DOI https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-523-5-7

MODERN CONCEPTS OF CLASSICAL FORM ANALYSIS IN FOREIGN MUSICOLOGY (ON THE EXAMPLE OF JOSEPH HAYDN'S HOB.I:56 AND WOLFGANG MOZART K.338 SYMPHONIES)

Okner I., Vasylenko O. V.

INTRODUCTION

The form as the parameter of music becomes one of the leading constructive and aesthetic elements defining the style of the classical period. In an age that prized logic, emotional restraint and reason, two outstanding representatives of classical music – Joseph Haydn (1734-1809) and Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791) – find a way to advance their creations of various genres through the use of the sonata form. The message of exposing the conflict, delving into it, and finding the possible solution as the result of the exploration, within the borders of the sonata form is expressed through the rationality of underlining it harmonic periods, punctuated by cadential closures and containing motivic material that is important both rhythmically and thematically. Comparison analysis of the harmonic development of two sonata *allegro* forms in the first movements of the symphonies, completed only six years apart, would demonstrate what was inherited by each composer's style from the masters of the late Baroque, and how the traditional was enriched by Haydn and Mozart, becoming new and experimental.

The following analysis of the chromatic and diatonic forces within the sonata *allegro* forms of the 1st movements of *Symphony No. 56 in C* by Joseph Haydn (1774) and *Symphony No. 34 in C*, K. 338 by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1780), written in the common key, is conducted according to an original theory of eleven-pitch tonality developed by the contemporary American musicologist, Henry Burnett. His theory of eleven-pitch tonality in the opuses of Baroque**,** Classical, and Romantic composers is based on establishing a direct connection between forming and modal processes, causing changes in the structure and dynamics of the unfolding of the sonata form. It integrates the progressive ideas of structural-harmonic music analysis of Heinrich Schenker, the neurophysiological underpinnings of David Epstein's approach to music, and the validation of twelve-note cycles in music compositions of the Classical period done by James M. Baker. Understanding the consequences of the collaboration of the chromatic and the diatonic forces within the sonata *allegro* form as it was realized by the

two composers – the leading representatives of the Classical period of music – is the purpose of the analysis of this paper.

1. Modal and chromatic analysis of sonata *allegro* form of the 1st movements of *Symphony No. 56 in C* by Joseph Haydn according to the theory of Henry Burnett

Symphony No. 56 in C, composed by Joseph Haydn in 1774, appears to be a part of the "mass production" of symphonies, with over three dozen of them written between 1766 and 1775, confirming a balanced four-movement configuration of the genre and beginning with *Allegro.* "One particular genus of symphony is exploited in this period, the extrovert C major type with trumpets and/or C alto horns and timpani," [1] and *Symphony No. 56* is a perfect example of it. The exposition of *Allegro di molto,* omitting any kind of introduction, brings forward the opening statement (mm. 1-14)[2], which confirms the tonic of C major. The opening statement derives from "the motivic segmentation of the late Baroque concerto"[3] and copies the structure of the three-part ritornello theme.

An early 20th century study of the Baroque concerto by Wilhelm Fischer entitled "On the History of the Development of the Viennese Classical Style [*Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils*]"[4] provided us with the names of different segments of the ritornello theme. According to Henry Burnett[5], the Austrian musicologist established that the ritornello theme includes three distinctive segments. The first one is *Vordersatz* (the precursor) – the introduction or exposition of the motif and the tonic key, the second is *Fortspinnung* (spinning-forth) – the continuation and extension of the initial material by using internal repetitions, intervallic changes and sequences, and the third is *Epilog* (conclusion) – the formal cadence in the tonic.

Just like *Vordersatz, Fortspinnung*, and *Epilog* of the ritornello, the three phrases of the opening statement of Haydn's symphony, structured 2+8+4 (positioned respectively in mm. 1-2, 3-10, and 11-14), differ motivically, rhythmically, dynamically, harmonically, and proportionally. The choice of the type of opening statement, which supports unevenness of phrases as well

[1] Landon, H.C. Robbins and David Wyn Jones. *Haydn: His Life and Music.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988, p. 147.

[2] Bar numbers are named after the edition: Haydn, Joseph. Symphony No.56 in C major, Hob.I:56. Ed: Helmut Schultz. Boston: Haydn Society, 1951. Plate H.M.P. 55. IMSLP31344-PMLP71366-Haydn_Sinfonia_Hob_I_56,_C.pdf

[3] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg. *Composition, Chromaticism and the Developmental Process: a New Theory of Tonality*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007, p. 185.

[4] Fischer, Wilhelm. "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte Des Wiener Klassischen Stils." *Studien Zur Musikwissenschaft*, no. 3, 1915, pp. 24–84. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41460317. Accessed 13 Nov. 2024.

[5] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 145.

as their contrast, is influenced by the absence of the slow introduction to the movement – and the absence of the need to balance the introduction's rhythmic irregularity.

Henry Burnett in his study of the compositional design elements of the sonata form describes this type of the opening statement in the following fashion: "the opening phrase (a historical product of the *Vordersatz)* has a short, fanfare-like quality", the intermediary phrase (remaining within tonic harmony) is "a lengthier, more lyrical phrase, played *piano",* and the last phrase that ends on a half cadence of C major is "dramatizing the event with a full orchestra *forte."*[6] Landon and Jones in their research on Haydn's life and works, confirm the typical for the composer's style opening statement, stating that "the descending *forte* arpeggio of the opening theme is a recurring feature in symphonies of this period," together with "a *piano* passage for strings alone, whose deceptively unremarkable content provokes vigorous discussion in the development and a charming digression in the recapitulation." [7].

The expansion of sonata *allegro* could not be possible without its modal and chromatic advance. Applying the tools of dual – modal and chromatic progression, based on the gamut system of that mode, suggested by Henry Burnett and Roy Nitzberg[8], the analysis of this sonata *Allegro* would follow the ascending in half-step order chromatic octave (*Primary Chromatic Array* or *PCA*), and the descending diatonic octave (*Primary Diatonic Array* or *PDA*), with lesser chromatic orderings not reaching tonic octave completion (*Secondary Chromatic Arrays* or *SCAs*) included. When eleven chromatic and diatonic pitch classes are interrupted by the twelfth or "missing pitch" – "the minor third or augmented second above either the central hexachord of the modal gamut or of the tonic system of a key"[9] , the system modulates from one eleven-pitch-class system to another. Each PCA and SCA tone achieved is referenced in this article by its measure position and, when necessary, the name of the orchestra instrument delivering it.

The "lyrical phrase" with its "deceptively unremarkable content" introduces C# (**m. 8**) as the only chromatic tone of the statement, forming the "chromatic dyad" – an analytical term coined by Burnett and O'Donnell – and initiating the dyad conflict **[C-C#]**[10]. This tone's appearance coincides with the start of the PCA rise: **C or PC(0)** moves to **C# or PC(1),** resolving in **D or PC(2)** (**m. 8**, violin I), and motivically

[6] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 186.
[7] Landon, H.C. Robbins and David Wyn Jones, *ibid*, p. 147.
[8] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 10.
[9] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 11.
[10] Burnett, Henry, and Shaugn O'Donnell, *"Linear Ordering of the Chromatic Aggregate in Classical Symphonic Music," In Music Theory Spectrum, 18/1 (1996),* p. 26.

outlines a chromatic move b-c-c#-d (mm. 7-9). Among the three phrases of the opening statement, the second phrase (mm. 3-10) is the only one structurally closed; the statement in its entirety is open-ended, stopping with a "question" (*quasi* half cadence) – a unison on the dominant tone. *Allegro*'s counterstatement (mm. 15-28) is a full restatement of the 14-bar-long opening, with minimal alterations in orchestration, again, ending on the "question" of half cadence.

The bridge (mm. 29-52) allows for the gradual destabilization of the tonic (the first harmonic area) and preparations for the dominant or G major (the second harmonic area), integrating F# as a leading tone of the future key. The anticipation of the dominant is enhanced by the appearance of the second dyad conflict **[B ♭ -B♮]** (**m. 38**, oboe I & violin I). Embedded into the bass line, a missing pitch or **PC(3) E ♭ (m. 39)** makes an attempt to shift the system from "0" to 3 ♭ as the composition approaches the second harmonic area, but the attempt is short-lived: F# in m. 42 balances the system back to "0".

The introduction of the missing pitch of the tonic system – "always a dramatic event of some harmonic significance"[11] – leads to the formation of the augmented sixth chord E ♭ -G-C# (end of m. 41) on the flat third degree of the major mode, which is typical for Haydn's symphonies and could be viewed as the outgrowth of the ritornello's *pianoidée* passages in the parallel minor, which in Vivaldi and Sammartini's composition signaled the arrival of the dominant area. The term *pianoidée* was coined in 1932 by Walther Krüger[12] and meant "a quiet idea". When introduced, the *pianoidée* brought about a sudden and dramatically expressive shift from the major key into its parallel minor, often accompanied by changed dynamic level (*diminuendo)* and a lighter texture of music. By adding the new thematic segment in the ritornello theme, Vivaldi ultimately opened another channel of modal changes within his compositions.

The entire segment of the ritornello theme in present sonata *Allegro* form is reduced to a single sonority rooted on a missing pitch of the PCA. The pattern of the harmonic development could be traced back to Wagenseil's symphonies as well. According to Burnett, "the augmented sixth chord (in its function as a flat sixth relation to dominant) appears to secure the structural dominant at the close of the bridge period, a compositional trait that Haydn may have acquired from Wagenseil."[13] The chromatic move b-c-c#-d of the opening statement's middle phrase is now repeated in the bass line (mm. 36-38), contrapuntally to the a-b ♭ -b♮-c of the upper voices (mm.

[11] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 180.
[12] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 145.
[13] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg, *ibid*, p. 207.

37-39, oboe I & violin I). In mm. 44-47, both of them are united in a chromatic descending move d-c#-c♮-b-b♭-a (oboe II, violin I & II). Pedal on V/V leads to a half cadence on $V^{5/6}$/V and a simulation of "medial caesura" (m. 52) marked by *fermata*.

The second harmonic area starts at m. 53, motivically, dynamically, and structurally referencing the material of the first harmonic area. The segment d-g-f-e of the "lyrical phrase" (mm. 4-6, violin I) is diatonically-altered for the dominant key as d-g-f#-e (mm. 53-54, violin I), it is played *piano* by the strings only, and the entire opening phrase is repeated in the counterstatement, just like the opening statement, without changes (mm. 57-60). The replication of the same four-bar phrase, twice displaying the I^6-ii^6-$V^{4/2}$-I^6 sequence in the new key, constitutes a complete period in the dominant. The "medial caesura", which, according to the Sonata Theory of Hepokoski and Darcy, is used as a necessary marker of the second theme in the two-part exposition, here is "not-fully-realized"[14], allowing the exposition of the *Symphony No. 56* to proceed continuously from beginning to closure.

After the opening diatonic affirmation of the new key, the harmonic development picks up where it stopped: in the transition segment (mm. 61-83) E♭ - a missing pitch of PCA that appeared in the bridge segment - gets reinterpreted as **D# or PC(3)**, resolving into **E or PC(4) (m. 62**, violin I). We can rightfully presume that the exposition is "continuous", being built upon the opening statement's material, but the notable switch from E♭ to D# between the first and the second harmonic area indicates an inner division within this part of the sonata form, driven exclusively by the modal logic of it. There is no system shift to 3#s, since D# (a missing pitch of C hexachord) in violin I is well-balanced by C (a missing pitch of A hexachord) of violin II and viola. The transition segment, skipping PC(5), brings in **F# or PC(6)** that resolves into **G or PC(7)** (**mm. 68)**. The existing two chromatic dyads are shown again, C-C# (within the motive b-c-c#-d) in mm. 74-75 (cello & bass) and B♭-B♮ (within the unfinished motive a-b♭–b♮) in mm. 75-76 (violin I & oboe I), then together in a descending order in m. 81 (violin I).

The codetta (mm. 83-99) restores stability and finally achieves a perfect cadence in m. 97 - its 14th measure, possibly "mimicking" the length of the opening statement, – affirming the key of the dominant only four bars before the end of the exposition and celebrating it with a rising fanfare of *tutti*. The concept of delaying the strong establishment of the second harmonic area until the codetta of the exposition is one of the features that Haydn's sonata

[14] Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. *Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 63.

form inherited from Wagenseil and Monn's symphonic works, implementing such a delay to support the structure of monothematic compositions.

The development section (mm. 100-165) begins with adding **G# or PC(8)** going into **A or PC(9)** (**mm. 100-101**, cello & bass). The harmonic changes follow the fifths of the reordered C hexachord.

Hexachord pitch classes	**F**	**C**	**G/g**	**D**	**a**	**E**
Harmonic function	**IV**	**I**	**V/v**	**ii**	**vi**	**Iii**

Figure 1. The harmonic changes are related to the fifth tones of the reordered C hexachord

It is important to notice that the harmonic changes are accomplished by means of the tones involved in the dyad conflicts and a missing pitch of PCA**.** The **[C-C#]** dyad helps the move from **a(vi)** to **d(ii)**, then B ♭ and E ♭ prepare the move from **d(ii)** to **g(v). [E ♭ -E♮]** is the new chromatic dyad in mm. 121-122, getting ready for the move from **g(v)** to **F(IV).** F#, sustained for 5 measures (mm. 118-122, violin I) is changed into F♮ in m. 123, presenting another dyad conflict **[F-F#].** As an unexpected harmonic turn, the dyad **[B ♭ -B♮]** is aligned vertically in mm. 125-126. **A# or PC (10)**, remaining in effect until the recapitulation, is repeatedly played together with **B or PC (11)** in **mm. 129-132**, and, with the appearance of a missing pitch D# in m. 132, they arrange the move from **F(IV)** to **e (iii)** – a dramatic jump from one border of the reordered tonic hexachord to another! Finally, in mm. 150-153, within the ascending move C-C#-D-D# (violins & oboe II), the last chromatic dyad **[D-D#]** (m. 153) is formed, and it prepares a half cadence in a (vi).

Chromatic dyad	**[C–C#]**	**[D–D#]**	**[E ♭ -E]**	**[F–F#]**	**[G–G#]**	**A**	**[B ♭ –B]**	**C**
Horizontal coordinate	**m. 8**	**m. 153/**	**mm.121 -122**	**m. 123**	**mm.141 -142**		**m. 38**	
Vertical coordinate	**m. 186**	**m. 192**		**m. 194**			**m. 125, 188**	

Figure 2. Order of the appearance of the chromatic dyads

The augmented sixth chord, first used in the exposition (m. 41), now is making a comeback, expanded into a transitional passage at the very end of the development section (mm. 155-164). It "tunes out" the dynamic and harmonic build-up, and, just as before, has the effect of the ritornello's *pianoidée.* The reversed dyad **[G#-G]** (mm. 159-161) accommodates the entrance of tonic in m. 165 (**B or PC(11)** is repeated again in **mm. 163-164**, resolving into *tutti'*s **C or PC(0)**) – the beginning of the recapitulation section.

There is no false recapitulation, so typical for Haydn's sonata form, but the final section of the first movement does not lessen the number of unpredictable twists in its music. After the composer embellishes the reappearance of the opening statement (mm. 165-178) by adding two oboes, duplicating violins, to the "lyrical phrase", where, as before, the first steps of the second PCA rise – **C# or PC(1)** going into **D or PC(2) in m. 172** – are taken. The anticipated exposition's scenario of a full restatement suddenly (at the end of the very same "lyrical phrase") changes to show a new ending of the lengthened and enriched by the sequential progression counterstatement (mm. 179-198). Reminiscent of what happened once in the development section (m. 125), the pairs of the chromatic dyads are switched (like in a game of topsy-turvy) from horizontal to vertical dimension, "confusing" the harmonic orientation of the fragment: the dyad **[C-C#]** is played on the adjacent beats (m. 186, violin I vs. violin II & oboe I), it is followed by the dyad **[B ♭ –B]** joined in the same manner (m. 188, violin I vs. violin II), then the dyad **[D-D#]** is played on the same beat (!) (m. 192, oboe I vs. violin II), and the dyad **[F-F#]** is constructed on the neighboring beats again (m. 194, oboe I vs. viola & bass).

The second rise of PCA continues: **D# or PC(3)** moves into **E or PC(4)** in **m. 191**, then into **F or PC(5)** in **m. 193**. **F# or PC(6)** gets resolved into **G or PC(7)** in **mm. 196-197**. The presence of PC(5), omitted in the initial PCA climb, accentuates the chromatic explorations of the development section. Inclusion of the missing PC(5) only in the second PCA rise is, according to Burnett, typical for Haydn.[15]The descending scale c-b ♭ –a-g-f-e-e ♭ –d-… (mm. 186-197, violin I) is connecting the sequential progression of the new ending of the counterstatement, with …-c given at the start of the bridge, now affirming the tonic of the movement (mm. 199-222) and ending with a *fermata* on a half cadence.

Similar to the exposition, the recapitulation section does not produce a proper period after the bridge is ended, which defines the simulation of the "medial caesura" (m. 222) as "not-fully-realized". The transition segment

[15] Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg. *Composition, Chromaticism and the Developmental Process: a New Theory of Tonality.* Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007, p.226.

(mm. 231-252), having no new key to establish, does not present major changes. The second rise of PCA is completed: **G# or PC(8)** and **A or PC(9)** are in **m. 232,** and, as the codetta is repeated in the tonic key (mm. 253-272), **B or PC(11)** leads to **C or PC(0)** in **m. 261.** Instead of bringing the perfect cadence, as was done in the exposition, the codetta of the recapitulation has one more "funny trick up its sleeve": a comical "freeze" of the harmonic rhythm and a zealous repeat of $V^{5/6}$-$I^{5/3}$, stretching each one of two sonorities over an entire measure (mm. 263-265). The key-affirmative fanfare of *tutti* is modified and now quotes the shortened motive of the third phrase of the opening statement (mm. 266-268) – not pausing on the dominant tone, but "cementing the tonic" by the successive "shouts" of V-I for the upcoming final bars of the movement.

2. Modal and chromatic analysis of sonata *allegro* form of the 1st movements of *Symphony No. 34 in C K.338 Wolfgang Mozart* according to the theory of Henry Burnett

Symphony No. 34 in C, K. 338, written by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart in 1780 in Salzburg, is the last of three symphonies (K. 318, 319, and 338) composed in 1779-1780 during his stay in that city. The symphony's first movement *Allegro vivace* begins its opening statement (mm. 1-20) with a fanfare signal that became the composer's signature, found later in the overtures to the operas *Idomeneo* and *La clemenza di Tito*, *Symphonies No. 38* ("Prague"), and *No. 41* ("Jupiter"). The choice of the instruments for the piece is similar to Haydn's *Allegro,* but Mozart substitutes 2 clarinets for 2 trumpets, allowing the first phrase of the movement to make an entrance.

The firmness of the fanfare is well-balanced by the underlining playfulness of the tone of the statement, echoing *tutti's* phrase (mm. 1- 4)[16] in a lighter fashion (mm. 5-6). Theatrical liveliness of the unfolding of music is felt in cancelling the expected ending of the period, again, by echoing *tutti's* affirmative sound with an unexpectedly added phrase in the minor subdominant harmony, performed, imitating the *pianoidée,* in a subdued manner (mm. 13-15) and showing very early in the exposition a missing pitch E ♭ of the movement's **PCA** (with a temporary switch of the system from "0" to 3 ♭ s in mm. 15-22). The initial period of the opening statement seems ready to finish in the minor tonic (m. 16), but recovers C major at the last moment and reinstates it in the appended cadential material. Just like the "exclamation" of mm. 1-2, introducing the opening period, the call of the horns and trumpets with the dance-like response of the oboes at the end of

[16] Bar numbers are named after the edition: Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus. *Symphony No.34 in C major*, K.338. Ed: Hans Ferdinand Redlich. London: Ernst Eulenburg, No.542, n.d.[1956]. Plate E.E. 6087. IMSLP411740-PMLP01566-Mozart-K338eul.pdf

the period (mm. 16-20) preserves the "acting glitter" of the music. Harmonically-contrasting segments present articulated two- and four-bar phrases.

The bridge (mm. 20-40) begins on a stable tonic fanfare, but drifts toward the dominant soon enough, introducing its leading tone F# (m. 22), as well as other chromatic tones, vertically forming the conflicting dyad – **[C-C#]** (**m. 22**, bass line vs. violin I) and applying the second dyad **[B-B ♭]** by preparing the upcoming dominant key with a tonicized minor dominant (mm. 28-37). The rise of the PCA also starts in the bridge: **C# or PC(1)** moves into **D or PC(2) (mm.31-32)**, with C# being a part of the augmented sixth chord that expends into the applied dominant and repeatedly relies on the missing pitch of **E ♭ or PC(3) (mm. 31-34).** The "exclamation" of *tutti's* fanfare returns, clearly stating the end of the first harmonic area.

As if in the ballet's conclusion of the scene, the first set of dancers gracefully moves for the curtains (mm. 38-39), and the participants of the next scene (here – the second harmonic area, starting at m. 41) take their positions. The influence of the dance genre on the music of this movement is explained by the presence of the features of the *style galant,* inherited by Mozart from symphonic works of Johann Christian Bach (1735–1782). The dominant key is confirmed by the completed period, ending with a counterstatement (m. 48).

The preparation for the transition segment (mm. 55-63) presents the dyad **[G-G#]** vertically (**m. 52**, bass line vs. oboe I), then repeats it in the transition (m. 55, oboe I vs. violins). The missing pitch is reappearing, spelled as D# (m. 60) with no system shifts, but leading to **E or PC(4) - F# or PC(6) (m. 61**, violins) **– G or PC(7) (m. 62)** just as the harmonic progression prepares the development section. Following the tradition of overture sinfonias, Mozart does not repeat the exposition, which seems to be consistent with the theatrical analogy: the scene never gets to be performed on the stage twice.

The development (mm. 64-157) propels the PCA rise forward: **G# or PC(8)** is resolved in **A or PC(9)** (**mm. 64-65**, violin I)**,** and **B ♭ or PC(10)** leads to **B or PC(11)** and into **C or PC(0) (mm. 95-96,** violin I). Not concerned with themes from the exposition, it presents new material, organized, just like in the first harmonic area of the movement, in proportionally unified two- and four-bar structures.

The first subdivision of the development (mm. 64-113) confirms the dominant, the second (mm. 114-157) moves - with the help of the missing pitch E ♭ and the successful system shift to 3 ♭ from m. 118 – from the dominant to the minor tonic, interpreted as a mediant sonority and followed by $V^{5/6}$/VI ♭ (m. 126). A flat major, being a relative major of F minor,

involved in the very first period of the exposition (with A ♭ making an unexpected theatrical appearance in m. 13) sounds like a fulfillment of the harmonic "promise" made earlier. The contrast of the segment is deepened by the faster-moving rhythmical patterns. Return back to the dominant is helped by the missing pitch of the 3 ♭ system - F# in m. 140 (the system is switched back to "0") – predicting the upcoming recapitulation.

The recapitulation (mm. 158-237) could be compared to the final scene of the ballet, where most leading characters join together on the stage, giving the admiring audience one more chance to enjoy their best moves. And so, the opening statement is broadened, sounding even "brassier", with expressive inclusion of B ♭ , E ♭ , and, of course, A ♭ chromatic tones, and finishing its "mini-scene" with the *tutti's* "exclamation". The second harmonic area's material (m. 177) shows the reversed dyad **[A ♭ -A]**-at its entrance (**m.179**, bassoon). The material from the first subdivision of the development is also making its appearance (mm. 200-220), now transposed from the dominant to the tonic. The dyads **[C-C#], [G-G#]/[A-A ♭]** and **[E ♭ -E]** are weaved into the fabric of the passages based on the material of the second subdivision of the development (mm. 221-229). With a short diatonic melody in mm. 230-231 (a "bow" given by the director/choreographer/composer himself?), the section brings in the closing cadence. The coda of the movement (mm. 238-264) repeats the first 10 bars of the opening statement (up to the echo of the minor subdominant), "wiping off" all the harmonic uncertainties with the brilliant major of the final fanfares – a loud and exhilarating sound of the standing ovation.

CONCLUSIONS

The comparison of two sonata forms, analyzed in the present paper, demonstrates the "stylistic inheritance" of each composer, relating Haydn's symphony to orchestral works by Antonio Vivaldi, Giovanni Battista Sammartini, Georg Matthias Monn, and Georg Christoph Wagenseil. It also indicates the new and advanced features of Haydn's music obtained by producing a monothematic composition. They are:

– the concept of enriched and contrasted material of the opening statement of the exposition, which gives enough of motivic and harmonic "hints" to be explored throughout the movement;

– the method of avoiding any full cadences as the material unfolds, not accomplishing the "medial caesura", and delaying the strong establishment of the second harmonic area until the codetta of the exposition;

– the ability to capture the inner division of the exposition's material not thematically, but modally: by changing the spelling of the missing pitch (E ♭ to D#) between the first and the second harmonic area;

– the intention of "maintaining both its continuity and the novelty to the end"[17] by suggesting many unexpected turns in the harmonic development of the form;

– the enrichment of the harmonic development by the way of introducing new chromatic tones or chromatic dyads, which appearance "as well as the completion of the entire aggregate frequently dramatizes musical form by coinciding with significant formal boundaries."[18]

Mozart's sonata form, contrary to Haydn's monothematic aspirations, is alive with contrasts of the assembled material, saturating not only the exposition section, but "spilled over" into the development and transformed again in the recapitulation. The playfulness and entertaining nature of the tone of music reminds of the strong connection of his symphony to the genre of Italian overture (sinfonia) and symphonic works of Johann Christian Bach, so much influenced by the *style galant.* Clear-structured phrases and periods of the form are unified by the strong logic of the harmonic changes, with none of the chromatisms being accidental and no statement merely repeated. The interactions between diatonic tones and their chromatic inflections – the conflicting dyads – are an important structural factor for the composer, incorporated motivically and harmonically, presented horizontally and vertically in the texture of the movement, and the unfolding of the PCA is aligned with the motivic development of the sonata form to mark an important point of arrival.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is modal and chromatic analysis of the sonata *allegro* form of the 1st movements of Symphony No. 56 in C by Joseph Haydn (1774) and Symphony No. 34 in C, K. 338 by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1780). The theoretical basis of the study is the general theory of musical style, individual teaching on musical form, and its relationship with the harmony of the classical style by Henry Burnet. When constructing an interpretative model of the form-creating concept of the classical symphonies, the method of ascending from the abstract to the concrete is utilized. The deductive method is used to isolate and characterize individual components of the classical model of the sonata allegro form.

Mozart's sonata form, contrary to Haydn's monothematic aspirations, is alive with contrasts of the assembled material, saturating not only the exposition section, but "spilled over" into the development and transformed again in the recapitulation. The playfulness and entertaining nature of the

[17] Webster, James. *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in his Instrumental Music.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 126.

[18] Burnett and O'Donnel, *ibid*, p. 23.

tone of music reminds of the strong connection of his symphony to the genre of Italian overture (sinfonia) and symphonic works of Johann Christian Bach, so much influenced by the style galant. Clear-structured phrases and periods of the form are unified by the strong logic of the harmonic changes, with none of the chromatisms being accidental and no statement merely repeated. The interactions between diatonic tones and their chromatic inflections – the conflicting dyads – are an important structural factor for the composer, incorporated motivically and harmonically, presented horizontally and vertically in the texture of the movement, and the unfolding of the PCA is aligned with the motivic development of the sonata form to mark an important point of arrival.

References

1. Burnett, Henry and Roy, Nitzberg. *Composition, Chromaticism and the Developmental Process: a New Theory of Tonality.* Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007. 430 p.
2. Burnett, Henry, and Shaugn O'Donnell. "Linear Ordering of the Chromatic Aggregate in Classical Symphonic Music," In *Music Theory Spectrum,* 18/1 (1996): 22-50.
3. Fisher, Stephen C. "Haydn's Overtures and their Adaptations as Concert Orchestral Works," Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1985: 67-83.
4. Fischer, Wilhelm. "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte Des Wiener Klassischen Stils." *Studien Zur Musikwissenschaft*, no. 3, 1915, pp. 24–84. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/41460317. Accessed 13 Nov. 2024.
5. Haimo, Ethan. *Haydn's Symphonic Forms: Essays in Com-positional Logic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995: 268-79. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198163923.003.0011
6. Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. *Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
7. Landon, H.C. Robbins and David Wyn Jones. *Haydn: His Life and Music.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988: 540–543. https://www.jstor.org/stable/735994
8. Mutch, Caleb. "The Formal Function of Fortspinnung," *Theory and Practice,* 43: 1-33. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26892826
9. Rasch, Rudolf. "How Does Mozart Start His Development Sections?" In *Ad Parnassum: A Journal of Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Instrumental Music* 10, no. 19 (April 2012): 51–102.

10. Rosen, Charles. “Structural Dissonance and the Classical Sonata.” In *Freedom and the Arts: Essays on Music and Literature*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012, pp. 121–34.

11. Rovelli, Federica. “Contrast or Return?: Monothematicism in the Late 18th Century Instrumental Rondo.” In *Mozart-Studien 21* (2012): 107–126.

12. Stevens, Jane R. “An 18th-century Description of Concerto First Movement Form,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society,* XXIV (Spring, 1974): 92.

13. Vallieres, Michel. “Beginnings, Middles, and Ends: Perception of Intrinsic Formal Functionality in the Piano Sonatas of W.A. Mozart.” Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2012.

14. Viktoriia Bodina-Diachok, Veronika Pieshkova, Tetiana Duhina, Martsenkivska Olena, Liliia Mudretska, Olha Vasylenko, Irene Okner. Modern concepts of baroque music analysis in foreign musicology (on the example of Antonio Vivaldi’s RV 396 concerto). *Ad Alta: Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, Volume 13, Issue 2, Special Issue XXXVIII, November 2023, pp. 115 – 119. Available at: https://www.magnanimitas.cz/ADALTA/130238/papers/A_19.pdf

15. Webster, James. *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in his Instrumental Music.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. ttps://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511552434

Information about the authors:

Okner Irene,
Master of Arts in Music (graduate of Aaron Copland School of Music, New York),
Independent researcher
New York, USA

Vasylenko Olha Valentynivna,
Candidate of Art History, Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of Music History
R. Glier Kyiv Municipal Academy of Music,
31, Pavlo Skoropadsky St., Kyiv, 01032, Ukraine