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The Case of the Missing Second Group: Sonata Form in Haydn’s Op. 64 no. 1

By Zoe Weiss
Cornell University

I. Introduction

Haydn’s late quartets are rewarding sources of material for those interested in the intersection of performance practice and analysis. Not only were the quartets performed by professionals in London, and probably Vienna, but they were also widely published because of Haydn’s shrewdness in selling the same work to publishers in different countries. Such publications appealed to talented amateurs among the aristocracy and upper classes, for whom quartet playing remained an important locus of social and musical interaction. The late quartets are notable among Haydn’s works for the remarkable number of performance indications he included. By Mary Hunter’s count, indications of fingerings are present in authentic sources for 24 of Haydn’s 68 string quartets, and almost exclusively in Opus 33 and later. By comparison, Mozart did not notate a single fingering in any of his string quartets or quintets. Haydn’s fingerings are also specific to the quartets; and there are no fingerings in the string trios, duos, or baryton trios.¹

Haydn’s prescriptive approach to performance practice, however, went beyond fingerings, and sometimes included indications for which string to play or for specific bow techniques. The sound world of Haydn’s string quartets is striking in its diversity of textures, timbres, and colors—colors which Haydn calls for through this notation of particular techniques. Such variety is possible because of Haydn’s skill and knowledge about how string instruments work. His early biographer Griesinger related Haydn’s claim that “I was a wizard at no instrument, but I knew the strength and working of all.”² Perhaps because he was an accomplished player of both the violin and the viola, Haydn’s string writing displays not only idiomatic writing but also an interest in seeking out the instruments’

¹ Hunter, “Haydn’s String Quartet Fingerings.” 281-2.
² Griesinger, Biographische Notizen über Joseph Haydn, tr. Vernon Gotwals, 63.
expressive extremes. The care Haydn gives to his detailed prescriptions for the physicality of performance in the late quartets invites analytical attention to these elements. Specifically, how the physicality of texture can transform a traditional reading of sonata form.

II. Sound and Physicality in Op. 64 no. 1/i Exposition

The first movement of Haydn’s Quartet in C major, Op. 64 no. 1 is an ideal laboratory for this study because it contains many performance markings, and also because it has an unusual formal structure which cannot be entirely rationalized using the conventions of sonata form. To understand the formal ramifications of the recapitulation, we must look at the exposition in close detail. From the first phrase of the piece, Haydn is concerned with color. At the opening, the three instruments that play all begin in their bottom register, each touching their lowest open string before the end of the first bar. Haydn indicates through the numeral 4 on the first violin’s highest G that the opening gesture is to be played entirely on the lowest string. This prevalence of open strings, low registration, and resonant notes on the instruments give the first few bars an unusual depth and warmth, especially when played on thick gut strings. This effect is enhanced by the absence of the second violin, which Haydn does not bring in until bar 9 when the whole eight-bar phrase is repeated more fully orchestrated and in a higher register. See Example 1.3

After this second statement of the opening phrase and a cadence in bar 16, the music changes in character. Instead of the staccato scalar eighth-notes of the opening, the two inner parts now play slurred undulating eighths while the outer parts trade arpeggios in opposite directions. Both the second violin and the viola here alternate higher notes with their open G strings, with the viola in bars 17 and 19 moving between open D and open G. The cello begins each of bars 16-19 with its open C string. Though much else has changed, the sonorousness of low open strings continues. See Example 2.

3 Score examples are from Joseph Haydn: Streichquartette Opus 64, ed. Feder, Saslav, Kirkendale, Heitmann (Munich: G. Henle-Verlag, 2006). We thank the publishers at G. Henle-Verlag for graciously allowing the use of images from the publication in this article.
(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)

(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)
The medial caesura arrives in bar 25 at the second iteration of a half-cadential figure first seen in bar 22, and still in C major. Without transition, the second group begins with a G major transposition of the opening theme beginning with the upbeat to bar 26, a so-called “bifocal close.” See Example 3.

However, the opening theme is quickly abandoned and the harmony lands on D-seventh chord for four transitional measures, resolving eventually in an elided imperfect authentic cadence in bar 33. Here, the first violin reaches down to meet the bass line on its open G string and simultaneously begins a triplet arpeggio that rockets upwards over two octaves. The viola answers with its own triplet rocket that finishes with a B-flat, introducing mode-mixture and a short episode of G minor. This triplet rocket figure shows up in each of the four parts in turn before the first violin sails up to high G, the highest note heard yet by a large margin. See Example 4.

Having reached the end of this idea, the first violin steers everyone into a new and entirely different passage. In this new idea, the three lower parts play short chords that alternate between an A⁷ chord in third inversion and a D major triad in first inversion. Above this alternation, the first violin arpeggiates the same harmonies. See Example 5.

These arpeggiations, however, are executed through the technique of *bariolage*. Haydn indicates this doubly, both by marking the A as an open string and also by alternating beam directions in bars 40 and 42. The beaming shows the groupings of notes to be played on each string and is a conventional notation for *bariolage*. The *bariolage* idiom is defined by the alternation between strings, so in this instance, rather than play all the notes in bars 40 and 42 on the A string, the C-sharp and E must be played on the D string to create the string crossing effect. In order to do this, the violinist must play these measures with the left hand in either fifth or sixth position, quite high up for a lower string. For the measures of D major, the violinist has more options. They could choose to continue the *bariolage* by shifting back to third position to play the D and F-sharp on the A string, or they could stay in sixth position on the D string and lift up their fingers to play the open string.

---

4 Bariolage consists of the mixing of open and stopped strings. The term is often used to describe unisons across open and stopped strings but also encompasses the alternation of different open and stopped notes across strings.
(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)

(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)
Both fingerings have their difficulties. The measures of A require the violinist to play in a high position and those of D require them to either shift hand position every measure or slur between a high covered note and an open string. Neither of these options are easy, especially on an instrument without a chin or shoulder rest, which makes shifting more cumbersome. In the scenario in which the violinist plays all the measures in sixth position, finding a contact point for the bow in which a high note and an open string can both speak well will a challenge. These difficulties lend the passage a distinctive sound. Playing over an octave above the open string on the bottom strings is rare and does not happen in this repertoire unless specifically indicated. Haydn makes use of this effect through such explicit notations as long slurs or textual annotations such as *una corda*, *l’istesso corda*, or *sul G*. On an unwound gut D-string, this register will not have the brightness, clarity, or crispness of articulation found on the upper strings. Rather, the fingered notes of the *bariolage* passage will radiate warmth and richness, and will have fuzzier edges. In addition to this special kind of sound created by playing up high on low strings, Mary Hunter reminds us that fingerings primarily indicate how the music should feel in the body, writing, “the physicality of the reaction to fingering indications is . . . always present, and . . . always primary.”5 The prescribed awkwardness of the passage will consume the first violinist in what Hunter calls the “unlovely physical labor of reproducing this music.”6

---

5 Hunter, “Haydn’s String Quartet Fingerings,” 284-5.

6 Hunter, “Haydn’s String Quartet Fingerings,” 298.
The *bariolage* figure is not the only way in which this passage engages the physicality of the players. These bars contain very little of what might be called motivic material. Nor does the chordal alternation create much in the way of harmonic interest. Instead, the interest comes from a shift in texture and the way it physically feels to play the passage. Elisabeth Le Guin describes a similarly static passage in a Boccherini string quartet where the same two chords as here, a seventh in third inversion moving to a triad in first inversion, are alternated many times without variation. Le Guin argues that the beauty of the passage is in the various tactile pleasures afforded the players, pleasures which are heightened by repetition. She describes the experience of the cellist moving “from A, one of the most resonant pitches on the instrument, against which is stacked an entire triad with which it forms multiple, rich dissonances, to the much weaker, less resonant, and (in relation to the upper parts) more consonant G[−sharp].”⁷ For Le Guin, the point of this musical passage is the pleasure of playing it. She writes, “All these layered, interactive repetitions do not escalate; their small frictions and overlappings do not even suggest a direction. They invite the player’s ear and eye toward nothing beyond himself and his colleagues in the intimate act of playing.”⁸ As in the Boccherini example, in Op. 64 no. 1 the cello player has the pleasure of leaning into the resonant G and its palpably vibrating dissonances against the A in the second violin and the C-sharp and A in the first violin. This is followed by the equal pleasure of resolving to the quieter F-sharp, placing the note so that the clear sound of pure thirds emerges. Additionally, the lower three parts can enjoy the pleasure of rhythmic synchrony and the thrilling synergy to which it leads. Both the repetition and the scarcity of notes on the page allow the second violinist, violist, and cellist to glance up from their music more frequently and look at each other. This creates moments of “conversation” amongst the players themselves, not just the parts they play, and brings out the pleasure of precision and intonation. This is in contrast with the work being performed by the first violinist who may be too absorbed in the task to partake in these other pleasures.

Thus far, our examination of this *bariolage* passage has been restricted to the version found in

---


Haydn’s autograph manuscript and the 1792 London first edition by Bland. There are, however, two other first editions from 1791, one by Sieber in Paris, and one by Kozeluch in Vienna, which both offer a different version of these five bars. In each, the first violin’s figure is given in triplets rather than duple eighth-notes and open strings are indicated with zeros for both the A and the E in the measures of A major. See Example 6.

Example 6: Haydn, String Quartet in C, Op. 64 no. 1/i, bars 39-44; ossia based on Sieber and Kozeluch editions. (Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)

This new figuration and its markings suggest situating the hand in a lower (third) position and using the fourth finger to play the C-sharp on the D string. This allows the bow to sweep across three strings, letting the notes ring and bleed into each other. It is a gesture that feels good in the arm and it produces a ringing, extroverted sound. The D major measures can also be played in third position, so no shifting is necessary. Why are there multiple versions of this passage? In two places in Op. 64, Haydn makes reference to the difficulty of the music. In one (the slow movement of Op. 64 no. 2), he writes that he has notated the accidentals unconventionally in order to make the passage easier to play, avoiding a confusing F-double sharp for an open G string. In the other (the first movement of Op. 64 no. 3), he supplies an optional simplification for a measure of passage-work stating, “um es leichter zu spielen.”9 The triplet version of the passage from Op. 64 no. 1 is both easier to finger and easier to bow, all while sounding flashier. While professionals would not have struggled to play the autograph version, the broader clientele of amateurs who purchased printed editions might have found it frustrating. For them, the showier but less colorful triplet version would, no doubt, have been preferable.

The two versions are important because the physical execution of each will color the passage differently by influencing the interactions among the members of the quartet. Despite an identical

---

accompaniment, the energy of the passage differs dramatically between the two versions. In the triplet version, an extroverted bright sound from the violin will bring the lower three voices into that world, uniting the players. In the duple version, the inwardness and depth of the top line will give the first violin a color-world that the other three will not be able to fully match, and the concentration required of the first violinist will prevent them from being fully engaged with the others. Most recordings choose the flashier triplet version. Quatuor Mosaïques performs the duple version the first time through the exposition, but ignores the stem direction on the beams and uses an open E string. I have not encountered a recording that reproduces Haydn’s notation of this passage.

In the autograph manuscript, Haydn originally followed the *bariolage* passage by moving directly to the next thematic violin entrance. This was later crossed out and a new sheet of paper inserted onto which the passage was rewritten with the inclusion of four new bars, 45-48 in this score. See Example 7.

These added bars continue the *bariolage* bowing, as specified by Haydn’s fingerings, but now on a unison pitch. Beneath it, thematic material creeps in to create a transition between the world of the static and the world of the thematic. Having reentered thematic territory, the second group moves towards conclusion. The first violin ascends all the way to high G and then falls in a drastic shift of register to a tightly voiced second-inversion chord on the downbeat of bar 54 followed by two beats of total silence. See Example 8.

It is a moment of expectation, and the listener is left wondering when the cadence will arrive. It does so with a cheeky gesture that interrupts itself to repeat the same gambit again before finally confirming the finality of the cadence. As it turns out, the triplet gesture of this closing theme provides much of the material for the development and recapitulation. Thus ends the exposition. To recap, as it were, there are four distinctive features that take place in the second group: the triplet rocket figures, the *bariolage* passage, the huge ascent and drop in the first violin, and the closing theme.
(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)

Example 8: Haydn, String Quartet in C, Op. 64 no. 1/i, bars 51-64.
(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)
III. Ramifications and Solutions in the Recapitulation

If we turn now to the recapitulation, we will find that only these latter two elements appear at all. There is no return of either the triplet rockets or the bariolage passage. The recapitulation begins by repeating the first 22 measures of the piece, the entire first group verbatim (albeit with two tiny alterations in the accompaniment). Paul Griffiths notes the rarity of this occurrence in Haydn, writing that, “almost half the exposition . . . is recapitulated without any change whatever, making a repeat more literal than in any Haydn quartet since opp. 1 and 2.” After only five measures of transition, the recapitulation rejoins the exposition (in bar 125) at a decorated version of the grand ascent and fall in the first violin, the gesture from the very end of the second group. The transition has not only averted the move to the dominant but it has also skirted the majority of the second group. The closing theme follows but is interrupted in bar 134 by an interlude in A-flat, which repeats an episode from the development. This leads to a fugal presentation of elements from the first theme in bar 152 before welding back to the closing theme which is repeated emphatically for closure. See Example 9.

Why are there no rocket figures? And especially, why is there no bariolage passage? There is no technical hurdle, the figure would work easily down a fifth. In other works, Haydn uses bariolage to demarcate formal boundaries. James Mackay has examined the finale of Op. 50 no. 6 (nicknamed “The Frog” for its use of bariolage) and concluded that, “the co-incidence of bariolage with virtually every important tonal and thematic event in this movement displays Haydn’s command of sonata form by this relatively late stage in his musical career, and the subtle means by which he makes this form accessible to the attentive listener.” In Op. 50 no. 6, the sonata form structure of the movement is made more clearly audible by the instances of bariolage. The same cannot be said of the first movement of Op. 64 no. 1. Here, the bariolage stakes out a territory that at first seems outside the usual structural principles of sonata form. But it is not just the bariolage passage that is missing from the recapitulation. 28 of the 35 measures in the second group (80%) are omitted. It is not unusual in Haydn for material from the exposition to be missing from the recapitulation, and Haydn’s

10 Griffiths, *The String Quartet*, 64.

(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)
recapitulations often involve substantial excisions and recomposition. Ethan Haimo has suggested that such “altered reprises” are necessitated by Haydn’s preference for using main theme transpositions (MTTs) rather than “second themes.”¹² A MTT can intensify the dramatic narrative of sonata form by taking the most important material of the first group and putting it into the dominant (or other secondary key area) before returning the same material to the tonic. The use of a MTT, however, causes problems in the recapitulation because it would be redundant to repeat the material again without the transposition. This presents the need for some level of recomposition, a challenge that Haydn happily embraces. Such recomposition often involves shuffling themes around and some development of ideas from earlier in the movement, including important ideas from the second group. In Table 1, I have borrowed Haimo’s style of visualization to illustrate the origin of all the material in the recapitulation.

Table 1: Motivic Material in the Recapitulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bars 1-22</td>
<td>Bars 98-119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 23-25</td>
<td>Bars 120-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bars 25-51</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bars 125-127</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 52-53</td>
<td>Bars 128-134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars 54-58</td>
<td>Bars 135-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar 59</td>
<td>Bars 140-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bars 152-164</strong> (newly composed based on measure 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bars 77-80</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bars 165-169</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bars 170-174</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned, it is more than unusual that such a large portion of the exposition — indeed, the majority of the content presented outside of the tonic — is pointedly avoided in the recapitulation. It seems that despite the energy of the triplet rockets and the hypnotic loveliness of the *bariolage* passage, Haydn deliberately chose not to recapitulate the material. This choice certainly strains all definitions of the sonata principle. The “sonata principle” was first articulated in its current meaning by Edward Cone who states that it, “requires that important statements made in a key other than the tonic must either be re-stated in the tonic, or brought into a closer relation with the tonic, before the movement ends.”¹³ A slightly different definition comes from Charles Rosen: “What must reappear in the recapitulation . . . is the second group, at least any part of it that has an individual and characteristic aspect, and that does not already have its analogue in the first group.”¹⁴ Speaking specifically about sonata form in later Haydn, James Webster writes,

---


the recapitulation does not necessarily follow either the course of the exposition or any other definable pattern. Even where more or less the same events occur in more or less the same order, every sentence may be rewritten. . . . In other cases paragraphs appear in reverse order. . . . subsidiary material is expanded . . . or the whole simply rewritten. . . . But the most important material from the second group is still recapitulated in the tonic.\textsuperscript{15}

Looking at the example of Op. 64 no. 1, we are faced with a dilemma. It is hard to dismiss the majority of the second group as unimportant, especially a second group as distinctive as I hope I've shown this one to be. Yet if we don't, can we still consider this movement a sonata?

Steve Larson has attempted to find traces of the second group in the recapitulation as a way to reconcile this movement with sonata form. He cites two places. First, he suggests that the triplet arpeggios in the A-flat passage “recall the triplet figures of the omitted portion of the second period of the exposition (bars 33-44).”\textsuperscript{16} While the alternation of harmonies in the lower three voices is similar to those of the \textit{bariolage} passage, the figuration itself comes not from the triplet rockets (bars 33-39, see Example 4) or the \textit{bariolage} passage (bars 40-44, see Example 6) but rather from the closing theme triplets of bar 59 and its pick-up with which the A-flat triplets share not only a contour but also bowing and articulation. Larson’s second instance seems to hinge on a mistaken conception that the triplet version of the \textit{bariolage} passage was a correction by Haydn, which causes him to claim that the triplets in the final measures of the piece (bars 170-173) are related to the \textit{bariolage} passage, which I believe they are not.\textsuperscript{17}


\textsuperscript{16} Larson, “Recapitulation Recomposition of the Sonata-Form First Movements of Haydn’s String Quartets,” 164.

\textsuperscript{17} Larson, “Recapitulation Recomposition,” 165. He writes, “Finally, we hear the closing theme (bars 55-60) recapitulated again in the tonic, this time with a perfect instead of an interrupted cadence. The final cadence is reinforced with material that is not a transposition of the final cadence of the exposition (bars 59-60), but a transposition of bars 40-44 – the material shown to be added in the autograph (Feder 1979). This material is also altered to reflect its changed function. It is inverted so that it points down (conclusively) instead of up (transitionally).” I believe Larson must have confused Feder’s discussion of the insertion of bars 45-48 for the alternate version of bars 40-44, mistakenly concluding that the triplet version of the \textit{bariolage} was a correction by Haydn. Bars 170-173 do not seem connected either to the duple version of bars 40-44 or the inserted bars 45-48.
There is one moment in which something from the second group appears to recur in the recapitulation. It happens during the repetition of the first group and is one of only two minor alterations from its original presentation. Rather than repeating the staid eighth-note arpeggio as it had in the exposition, the cello plays an exuberant triplet arpeggio in bar 115 that looks a lot like the rocket figure in bar 36. See Example 10.

(Used with permission, G. Henle Verlag.)

James Hepokoski has warned against this impulse to look for oblique linkages and instances of “implied” recapitulation, arguing that the term “recapitulation” should be reserved for more literal restatements of earlier material. I am not convinced that the hint of the rocket figure, obscured as it

---

18 Hepokoski, “Beyond the Sonata Principle.”
is by being an accompaniment of the first group material, counts as being a meaningful recurrence of the second group. Nevertheless, we need not necessarily banish Op. 64 no. 1 from the realm of sonata form. I propose here a different approach to formal structure, one which incorporates texture, embodied performance, and what Edward Klorman has termed “multiple agency.” Through these elements and a narrative, I hope to bring this movement closer to the world of sonata form. Moreover, by considering textural elements to be thematic, I argue that a “literal” recapitulation of material from the second group does occur in the first movement of Op. 64 no. 1.

The metaphor of conversation is a familiar one when discussing the string quartet and has its roots in the eighteenth century itself. While the virtues and short-comings of the metaphor have been much explored, Klorman argues that the impulse to talk about string quartets as analogous to conversations betrays a more basic tendency to understand these works as containing more than one personality. He writes,

> Fundamentally, when chamber music is described as conversational . . . I believe most authors refer to a way of experiencing a musical passage or composition as embodying multiple, independent characters – often represented by the individual instruments – who engage in a seemingly spontaneous interaction involving the exchange of roles and/or musical ideas (his emphasis).\(^{20}\)

Klorman’s focus is on the metrical and harmonic “actions” musical characters can take within a piece. Here, however, I am interested in what texture can tell us about the fluctuating relationships between these characters. Texture is hard to define, perhaps because it is the sum of many parts, from timbre, dynamics, and articulations to the number of voices, the spacing and register of chords, and the relationship between the voices. Though under-theorized, texture contributes far more than variety, “wit,” or “inventiveness”. Janet Levy has shown how both particular textures and moments of textural

\(^{19}\) Klorman, *Mozart’s Music of Friends*.

change can act as syntax within a movement.\textsuperscript{21} The specific texture of unison passages has been studied by Mary Hunter who describes its use in demarcating formal structures and indicating particular topoi.\textsuperscript{22} This sort of textural demarcation can be seen in the \textit{bariolage} passage and how it is highlighted through its textural isolation. We can also see a textural demarcation between the first and the second group in terms of overall register and color as the low, resonant sonorities of the first group give way to the rockets and soaring high passages of the second group. In addition to marking structure, however, texture, specifically the way voices relate to each other, can act as thematic material itself.

\textit{IV. Reinterpreting the movement}

Returning to the start of the movement, I offer a very different analytical account than the one above, one which is illustrated in colors on the annotated score, Example 11 (following V. Conclusion, 21-23).

From the beginning, the predominant relationship among the instruments is that of pairs. At the outset, the first violin and viola play a duet but by bar 8 the viola joins the cello while the two violins are paired. These paired relationships are indicated in the annotated score with magenta and green lines. Duets, with little interjections of trios and quartets, continue through the end of the first group. I consider these pairings to be part of the thematic identity of the first group and one which will be recapitulated along with the motivic thematic material. At the beginning of the second group, the texture changes, and in bar 26 we start to see the first violin playing small bits of independent material (indicated by purple). The rising triplet rocket figures that begin in bar 33 bring a new relationship between the voices. Each instrument gets its own moment to break out of the cooperative texture and play independently. The textural “theme” of equal and independent voices introduced here does not occur again until the recapitulation. Bar 40 brings us to the \textit{bariolage} passage and a second completely different texture. Here, the first violin plays completely independently from the other voices, engrossed in the labor of the passage and untethered from the trio of lower voices which

\textsuperscript{21} Levy, “Texture as a Sign.”

\textsuperscript{22} Hunter, “Unisons in Haydn’s String Quartets.”
accompany it (in yellow). This thematic texture of three-supporting-one will return in both the development and the recapitulation. During the inserted transition that follows the *bariolage*, a duet between the cello and second violin coaxes the first violin back into the fold where it takes up a duet with the viola. The closing theme, beginning in bar 54 brings all the instruments into a unified statement (in orange). The diversity of textural relationships found in the second group is in stark contrast to the duet-heavy texture of the first group. Both the diversity and the specific textures are part of the thematic identity of the second group.

The development begins with a couple of short trio relationships (in blue) before the first violin, in bar 69, begins to play virtuosic triplets. Just like the *bariolage* passage, here the violin is playing independent musical material while the lower three voices accompany until all four voices coalesce to play bars 77-80. A duet passage beginning in bar 85 is interrupted by a violin cadenza which leads seamlessly back into the recapitulation at bar 98. Both the duet texture and the three-plus-one texture have been developed over the course of the section.

The recapitulation is texturally identical to the exposition for the entirety of the first group. When it diverges from the exposition in bar 120, the music moves towards the huge ascent and fall theme from the very end of the second group. The subsequent closing theme with its textural consensus leads to a unanimous arrival on the surprising sonority of A-flat major in bar 134. This is a moment of great gravity, one Charles Rosen hears as the climax of the piece. He writes that the whole passage that follows is “an expansion of this chord, one of the most remarkable in Haydn, and an example of the physical excitement this kind of expansion can generate.”23 This halo of A-flat is as beautiful as it is otherworldly. The resonance of this chord, so different from the open string-filled ringing of C major, gives the impression of having entered a new sensory space. But even in so foreign a land as A-flat major, the texture of the *bariolage* passage returns. The first violin begins playing its own triplet figurations above a chordal accompaniment by the lower three voices. Both the harmonies and the texture work to demarcate this extraordinary passage, much as the *bariolage* effect had earlier. Even the muted color of A-flat recalls the similarly muted tones of the high notes on low strings found in the *bariolage* episode. The A-flat passage falls into silence and a series of plangent false-starts, in

---

which the instruments make their way back to unity, leads to the quasi-fugal moment in bar 152. As in the triplet rocket figures, here each instrument gets a moment to play the motive. Rather than take turns in their independent lines as they had in the exposition, here the instruments speak over each other, clamoring to be heard. The sound of equality is particularly distinctive here. This independence fades into cooperation and by the final five bars any rift is repaired, with the first violin taking a back seat while the second violin and viola drive the music with triplets.

V. Conclusion

This texture-based approach offers a different perspective on the second group and what elements of it might be of formal importance. If the most important ideas of the second group are textural rather than motivic, we can see them clearly return in the recapitulation. The only moment in the exposition in which the four voices were truly equal and independent — the triplet rocket figures — returns in the form of the quasi-fugue. The only moment in the exposition where the first violin acts completely alone above a unified accompaniment — the bariolage passage — returns in both the development and the recapitulation. While the surface motives vary, something profound unites these passages, something that goes beyond my on-paper textural analysis. The complex relationships that emerge from the notation become actualized in the bodies of the players. The bariolage passage will be memorable to all four musicians, not just for the bariolage itself but for what it feels like to be one of the lower three voices moving in unison or to be the first violin showing off above them. To the player, this feeling can act as a formal signpost as much as a theme. Clearly, the form of the first movement of Op. 64 no. 1 is not that of a normative sonata. Nor does my analysis aim to put it neatly back in that box. Yet I have argued that the relationship between voices can be treated thematically and in light of that, meaningful textural elements of the second group do return in the recapitulation.
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Abstract

Georg August Griesinger, writing in 1810 reports Haydn’s claim that he "knew the strength and working of all [instruments]." Indeed, the fingerings Haydn includes in his string quartets show a sophisticated understanding of the mechanics of violin playing and the use of extended techniques for expressive effect. In the first movement of the string quartet Op. 64 no. 1, Haydn leverages such techniques in the second group of the exposition to create two moments of unique texture and timbre. One of these highlights the first violin using a distinctive *bariolage* technique that Haydn carefully notates. Surprisingly, this compelling second group does not appear at all in the recapitulation. The question then is, is this a sonata? The "failure" of the second group to return suggests that a different kind of reading altogether may be called for. Drawing on Janet Levy and Mary Hunter’s work on texture as a signifier of formal structure and Elisabeth Le Guin’s exploration of physicality as musical content, I argue that a textural approach can reconcile the formal structures of Op. 64 no. 1, i with the sonata principle. I use Edward Klorman’s concept of "multiple agency" to create a narrative reading in which the relationships between voices are treated thematically, offering a different perspective on the second group and what elements from it might be of formal importance. If the most important ideas of the second group are textural rather than motivic, they do indeed return in the recapitulation.