated through the appearance of one strong element across movements, or moderately integrated by two strong elements. The tables in appendix 2 provide a complete breakdown of the lists in chapter 4. As they show, the cyclic integration of Haydn and Mozart’s instrumental works do in fact appear in a wide variety of strengths. If selected at random, the “typical” composition by either of these two composers will most likely have a moderate sense of cyclic integration.

The fact that a significant portion of the works examined are either weakly or moderately integrated indicates that Haydn and Mozart showed a consistent concern with integrating their works in at least a minimal way beyond the conventional. The significance of this is clear: cyclic integration was not an occasional or passing interest for these composers, or some unconventional approach to composition reserved for “quirky” works, but was part of their “normal” approach to writing multi-movement works.

**Works Including an Extremely Strong Element of Cyclic Integration**

Haydn and Mozart fostered a strong sense of cyclic integration in a significant number of works by incorporating one extremely strong musical element in multiple movements. These works might be thought of as those works with the most immediately apparent connections across their movements. About a dozen of the works studied include this type of integration. The exact instances and thresholds for determining what kind of element is strong enough to warrant inclusion on the list is somewhat subjective, but there is nevertheless a solid nucleus of works by Haydn and Mozart that have an undeniable sense of cyclic integration created
through the use of a single musical element.\footnote{Haydn’s Symphonies No. 26 and 67, for example, are clearly integrated through their respective single elements, but the problems of subjectivity on this list arise with borderline works, such as Symphonies No. 83 (included even though it’s element is not as immediately apparent as some of the others on the list) or 45 (not included despite its immediately apparent but inconspicuously placed D major interludes).} The works that reasonably fall into this
category, along with their respective integrating element are given in table 5.1.

Table 5.1: Works by Haydn and Mozart whose strong sense of cyclic integration includes an extremely strong element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haydn</th>
<th>Element Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 26</td>
<td>Use of chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 46</td>
<td>Thematic recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 49</td>
<td>Thematic resemblance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 67</td>
<td>String timbres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 70</td>
<td>Invertible counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 83</td>
<td>Mocking rhetorical gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 100</td>
<td>Texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 104</td>
<td>Thematic resemblance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. 33/2</td>
<td>Closing with opening gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. 33/3</td>
<td>Movement openings (including “bird” gestures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Element Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 36, K. 425</td>
<td>Plagal gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 41, K. 551</td>
<td>Opening contrasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. K. 575</td>
<td>Treatment of cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qnt. K. 614</td>
<td>Thematic resemblance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Sonata K. 545</td>
<td>Movement openings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these works has one immediately apparent element shared between at least two movements. The cyclic element used in each work is too strong to be reasonably denied, even in cases where only two movements share the given element. For example, only two movements of Haydn’s String Quartet in E flat Op. 33/2 (The Joke) close with their opening gesture, but Haydn calls so much attention to the gestures in both movements that one cannot help but notice the connection. Perhaps some of these works’ elements are stronger than the elements of the others on the table, but at such a high degree of strength there is little point in distinguishing these degrees unless one wishes to compare specific works to one another.
Two factors make the musical elements listed in table 5.1 extremely strong: the distinctiveness of the gesture and the readily apparent manner in which the composer sets it. Haydn’s use of chant melodies in Symphony No. 26 is unique in his symphonic output, for instance. However, part of the underlying strength of this work’s sense of cyclic integration lays in the way in which Haydn sets the melodies using a distinct texture (melody in the first oboe and second violin with the first violin playing an obbligato line). By setting the chant themes in this texture he makes the connection obvious to his audience. The movements of Mozart’s Symphony No. 36 in C major, K. 425 (Linz) similarly use plagal gestures to an extent not found in any other work by either composer. Mozart makes the connection of plagal gestures across the movements manifest by emphasizing the plagal motion very near the openings of each movement.

On first glance one might expect that Haydn included extremely strong elements of cyclic integration in his works more often than Mozart. Haydn’s use of musical “gimmicks” is well known, and some of the cases listed in table 5.1 might be labeled as gimmicks of a sort. Haydn does in fact have more works listed on table 5.1 than Mozart, but this is slightly deceiving, since as a percentage of output, the frequency with which the two use this type of element is approximately equal. More than twice as many works by Haydn than by Mozart were examined in this dissertation.

Despite an approximate equality in their frequency of including an extremely strong element of cyclic integration, Haydn and Mozart approached this type of element in very different ways. Haydn often resorts to a gimmick of sorts to make the connection apparent. The clearest examples Haydn’s gimmicks fostering a sense of cyclic integration are Op. 33/2 and Symphony No. 67 in F major. In Op. 33/2 the outer movements close using their
respective opening gestures, but Haydn calls attention to his practice by exaggerating this idea at the end of the finale. The same is true of cyclic integration in Symphony No. 67, which relies on the use of very uncharacteristic string timbres. Mozart, on the other hand, typically worked to connect his movements using musical means that remained squarely within the bounds of Classical-era musical style and convention. That is, Mozart does not use string timbres, chant melodies, or false endings like Haydn, nor does he break from formal expectations or interrupt the progress of the music to call attention to his gestures. The movement openings of his Piano Sonata in C major, K. 545, for example, are essentially identical, but the melodic and harmonic similarities all fall squarely within the conventions of the era. In essence, Haydn went to much greater lengths to make his gimmicks apparent than Mozart, who was more content to create seamless connections that might pass unnoticed.

The use of an extremely strong element by Haydn and Mozart set a precedent for Beethoven’s practice, but their practice typically differs from Beethoven’s in degree of pervasiveness. Most of the works in table 5.1 have their element present in only two movements. In contrast, Beethoven’s strongest connections generally appear in three or more movements and often appear pervasively in each of the included movements. Beethoven applies the thematic resemblance in the Fifth Symphony pervasively in at least three of the movements, for example. This means that Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven sometimes approached cyclic integration with the same fundamental mindset through the use of a single, strongly evident musical element, but that they each had differing notions of how many movements should incorporate the element, how much they should call attention to the element, and how pervasively the element should appear within each movement.
Works Including Multiple Strong Cyclic Elements

The use of multiple elements of cyclic integration can also create a strong sense of cyclic integration, as shown in the analysis of K. 464 in chapter 3. In these works Haydn and Mozart usually combine multiple musical elements of varying degrees of strength to foster a sense of cyclic integration. In the same way, this incorporation of multiple elements frequently complements an extremely strong element as well. Each instance of a strongly integrated work thus includes the same basic approach: a number of connections within a continuum. The differences arise in the degree of strength for each individual element.

As noted earlier, determining which works have “enough” connections to qualify as strongly integrated is not without its difficulties. I have therefore taken what I feel to be a conservative approach to compiling table 5.2, under the presumption that it is better to err on the side of caution. Each of these works has at least three distinct cyclic elements, and each of these elements is independently strong. The presence of three strong musical elements means that the works listed here reasonably deserve the label of “strongly” integrated.

Table 5.2: Works in which many strong elements foster a sense of cyclic integration\(^3\) (cont’d on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haydn</th>
<th>Listings in Chapter 4</th>
<th>Haydn</th>
<th>Listings in Chapter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 42</td>
<td>Form, harmony, dynamics</td>
<td>St. Qt. 20/2</td>
<td>Run-on, texture (2 separate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 44</td>
<td>Beg/end, dynamics, texture, pedals</td>
<td>St. Qt. 33/1</td>
<td>Form, anacrusis, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 45</td>
<td>Run-on, theme, form(^4)</td>
<td>St. Qt. 33/2</td>
<td>Beg/end, harmony, anacrusis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 46</td>
<td>Theme, rhetoric, rests, texture, articulation</td>
<td>St. Qt. 50/2</td>
<td>Interval, rests, pedals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) Note that in some cases the listed elements overlap, though I have taken this into account by listing only those works with a minimum of three non-overlapping elements.

\(^4\) These are only the elements listed in chapter 4. For a complete analysis of this work and its cyclic integration see James Webster, *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
| Sym. 48 | Harmony, texture, pedals | St. Qt. 50/3 | Harmony, theme, anacrusis |
| Sym. 53 | Form, anacrusis, dynamics, texture | St. Qt. 50/4 | Mode, texture (2 separate) |
| Sym. 61 | Flourish, rests, texture | St. Qt. 54/1 | Rhythm, rhetoric, texture |
| Sym. 65 | Rhythm, rests, pedals | St. Qt. 54/2 | Form, mode, rests, texture |
| Sym. 70 | Mode, rests, texture | St. Qt. 54/3 | Mode, texture, pedals |
| Sym. 82 | Key, dynamics, texture, rhetoric | St. Qt. 55/3 | Interval, texture (2 separate), pedals |
| Sym. 84 | Key, texture, articulation | St. Qt. 64/5 | Mode, meter, texture (2 separate) |
| Sym. 85 | Form, rhythm, texture | St. Qt. 64/6 | Key, rhetoric, pedals |
| Sym. 86 | Key, rhythm, rests | St. Qt. 71/3 | Meter, rests, texture |
| Sym. 95 | Beg/end, mode, texture | St. Qt. 74/1 | Key, meter, texture (3 separate), pedals |
| Sym. 96 | Key, rhetoric, texture | St. Qt. 74/3 | Harmony, key, mode, texture (2 separate) |
| Sym. 97 | Beg/end, meter, rhetoric, texture | St. Qt. 76/2 | Mode, interval, rhetoric |
| Sym. 101 | Formal, mode, rhythm | St. Qt. 76/4 | Beg/end, harmony, interval, meter/rhetoric, texture, articulation |
| Sym. 103 | Harmony, theme, rhetoric, texture | St. Qt. 76/6 | Texture (2 separate), pedals |
| Cello Concerto No. 2 | Theme, dynamics, texture | St. Qt. 77/2 | Beg/end, key, rests, pedals |
| Pno. Sonata Hob. XVI: 34 | Run-on, mode, texture | | |
| Pno. Sonata Hob. XVI: 37 | Run-on, mode, texture | | |

### Mozart Listings in Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Listings in Chapter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 29</td>
<td>Form, theme, interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 31</td>
<td>Mode, texture, dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 36</td>
<td>Harmony, key, mode, dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sym. 41</td>
<td>Form, mode, texture [2], dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Concerto K. 467</td>
<td>Key, theme, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. K. 464</td>
<td>Theme, rest, dynamics, texture, articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. K. 575</td>
<td>Theme, texture (2 separate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. K. 590</td>
<td>Beg/end, mode, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Qt. K. 593</td>
<td>Beg/end, key, dynamics, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Sonata K. 280/189e</td>
<td>Form, dynamics, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Sonata K. 330/300h</td>
<td>Theme/rhythm, meter, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Sonata K. 533</td>
<td>Beg/end, harmony, texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pno. Trio K. 496</td>
<td>Key, theme, texture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of these works’ degree of cyclic integration falls in a slightly different place along a continuum within the category of “strongly” integrated, and each of these works is integrated in a different way from the others. K. 464 stands out among the works by Mozart because it incorporates five different elements in multiple movements. The same holds true of Haydn’s String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 76/4 (Sunrise), in which Haydn includes six different elements in multiple movements. Even those works with three elements are strongly integrated, though perhaps to a slightly lesser extent than Op. 76/4 or K. 464.

Some of the works listed in table 5.2 also appear in table 5.1 because they include both a single extremely strong element and multiple supporting elements (e.g. Haydn’s Symphony No. 49). This overlap is slightly misleading, as every strongly integrated work includes many elements of cyclic integration. In the case of Symphony No. 49 and the other works listed in table 5.1, there is simply one extremely strong element present that is “enough” to foster a strong sense of cyclic integration without the need to refer to other elements. With both a number of strong elements and an extremely strong element, the works appearing on both tables 5.1 and 5.2 fall at the strongest side of the continuum of strengths possible for a work. A good parallel example in this regard is Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, which includes a strong thematic resemblance, thematic recall, and a number of other less evident connections. Either the resemblance or the recall would have been enough to foster a strong sense of cyclic integration in that work, but the inclusion of so many strong elements gives this work an even stronger degree of integration.

As is apparent in table 5.2, Haydn included multiple cooperating strong elements in his works more frequently both in terms of sheer number of works, and of works as a percentage of those analyzed. This indicates a general difference in frequency between
Haydn and Mozart’s approaches to cyclic integration. While slightly less than one in three of Haydn’s works have a strong degree of cyclic integration, only one in five works by Mozart fall into this same category. Simply put, a greater percentage of Haydn’s works than Mozart’s, as analyzed for this study, are strongly integrated. However, it is less than a 10% difference, and so the gap is not as substantial as it might seem.  

**Genre as Influence in Degree of Cyclic Integration**

Genre played a significant role in the degree of cyclic integration given to a work by Haydn and Mozart. The symphonies and string quartets/quintets are those genres that most frequently include a strong degree of integration across movements. The piano trios/quartets and concertos, in contrast, include fewer instances of elements connecting movements. Finally, the Mozart piano sonatas are typically strongly integrated about as often as his symphonies and string quartets, but the Haydn piano sonatas are strongly integrated with much less frequency.

A disparity in genres skews the overall percentage of works with a strong sense of cyclic integration in favor of Haydn over Mozart. Many of Haydn’s works listed in tables 5.1 and 5.2 are symphonies, a genre that makes up a larger percentage of Haydn’s output over the period analyzed than it does for Mozart. Haydn wrote sixty symphonies during the period under examination, or 38% of the total number of his works examined. In contrast, Mozart wrote only fourteen symphonies over the same span, 18% of his output examined. Thus, if a strong degree of cyclic integration is more likely in a symphony than other genres (which the

---

5 See table 6.1 in appendix 2 for a complete comparison.

6 A statistical breakdown of elements by genre appears in appendix 2.
statistical tables in appendix 2 indicate), Haydn would (and does) show a distinct numerical advantage over Mozart as far as overall number of strongly integrated compositions.

However, even in those genres with a more equal ratio of works as a percentage of output, Mozart’s still exhibits a smaller percentage of works using multiple elements to foster a strong degree of cyclic integration. The string quartets and quintets, for example, show Haydn (33% of output examined) and Mozart (21% of output examined) on a slightly more equal footing: 35% of Haydn’s string quartets are strongly integrated compared with 31% of Mozart’s.

To generalize, Haydn included a strong sense of cyclic integration in his works more frequently than Mozart did, but this greater frequency is likely due to the fact that Haydn wrote more symphonies than Mozart, and not to a difference of interest in connecting movements. The “typical” work by Haydn is more likely to be strongly integrated than the “typical” Mozart composition, but overall their approaches have more similarities than differences.

It might be tempting to relate the disparity of degree among the genres to the varying statures of each genre. The marketability and prestige of the string quartet as a genre, for example, increased considerably over the span of time examined.\footnote{For more on the increasing prestige of the string quartet at this time see W. Dean Sutcliffe, “Haydn, Mozart, and Their Contemporaries,” in \textit{The Cambridge Companion to the String Quartet}, ed. Robin Stowell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), esp. 206.} It may not be a coincidence that Haydn’s pre-Op. 33 quartets are on the whole more weakly integrated than his post-Op. 33 quartets. However, arguing that the cyclic integration of works in more “weighty” genres were given special treatment implicitly argues that cyclic integration was a means of giving a work greater aesthetic value. As shown in chapter 2, there is no basis for
assessing the aesthetic importance of cyclic integration in the music of this era. There is no primary source material that would suggest that a work with a strong sense of cyclic integration was thought of as more artful, well crafted or generically “better” than a work with no sense of cyclic integration beyond the conventional. Haydn and Mozart simply may have had differing notions of where the use of cyclic integration in this manner was appropriate. To say that Haydn and Mozart saw the symphony and string quartet as more appropriate venues for cyclic integration than concertos, piano sonatas, and piano trios reflects the analyses and survey of their practice as given in chapter 4, but also overlooks other potentially influential factors.

It seems more likely that the requirements and compositional options available in certain genres was the deciding factor in which genres have more strongly integrated works. For example, the symphony offered these composers an opportunity to use texture as an element of cyclic integration more frequently than other genres. In the same way string quartets often presented these composers with the possibility of including contrapuntal devices. Concertos, on the other hand, required the featuring of a soloist practically throughout, limiting the possible use of texture as an element. Similarly, piano sonatas offered very few opportunities for odd or unique textures, as the works are for a single instrument. In the same way, the texture of the piano trio at this time, which was typically that of an accompanied piano sonata, offered little opportunity for the inclusion of independent cello or violin lines.

Another factor in degree of cyclic integration may be the role of the intended audience. Haydn once noted that he was forced to be “original” at Eszterháza because of his
isolation from other composers. Certainly his symphonies and string quartets include a wide variety of original and unconventional musical ideas. In fact these frequently foster a sense of cyclic integration through the inclusion of an extremely strong element in the guise of a gimmick. Since these elements stand out from other more conventional elements, they more readily foster a sense of cyclic integration, hence a preponderance of symphonies and string quartets with a strong sense of cyclic integration. Mozart ostensibly wrote his Op. 10 “Haydn” String Quartets for a very specific and knowledgeable audience, namely Haydn himself. Perhaps cyclic integration offered a means of demonstrating one’s compositional prowess in comparison to the work of others. The same could be said of Mozart’s “Prussian” String Quartets, where the cello features were a musical result of extra-musical concerns.

One final trend observed in the works examined is the potential significance of key and mode on a work’s sense of cyclic integration. Haydn’s strongly integrated works include works in a wide range of keys and seem evenly distributed between the major and minor modes. The works by Mozart listed above are in fewer different keys and are exclusively written in the major mode. The possibility exists that Mozart thought of minor-mode works as inherently more integrated and thus did not see the need for including as many cyclic elements there as in his major-mode compositions. However, of the 76 works by Mozart examined only nine were in minor. Therefore a small sampling of works is an equally plausible explanation for the lack of strongly integrated minor-mode works.

---


9 These are Sym. 40, K. 466, K. 491, K. 421/417b, K. 406/516b, K. 516, K. 478, K. 310/300d, and K. 457.
Chronology and Cyclic Integration

Chronology also plays a role in the use of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s instrumental works. In examining the dates of composition for those works listed in tables 5.1 and 5.2, certain trends become apparent. There seemingly are periods of time when more works include a strong sense of cyclic integration, and periods of time where fewer works incorporate a strong sense of integration. As it happens, the early 1780s were a turning point for both of these composers, but in different ways for each.

On the whole, Mozart’s practice increasingly included a strong sense of cyclic integration over time. Works with a strong sense of cyclic integration by this composer appeared beginning in 1774. Prior to 1783, he wrote strongly integrated works at a pace of one every other year. From 1783 onward, the pace increases to more than one per year on average.\footnote{These works with their date of composition are as follows: Sym. 29 (1774), K. 280/189e (1775), Sym. 31 (1778), K. 330/300h (1781-83), Sym. 36 (1783), K. 464 and K. 467 (1785), K. 496 (1786), Sym. 41, K. 533, and K. 545 (1788), K. 575 (1789), K. 593 (1790), and K. 614 (1791). Dates are taken from: Stanley Sadie, *The New Grove Mozart* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1980).} Biographically speaking, his increasing pace roughly coincided with his move to Vienna in 1781 and persisted to the end of his life in 1791. In addition, he wrote all of his works whose integration incorporates an extremely strong element from 1783-1791, with three of the five works appearing in 1788 and 1789.\footnote{These are Sym. 41, K. 575, and K. 545. The other two works from table 5.1 are Sym. 36 (1783) and K. 614 (1791).} This means that the final four years of Mozart’s life were those in which he wrote the majority of his most strongly integrated works.
Haydn wrote compositions with a strong degree of cyclic integration throughout the period examined (c. 1768-1799). However, within this span of time there were both periods of intense interest and periods of comparatively little interest. His most intense phase of cyclic integration began around 1785 and lasted until 1797, roughly the span of time beginning with the “Paris” symphonies and ending with his final pair of string quartets, Op. 77. Twenty-seven of his forty-eight strongly integrated works appeared during these years. The years 1773-1777, by contrast included only two strongly integrated works. These years, of course, include some of Haydn’s busiest years for writing, editing, and producing opera, so he wrote comparatively fewer instrumental works in general. Whereas Mozart became increasingly interested with the use of an extremely strong element late in life, Haydn incorporated this type of element less and less frequently with the passage of time. Seven of the ten works by Haydn listed in table 5.2 appear in the period of 1768-1781, ending with the Op. 33 string quartets. The remaining three works span the ten years of 1785-1795.

To roughly generalize then, the early 1780s were a pivotal point for both Haydn and Mozart’s use of cyclic integration, but in different ways. Haydn replaced extremely strong

---

12 These works with their date of composition are as follows: Sym. 49 (1768), Sym. 48 (1769?), Sym. 65 (1769-72), Sym. 26 (1770), Sym. 42 (1771), Sym. 44, 45, and 46, and Op. 20/2 1772, Sym. 1779 (c. 1775/6), Sym. 61 (1776), Sym. 53 and 70 (1778/9), Pno. Sonata 37 (1780), Op. 33/1, 2, and 3 (1781), Cello Concerto No. 2 (1783), Pno. Sonata 34 (1784), Sym. 83 and 85 (1785), Sym. 82, 84, and 86 (1786), Op. 50/2, 3, and 4 (1787), Op. 54/1, 2, and 3, and Op. 55/3 (1788), Op. 65/5 and 6 (1790), Sym. 95 and 96 (1791), Sym. 97 (1792), Sym. 100 and 101, Op. 71/3, 74/1, and 74/3 (1793), Sym. 103 and 104 (1795), Op. 76/2, 4, and 6 (1797), and Op. 77/2 (1799). Dates are taken from: Jens Peter Larsen and Geog Feder, The New Grove Haydn (W. W. Norton, 1980).

13 Determining the exact span of time involved here is somewhat problematic, since a number of the symphonies written in the 1770s cannot be precisely dated.

14 These are Sym. 49 (1768), Sym. 26 (1770), Sym. 46 (1772), Sym. 67 and 70 (1779), and Op. 33/2 and 3 (1781).

15 These are Sym. 83 (1785), Sym. 100 (1793), and Sym. 104 (1795).
elements with a greater number of somewhat less immediately apparent elements of cyclic integration after Op. 33 in 1781. That is, after 1781 he used extremely strong elements only sparingly, but beginning in 1785 with the “Paris” symphonies used a much greater number of strong elements across movements. The early 1780s were also an important break for Mozart’s practice, as in 1783 he began to use extremely strong elements and also more frequently included a greater number of integrative elements.

Conclusions

For nearly two centuries, cyclic integration in the instrumental works of Haydn and Mozart has been viewed as a poor, inconsistently applied precursor to Beethoven’s paradigmatic practice. This study has argued first that Haydn and Mozart’s practice cannot be evaluated using the same approaches typically applied to the music of later eras and second that Haydn and Mozart did in fact connect the movements of their works on a regular basis, often to the extent of creating a work with a very strong sense of cyclic integration. Works with a strong degree of cyclic integration appear in about a quarter of the works examined, while the majority of their instrumental works have at least a weak sense of cyclic integration.

This reevaluation of Haydn and Mozart’s practice would not have been possible without a reexamination of the analytic premises used to evaluate cyclic integration. Having examined elements other than and in addition to thematic resemblances, a more complete picture of their practice has been offered. As argued in chapter 3 and shown in chapter 4, Haydn and Mozart used a variety of musical elements to connect the movements of their works. This includes connections of form, harmony, theme, rhythm, meter, phrase structure, rhetoric, and texture. All of these elements can appear at varying degrees of strength within a
continuum, and by the same token, any given work’s degree of cyclic integration can range from conventional to very strong.

The survey of 247 works given in chapter 4 and analyzed in chapter 5 offers a number of new insights into Haydn and Mozart’s compositional practice. These composers used a full range of possibilities for fostering a strong sense of cyclic integration. In addition, the cyclic integration of all of Haydn and Mozart’s works fall along a continuum with a broad range of strengths for both a work’s overall sense of cyclic integration and a given musical element’s degree of strength. Their approaches include the use of multiple elements as a type of matrix of elements to promote a strong sense of cyclic integration, as seen in K. 464 as examined in chapter 3, for example. In some cases, the use of a single extremely strong element is enough to foster a strong sense of cyclic integration, as seen, for instance, in Haydn’s Symphony No. 26. A number of works have both an extremely strong element and a host of other elements, as seen in Haydn’s Symphony No. 46.

Genre and chronology both played significant roles in determining the likelihood of that these composer would write a strongly integrated work. Haydn and Mozart’s approaches to cyclic integration varied by genre, with the symphony and string quartet as their most strongly integrated genres on average. In addition, Haydn and Mozart’s approaches to cyclic integration changed over time, with the early 1780s standing as a pivotal point for both. Before this date Haydn more often included an extremely strong element, while after this date he more typically included a number of strong elements across movements. Mozart’s most strongly integrated works, in contrast, typically appear after the early 1780s, including all of his works that include an extremely strong element of cyclic integration.
Nineteenth-century organicism has traditionally dictated the ways in which cyclic integration in this repertoire is examined, including a focus on thematic material and the view that connections must be strongly evident throughout each moment of a work. This approach is well suited to the music of later eras, but not to the music of Haydn and Mozart. This dissertation has operated under an alternative set of parameters for cyclic integration. The key facets of these parameters are the consideration of as many musical elements as possible, an openness to the possibility that some connections are neither strong nor weak but of varying strengths within a continuum from movement to movement, and the possibility that some works are neither strongly integrated nor conventionally integrated, but somewhere in between. The use of a broader set of parameters opens the door to a better understanding of cyclic integration in the Classical era, including the likelihood that their cyclic integration is more similar to Beethoven’s practice than it is different.
Appendix 1:

An Index of Works Listed in the Chapter 4 Section Summaries

This appendix is a cross listing of the elements of cyclic integration given in chapter 4 sorted by work. Works without any observed cyclic elements beyond the conventional appear as well. The following list is a key of elements for the appendix:

* - indicates a work that includes an extremely strong element (cross-listed in table 5.1)
a – anacrusis
at - articulation
d – dynamics
f – formal anomalies or formal strategies
fl – flourish figure
h – harmonic motion
i – interval
k – key area
m – mode or modal contrast
mt – meter or metric distortion
o/c – parallels between openings and/or closings
p – pedal tones
rd – rhetorical device
rhy – rhythmic idea
ro – run-on movements¹
s – rests or silence
t – texture
tr – thematic resemblance or thematic recall
[#] – the number of distinct instances of that particular element (one unless stated otherwise)

¹ According to lists in Webster (Farewell, 188, 192), but excluding works listed by Webster that have only a run-on connection within a single movement (e.g. between a slow introduction and sonata form exposition), and those works whose run-on connection is limited to a tempo change within a single movement (e.g. Op. 76/4/iv, those works with what Webster defines as “compound” movements).
Haydn
Symphonies
26 (tr, t)*
41
42 (f, h, d)
43 (h)
44 (o/c, d, t, p)
45 (ro, f, tr)
46 (tr, rd, s, t, at)*
47 (t)
48 (h, t, p)
49 (tr, p)*
50
51 (k, t)
52
53 (f, a, d, t)
54 (t)
55 (t)
56 (o/c, tr, d)
57 (d, t)
58 (tr, t)
59 (tr, t)
60
61 (fl, s, t)
62 (t)
63
64 (s, d)
65 (mt, s, p)
66 (t)
67 (t)*
68 (i)
69 (i)
70 (m, s, t)*
71
72
73
74
75
76 (tr, s)
77 (t)
78 (k, d)
79 (o/c, d)
80 (tr, at)
81 (p)
82 (k, d, t, rd)
83 (rd)*
84 (k, t, at)
85 (f, rhy, t)
86 (k, rhy, s)
87 (k, rhy)
88 (a)
89 (tr, rd)
90 (s)
91 (t [2])
92
93 (tr, t)
94
95 (o/c, m, t)
96 (k, s, t)
97 (o/c, mt, rd, t)
98 (k, at)
99 (t)
100 (k, t)*
101 (f, m, rhy)
102 (rd, tv)
103 (h, tr, rd, t)
104 (tr, i)*
Cello Concerto No.
1 (t)
2 (tr, d, t)
Trumpet Concerto (p)
Piano Concerto Hob. 3 (tr)
String Quartets
9/1 (t)
9/2
9/3
9/4 (t)
9/5 (a, t)
9/6 (p)
17/1 (h)
17/2 (o/c)
17/3 (o/c, tr)
17/4 (t)
17/5 (o/c, p)
17/6 (t)
20/1 (f, t)
20/2 (ro, t [2])
20/3
20/4 (h)
20/5 (p)
20/6 (mt)
33/1 (f, a, t)
33/2 (o/c, f, a)*
33/3 (h, rd)*
33/4 (rd)
33/5 (t)
33/6
42 (m, t)
50/1 (f, rd)
50/2 (i, s, p)
50/3 (h, tr, a)
50/4 (m, t [2])
50/5 (t)
50/6 (o/c)
54/1 (rhy, rd, t)
54/2 (f, m, s, t)
54/3 (m, t, p)
55/1 (t)
55/2 (t)
55/3 (i, t [2], p)
64/1 (at)
64/2 (tr, t)
64/3 (mt)
64/4 (o/c, t)
64/5 (m, mt, t [2])
64/6 (k, rd, p)
71/1 (i, t)
71/2 (rd, t)
71/3 (mt, s, t)
74/1 (k, mt, t [3], p)
74/2
74/3 (h, k, m, t)
76/1 (o/c, i)
76/2 (m, i, rd)
76/3
76/4 (o/c, h, i, mt, rd, t, at)
76/5
76/6 (t [2], p)
77/1 (m, at)
77/2 (o/c, k, t, s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haydn (cont’d)</th>
<th>Piano Trios Hob. XV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonatas Hob. XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (f, s)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 (ro, m)</td>
<td>7 (ro, h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 (ro, m, t)</td>
<td>8 (rhy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 (h, rhy)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 (m)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (ro, m, t)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 (ro)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>13 (o/c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (p)</td>
<td>14 (ro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>15 (o/c, tr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>16 (ro, tr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 (f)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>18 (ro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 (o/c)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>20 (rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 (t, p)</td>
<td>21 (rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 (t, k)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 (o/c)</td>
<td>23 (rhy, mt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 (o/c, p)</td>
<td>24 (ro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>25 (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 (k, t)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (ro)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (ro, p)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (o/c, fl)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mozart</strong></td>
<td><strong>Symphonies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26 (ro)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30 (f, tr)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clarinet Concerto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Horn Concertos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Double Piano Concerto</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Concertos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Trios</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clarinet Trio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Quartets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>String Quintets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clarinet Quintet</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Sonatas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:

A Statistical Breakdown of the Chapter 4 Section Summaries

This appendix lists in table format the degree of strengths for the works by Haydn and Mozart analyzed as analyzed and listed in chapter 4.

Table 6.1: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s symphonies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s concertos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Defined in chapter 5 as those works with either an extremely strong element or three or more strong elements of cyclic integration. A list of these works appears in tables 5.1 and 5.2.
Table 6.4: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s string quartets and quintets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements:</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s piano sonatas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements:</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Strengths of cyclic integration in Haydn and Mozart’s piano trios and quartets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements:</th>
<th>0 Conventional</th>
<th>1 Weak</th>
<th>2 Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Total Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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