Harmony in Haydn and Mozart

Integrating Schenkerian tools and an innovative approach to harmony, David Damschroder provides numerous penetrating analyses of works by Haydn and Mozart. A series of introductory chapters assist readers in developing their analytical capacity. Beginning with short excerpts from string quartets, the study proceeds by assessing the inner workings of twelve expositions from Haydn piano sonatas, six arias in G Minor from Mozart operas, and three rondos in D Major from piano concertos by Haydn and Mozart. In the Masterworks section that follows, Damschroder presents detailed analyses of six movements from symphonies, chamber music, and opera by Haydn and Mozart, and compares his outcomes with those of other analysts, including V. Kofi Agawu, Robert O. Gjerdingen, James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, Carl Schachter, and James Webster. The book represents an important contribution to modern analytical discourse on a treasured body of music, and an assessment of recent accomplishments within that realm.

DAVID DAMSCHRODER is Professor of Music Theory at the University of Minnesota. His current research focuses on harmony in tonal music, a project that began with a careful examination of historical analytical practices, the basis for his *Thinking About Harmony: Historical Perspectives on Analysis* (Cambridge, 2008). The project continues with focused studies on selected repertoires: *Harmony in Schubert* (Cambridge, 2010), and the present volume. Damschroder is the co-author of *Music Theory from Zarlino to Schenker* (1990), and his articles and reviews have appeared in many publications including *Music Theory Spectrum*, *The Journal of Music Theory*, and *Music Theory Online*.

Harmony in Haydn and Mozart

DAVID DAMSCHRODER
The University of Minnesota

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107025349

First published 2012

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Damschroder, David.
Harmony in Haydn and Mozart / David Damschroder.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-107-02534-9
1. Haydn, Joseph, 1732–1809 – Criticism and interpretation. 2. Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756–1791 – Criticism and interpretation. 3. Music – 18th century – History and criticism. 4. Music – 18th century – Analysis, appreciation. 5. Harmony. I. Title.
ML195.D36 2012
780.92′2–dc23

2012000795

ISBN 978-1-107-02534-9 Hardback

Contents

Preface

Within the bewilderingly diverse array of musical repertoires at our disposal, the music of Haydn and Mozart holds a special place. To take pleasure in and to be moved by their works is to celebrate the human condition in a unique and wondrous way and to become part of an unbroken chain of enthusiasts extending back over two hundred years. For many musicians and aficionados, this repertoire remains the core of a revered tradition. Such favor makes it especially worthy of our attention, as does its extraordinary impact upon later generations of composers. By presenting in-depth analyses of a carefully chosen assemblage of works by Haydn and Mozart, with emphasis on harmony, I offer guidance to serious listeners and performers who seek to develop fresh ways of thinking about this music, thereby deepening their understanding of how it is structured and enhancing their capacity to bring it to life in performance.

This volume is part of a broader project that began with a consideration of how harmonic analysis emerged as a field of musical inquiry: *Thinking About Harmony: Historical Perspectives on Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, 2008; hereafter abbreviated as *TAH*). I then developed my own distinctive approach to harmonic analysis, integrating various historical notions, the Schenkerian perspective, and my own speculations in the context of music by Franz Schubert: *Harmony in Schubert* (Cambridge University Press, 2010; hereafter abbreviated as *Schubert*). Currently I am testing and refining those ideas in the context of music by other composers. *Harmony in Haydn and Mozart* is in some ways a more foundational book than is *Schubert*, and readers may prefer to start here. (Eventually other volumes may appear as well. Avid readers may choose to proceed chronologically, or in the order of publication, or according to which composers interest them the most.) As I did also in *Schubert*, I provide a foundation for my perspective in an introductory Methodological Orientation – here encompassing the first four chapters – that explores twelve excerpts from Haydn and Mozart string quartets, twelve Haydn piano sonata expositions in major keys, six Mozart opera arias in the key of G Minor, and three sonata-rondos from Haydn and Mozart piano concertos. I assume a prior

exposure to Roman-numeral harmonic analysis and to the Schenkerian perspective, especially that presented in Schenker's *Der freie Satz* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1935; translation of Oswald Jonas's 1956 edition by Ernst Oster as *Free Composition*, New York: Longman, 1979; hereafter abbreviated as *FC*). Though nowadays analytical work is being pursued from a wide range of perspectives, to the extent that some (for example, Joseph Kerman and Robert O. Gjerdingen) question the utility of the Schenkerian approach, I hope to demonstrate through my project not only that it offers extraordinary insights, but also that it may serve as a foundation for potent new developments in analytical thinking. Consequently my discussion of harmony takes place in the context of an exploration of a work's underlying voice-leading structure. Whereas in *Schubert* the relationship between harmony and narrative often came to the fore, in *Harmony in Haydn and Mozart* issues of form – especially the various manifestations of sonata form – often intersect my harmonic investigation.

My original intent when writing *Schubert* was to offer a thorough exposition of my own views on harmony, tracing their development out of the analytical practices I had explored in *TAH*. At the urging of a colleague and through the coincidental alignment of repertoire by Schubert that I wanted to address and the published analyses of several other authors, I expanded my purview by integrating my analytical presentations with assessments of alternative approaches to the same works, a practice that not only made for a more varied and engaging commentary but also led me in directions I likely would not have pursued without the prodding of those other authors. By both seeing how my analyses unfold and also coming to understand why I do not proceed in certain other ways, readers attain a more thorough and penetrating comprehension of the analytical perspective that I espouse. I have elected to continue the practice of presenting analyses in conjunction with those of other authors in this volume. Though this is a somewhat dangerous undertaking, in that I have not invested the many thousands of hours pursuing each alternative methodology as I have my own and thus might inadvertently have taken some wrong turns, I accept that risk as healthier for the field than the alternative: that only committed advocates of a system, who indeed have spent those thousands of hours attaining expertise, be permitted to offer criticism. The heart of the book, following the Methodological Orientation, is a Masterpieces section consisting of six chapters that juxtapose my interpretations of movements by Haydn or Mozart with critical commentary on analyses of the same works by others, set off from the flow of my analyses via shading. (Readers may choose to skip over these sections without disturbing the continuity of my analytical

discussion.) The alternative analyses appear in journals and books that should be available at any music research library (and in some cases also on the Internet), allowing committed readers to maximize their exposure to the issues at hand. From Chapter 2 onwards, readers will need to obtain scores for the works discussed. Though the Methodological Orientation should be read first and in the order presented, the chapters of the Masterpieces section, which is arranged chronologically, may be read selectively or out of order.

My work stems from the premise that one will succeed best in listening to and performing music by coming to understand the logic through which the composer has set down a composition's pitches. (That exploration may complement the pursuit of various other worthwhile perspectives, such as music/text relationships or the semiotic study of musical topics.) Though ultimately an analytical fluency will develop, in the initial stages one needs to proceed slowly and methodically in working through the substance of a composition. My project is designed to help committed aspirants make progress in developing that insight. Since many approaches to analysis are available, I offer readers the opportunity to compare a range of procedures and their outcomes. Though I will show a preference for some analytical practices over others, ultimately readers must decide for themselves which path(s) to pursue as they progress in their artistic developments.

I appreciate the feedback on drafts of this work that I have received from various quarters. I also acknowledge the support of a single-semester leave and an Imagine Fund award from the University of Minnesota, which have allowed me to bring this work to fruition sooner than I had anticipated and to have access to a wide range of materials. Pete Smucker has provided expert setting of the music examples.

Conventions regarding note relations, chords, keys, and Roman numerals

Pitch simultaneities (such as C-E-G) are indicated using hyphens (-), while pitch successions (such as C–E–G) are indicated using dashes (–). Direction may be indicated in melodic succession: ascending as C<E<G, descending as G>E>C. A black arrow may be used to indicate a descending-fifth relationship that is or emulates a $V^{(7)}$–I succession, whereas an outline arrow may be used to indicate a succession from a chord of the augmented-sixth type: for example, C➔F–D➔G➔C; C–A♭–D⇒G➔C.

Keys and chords are distinguished as follows: C Major (with a capital M) is the key of C Major; C major (with a small m) is a C major chord.

Unless another analyst's methodology is being discussed, Roman numerals are presented in capital letters regardless of a chord's quality, modified by one or more accidentals if the chord is altered. Thus C Major: I II V I and not I ii V I; and C Minor: I II V♯ I♯ (closing on a major tonic), not i ii° V I. An accidental to the left of the numeral corresponds to the chord's root, to the right corresponds to its third. If the chordal fifth, seventh, or ninth is altered, the analytical symbol will incorporate the corresponding Arabic numeral, as in C Minor: $\mathrm{II}^{5\sharp}_{\sharp}$. (Arrow notation – here II➔ – offers an attractive, though less precise, alternative to the complete analytical symbol.) The bullet symbol (•) indicates an absent root. For example, B-D-F in C Major will be analyzed as $\mathrm{V}^{7}_{\bullet}$ (or, with less precision, as V➔).

Likewise a progression of chordal roots generally is presented in capital letters (C–D–G–C), though on occasions when quality is a factor in the discussion a capital letter may refer to major quality, a small letter to minor quality, and a small letter followed by a degree circle (°) to diminished quality: for example, C–a–F–d–b°–G–e–C.

A bracket is used to connect the analytical notation for two musical events that normally would follow one another but that in the context under discussion occur at the same moment: for example, C ⌈F♯ B⌉ E when an F♯-A♯-C♯ chord sounds with, rather than before, root B in a descending circle of fifths.

Parentheses around a pitch in an analytical example indicate that it is not actually present in the score, though it is understood. Parentheses around analytical notation may refer to the expansion of a deeper-level harmony (for example, when I is expanded by I IV V I) or to the harmonic assertion of a voice-leading phenomenon (for example, when the 6 phase of a I^{5-6}, as in C-E-G to C-E-A, asserts the harmonic role of VI). Open parentheses designate a voice-leading transition between two harmonies. For example, I ( ) IV indicates that the chords between I and IV (perhaps a circular, parallel, or sequential progression) do not themselves participate in the harmonic progression, but instead serve to connect the harmonies I and IV.

When a score's chordal spellings do not coincide with the structurally appropriate spellings (for example, the substitution of easier-to-read F♯-A-C♯ for cumbersome G♭-B𝄫-D♭), I generally will use the structurally appropriate spellings in my examples and commentaries, often placing the enharmonic spellings within square brackets to assist readers in locating the pitches in question within the score.

I pay very close attention to hierarchies among pitches and chords. To alert readers to various hierarchical relationships I often will underline some pitch names to indicate their hierarchical prominence. For example, C<E D>B C above bass C–G–C conveys the relationship between two unfolded strands: a more prominent outer strand E>D>C, and a subordinate inner strand C>B<C.

Because diverse musical contexts are analyzed using graphs, it is difficult to pin down precise guidelines for how their notation should be crafted and read. Many styles of "Schenkerian" notation have appeared since the publication of *FC* (which itself does not present a single normative style). I regard the creation of a reductive graph as an art, endeavoring to use notation that is as clear and informative as possible. In general, open noteheads in my graphs represent deeper structural or harmonic events than filled-in noteheads, while notes at the endpoints of beams or slurs are deeper than internal notes. Notes connected to a beam by a stem are more integral to the structure than those that are not. Especially in the early chapters I offer abundant commentary, which will give readers the opportunity to develop facility in interpreting my notation. Occasional annotations using abbreviations indicate functions of individual pitches or formal events, as follows:

ant.	anticipation
C	closing zone
CP	chromatic passing note
EEC	essential expositional closure
ESC	essential structural closure
HC	half cadence
IAC	imperfect authentic cadence
IN	incomplete neighboring note
MC	medial caesura
N	neighboring note
P	an individual pitch: passing note
P	form: primary-theme zone
PAC	perfect authentic cadence
P^{rf}	primary-theme zone (refrain) in a sonata-rondo
prg.	progression
S	secondary-theme zone
susp.	suspension
TR	transition
W	wobble

Of course, the graphs often will incorporate Roman-numeral harmonic analyses, and in this regard I often depart from Schenker's practice. Because it is innovative, I document my Roman-numeral usage very carefully as the chapters unfold.

Because measure numbers are a pervasive feature in my close analyses, I have developed an abbreviated style of reference, in the form $\text{measure}_{\text{beat}}$. For example, the symbol 2_3 indicates the third beat of measure 2. Generally the word "measure" will not precede the number. I regard measures in $\frac{2}{2}$ and $\frac{6}{8}$ as containing two beats. A measure designation such as 14/16 means that a given chord is prolonged from measure 14 through measure 16, with contrasting content occurring between statements of the chord, whereas the designation 14–16 indicates a continuous prolongation of a single chord without significant internal contrast. The symbol 15|16 indicates measure 16 along with its upbeat.