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On March 28th, 1800, Joseph Haydn’s last concerto was premiered. The concerto was written for a new instrument that had been designed and built by Anton Weidinger, who was also the featured performer. The instrument was a fully-chromatic Klappentrompete or Keyed Trumpet. In their critical edition of Joseph Haydn’s trumpet concerto, musicologists H.C. Robbins Landon and Edward Tarr invite us to imagine the atmosphere at the premiere performance of the piece:

After only a few bars the soloist lifts his instrument to his lips and plays his first note: E-flat ... Then Weidinger plays again, but these notes are nothing new: they lie in the clarino register, available to any brass instrument. The audience becomes uneasy, Weidinger’s ‘organized trumpet’ seems to be nothing special at all... until the soloist raises his instrument for a third time. The amazement which followed the solo entry must have been complete, on hearing the trumpet play an entire diatonic scale in its low register, where a natural trumpet is only capable of producing a dominant seventh arpeggio. Haydn artfully devised the principal theme of the first movement to show off this very fact...¹

Indeed, Haydn took full advantage of the chromatic capabilities of the new instrument when he composed this concerto. The new possibilities are highlighted when the Trumpet Concerto is compared to Haydn’s earlier concerto written for horn (Hob. VIId: 3), a brass instrument with natural notes confined to the harmonic series but with the ability to play chromatically through stopped notes. While a detailed musical analysis of both concerti would assist in clarifying Haydn’s compositional solution to the restraints inherent to instruments like the natural horn

and show how Haydn was able to compose when he had more freedom with a fully chromatic instrument, there is much more to be gained from examining the music at a structural level. I propose that a comparison of Haydn’s Horn Concerto and Trumpet Concerto informed by Schenkerian analysis will reveal elements of the musical structure that facilitate insight into the development of concerto style and Haydn’s maturation as a composer.

An important motivation for a comparison of these two works is their position at the beginning and end of Haydn’s oeuvre. Haydn’s Concerto for Horn was composed in 1762 during the second year of his position with the Esterházy musical establishment. Haydn held this position with the Esterházy family for thirty years. Thus, we can identify the Horn Concerto as one of Haydn’s early works, both generally and in the concerto genre. In contrast, the Trumpet Concerto was composed in 1796, over thirty years later. Haydn had been relieved of his duties with the Esterházy family, travelled to London in 1790 and returned to Vienna in 1795. The Trumpet Concerto was composed a year after Haydn returned to Vienna and was, in fact, the last concerto he composed. In light of these facts, the Trumpet Concerto provides a wonderful example of Haydn’s fully developed compositional style in the concerto genre.

A number of things must be taken into consideration when comparing these two pieces. For example, the instrumentation of the orchestra is substantially different between the two. In the Horn Concerto, the orchestra contains two oboes and strings, while the Trumpet Concerto features a full wind section of two flutes, two oboes, two horns, two trumpets, timpani, and strings. Haydn’s orchestration was undoubtedly affected by the conditions of his working environment at the time: the Burgtheater orchestra was much smaller in 1762 than in 1796. Orchestral conventions had also changed, and like those conventions, Haydn’s compositional
style did too. Surface-level analysis provides an example of just how different these pieces are from one another. One clear example of this change in style is Haydn’s interaction and use of the orchestra with the solo instrument. On examination of the opening measures of each concerto’s first movement solo exposition one can see important differences. In the Horn Concerto, the solo horn enters and the first violins play the opening statement in unison. Beneath the opening theme, the rest of the strings repeat eighth-note rhythms and act as a continuo moving the harmony forward as seen in Example 1.0.1.

Example 1.0.1: Score excerpt of measures 28-41 from the first movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto showing the instrumental roles in the orchestration.
This separation of solo and accompaniment is very clear throughout the entire Concerto, though the first violins relinquish their unison duties from time to time. In the opening measures of the Trumpet Concerto’s exposition, by contrast, we see a very different use of the orchestra in relation to the solo. Where the solo trumpet enters, the first violins immediately move in contrary motion to the opening statement. The trumpet and flute exchange the melody and the trumpet expands the motive a bit further before the entire orchestra takes over to state the next musical idea. Example 1.0.2 shows this interplay between soloist and orchestra.

Example 1.0.2: Score excerpt of measures 38-47 of the first movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

This counterpoint contrasts with the Horn Concerto significantly. The interaction between the orchestra and solo in the Trumpet Concerto not only allows Haydn more freedom to develop his musical ideas, but also provides a much larger textural range. These examples show just one of many surface-level differences in style revealed by these two pieces. As we shall see, a detailed Schenkerian musical analysis will reveal deeper-level stylistic changes in
relation to motivic development, form, and structure. Additionally, this kind of in-depth Schenkerian analysis will provide a basis for further scholarship in the area of Haydn concerto analysis. This analysis will endeavor to address current questions, and stimulate others in multiple fields, including musicology, music theory, and brass instrument history.

1.1 Significance and State of the Research

Evaluating the current state of research in regard to Haydn and his works, one finds no shortage of musical analyses. This is unsurprising when one considers the importance of Haydn’s role in European musical history during the second half of the Eighteenth century. Haydn composed music in a number of different genres, with two genres receiving particular attention by the composer: symphonies and string quartets. Because of the importance of these two genres, scholarship and musical analysis have focused primarily on them. Further supporting the tendency to focus on them is the ubiquitous view of them as “serious” and “complex” music. David Schroeder claims in his book *Haydn and the Enlightenment* with regard to Haydn’s String Quartets that they are “a realization of one of the highest goals of the Enlightenment. With accompaniments that can be transformed into melodies and vice versa, there is the apparent recognition of a higher social truth which is that differences do not preclude equality.”

“enlightened” string quartet or symphony. Scholars, such as Floyd Grave, have addressed problems with this simplistic view of genre quality, noting the existence of concerto style within Haydn’s String Quartets. Grave argues that injecting aspects of concerto style into the string quartets provided Haydn with many sources of compositional inspiration. He concludes that “to concede the vital presence of concerto style in Haydn’s quartets is not to diminish their stature but to extend our range of perspectives from which to understand and explain them.”

Considering this stylistic overlap between genres, it is evident that analysis of Haydn’s concertos is not only a worthy undertaking, but provides a means to understanding his broader compositional technique.

The two concertos analyzed here (Haydn’s Horn Concerto, Hob. VIIId: 3; and Trumpet Concerto, Hob. VIIe: 1) have received limited scholarly attention. In the case of the Horn Concerto, some basic analyses have been produced, including a formal outline using the analytical methods provided by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory*. One such outline exists in Anna Marie Leverenz’s doctoral dissertation, “The Debated Authenticity of Franz Joseph Haydn’s Concertos for Horn,” which uses historical and musical analysis to compare the horn concerti misattributed to Joseph Haydn. The analysis of the Hob. VIIId: 3 Horn Concerto is very limited in this dissertation since it deals mostly with surface-level formal outlines and lacks a comprehensive examination of the structure of the piece. Since that dissertation deals with misattribution, and attribution of the Hob. VIIId: 3 is not in question,

---

4 “Surface-level” here refers to a lack of consideration for the harmonic structure and voice-leading involved in form. Attention is paid mostly to where the formal sections of the piece occur rather than how they occur. Anna M. Leverenz, *The Debated Authenticity of Franz Joseph Haydn’s Concertos for Horn*, DMA Diss., University of Cincinnati, 2010.
the lack of focus upon analysis is understandable. Though its analytical content is lacking for these purposes, the contents of Leverenz’s dissertation are particularly helpful in understanding issues of misattribution and historical context of Haydn’s Horn Concerto. Apart from Leverenz’s work and general formal analyses, there seems to be a particular lack of published analyses of the Horn Concerto. A Schenkerian approach in analysis of this music is even more difficult to find. Thus, this linear analysis to be present here will help to fill a gap in research and facilitate new insight into the only surviving horn concerto by Haydn.

Compared to the Horn Concerto, Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto has received significantly more attention from scholars. As Haydn’s last Concerto composed, it represents a unique moment in the history of Haydn’s compositions. Additionally, it is one of only two existing Classical-period concertos written for the trumpet. On account of its unique and anomalous status, it is one of the most frequently performed pieces for solo trumpet in both performance halls and universities. It was cited as a musical example in William Caplin’s *Classical Form*, to show what he deems a “subordinate-key ritornello” within Concerto form. The analysis presented in *Classical Form* can be contrasted with the results of other analytical approaches, most notably a Schenkerian analysis. A dissertation by Tracy M. Parish that deals specifically with analyzing the Trumpet Concerto - *A Performance Interpretation of the Concerto in E Flat Major by Joseph Haydn Based on Contemporaneous Writings and Period Performance Practice* - employs analytical methods described and implemented by Haydn’s contemporaries such as Joachim Quantz, Leopold Mozart, Johann Tromlitz, and Daniel Türk, and especially, the

---

approach of Heinrich Christoph Koch. Koch’s method deals with phrase structure and the metrical division of phrases within a piece. The results of such an analysis are significantly different from those of a Schenkerian-style linear analysis since Koch’s methods do not explore the harmonic structure and voice-leading of the piece.

Research on some other Haydn instrumental concerti that will prove useful to understanding the genre as a whole. An example of this exists in an article by Wolfram Steinbeck, where he presents formal and thematic outlines of a few keyboard and string concerti composed by Haydn. Though these are useful outlines, they do not include the Trumpet Concerto or the Horn Concerto, and are presented in a Caplin-influenced formal outline dealing mostly with thematic content.

Numerous books and articles look specifically at Haydn’s style, many of which compare Haydn with Mozart and Beethoven. One of these resources is Charles Rosen’s The Classical Style, where the author outlines many aspects of compositional style through examination of the works of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. It is worth noting that Haydn’s Concertos are not examined in this book. In an article entitled “The Sonata Principle Reformulated for Haydn Post-1770 and a Typology of his Recapitulatory Strategies,” published in the Journal of Royal Musical Association, Matthew Riley presents a method for notating the occurrence of thematic ideas in Haydn’s Sonata forms. While this type of thematic analysis does not specifically address any structural analysis, Riley’s discussion of Haydn’s peculiarities when it comes to sonata form and

---

6 Tracy M. Parish, A Performance Interpretation of the Concerto in E Flat Major by Joseph Haydn Based on Contemporaneous Writings and Period Performance Practice, DMA diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Proquest Dissertations Publishing, 2008. 3347496

recapitulations may prove useful in my analysis. Another useful text is the monumental
codification of the Sonata Principle by Hepokoski and Darcy, contained in *Elements of Sonata
Theory*. In this book, these scholars present an extremely thorough analysis of Mozart’s
Concerto form, and consider some of the ideas and language used by Schenkerians, sometimes
referencing prolongation, and certainly dealing with structure in their method of analysis.

The aforementioned analyses have all been from a non-Schenkerian perspective. Since
there are no published Schenkerian analyses of Haydn’s concertos, this dissertation will be a
welcome addition to scholarship. As a comparative analysis that examines two concerti on the
opposite end of Haydn’s compositional career, a Schenkerian analysis of these two pieces may
facilitate new insight into Haydn’s compositional style.

1.2 Analytical Methods

Schenkerian Analysis is an analytical method used for determining and clearly displaying
the structure of musical compositions. Graphic notation, including traditional durational note
values, is used to depict the foreground, middleground, and background structures of the
music. These graphs are considered by Schenker to be accurate representations of the musical
structures, not purely pedagogical tools.8 Because of the capabilities of Schenkerian analysis, it
will be the primary method of analysis for Haydn’s Horn and Trumpet Concertos. Determining
and then comparing the musical structures of these two pieces may afford insight into Haydn’s
compositional process.

---

One of the fundamental concepts of Schenkerian analysis is the horizontal hearing of musical structure. Oswald Jonas in *Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker* explains this as “hearing of the contrapuntal passing motions through all of the complexity of the foreground phenomena,” and also the “realization of a definite vertical concept in the horizontal plane.”

According to Schenker, “cohesion is the most important thing in music,” and to achieve musical cohesion, foreground musical content is connected to the fundamental structure which exists in the background. Understanding this fundamental structure can illuminate musical form. Jonas explains that Schenker’s theory “shows that form and content are inseparably connected, and that the living tonal organism cannot be seen as having ‘kernel’ and ‘outer shell.’” The musical content is often connected to the form through all levels of the musical structure and Schenkerian analysis assists in identifying and explaining these connections.

In his article “Forward to Haydn!: Schenker’s Politics and the German Revival of Haydn,” Bryan Proksch proposes that, while Schenker spent considerably more time on the music of composers such Beethoven and Mozart, Schenker’s contributions to Haydn scholarship were essential to the 20th century revival of Haydn’s reputation “as a key composer in music history.” One reason for this stemmed from Schenker’s association with Anthony van Hoboken who had begun acquiring Haydn works in 1919. Hoboken eventually released his famed catalogue in 1957, but long before this, he and Schenker seemed to have become friends. Schenker benefited from this friendship with direct access to manuscript scores of...

---

10 Ibid: 137.
11 Ibid: 141.
13 Ibid: 333.
Haydn and financial support from Hoboken. Schenker had been very familiar with some of Haydn’s string quartets and piano sonatas even before his relationship with Hoboken had developed, using examples from the sonatas in his ornamentation treatise and later in both Harmonielehre and Der freie Satz. Additionally, Schenker published a graph of the development section from Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E-flat Major (Hob. XVI, No. 49) in his Five Graphic Music Analyses. In the foreword to this publication, Schenker makes his opinion of Haydn known: “May it (the graph of Haydn’s sonata) reveal Haydn’s demonic spirit which has remained unknown up to the present day. Even though Haydn wrote no operas of importance, and is thus ranked lower than Mozart or Beethoven by the general public, he is indeed of the same greatness as these masters.” From this quote, one can see the great esteem in which Haydn was held by Schenker. Indeed, Schenker promoted the music of Haydn in a number of different ways throughout his career and respected the composer tremendously.

14 Ibid: 333.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

2.1 The Instrumental Concertos of Joseph Haydn

Haydn composed a substantial amount of music in instrumental genres during his lifetime. He is perhaps most famous for his contributions to the symphony and string quartet genres having composed over one hundred symphonies and over sixty string quartets. In the solo instrumental concerto genre, Haydn produced around twenty known solo instrument concertos, most of which have been lost. The lack of precision in this count is due to numerous spurious attributions, lost scores, and even cases of fraudulence. Regarding Haydn’s concertos for wind instruments, there is evidence that he composed a flute concerto and a bassoon concerto, but both have been lost. Additionally, there is some indication that another horn concerto and concerto for two horns were composed but lost. All of the aforementioned wind concertos were from Haydn’s earliest years as an employee of the Esterházy family. There are only two existing authenticated concertos for wind instruments by Haydn, the Horn Concerto in D Major (Hob. VIIId: 3) and Trumpet Concerto in E-flat (Hob. VIIe: 1). Though both the trumpet and horn’s musical uses differed tremendously, it is remarkable that these are the only two wind instrument concertos by Haydn to have survived, especially

since the horn and trumpet are so closely related. In addition to these wind instrument
concertos, Haydn also composed concertos for other instruments including keyboard (organ),
violin, violone, lira, cello, and baryton.

2.2 Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D and his Early Career with the Esterházy Court

One important aspect to recognize when comparing the Horn and Trumpet concertos is
their compositional chronology. The historical context, working conditions, and aspects of
musical style differed between these two compositions. A 34-year time-span separated the
Horn Concerto of 1762 and the Trumpet Concerto of 1796. To clarify the historical context of
Haydn’s Horn Concerto, one must understand the nature of his employment at the time. In
1761, at the age of 29, Haydn began a contract as Vice-Kapellmeister with the wealthy and
influential Esterházy family in Eisenstadt. This position required Haydn to perform a number
of duties including supervising the music archive, performing, offering instruction, and
composition. The Vice-Kapellmeister position was held by Haydn until 1766, when Gregor
Joseph Werner died and Haydn succeeded him in the position of Kapellmeister. Haydn’s
compositions were focused mostly on instrumental music during this time period and the
setting for performance was exclusively at the Esterházy court. About twenty five symphonies

21 Both the horn and trumpet (in natural or keyed forms) can be defined as lip-vibrating aerophones, were typically
made from brass, and were operated similarly.
22 James Webster and Georg Feder. “Haydn, Joseph,” Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online, Oxford University
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
were composed during the early 1760s and concertos for violin, cello, violone, flute, bassoon, and horns, most of which are lost.25

Haydn maintained a prominent position in the musical life of the Esterházy’s princely court and the position entailed particular idiosyncrasies that not only influenced, but dictated the manner in which Haydn composed. This role is clarified by Gerhard J. Winkler and Irene Zedlacher in their article *Joseph Haydn’s “Experimental Studio” in Esterháza*, “Haydn’s position in the prince’s household is comparable to that of a director of a department employed solely for the purpose of court entertainment (to speak of the Esterházy family as ‘patrons,’ as often is found in the literature, is no apt description of the situation). It was not a case of the composer Haydn introducing his newly created work to the audience. Rather, the princely master was having a work by his court conductor performed by his orchestra for his own diversion. Or he presented a work to an invited court society on a specific occasion.”26 The setting in which Haydn was composing was well contained. He was intimately familiar with the ensembles for which he was composing and, because of this closed environment, was able to experiment without the critical influence of the outside world.27 Such conditions contributed to the originality of Haydn’s compositions.

It was during his second year as Vice-Kapellmeister, 1762, that Haydn composed the Horn Concerto in D Major. An important quality of this piece is the conditions surrounding its composition, in particular, the likelihood that it was composed for a hornist outside of the

Esterházy court orchestra. In the past, researchers have debated which of the Esterházy hornists were likely to have been the intended performer of the concerto, especially since records relating to orchestra personnel exist. The hornists for whom Haydn was composing in the Esterházy orchestra in 1762 included Johann Knoblauch and Thaddäus Steinmüller. It would be reasonable to assume that one of these hornists was the intended performer for Haydn’s concerto as many scholars have done in the past. The general consensus, and what seems to be more likely, is that the hornist named Joseph Leitgeb (the same hornist for whom Mozart wrote his horn concertos) was the intended performer of Haydn’s Horn Concerto. Evidence presented for Leitgeb’s position includes the date of composition (1762) coinciding with Leitgeb’s concert series at Vienna’s Burgtheater. Musicologist Michael Lorenz provides further evidence for this by discovering Leitgeb’s signature in the autograph manuscript of the Horn Concerto and posits that Leitgeb probably sold the manuscript during difficult financial times. It may be that the score’s transfer of ownership from Haydn to Leitgeb and eventually to the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna is the reason this concerto, unlike most of the rest of Haydn’s during this time period, still survives to this day. Another marking on the score, this time by Haydn himself, proclaims “written while asleep,” suggesting the piece was composed after normal working hours or during his personal time. This means that Haydn’s Horn Concerto was likely composed for a performance outside of his typical situation at

30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 “im schlaf geschrieben”
Eisenstadt and instead for Joseph Leitgeb’s concert series at the Burgtheater. If this is true, its unique setting is not so far removed from that of Haydn’s much later Trumpet Concerto which was also composed for a soloist and premiered in Vienna’s Burgtheater some thirty eight years later.

2.3 Haydn’s Return to Vienna and his Concerto for Keyed Trumpet

Between 1762 and 1790, Haydn continued his employment with the Esterházy family. His title and position changed in 1766 to that of Kapellmeister, giving him full directorship over the musical establishment at the Esterházy’s. His new duties meant a change in focus when it came to composition, which included a new focus on church and vocal music, and a decrease in emphasis on instrumental works. Though he is not known for it, Haydn composed a number of operas for the court up until 1784. Instrumental genres for which Haydn still composed for included symphonies, string quartets, keyboard works, and music for baryton (the baryton works were composed at the request of his patron, Nicolaus Esterházy, who was a capable player of the instrument). In the concerto genre, Haydn only composed one surviving concerto for wind or string instruments, the Cello Concerto in D (Hob. VIIb: 2). A few harpsichord concertos were also written in the 1780s. One of the most important developments to occur during this time period was the expansion of music printing. In 1780, Haydn produced his first publication and would continue publishing his works internationally to

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
earn supplemental income. This distribution of music resulted in considerable fame and recognition for Haydn and demand for his music increased substantially. In the winters, Haydn would spend time in Vienna where much of his music was performed. He even met and maintained some kind of friendship with Mozart, though the extent of that relationship is debated.

In 1790, Haydn’s circumstances changed dramatically. A series of deaths in the Esterházy family eventually led to the dissolution of the musical establishment at Eisenstadt. With these deaths, the closure of musical life at Eisenstadt, and a new patron in Prince Anton Esterházy, Haydn was granted leave by the Prince when offered a contract to compose in London around 1791. In London, Haydn would produce the first six of his “London” Symphonies between 1791 and 1792, where they were received with approval. David P. Schroeder, in his book *Haydn and the Enlightenment* suggests that the London symphonies represent an evolving relationship between Haydn and his audience. Changes in the relationship between audience and composer are important for understanding these works, and also the Trumpet Concerto. Schroeder claims that the earliest of these “London” Symphonies (Symphonies 96, 95, and 93 were performed first) show Haydn’s “need to win audience approval,” and that these works “thoroughly established Haydn’s reputation,” so he could begin developing complexity in favor of “popular features.” After returning to Vienna in 1792 (where Beethoven briefly studied with Haydn the next year) and staying for about 18 months, as requested by Prince Anton,

38 Ibid.
Haydn returned to London with a collection of new compositions.\(^{40}\) Schroeder believes the next three symphonies presented by Haydn in 1794 were a collaboration of complex and popular features and were particularly well received.\(^{41}\) Referring to the final three symphonies, Schroeder claims that “Haydn no longer needed to win approval...The level of complexity here is exceedingly high, and with this complexity, he introduced his audience to the highest intellectual and moral level that could be envisaged as being possible in the symphonies.”\(^{42}\) This experience of symphonic writing, and perhaps the complexity developed in these last symphonies, would be influential for Haydn when he composed the Trumpet Concerto just a year after his 104\(^{th}\) Symphony.

Haydn returned to Vienna for good in 1795, reestablishing his place as Esterházy Kapellmeister, which was now more prominently centered in Vienna rather than Eisenstadt. He would remain in Vienna from 1795 until his death in 1809. With his success in international publishing and positive reception in London (including the title of Doctor from Oxford University), Haydn used his lofty status to his advantage. He received considerably more respect than he had earlier in his career and perhaps more importantly, much more freedom to compose and conduct with other important Austrian noble families.\(^{43}\) This recognition both at home and abroad contributed to Haydn’s eminence within the Vienna musical scene and opened up many new opportunities.


\(^{42}\) Ibid: 104.

In 1796, Haydn composed what would be his last concerto and his final purely orchestral work, the Trumpet Concerto (Concerto for Clarino) in E-flat Major.\textsuperscript{44} It was composed for Anton Weidinger, an Imperial Royal Court and Theatre trumpeter and inventor of a fully chromatic keyed trumpet.\textsuperscript{45} This instrument was the first of its kind, containing holes covered by keys which raised the pitch by semitones.\textsuperscript{46} While the earliest prototypes seem to have had five keys, some scholars believe seven keys existed in total.\textsuperscript{47} In regard to the sound quality produced by this new instrument, contemporaneous accounts claims it lacked the strength of a typical trumpet.\textsuperscript{48}

Though it was composed in 1796, the Trumpet Concerto was not publicly premiered until March 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1800. The premiere took place at the Burgtheater in Vienna at a benefit concert held by Anton Weidinger. Vienna, unlike London, did not have a vibrant concert scene open to the public. The Burgtheater was one of the largest venues. However, it was difficult to schedule a concert there since the opera reserved most of the allocated times. Indeed, it is likely to be the reason the premiere performance of the Trumpet Concerto did not occur until four years after the piece was originally composed because of difficulties securing the venue. H.C. Robbins Landon explains the process of booking the Burgtheater saying, “The artist hired one of the buildings available for the purpose, engaged an orchestra and possibly other soloists,\

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid: 226.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid: 227.
printed an announcement in the *Wiener Zeitung*, and hoped that the public would come.”

This “hope” for public attendance suggests how difficult it was to fill up the theater.

### 2.4 Comparing the Contexts of Haydn’s Two Brass Concertos

While the historical contexts surrounding the two concertos are considerably different, there are, however, a few noteworthy similarities worth identifying. Interestingly enough, some of the circumstances surrounding the premieres of both these works are strikingly alike. Both pieces were premiered at the Burgtheater in Vienna by soloists performing works composed specifically for them. Because of the strict working conditions imposed on Haydn early in his career, the Horn Concerto’s premiere was unique because of its separation from the composer’s Esterházy duties. The Trumpet Concerto was no less unique, but for different reasons, the foremost of which was that the keyed trumpet was a newly invented instrument. The exclusivity of these compositions and their premieres likely contributed to the survival of their manuscripts. Both pieces were never printed and the only surviving scores are the original autographs. In reference to these concertos, as well as the Cello Concerto in C (Hob. VIIb: 1) and Lira Concertos (Hob. VIIh: 1-5), Robbins Landon clarifies their exceptionality, “Haydn’s concertos have survived almost by accident, and often in one single source...They were all occasional works, and probably written for friends of Haydn’s.”

Weidinger, Leitgeb was indeed a friend of Haydn’s, but the event for which the Horn Concerto

49 Ibid: 228.
50 This is assuming that Joseph Leitgeb was, in fact, the intended performer.
was composed (Leitgeb’s solo concert series at the Burgtheater) shares in the “occasional” quality of both concertos.

One of the most noteworthy differences between the time Haydn’s Horn Concerto and Trumpet Concerto were composed was Haydn’s fame. In 1762 Haydn had not yet even taken the reigns as Kapellmeister at Eisenstadt; it was long before Haydn began circulating his printed works on the market, which did not happen until around 1780. Between the publication of his music and the remarkably successful compositions for and visits to London (1791-1795), Haydn’s reputation had grown tremendously by the time he composed the Trumpet Concerto, he had become an international superstar. Haydn’s Horn Concerto would have been one of many performed by Joseph Leitgeb during his Vienna concert series, while in the case of the Trumpet Concerto, Anton Weidinger used the reputation of Haydn to advertise for the premiere performance, which included additional symphonic works by Haydn.\textsuperscript{52} Haydn had developed a reputation as one of the greatest composers of his time and the Trumpet Concerto would be one of his last symphonic compositions.

In addition to changes in popularity, another important difference between the Haydn of 1762 and 1796 was experience in symphonic composition. Between 1761 and 1762, Haydn had only composed his first ten symphonies and perhaps a few other concertos. By 1796, Haydn had composed the rest of his symphonies, 104 in total, including his successful final twelve “London” symphonies in the five years prior to the Trumpet Concerto’s date of composition.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid: 227-228.
An important distinction that must be identified between these two concertos is the solo instrument involved in each. At the time Haydn composed his Horn Concerto, the horn was typically used in its most natural state, playing notes within the harmonic series. In the case of Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D Major, this would have been performed on a horn pitched in D, with a harmonic series as shown in Example 2.4.1.

Example 2.4.1: Naturally produced pitches of the harmonic series available to a horn in D.

An entire diatonic scale in the key of D-major can be performed naturally in such a case. Alterations to these notes could be made in a number of ways, though the most substantial technique of doing so, by using the hand to “stop” notes, was not well developed as of 1792. 53 Nevertheless, within the Concerto for Horn, Haydn composes multiple passages requiring chromatic alterations from the performer. In Haydn Chronicle and Works, Robbins Landon spends a considerable amount of his entry on the Concerto for Horn discussing these passages,

noting that the “exploitation of the pedal range certainly suggest that even at this very early, pre-hand-horn stage of the instrument’s development, some kind of stopping was possible by virtuoso artists such as Leutgeb.” The musical bars referred to by Robbins Landon are measures 36 through 40 of the second movement. The sounding pitches in the horn part are shown in Example 2.4.2.

Example 2.4.2: The sounding pitches produced by the solo horn in measures 36-40 from the second movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D.

If Example 2.4.2 is compared with the harmonic series shown in Example 2.4.1, one can see just how many pitches were to be altered by the performer of this piece. With the prominence of horn stopping that occurred in the subsequent years, especially by performers such as Joseph Leitgeb (as seen in works such as Mozart’s Horn Concertos, composed years later for Leitgeb), these precursory alterations are entirely understandable and are perhaps further evidence of Leitgeb’s involvement. In measures 85 and 86 of the first movement, there exists a more typical use of altered notes presented as upper neighbor embellishments to a descending D-major arpeggio. Seen in Example 2.4.3, this ornamental figure shows just how sparsely Haydn used

54 Ibid: 515.
altered notes in this composition (the most substantial alteration existing in the second movement shown in Example 2.4.2).

Example 2.4.3: The sounding pitches produced by the solo horn in measures 85 and 86 from the first movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D. The B and G produced in measure 85 are altered pitches not found naturally in the horn’s harmonic series.

This gestural use of unnatural notes avoids bringing attention to the technique, rather, it serves the purpose of ornamentation. To some extent, Haydn was constrained by the horn or horn player’s capabilities at the time of composition.

Thirty four years later, with Anton Weidinger’s invention of the keyed trumpet, Haydn would have much more melodic freedom. The keyed trumpet Haydn composed for had a fundamental pitch of E-flat. Based on the contents of the Concerto for Trumpet and current understanding of Weidinger’s invention, it is evident that the instrument was capable of playing chromatically from, at the very least, third partial E-flat up to the D-flat nearly two octaves above. This range of use is shown in Example 2.4.4.
Example 2.4.4: The sounding pitches (or their enharmonic equivalent) Haydn composed within the Trumpet Concerto’s solo trumpet part, excepting the C, D-flat, and D-natural shown.

Pitches not used in the solo part of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto

Not only was the keyed trumpet capable of producing these pitches, but Haydn actually used all but three notes of this series within the trumpet part of this concerto. This increased vocabulary of available notes is remarkable in a comparison with the diatonically confined solo part from the Horn Concerto. It is unclear why Haydn did not include these three notes; it may have been a purely musical decision or a decision or based on the low quality of intonation or tone in that register. In Johann Nepomuk Hummel’s Trumpet Concerto (1803), the only other existing concerto written for Weidinger’s keyed trumpet, one can observe all of these missing notes (transposed up one half step, as it was written for trumpet in E-natural rather than E-flat). This means a different keyed trumpet with an E-natural fundamental may have been used for the Hummel Concerto. The keyed trumpet functioned by raising the pitch a semitone each
time a key was pressed down. If this was the case, it seems most likely that Haydn simply chose not to use those pitches. With these facts in mind, one can see how Haydn benefited from considerably more compositional freedom when it came to writing for the keyed trumpet compared to the horn.

One important aspect of a composition is the instrumentation, and how the composer employs it. Haydn’s orchestra for the Horn Concerto in D consists of 2 oboes, solo horn, violin 1, violin 2, viola, harpsichord, cello, and bass. Generally, when the horn soloist is silent, the melody is maintained firmly by the first violins or oboes. It is also important to note that once the horn solo enters, the first violins continue to play with the horn soloist in unison for most of the concerto. The horn part only breaks from the first violins on occasion for brief flourishes showcasing the soloist’s virtuosity as in measures 51 and 52 of the second movement.

Example 3.1.1: Measures 51-53 from the second movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D. The solo horn (in D) elaborates and embellishes the melody before reuniting in unison with the first violins.

Virtuosic figures like this one are injected into the music periodically, giving a small chance for the solo horn to break away from its unison with the first violins. Additionally, each
movement includes a structural fermata near the end of the movement allowing the soloist to perform a cadenza.

The style of composition, when it comes to instrumental roles, is what one might expect from an early Classical piece. The harpsichord, cello, and bass parts are fairly typical of a continuo group with their role as bass voice throughout the concerto. The viola part alternates between an independent inner voice and doubling the bass. The second violins are consistently an inner voice. The wind instruments, in this case represented by two oboes, are employed only in the orchestral tutti sections and is omitted entirely from the second movement. In fact, the oboes and solo horn never play simultaneously. This orchestration never obscures the melody by overpowering the horn soloist. Overall Haydn’s orchestration of this piece is fairly conventional and lacks any especially remarkable features.

One of the most interesting aspects of this concerto is its form. Concerto form in the Classical style is usually distinguished from sonata form in several ways. The most fundamental differences between standard sonata paradigms and the concerto versions of sonata form are due to the concerto’s inherent feature: the dichotomy of the orchestra and the soloist. In the early eighteenth century, instrumental concertos were usually composed in ritornello form. Ritornello form is explained by William Caplin as “passages performed by the full orchestra, each termed a ‘ritornello’ (little return), alternate with passages played by the solo instrument.” This form provides an efficient way of dealing with the dichotomy between orchestra and soloist by alternating orchestra sections with soloist sections. Ritornello form

---

underwent a transformation later in the century by incorporating elements of classical forms such as sonata form.\footnote{Ibid: 243.} Caplin, in \textit{Classical Form}, makes the argument that concerto form must be considered an independent form that is “a variant of neither the baroque ritornello form nor the classical sonata form but one that incorporates form-functional elements associated with both.”\footnote{Ibid: 243.} Caplin presents an outline of the six sections of concerto form as follows:

(1) an opening ritornello for orchestra alone, (2) a solo section (with orchestral accompaniment) that functions like a sonata exposition by modulating from the home to the subordinate key, (3) a subordinate-key ritornello for orchestra that reinforces the modulation, (4) a solo section functioning as a sonata development, (5) a solo section functioning as a sonata recapitulation, and (6) a closing ritornello for orchestra (usually interrupted by a solo cadenza) that completes the structural frame.\footnote{Ibid: 243.}

Caplin’s use of the term “ritornello” in reference to concerto form is inadequate, at least with regard to Haydn’s concertos, because the term ritornello implies that the material functions as a returning and reoccurring formal section. Though material within the opening “ritornello” sections does return and recur through Haydn’s Horn Concerto, the section as a whole is not fully repeated. Segments of this section return at different times. In Haydn’s Horn Concerto, the section Caplin would describe as the “opening ritornello for orchestra,” functions more as an exposition than a ritornello, with the important qualification that it is for the orchestra \textit{alone}. Thus, in this particular case, “orchestral exposition” more accurately describes the formal function of this section of material. Indeed, the function of this section is to exposit musical materials integral to the piece as a whole, with the important caveat that it is presented solely by the orchestra prior to the entrance of the soloist. This is not to say that
Haydn’s concerto form subscribes perfectly to sonata form. More importantly, Haydn’s manipulation of concerto form may be more clearly understood when a rigid formal scheme is not imposed upon the musical structures. Hepokoski and Darcy, in *Elements of Sonata Theory*, write of Mozart’s paradoxical freedom within the supposedly rigid concerto form:

Surveying Mozart’s concertos, one gets the impression that he has individualized as much as can be individualized...Mozart exploited the potential for ingenuity in every standardized zone, turning a genre weighted down with near-obligatory conventions into a continuous source of astonishment. As a result, each work is a world unto itself, with multiple internal interactions and conceptual threads binding together each whole as a unique utterance.60

Taking account of the internal interaction of musical materials facilitates understanding Haydn’s concerto form as resulting from a process of interactions unique to each piece. Formal concepts from the older ritornello form, while identifiable, are undermined by the more goal-oriented and structurally significant language of sonata forms. Hepokoski and Darcy identify the difficulties in concerto form (or as they refer to it as Type 5 Sonata Form):

Making use of traditions grounded in the history of the genre, this sonata type is not to be derived exclusively from sonata practice (as a variant of it)... On the contrary, the historically separate ritornello formats of earlier concertos, especially around the middle of the eighteenth century, were instead increasingly informed by formal layouts characteristic of the new symphony writing of the period... All who have dealt with the formal structures of concertos in the period 1730-1820 are aware of the complexities—and the perils—involved in writing even the most basic things about this topic. If sonatas in general present us with challenges of understanding...the concerto-sonata combinations...redouble those challenges, seeding the field of analysis with conceptual and terminological landmines.61

Analysis of the structure of the first movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto will help to clarify the form.

3.1 First Movement

Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D-Major begins with an orchestral exposition. This music is performed by the orchestra without the participation of the solo horn and lasts through measure 30. Tonally, the music of this section is stable, introducing the listener to the main ideas of the movement and the tonic key of D-major. Supporting this notion, D is prolonged in the bass through the entire orchestral exposition. The primary theme of the first movement is stated by the oboes and first violins, marked by an ascending arpeggio of the tonic chord, followed by a descent from scale degree 5 to 1 as a succinct four-measure phrase. This theme is stated numerous times throughout. Notice that the 5 (A) reached at the top of the ascending arpeggio in measure 2 is the first instance of the movement’s head tone (or primary tone). This primary theme is shared equally by both the orchestra and soloist throughout the movement. Example 3.1.1 shows the primary theme of the movement as it first appears.
Example 3.1.1: The primary theme as it appears in the first four measures from the first movement of Haydn Horn Concerto.

After the primary theme’s most succinct form is completed, the two-measure D-major arpeggio to the head tone is restated and the descent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ is elaborated. A half-cadence is reached in measure 15, where the descending upper voice moves past 1 and instead drops to C-sharp, supported by an A in the bass voice. We may understand this V as “back-relating” to the initial tonic, supporting as small-scale interruption. In measure 16, the C-sharp is then shifted into the bass to function as the leading tond to D in a first inversion dominant seventh and the A is regained in the top voice. The music of measures 16 to 26 seems to function as an orchestral secondary theme, continuing the prolongation of the tonic and followed by a closing statement in measures 26 through 30. To summarize: the entirety of the orchestral exposition prolongs the tonic and its formal design can be understood as primary theme (mm. 1-15), orchestral secondary theme (mm. 16-26), and closing statement (mm. 26-30). The orchestral exposition closes with a clear descent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ supported by an authentic cadence on D. The
strength of this cadence clearly marks the end of this formal section and supports its function as the presentation of some of the movement’s main musical materials. For that reason, labeling this section an “orchestral exposition” is a fitting descriptive.

The solo horn is finally introduced in measure 31, beginning the solo exposition. Much like an exposition in “normative” sonata form, there is a primary group in the tonic key (mm. 31-51) and a definitive move to a second group in the dominant key. With that said, some of this exposition’s qualities are non-standard when it comes to sonata theory paradigms and an examination of the exposition and development help to clarify some of those differences. The head tone \( \hat{5} \), which is prolonged over the tonic throughout the primary group finally begins a real descent from \( \hat{5} \) to \( \hat{2} \) in measures 47-50. As shown in Example 3.1.2, beginning on the first beat of measure 47, \( \hat{5} \) moves down to \( \hat{4} \) on the first beat of 49 and \( \hat{3} \) on the last beat of 49, to \( \hat{2} \) in measure 50. This descent coincides with a movement to the dominant in the bass in measure 50. This dominant prolongation supports the second group (or subordinate theme) beginning in measure 51. The move from the tonic-prolonged first group to the dominant prolongation of the second group is sketched in Example 3.1.2.
Example 3.1.2: Graph of measures 46-51 of the first movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D.

In the second group, the top voice E in the key of A-major is prolonged and serves the dual role of a background 5 in D-major and 5 in A-major. Between measures 51 and 60, the horn solo with orchestral accompaniment plays only ten measures of new material, including a climactic E in the upper register (mm. 58) descending from 5 down by step to 1, all within the dominant key. The subsequent sections of music are perhaps the most interesting, at least formally, of the movement. It is at this point, in measures 60-63, that the horn soloist rests and the orchestra restates the primary theme, but this time in the dominant key of A-major. This restatement maintains the prolongation of A in the bass and E in the upper voice. After the primary theme recurs, the orchestra continues on with new musical material. It is this section, where the orchestra presents musical material within the secondary or subordinate key (in the dominant, in this case) that Caplin would call the “subordinate ritornello”. Hepokoski and Darcy, in *Elements of Sonata Theory*, also consider statements like this as a second ritornello.
More importantly, they speak to the structural purpose and significance of the second ritornello noting that “beyond marking an arrival-point in the form and moving us onward to the next phase...R2 provides the unmistakable impression of the ardently supportive orchestral celebration of the final V:PAC simultaneously achieved by the soloist.” Other than providing the soloist a break prior to the development (a break that is undoubtedly appreciated especially by brass players), the music further emphasizes the A-major key. It allows the orchestra an opportunity to play music in the secondary key and continues the dichotomy between orchestra and soloist. It is after this point that one would expect a transition to the development. What occurs instead is yet another statement of the opening motive in A-major (mm. 78); but this time, after the descent from E to A, the A descends down by step to the tonic – or so it might seem.

It is true that the primary theme seems to reappear in the tonic key of D-major, stated by the solo horn (mm.82). From a formal perspective, this putative return to the tonic acts as a short closing group to the exposition, for the development begins in measure 87. But what is most important about this closing group is its structural significance. The return to D, which appears to be a tonic return, is in fact a false (or apparent) tonic which is actually the upper-third of B, one of the main key areas of the development. The entire closing group and development are supported in the background by a prolongation of the dominant, A; the D material is caught within this prolongation. The tonal structure is better understood by considering the background voice-leading of the development. Example 3.1.3 is a graph of measures 81-100 showing the development’s voice-leading as it moves to B minor.

63 Ibid: 548.
In measure 81, the bass voice reaches A, marking a clear dominant arrival. The subsequent resolution to the apparent tonic in measure 82 is not the main connection; rather, as shown in the graph, the A in measure 81 ascends through A sharp to B in measure 97.

Haydn’s implementation of an arrival of the primary theme and apparent tonic serves dual purposes: the repetition of the first theme closes the exposition from a design perspective while, from a structural point of view the putative tonic, transformed into the upper third of B-minor, prepares the modulation to B-minor in the development that follows. The development begins in measure 87 with a local-level three-note descent D-C-B in the upper voice. Another possibility is that the four measures between measures 87 and 91 serve as an elision of the closing group with the development, evidenced by a foreshadowing of the development’s move from D to B. Regardless, the development most certainly begins by measure 91, where multiple
sequences are initiated. Beginning in measure 91, the bass moves chromatically upward from D up to F-sharp in measure 95. This completes a third progression from D to F-sharp, i.e., the upper third and upper fifth of B. Subsequently, the bass reaches B through A-sharp. This A-sharp is extremely important, for it is upon A-sharp functioning as a leading tone to B that the background voice-leading depends. Essentially, my reading suggests that the dominant A reached in measure 81 is prolonged until measure 96, where it ascends through A-sharp to the B in measure 97. In the top voice, F-sharp is prolonged beginning in measure 91 first as 3 of D-major and in measure 97 as 5 in B-minor. The B in measure 97 moves up through C-sharp in measure 104 to D in 105. In measure 107 the dominant is reached, with an A in the bass, while F-sharp in the top voice moves to E (♯2).

In measures 108-117, Haydn exploits the multiple roles of chords potential in tonal harmony to compose out the fundamental structure of the development. In particular, the “return” to D-major in the music beginning in measure 109 is again not the “real” tonic return. Hepokoski and Darcy suggest that, based on Koch’s observations, this return to music first heard in the orchestral exposition (or ritornello 1 in their terms) is a vestigial remnant of a third ritornello section. In essence, they view appearances of this type to be retransitional in nature. But, structurally, this D-major music functions not as a real tonic but rather as a predominant, or more specifically, the subdominant of the dominant in A-major. The heart of the matter is this: The music at measure 108 is not only a return to D-major, but this D-major coincides with some of the same music from measure 16 and on from the orchestral exposition. Thus, a listener experiences, at the very least, a feeling of return, even if that return is subtle. It

64 Ibid: 574.
is not until measure 115 that the actual, true function of this D-major material is revealed, for
D-major finally moves to an E-major dominant seventh chord, the dominant of the dominant.
At this point, the listener then realizes that the dominant key has not been relinquished – not
yet. This E-major dominant seventh resolves to the dominant in measure 117, which ushers in
the real tonic return supporting the primary theme and the beginning of the formal
recapitulation in measure 118. Thus, the D-major music is retrospectively identified as being in
the subdominant of an ongoing dominant prolongation. The top voice supports this
interpretation by emphatically descending from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ in measures 117. Scale degree 1 of the
dominant (A) then changes functions to $\hat{5}$ of the tonic key in measure 117, where it descends
down to $\hat{1}$. At the background level, the E of the top voice in measure 117 picks up the E from
measure 107. All of these factors support reading a background dominant prolongation through
the development until measure 117, as shown in Example 3.1.4.

Example 3.1.4: Background graph of measures 81-118 of the first movement of Haydn’s
Horn Concerto.
The recapitulation is much less remarkable than the music prior to it, rarely straying from the original iterations of its material. The primary group lasts from 118-139 and the soloist’s second group, stated in the tonic key this time, lasts from measures 140-150. An iteration of the orchestra’s second group starts in 150, but quickly gives way to a cadenza in measure 154. As was standard in the concerto genre, the cadenza allows for the soloist to have an opportunity to perform without any orchestra accompaniment. Structurally, the first half of a cadential cadence with a 3 in the tonic is reached by the orchestra, the soloist plays, and the orchestra joins in with the dominant in the bass and 2 in the top voice. After the cadenza, the orchestra makes a final statement of its own before the movement completes. In Caplin’s view of concerto form, he refers to this entire final group of materials as a “closing ritornello,” which is interrupted by the cadenza. Caplin makes sure to clarify that the materials following the cadenza should not be viewed as a coda, because the section “brings back material in much the same way that it appeared earlier in the work, whereas a coda almost always sets earlier ideas

---

in a fresh formal context.”66 Indeed, the music between measures 150 and the end are heard in
the orchestral exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy concur, for the most part, that the material
closing the concerto is the final ritornello and its purpose is to “pick up any remaining loose
ends of the composition—to restore any R1 (orchestral exposition) modules that had not been
heard since the opening ritornello.”67 Additionally, they suggest that this ritornello (R4)
section’s main purpose is to set up and respond to the cadenza, which is the “central
presentational event” of the material.68 Essentially, the closing material completes the
exchange between orchestra and soloist, which alternates back and forth through the entire
movement.

3.2 Second Movement

In the second movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto, the music differs in style and
character from that of the first movement. For example, an interesting feature of this
movement is the walking bass, a technique common in the Baroque. The walking bass is
maintained throughout most of the movement, propelling the music forward and providing a
rhythmic basis from which Haydn creates upbeat syncopations in the melody. While the tempo
and style are different in this movement, the form of this Adagio is similar to the first
movement in a few important ways, with one notable exception: the lack of development. The

68 Ibid: 600.
same formal exchange of music assigned to the orchestra and soloist occurs, within the confines of a tonic group of material and a dominant group. The resulting concerto form still contains a double exposition for the orchestra and soloist. Additionally, a subordinate ritornello or orchestral second group, exists after the soloist’s dominant-prolonged second group materials. Without a development section between the orchestral second group and the recapitulation, the orchestral second group acts in its place as a dividing formal section between solo exposition and solo recapitulation. In Caplin’s entry on sonata forms without development, regarding the use of the term recapitulation, he suggests “the use of this label in connection with a sonata without development is problematic. If a development is eliminated, then the section following the exposition will seem to function more as a repetition than a return.”

This might be the case of sonata forms that lack a development outside of the concerto genre, but with this “no-development” concerto form, the existence of an orchestral second group seems to function to separate the exposition from the recapitulation.

For the second movement, Haydn chose the concerto’s dominant key of A-major. In the opening section of music, the orchestra presents the primary theme. Like the first movement, the theme begins with an embellished ascending tonic arpeggio to $\hat{5}$ (the head tone of the movement) followed by a descent to $\hat{1}$. As shown in Example 3.2.1, the arpeggio is decorated by neighbor notes, beginning with A, G-sharp, A, followed by a D that reaches over C-sharp ($\hat{3}$) before resolving down to it. The head tone E is reached in measure 4 where it quickly moves

---

upward to 4 in measure 6. A graph of the opening measures and primary theme of the movement is shown in Example 3.2.1.

Example 3.2.1: Graph of measures 1-8 of the second movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto.

In the orchestral exposition, Haydn employs complex voice-leading procedures. After the tonic iteration of the primary theme, a local emphasis on the subdominant key of D-major is heard. This shift occurs in measure 8 where the tonic A-major chord transforms into a dominant seventh A-major chord, the dominant of IV, and moves to D-major in measure 9. This local movement to IV is supported by the leading tone C-sharp in the bass in measure 8 rather than the root position A-major one would expect if the music were to proceed in the tonic key. The function of this IV as a predominant revealed in measures 12 and 13, where a move to the dominant occurs. Coinciding with this securing of the dominant is the top voice arrival on 2 in measure 12. This moment marks the beginning of a complicated dominant prolongation which
lasts until the tonic arrival in measure 25. One of the reasons this prolongation is complicated is due to the usage of another apparent tonic. This can be seen in the alternating E-major and A-major chords of measures 13-16, where A-major functions as IV/V rather than as tonic. A series of similar IV-V motions occur in the following measures and an apparent tonic is heard in measure 23 where A functions as the upper-fifth scale degree of IV. The subdominant in measure 24 is heard as a neighbor note to the dominant prolongation which is regained in the latter half of the measure and finally resolves to the tonic A in measure 25. A sketch of this complex dominant prolongation is shown in Example 3.2.2.

Example 3.2.2: Graph of measures 1-25 of the orchestral exposition from the second movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto.

Thus, the voice-leading of the orchestral exposition proceeds by moving from the tonic iteration of the primary theme to a complex dominant prolongation through the subdominant rather than prolonging the tonic through the entirety of the formal section as Caplin’s model
prescribes. Here we see another case of the difficulties and complications one must confront in concerto form as, specifically due to Haydn’s use of complex structural procedures that already break away from the ritornello-related models.

The solo exposition begins in measure 28 and the primary theme is presented as it was in the previous section, but this time stated by the horn. The second phrase of the theme (which was not presented in the orchestral exposition) is placed in the lowest range of the horn, undoubtedly to showcase the soloist’s talents in that register before a transition to the dominant and second group occurs. Measure 46 marks the beginning of the second group, which features an off-beat outlining of alternating tonic and dominant chords. This technique of outlining the dominant and tonic chords in alternations is reminiscent of the orchestral-only theme from the first movement (mm.16 of the first movement). The second group features a prolongation of B in the top voice, 2 in the tonic key or 7 of the dominant key. The horn and first violins, as the top voice, ascend by step beginning in measure 50 up to the B in measure 52. The horn continues climbing past 7 to a climactic E in the horn’s high register before falling back down by step to 4, 3, 2, and 1 which is reached in measure 54. This cadence elides with the beginning of the orchestral second group, which, similarly to the orchestral exposition material and its complicated dominant prolongation, employs a prolongation of the dominant of the key (E-major, rather than the A-major of the orchestral exposition) with “apparent” tonic soundings of E-major. In other words, the complicated procedure in the voice-leading of the orchestral exposition is implemented within the secondary key. In this case, the dominant B prolongation begins in measure 57 where B in the bass coincides with F-sharp in the top voice (♯2) and returns to E in measure 66. The apparent E-major chord occurs in measure 60-62 and, just as in the
orchestral exposition, functions as the dominant of IV. As an added complexity, the expected IV is reconfigured as a pre-cadential II6, which is arrived at in measure 62. A short transition follows, where the upper-voice E arrived at in measure 65 becomes $\hat{5}$ of the tonic key and descends to A. This marks the arrival of the recapitulation.

The recapitulation proceeds as one would expect, with an iteration of the primary theme and secondary theme all within a prolongation of the tonic. As in typical concerto form, the secondary theme in the orchestra is interrupted by a fermata and solo cadenza. The measures prior to the cadenza are interesting, for Haydn uses the same off-beat descending stepwise motion in the top voice previously found in the orchestral exposition, but here extends the line. This extension brings the music to an augmented sixth chord in measure 100, which resolves to the dominant in the next measure. The half-diminished leading tone chord of the dominant follows and leads to the fermata and cadenza in measure 104. The movement closes with orchestral exposition’s closing material.

Overall, the second movement provides a clear example of concerto form without development. The underlying harmonic structure resembles that of a major-key concerto form by prolonging the tonic through the orchestral exposition and the primary group of the solo exposition, and then moving to the dominant in the second group. This dominant prolongation is continued through the orchestral second group, which functions as a digression and formal divider between the exposition and recapitulation. The dichotomy between orchestral music and solo music is maintained through alternating sections and through the double-exposition format. Haydn takes advantage of techniques which extend the formal sections through repetition, achieved by presenting $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ stepwise descents which are not supported by
authentic cadences. In other cases, he allows the $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ descent to go “too far” by continuing past $\hat{1}$ to the seventh scale degree of a secondary dominant chord. All of this provides the soloist an opportunity to showcase their lyrical playing in a well-constructed and straightforward format.

3.3 Third Movement

The third and final movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto returns back to the piece’s tonic key of D-major. A tempo marking of Allegro meets the expectation of the classical concerto’s normative fast-slow-fast movement layout model. A noteworthy feature of this movement, one found in many concerto third movements, is the virtuosic writing for the soloist. Extended passages containing sixteenth-note flourishes are found in numerous moments throughout the movement. Like the first movement, the instrumentation includes the two oboes omitted from the second movement; additionally, they are only used during orchestral sections when the horn solo is resting. This movement’s orchestral exposition provides a clear example of the purpose of this formal section; namely, to state the various musical materials from which the rest of the movement is derived. Each thematic statement is presented concisely and moves immediately to the next thematic statement. Formally, this finale movement is also in concerto form, and like the first movement, contains a proper development. The form does not really stray from the model Caplin suggests and its
predictability in that regard is rather striking. As will be shown, Haydn also implements some compositional techniques, both in the foreground and background, which are similar to the first movement, including the multi-functional apparent tonic.

The movement begins with its primary theme, a stepwise ascent from $\hat{1}$ up to the head tone $\hat{5}$. In the opening statement of the bass voice, which prolongs D, resembles a counter melody, introducing an off-beat sixteenth-note rhythmic motive before it occurs in the top voice. It further “counters” the melody by beginning on the second beat of the first measure rather than the first beat and moves in contrary motion to the ascending top voice. Interestingly enough, this brief motive only persists through the first three measures before the bass returns to its more common role as continuo. The counter-melodic nature of this opening motive is no coincidence as will be seen when it reappears as melody later in the movement. In measure 7, a descending sixteenth-note arpeggio motive is introduced and is supported by an alternating tonic and dominant motion in the bass. This alternation is similar to occurrences in each prior movement, namely the material beginning in measure 13 of the second movement and the material beginning in measure 16 of the first movement. These materials appear in the same formal section in all three movements: directly after the first statement of the primary theme in the orchestral exposition. This provides fairly clear evidence that Haydn, at the very least, considered it an adequate formal process within his understanding of concerto form at the time of composition. A brief prolongation of the dominant begins in measure 16, with the A in the bass embellished by a lower neighbor note G in measure 21, and an arrival back on the tonic in measure 25.
The solo exposition begins in measure 34 and continues until the development begins in measure 102. The statement of the primary group, with some added virtuosic embellishments by the horn, prolongs $5$ over the bass’s tonic D until a transition (mm. 48) and descent from $5$ to $2$ occurs. The $2$ (E) becomes $5$ of the dominant at the beginning of the second group in measure 58. This E is prolonged in the top voice through the solo second group over the dominant prolongation in the bass and descends to $4$, moving to the solo horn for a trill on $2$ in measure 73, and resolving down to A ($1$) in measure 74. It is at this point that the orchestral second group, or subordinate ritornello begins. The foreground material is particularly interesting through this section, for the bass motive from the very beginning measure of the movement is shifted to the first violins while the original motive of the primary theme is shifted to the rest of the strings. These two motives are shifted around the orchestral instruments in fragments. The arpeggio motive from the secondary theme of the orchestral exposition (materials beginning in mm. 6) appears in measure 82 and marks the beginning of a transition to a brief closing group. These can be seen in the score excerpt in Example 3.3.1.
Example 3.3.1: Measures 74-84 of the third movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto.

The closing group consists of the original bass motive from the primary group stated in the horn. This material is all presented within a background prolongation of the dominant which began at the start of the second group (mm. 58).

The development, which begins in measure 102, exhibits some similar traits to the first movement, especially through its use of D-major for multiple middleground structural purposes. The first of these D-major “returns” occurs right at the beginning of the development in measure 102, where the first segment of the primary theme is stated but extends past its original form through contrary stepwise motion in both the top voice (horn and violin) and bass voice. Like the first movement’s development, this development section prolongs A (the dominant) in the bass. The middleground modulation is substantially different, where instead of moving to the submediant B-minor as upper neighbor to the dominant a move to A-minor as
minor dominant occurs. The first cadence in A-minor takes place in measures 108, where an E-major dominant chord is reached, and resolves to the A-minor tonic in measure 109. Locally, the bass motion reaches the E-major dominant chord by a large stepwise descent from the D-major of measure 102. A fundamental element of the development’s structure is realized by the bass in measures 109-120, where a prolongation of A-minor through an unfolding of the triad occurs. This arpeggiation to the local A minor tonic can be heard as the bass moves from A in 109 to C in 111 and to E in 115. The C-natural is finally “corrected” when the C-sharp returns in measure 122, reintroducing the major dominant. At a local level this C-sharp acts as the leading tone to a D-major return. This passage, in the context of the rest of the development, can be seen in Example 3.3.2 which shows a graph of measures 96-142 of the third movement.

Example 3.3.2: Graph of measures 96-142 from the third movement of Haydn’s Horn Concerto.

The D-major arrival in measure 124 and its restatement of orchestral expositional music is much like the material beginning in measure 108 of the first movement. In both cases, this
“false tonic” supports a return of expositional material. In the third movement, this “false-tonic” – really this D is the subdominant of the dominant A – moves to E as the dominant of A in measure 131. Measure 132 marks the re-emergence of A in the bass as the dominant of the home key of D major, which supports the top voice 2 and reaffirms the dominant prolongation. The pedal on A in the bass marks the measures from 133 through 141 as a retransition and the beginning of the recapitulation in 142 confirms this interpretation.

In the recapitulation, Haydn chose to forgo the second group return. As is typical of standard sonata form types, in the reprise there is a return to A as the head tone 5 and tonic prolongation is reestablished until the final measures of the piece. The standard model would be to bring back the same or similar thematic material in the second group, but the material would be placed within the tonic key. In this movement, however, Haydn chose to expand the primary theme material rather than return to the secondary theme material. It can be seen as a replacement due to its formal setting directly after transitional measures. This transition takes place in measures 158-161. Haydn changed this transition in the recapitulation by composing a foreground dominant harmony which cadences back to the tonic in measure 160. Thus, Haydn transformed the transition from primary to second group of the exposition into an expansion of the primary theme.

Like the first two movements, the final movement assigns a cadenza for the horn soloist in order to close the soloist’s formal recapitulation. This cadenza occurs in measures 179-181 and is rounded out by the orchestra’s closing materials. The movement ends just like the orchestral exposition, with measures 181-end nearly identical to measures 25-33.
3.4 Conclusions

The form of the entire concerto as a whole encompasses fast outer movements in full concerto-sonata form and a slow inner movement in concerto-sonata form without development. Because of this “adherence” to the same general formal pattern in all three movements, Haydn’s Horn Concerto in D proves to be an eloquent example of concerto form at the time of its composition. Form within the Horn Concerto is further clarified by the underlying structure of the piece. In this concerto the tonic is prolonged through the entire orchestral exposition and is continued through the primary theme of the solo exposition. A transition follows the primary group of the solo exposition and moves to $\hat{2}$ and a prolongation of the dominant formally identified as the second group. The solo second group is followed by a orchestral section still within the secondary key. In the first movement, a false tonic arrival and restatement of the primary theme acts as a closing group to the solo exposition and gives way to the development. This differs from the third movement, where Haydn chose closing material within the dominant key. Both movements, regardless of their presentation of the closing group and middleground prolongations, continue a background dominant prolongation from the second groups through the entirety of the development. Developmental middleground includes predominant prolongations and an apparent tonic arrival which functions as a predominant of the dominant prolongation. The dominant prolongation finally moves back to the tonic at the beginning of the recapitulation, where the tonic is prolonged until the movement’s end.

The second movement showcases the functional change of concerto form without development where the orchestral second group “replaces” the dividing function of the
development. Much like the outer movements, the structure of the second movement maintains a tonic prolongation through the orchestral exposition and the primary theme of the solo exposition. The solo exposition transitions to the dominant key which is prolonged for a solo and orchestral second group. This iterance of concerto form omits the pre-dominant middleground prolongation found within the developmental sections of the first and third movements in favor of a more straightforward dominant prolongation.

Overall, the formal techniques of concerto form and its sonata qualities allow for a setting unique to the genre. This setting showcases the soloist and creates a formal dichotomy between soloist and orchestra, where some musical materials are shared between the two and others are distinctly separated. The sonata functions of the form and structure are readily identifiable and are blended with the vestiges of older formal techniques such as the Baroque ritornello. Haydn was able to compose his Horn Concerto using these formal techniques and incorporated many instances of wit and sophistication into the structure, providing us with an interesting work that will continue to be performed for years to come.
Haydn’s orchestration of his Trumpet Concerto is unique in its size and scope. The instrumentation includes a large woodwind section consisting of 2 flutes, 2 oboes, and 2 bassoons; brass and percussion including 2 horns, 2 trumpets (natural trumpets), and timpani; and lastly, a full complement of strings. Excepting a lack of 2 clarinets and the extra percussion of Symphony No. 100, the Trumpet Concerto’s orchestration is nearly as substantial as Haydn’s last symphonies. The choice to use such an orchestra likely reflects contemporaneous trends established by Haydn and other composers such as Mozart especially in the symphonic genre. With that said, in the concerto genre the precedent had been set in at least one case. In Mozart’s Piano Concerto No. 25 there is a nearly identical orchestration, with only one less flute part than Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

4.1 First Movement

As alluded to in the introduction to this study, Haydn seems to have injected some of his famous wit into the presentation of the keyed trumpet. The first entrance of the solo trumpet begins on a single pitch, E-flat (mm. 8), and is followed by notes found within the harmonic series (mm. 13-16). Additionally, the rhetorical style is what one might expect: a marshal, heroic
fanfare, accompanied by natural trumpets and timpani in the orchestra. Such a passage would have been nothing out of the ordinary for a contemporaneous listener. Much more striking is the opening of the primary group, in mm. 37, where Haydn introduces an entirely diatonic scale spanning over an octave in a much more melodic style, contrasting with that of the fanfare. Orchestral outbursts, including timpani and trumpets, follow the opening phrase of the primary group. These interjections emphasize the solo-versus-orchestra dynamic by assigning more melodic materials to the soloist and more heroic, fanfare materials to the orchestra. An interesting twist is given to this characterization in the recapitulation, where the soloist exhibits bravado matching that of the orchestra, with the original musical materials expanded upon.

The first movement begins with an orchestral exposition containing interesting hypermetrical division from the very first measure. This first measure acts as an up-beat measure to the duple hypermeter, placing the harmonic and rhythmic emphasis in the second measure. The hypermeter is confused by repetition, as the music is transferred back and forth between the strings and woodwinds in measures 1-7. The opening theme can be analyzed hypermetrically as follows: with a single upbeat measure in mm. 1 followed by three 2-measure hypermeasures. In measure 13 the hypermeter shifts from duple to triple: two 3-measure divisions begin in measure 13 and end at the beginning of measure 19. Measure 19 acts as a one-measure division before a 4-measure hypermetrical division follows. Thus, these opening 23 measures feature expansion of the hypermetric units, beginning with two-measure hypermeasures and moving to three-measure and subsequently four-measure hypermeasures. Aurally, this technique presents an “unpacking” of the musical materials by starting small and
expanding as time progresses. It provides a revealing example of the sophistication of Haydn’s compositional technique when the concerto was composed.

The orchestral exposition of this movement continues until measure 37, where another iteration of the single upbeat measure occurs and the solo trumpet makes its first full statement. Structurally, the bass prolongs E-flat throughout the entire orchestral exposition, though there is a hint of the motion to the dominant to come (in the solo exposition) in measures 16 to 20, where transitional material reaches B-flat through chromatic contrary motion in the top and bottom voices. In the top voice, the head tone G (\( \tilde{3} \)) moves in measure 16 up to A-flat, A-natural, to B-flat while the bass simultaneously moves from D-flat, to C, through C-flat (an augmented sixth chord) to B-flat. This arrival, which sounds like a move to the dominant key, is deflated slowly by more chromaticism, with both top and bottom voices descending to an eventual arrival back on the tonic E-flat in measure 24. The E-flat prolongation continues with \( \tilde{3} \) above it until the section’s final \( \tilde{2} \) to \( \tilde{1} \) descent occurs in measure 35 to 36. Thematically, the materially in this exposition is presented in a somewhat fragmentary fashion, partially due to the interesting manipulation of hypermeter mentioned earlier. The orchestral exposition functions as an expression of the main materials of the rest of the movement, both thematically and structurally.

Structurally, the primary theme of the solo exposition is fairly unremarkable, save for the manner in which the head tone is reached. A simple ascent in measure 37 from E-flat through F, to the G in measure 38 marks the initial ascent to the head tone. The melody then ascends through \( \tilde{3} \) up to B-flat, which on first listening may appear to be the actual head tone; however, it is revealed to be a cover tone once the melody continues its diatonic ascent to the
highest note in the melody G, or \( \hat{3} \) in measure 42. The transition to the second group begins in measure 52, as is shown in the graph presented as Example 4.1.1.

Example 4.1.1: Measures 50-60 of the first movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

To get to B-flat, the bass moves from the tonic E-flat up through E-natural in measure 58 (in the viola part) to the F of measure 59. The F is the root of a secondary dominant chord which resolves down to B-flat and the beginning of the second group in measure 60. The top voice moves from \( \hat{3} \) above the tonic at the beginning of the transition (mm. 52) to F or \( \hat{2} \) in measure 59 and is confirmed as \( \hat{5} \) of B-flat major in measure 60. Thus, a move from E-flat through E-natural to the secondary dominant F in the bass is accompanied by a top voice descent from \( \hat{3} \) to \( \hat{2} \), marking the transition to and arrival at the second thematic group.
Showing some resemblance of the primary theme, the secondary theme is marked by a stepwise diatonic ascent which begins on $\hat{1}$ of B-flat major and ascends up to the prolonged $\hat{5}$ ($\hat{2}$ of the tonic key). F is prolonged in the top voice until an interrupted descent occurs in measures 67-72, with the $\hat{2}$ in B-flat major arrival in the top voice and the dominant F-major in the bass. The head tone $\hat{5}$ is immediately restated in measure 73 and another descent takes place, but this time the dominant resolves to the tonic and $\hat{2}$ moves to $\hat{1}$. Even with this cadence, Haydn decided to state one more $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ descent before closing the secondary theme, allowing the trumpet to ascend to a climactic high-register B-flat before making the descent.

The brief closing group (Caplin’s subordinate ritornello) begins in measure 83 as the trumpet solo is given a brief rest. The closing group shifts the harmony from B-flat major to C minor and the start of the development in measure 93. This move to C minor is short-lived and ends up functioning as the upper third of A-flat major which is reached in measure 96. The prolongation of A-flat continues even through an emergence of E-flat (the tonic key) in measure 105 which instead of functioning as the tonic, functions as the dominant of A-flat. The bass makes a stepwise ascent from the E-flat reached in measure 105 through F to G to A-flat regained in measure 111. The A-flat prolongation reveals its subdominant function in measure 112-113 as it moves through A-natural to the dominant B-flat. This B-flat resecures the B-flat dominant as the framing prolongation within which A-flat functions as lower neighbor. In other words, the B-flat prolongation of the second group is picked up in measure 113 and the A-flat prolongation of the development functions as a lower-neighbor to this large-scale structural prolongation of B-flat. The structure of the development is displayed in Example 4.1.2.
Example 4.1.2: Graph of the first movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto showing details of the development (mm. 93-125).

The retransition is initiated when B-flat reemerges in measure 113. This retransition is marked by foreground chromatic embellishments of the dominant B-flat. Additionally, the B-flat in the bass moves to D in measure 121 and the B-flat moves to the top voices. This D then resolves up to the tonic E-flat and the B-flat moves down chromatically to the head-tone G before the recapitulation begins in measure 125. This upper and lower voice movement deliberately obscures a 2 to 1 resolution by placing 2 in an inner voice, which strengthens the immediate return of the 3 head tone in the recapitulation.

In the recapitulation, Haydn chooses to completely forego use of the second group materials in favor of continuation of the primary theme by variation and embellishment derived
from the development section. Haydn does this by using some of the E-flat melodic material from the development, where E-flat was the dominant of the A-flat prolongation. An example of this can be seen in measure 152-154 of the trumpet part which aligns with measures 107-109 of the development. Where the transition and move to the second group would have been, had Haydn chosen to implement it, there is new melodic material crafted out of the primary theme materials, containing heroic triplets in a fanfare style. This triumphant celebration of the regained tonic is marked by multiple reinforcing cadences of the tonic E-flat. Structurally, the tonic is prolonged through the entire recapitulation, with the head tone 3 maintained. The final descent is interesting in that the 2 is stated literally. Instead, 2 is implied during the trumpet soloist’s cadenza. The functional dominant is not in the orchestra; the ensemble plays at the tonic resolution instead. The movement closes with the same five measures ending the orchestral exposition.

The first movement displays a concerto form closely resembling standard sonata practices. Excepting the existence of an orchestral exposition to begin the movement, most vestiges of older ritornello form are replaced with standard sonata form procedures. The procedure of dichotomizing orchestra and solo music is continued, but instead of separating this music into formal spaces, the musical conversation between orchestra and soloist is interwoven at more local levels. An example of this is heard in the interplay of the primary theme, such as measures 39-41 of the solo exposition, where the melody of the solo trumpet in mm. 39 is repeated by the woodwinds in mm. 40 and returned to the trumpet in mm. 41. Another example of interplay between orchestra and soloist can be heard in measures 63-65 where, as in the last example, the trumpet soloist makes a statement and is answered by
another voice of the orchestra, in this case, the violins. Thus, Haydn’s implementation of the musical relationship between orchestra and soloist is more apparent on a local level, rather than inherently built into the form.

4.2 Second Movement

The Andante tempo and lyrical style of the second movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto does not part from the traditional stylistic arrangement of concerto movements. The primary theme of the movement begins quite similarly to Haydn’s famous melody “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser” also known as the “Kaiserhymne” through its sharing of the same first five notes. The opening phrase of the movement is shown in Example 4.2.1.

Example 4.2.1: The opening phrase (mm. 1-4) of the second movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto as excerpted from the score.
With the trumpet concerto’s composition date of 1796 and the premiere of the Kaiserhymne in 1797, this melody must have been present within Haydn’s mind. Though the overall phrase structure is remarkably similar to the Kaiserhymne, the primary theme of this movement parts from its precise melodic similarities after the opening five notes. Haydn chose the concerto’s subdominant key of A-flat major for this movement, which differs from the more common choice of using the dominant key for the second movement of a major-key concerto. The movement, while slow in tempo, is fairly short in length and lasts only fifty measures. The form of the movement is also fairly simple in its arrangement; a modified ternary form, where A-B-A’ is preceded by an orchestral statement of A. Even with this fairly simple formal design, Haydn incorporates a number of sophisticated elements into this movement, especially within the B section.

The primary theme begins on A-flat (\(\hat{1}\)) and ascends up by step, with embellishment, to the head tone 5 in the span of two measures. This E-flat moves down by step to 3 in measure 3 and 2 in measure 4 which resolves by incomplete authentic cadence. The bass, which prolongs A-flat, moves to C in measure 2 and up by step until it reaches A-flat again, moving contrary to the descending top voice. This concludes a four measure antecedent phrase, which is followed by a consequent phrase in measures 5-8. The consequent phrase is marked by an ascension past the head tone to the upper-neighbor F before quickly descending down to \(\hat{1}\) and an authentic cadence in the tonic key. The bass moves through C and D-flat to the dominant E-flat in measures 6 and 7. This concise eight measure statement marks the A-section of the movement. The solo trumpet repeats the A-section between measures 9 and 17 and is followed by a brief, two-measure orchestral transition to the B-section which begins in measure 19.
In the top voice of the transition, a descent from $\hat{5}$ (E-flat) to $\hat{2}$ (B-flat) occurs, coinciding with a bass movement to E-flat. $\hat{2}$ is then prolonged through the B-section. The bass moves from its A-flat prolongation up to E-flat in measure 18 and this E-flat is prolonged through the entirety of the B-section. With that said, it is the middleground bass progression that is particularly interesting in this B-section. This material is included in the graph in Example 4.2.2.

Example 4.2.2: Graph of measures 16-34 of the second movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

The E-flat sounded in measure 19 is held until measure 22, where the upper neighbor F-flat is heard and then descends down by step to C-flat. This C-flat, which is reinforced by a cadence in measures 23 to 24, is bVI of the dominant. Its arrival marks a middleground prolongation of C-flat major within the large-scale dominant prolongation. The top voice supports this reading with a $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ stepwise descent in the key of C-major from measures 22 to 24. In order to reach C-flat within the top voice, the trumpet part ascends chromatically from E-flat to C-flat in measures 20 through 22. This is then followed by the $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ descent in C-flat major.
As indicated by the existence of a C-flat prolongation, this is modal mixture within this B section. More evidence of this mixture is seen in the opening measures of the B-section within the trumpet’s melody. In measures 19 and 20 there is what appears to be a 5 to 2 stepwise descent in A-flat minor, but the transitional measures following this statement moves the tonality quickly to C-flat major, Haydn’s true tonal intention. Another example of modal mixture used by Haydn exists in measures 28-30. In these measures, C-flat major moves through D-flat minor before finally reaching the dominant seventh E-flat in measure 30. The arrival of E-flat in the bass also marks the reemergence of 2 (B-flat) in the top voice. This reemergence reveals the nature of C-flat in the top voice of the B-section as the upper-neighbor of the B-flat prolongation from measure 18. Another remarkable feature of this movement can be seen in the bass of the B-section. The bass motion of the B section can be retrospectively realized as a reimagining of the bass from the consequent phrase of the A section. In the consequent phrase of the A-section (mm. 13-16) the bass moves from C through D-flat to a dominant E-flat which resolves to the tonic. In the voice-leading of the B-section, the bass moves from C-flat, through D-flat minor, to the E-flat dominant, and then to the tonic. Thus, Haydn reimagined this bass motion with modal mixture in the B-section.

A final statement of the A-section occurs beginning in measure 33 with only a slight variance from its original statement: an emphasis on 1 in the high register of the trumpet in the consequential phrase. The transition material of measures 16-18 is repeated after the reprise, but in this instance it is followed by a coda. The coda reinforces the main bass motion (A-flat, C, D-flat, E-flat) and a descent from 5 (mm. 42) diatonically down to 1 (mm. 46). In the final four measures, the half-step upper-neighbor motive of E-flat and F-flat is sounded once more in the
trumpet part. This half-step reference provides a reminder of the modal mixture from earlier in
the movement as the movement comes to a close. Ultimately, this relatively simple formal
layout is intricately weaved together by Haydn’s sophisticated voice-leading. These complex
procedures result in a compact Andante middle movement filled with remarkable music.

4.3 Third Movement

As in a number of concerto third movements, the third movement of Haydn’s Trumpet
Concerto features key aspects of rondo form. In this case, the form also contains some sonata
form elements. Due to these features, the movement can be identified as a sonata-rondo.
Much of the evidence for an argument in favor of a sonata-rondo design exists in the handling
of the C-group. This movement returns to the concerto’s tonic key (E-flat) after the second
movement’s digression to the subdominant key. The first formal section of music features only
orchestral music, carrying on the concerto-style tradition. Beginning on B-flat in the violins, the
primary theme is made up of another diatonic ascent, a quality shared by the primary themes
of all three movements. This ascent moves up from B-flat to E-flat, and after some
embellishment continues up diatonically to A-flat before dropping to G. The A-flat functions as
an upper-neighbor to the movement’s head tone G (♯). The bass voice, which appears in the
viola during the opening phrase, prolongs E-flat and reaches the dominant in measure 11 where
the top voice also moves down to 2. This first phrase of the primary theme serves an
antecedent role and it is followed by an incomplete consequent phrase. It avoids completion by
transitioning to what is the secondary theme, or B-group (mm. 27), instead of ending in a cadence. The secondary theme is presented within a tonic prolongation and features a $3$ to $2$ motion in the first violin which is slightly obscured by a $5$ cover tone. The secondary theme is embellished beginning in measure 33 until multiple final authentic cadence statements are made to conclude the orchestral exposition; the $2$ occurring in measure 42 and $1$ in measure 43.

The solo exposition and trumpet’s first statement of the primary theme begins in measure 44 and concludes in measure 67 where the consequent phrase is completed. This statement is followed by an orchestral transition section. The transition’s main purpose of modulating to a dominant prolongation is achieved in measure 80, with the top voice prolongation of $3$ moving down to $2$ two measures prior when the trumpet re-enters. A graph of these measures is featured in Example 4.3.1.

Example 4.3.1: Graph of measures 72-80 of the third movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.
During the subsequent dominant prolongation, the trumpet soloist is given an opportunity to display virtuosic technique through fast-moving trills followed by large leaps. In the top voice, an interplay between the prolonging 5 (or ♯2 in the tonic key) and its upper neighbor G-natural takes place before a chromatic stepwise descent follows. This descent occurs between measures 93 through 98 and is accompanied by an auxiliary cadence in F major (the dominant within B-flat major); the bass voice moving from C (mm. 94) through E (mm. 96) to F in measure 98. Example 4.3.2 features a graph of measures 80-100.

Example 4.3.2: Measures 80-100 of the third movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

The F is locally prolonged through a pedal until it finally cadences to B-flat in measure 116. The top voice maintains its prolongation of 5 until a descent down to 2 occurs in measure 115, and 1 in measure 116. A brief reiteration of this cadence occurs until a fermata on B-flat appears. This held B-flat elides with a return to the primary theme in the tonic E-flat (mm. 125).
The statement of the primary theme is immediately followed by the C-group, or development group in this sonata-rondo. Evidence in favor of understanding this C-group as a development includes the insertion of thematic material from the primary theme. The primary theme is varied through different keys, beginning first with a move to the subdominant A-flat at the formal beginning of the development (mm. 142). A-flat is only a brief, local arrival which is realized to be the upper third of the F-minor in measure 149. F-minor, the supertonic key in E-flat, is maintained until the bass continues up to G at measure 168. The arrival on G is a particularly interesting moment in this movement, where an alternation of the diminished seventh of G and G-major occurs between measures 168 and 173. It creates a sense of tonal ambiguity in relationship to the tonic key of E-flat. G-major is outlined in the melody with an added upper neighbor A-flat, revealing another iteration of the half-step upper-neighbor so prominently featured in this piece. It is tempting to say that the G-major arrival can be heard in relation to the brief modulation to F-minor as the secondary dominant; but this dominant seventh never cadences to C. Additionally, one might expect the bass voice to continue its diatonic ascent which began on E-flat (mm. 170) moved up through F (mm. 149) to the G in measures 168. Instead, the B-natural of the G-major chord functions as an enharmonic C-flat, resolving down to B-flat in measure 179. The remaining chord tones change their function, most notably the upper-neighbor A-flat becomes the seventh of a dominant B-flat chord while the G becomes a lower neighbor. The G is omitted in measure 180 and the peculiar path to reach the dominant is retrospectively realized. This intricate voice-leading is shown in Example 4.3.3 which features a graph of measures 137-181.
Example 4.3.3: Measures 137-181 of the third movement of Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto.

Measure 179 marks the arrival of the dominant in the tonic key, which resolves to the tonic and coincides with a reiteration of the primary theme (mm. 181). This arrival also ushers in the beginning of the recapitulation within sonata-rondo form.

As expected in both a recapitulation and rondo the primary theme is followed by the secondary theme, and like the orchestral exposition, it maintains a tonic prolongation rather than moving to the dominant. In addition to this, Haydn includes a variation on the second group by providing the trumpet part with more difficult passages in order to showcase virtuosity. An example of this can be seen in measures 204-214, where fast arpeggios and octave leaps make up the melodic material of the trumpet part. The head tone 3 is prolonged over E-flat in the bass through this entire section. In measure 232 a brief transition occurs back to another iteration of the primary theme, which, if standard models are followed, should be its final sounding within sonata-rondo form. What makes this statement different from other statements of the primary theme is the variation and expanding of the melody within the strings, beginning in measure 241, and continuing in the trumpet solo in measure 249. The
orchestra begins a transitional episode in measure 256 which arrives at a cadential progression in measure 278 and a dominant seventh chord in mm. 279. Haydn seems to play with a listener’s expectations at this arrival; a standard procedure would include an authentic cadence and perhaps the final measures of the piece. Instead, Haydn follows the dominant chord with two measures of silence and a subsequent statement of the primary theme once more at a quiet dynamic level. This statement is the final one and acts as a surprise before the alternating dominant and tonic cadences of the piece’s closing measures.

4.4 Conclusions

Haydn’s Trumpet Concerto provides a salient example of his sophistication and wit during his later years. The three movements of the concerto are unique in their formal and structural procedures, but contain some overarching similarities which link them together. One of these links between the movements exists in motivic form as a half-step upper neighbor relationship. Perhaps most revealing is that this motive is implemented not only on a local level, but also at the structural level. For example, in the first movement the half-step upper-neighbor can be seen in the bass in measures 113-118, where B-flat is embellished by the upper-neighbor C-flat (an augmented sixth chord). The trumpet solo also sounds this same interval in measures 115-117. In the second movement, both a local half-step upper-neighbor motive and a structural half-step upper-neighbor is included. Much like the dominant to augmented sixth example from the first movement, the bass in measures 30-33 shows an E-flat dominant embellished by its upper-neighbor F-flat. The structural example of this embellishment is seen
in the voice-leading of the second group where the prolonged top voice B-flat (mm. 18) is embellished by a C-flat prolongation beginning in measure 24. The C-flat returns to B-flat in measure 30, completing the structural upper-neighbor motive. Thus, Haydn not only makes a motivic connection between the movements of the concerto, but he also composes out this motive into the structure of the second movement. This is a striking example of Haydn’s maturity as a composer.

Another interesting aspect of the concerto is Haydn’s implementation of music for the newly-invented chromatic keyed trumpet. Embedded into the thematic material of the piece are displays of diatonic and chromatic materials. It seems rather likely that Haydn chose to include such displays purposefully, especially with the obvious humor of the beginning of the piece, where the trumpet soloist plays the notes typically found within the natural trumpet’s harmonic series during the orchestral exposition, but is then followed by a long ascending diatonic melody. Besides this more obvious local example of diatonic melody for the trumpet and the use of almost all chromatically available notes shown earlier in this document, Haydn also continues this trend in all three movements. For example, the opening pitches of each movement’s primary theme feature a complete ascending E-flat major scale. In the first movement, the primary theme opens with the three note motive E-flat, F, G. The second movement, written in A-flat major, begins its primary theme with A-flat, B-flat, C. Finally, the third movement’s primary theme begins on B-flat and moves up diatonically to E-flat, through C and D. It may be a bit of a stretch to imply that Haydn meant to deliberately compose out an E-flat major scale through the opening notes of his primary themes (though it technically occurs), but it is not a stretch to suggest that Haydn chose such displays of diatonic and chromatic
melody in his themes in order to show the capabilities of the newly invented instrument he composed for.

The Trumpet Concerto provides an example of a concerto form more closely resembling “Classical” sonata types rather than the evolutionarily important ritornello form of the past. While all three movements contain an opening formal section where the orchestra presents the materials of the movement, Haydn minimizes the vestigial “subordinate ritornello” of older concerto forms through brevity, making what might have been a subordinate ritornello in the first movement function more as a closing group. The dichotomy inherent in concertos between orchestra and soloist is maintained by Haydn through the local exchange of musical materials between soloist and orchestra rather than by following strict formal models. In this way, Haydn elevates the possibilities within concerto forms by setting the precedent which allows exchange between soloist and orchestra at any point within a formal setting rather than confining it to only the formal design.
The differences between Haydn’s Horn Concerto and Trumpet Concerto are substantial, but not completely irreconcilable in their conception and structure. Formally, both pieces exhibit the fundamental dichotomy of any concerto: the presentation of solo music and the accompanying orchestra. With the 34-year timespan separating these concertos, it is to be expected that Haydn’s approach to the concerto genre may have undergone some changes. As seen in the analysis of both concertos, such a hypothesis seems to be true. Changes can be seen in a number of dimensions, the most obvious of which is perhaps the expansion of instrumentation between these two concertos. The increase in instrumentation matches the trends within the symphonic repertoire. In their implementation, Haydn treats the instruments differently in each concerto. The two oboes within the Horn Concerto are used only as orchestral tutti instruments while the strings play multiple roles. The first violins contain the main melodic material in both the orchestral sections and solo sections, acting as a sort of supporting voice for the horn soloist. In the Trumpet Concerto, by contrast, there is a substantially greater degree of independence in the solo part and in each instrument’s part. For example, woodwind parts intertwine with the solo trumpet part melody throughout the concerto, sometimes in conjunction with strings, and other times as a separate entity from the strings. This greater amount of instrumental freedom allows a variety of changes to occur in the musical texture of the Trumpet Concerto, while the Horn Concerto exhibits less textural variety.
These changes in orchestration reveal the more constrained and simple procedures of the Horn Concerto versus the freer and more complex orchestration of the Trumpet Concerto. With these changes come an evolution of form.

The formal procedures of Haydn’s Horn Concerto more readily identify with the combinatory quality of concerto form, where the older ritornello form is merged with sonata procedures. The vestiges of ritornello form are still quite apparent in the Horn Concerto, through the implementation of an orchestral second group. Because of this harkening back to ritornello form, scholars like Caplin and Hepokoski label this material as a subordinate ritornello or Ritornello 2, rather than viewing them as functioning within bounds of sonata structures. Such remnants are less apparent in the Trumpet Concerto, which is less strict in its formal implementation of the orchestra/soloist dichotomy. The Trumpet Concerto also includes an opening formal section in all of its movements which is presented solely by the orchestra, but during the remaining formal regions of the movements Haydn instead favors smaller moments to interplay between orchestra and soloist rather than the large formal sections in the Horn Concerto. These local moments of interplay are related to the freer instrumentation of the Trumpet Concerto, where all instruments are able to carry melody or accompaniment during any formal region of the piece. This freedom renders the ritornello procedure obsolete in its purpose; namely, to maintain the dichotomy between orchestra and soloist. Additionally, Haydn implements concerto form for all three movements of the Horn Concerto (though the second movement lacks development) while for the Trumpet Concerto he employs sonata form for the first movement, ternary form for the second movement, and sonata-rondo for the third movement.
Haydn’s structural techniques maintain complexity and sophistication in both the Horn Concerto and Trumpet Concerto. While the Horn Concerto implements interesting structural elements within its single movements, the Trumpet Concerto shows connections at both the local and macro (multi-movement) level. One of the prominent examples of the Horn Concerto’s interesting structural elements is the use of the apparent tonic. That is, a tonic chord with the ability to have purpose and function other than as the tonic. In this manner, listeners are deceived by apparent returns to the tonic which are caught within the prolongation of other chords. More precisely, in the first movement of the Horn Concerto, the apparent tonic device is implemented as the upper-third of vi, while in both the first and third movement of the Horn Concerto it is used as the IV/V within a dominant prolongation. The apparent tonic arrival also coincides with “ritornello” thematic material derived from the orchestral exposition. Thus, a “return” occurs, but it is not the structural return to the tonic, which is withheld to coincide with the reprise solo exposition’s primary theme. This procedure is particularly interesting because it shows Haydn’s sophistication even in his earliest years and that he was already moving beyond the “constraints” of what was considered a strict form.

From analysis of the Trumpet Concerto, one sees not only an increase in chromaticism, especially through the modal mixture within the second movement, but also the inclusion of motivic elements within the structure of the piece. The half-step upper neighbor motive heard throughout the piece is also integrated into the structure of the second movement, where the 2, the B-flat prolongation in the top voice, is structurally decorated by the upper neighbor C-flat. This half-step upper neighbor motive is heard at various local levels in all three movements in addition to its structural iteration and proves to be a striking example of Haydn’s
organizational awareness and ability to project intricate musical ideas at a macro level as well as locally. Haydn also fully exploits the new possibilities of the instrument for which he was writing in the Trumpet Concerto. Composing for the newly invented chromatic instrument, Haydn deliberately emphasizes chromaticism to showcase its abilities.

In conclusion, the comparison of Haydn’s Horn Concerto and Trumpet Concerto reveals a number of ways in which Haydn’s compositional technique had evolved between 1762 and 1796. The Trumpet Concerto is markedly different from the Horn Concerto in its approach to form, where we see a shift toward the freer procedures of normative sonata form, and this freedom is manifested in a more intricate orchestration. Additional insight into the evolution of concerto form, from its ritornello roots to its embracing of sonata procedures, is seen as the stricter form of the Horn Concerto is loosened in the Trumpet Concerto. These insights and the many others revealed from analysis of these pieces would benefit greatly from further analysis of other concertos by Haydn, in addition to those of other composers. As it stands, these are the only two concertos for brass instruments still in existence by Joseph Haydn, and even with their substantial differences, their quality exemplifies the compositional abilities of the composer.


