MTO A JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR MUSIC THEORY

The Expositional Rondo: A New Formal Type in Pre-Classical and Classical Rondo Finales*

Graham G. Hunt

NOTE: The examples for the (text-only) PDF version of this item are available online at:
https://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.25.31.3/mto.25.31.3.hunt.php

KEYWORDS: Rondo, Sonata-Rondo, Exposition, Haydn, Mozart, Galant, Formenlehre

ABSTRACT: This paper argues that "problematic" or "inconvenient" sonata-rondo movements lacking clear recapitulations, such as Haydn's "Clock" symphony finale, should be defined neither negatively (as a flawed or "lesser" sonata-rondo form) nor experientially (as a midstream conversion from Type 4 to rondo), but rather as descendants of the expositional rondo that originated in finales as early as the 1760s in pieces by Mozart, Joseph and Michael Haydn, J.C. Bach, and Joseph Bologne, the Chevalier St. Georges. Their first couplet-episode (AB) pair forms a sonata exposition (by Galant standards, using Burstein's (2020) recently revived Kochian terms such as *Grundabsätze* and *Quintabsätze*, as well as the Modulating Prinner), and then proceeds to the standard couplet-episode (AC, AD, etc.) layout until complete; the expositional materials never return. As the generic norms of their sonata forms began to take shape in the 1770s, both Mozart and Haydn began to add a section late in the pieces, perhaps to compensate for the lack of the return of expositional materials, a section I label a "balancing" section.

This article proposes that the expositional rondo was not "redundant" or "lesser"—terms that have been used to describe problematic finales that defied easy identification—but rather an option that composers often utilized while sonata and rondo forms were beginning to crystallize. Furthermore, these expositional rondos will provide a fresh approach to finales in the following decades, concluding with detailed examinations of "inconvenient" finales, most notably the finales of Haydn's London Symphonies, notorious for their ambiguous formal layouts.

DOI: 10.30535/mto.31.3.3

Received July 2024

Volume 31, Number 3, September 2025

Introduction

[0.1] Fewer "sonata-rondo" finales have proven more elusive to analysts than those of Haydn's 97th and 101st Symphonies, the latter of which was nicknamed the "Clock" symphony. Formal outlines of both are offered in **Examples 1 and 2**.(1) As shown, both begin with a clear "rondo-like" refrain section cast in a repeated aba' form and proceed to a section that is ostensibly the exposition

of a Type 4 sonata-rondo form as defined by Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), with the normative P–TR–S–C sonata exposition layout.(2) However, following the return of the refrain and the central episode (the rondo "C" section, not to be confused with the Closing zone of the exposition, also labelled "C"), the expected recapitulation of the post-P expositional materials (TR, S, and C) does not occur. Rather, in the Clock symphony, a lengthy fugato section using the refrain motive as its subject spins out, followed by a Coda also based on the refrain. And in the 97th's finale, the third A section is followed not by the tonic return of post-P materials, but instead a brief extension/link section to a refrain-based Coda.

[0.2] What, then, do we make of these movements' overall forms? They have generated various labels in scholarly literature over the years. Matthew Santa, in his textbook on form, calls the Clock finale a "model-defying form" (2016, 123–24); Michelle Fillion, in her formal studies of Haydn's rondo finales, adopts Czerny's term "lesser" sonata-rondos for both finales (Fillion 2012, 198ff.; Czerny 1848, 69ff.); and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, in their landmark treatise on Sonata Theory, consider them both examples of Type 4 sonata-rondos with "radicalized recomposition of recapitulatory space" (2006, 416). Another related interpretation occasionally offered in the literature, though not specifically applied to these finales, is a formal "conversion" of sorts, in which the pieces initially seem to outline a sonata-rondo form but become five-part rondo forms throughout the course of the movement.(3) Given all of Haydn's oft-discussed "witty" and experimental finales from late in his career, they certainly defy a straightforward formal label. To offer some context to these nettlesome finales, this paper will examine finales from the previous three decades that present similar analytical challenges, before returning to these two finales. In doing so, I propose a new formal type: the five-part expositional rondo.

[0.3] Recently, Jason Yust (2017) and Jan Miyake (2020) have re-opened discussions on ambiguous sonata, rondo, and sonata-rondo forms in finales from the last half of the 18th century.(4) The main points of contention in debatable sonata-rondo forms were the expositional character of the first rotation (A and B), the presence or lack of re-transitions and internal binary forms, and the recapitulation of the expositional materials in the tonic key. Indeed, a central question about the first point is whether the presence of a sonata exposition creates the same expectation for a recapitulation in an apparent sonata-rondo finale as it does in a standard (Type 3) first-movement sonata form. This paper will argue that in the 1760s, when the expositional rondo first began to appear, it does not necessarily engender this expectation, since the sonata-rondo was not yet a standard finale layout. In later decades, however, when unambiguous sonata-forms began to appear with more regularity, these expositions *did* create this expectation, and composers would sometimes compensate for the absence of a recapitulation by using "balancing sections." In addition, I argue that the expositional rondo form was not, as Fillion refers to it, "redundant" or "lesser," but rather an option that composers often used while sonata and rondo forms themselves were beginning to crystallize.(5) After examining representative examples from the 1760s, 1770s, and 1780s, the paper will conclude with a detailed examination of the two finales of Haydn's London Symphonies mentioned above.

1. The 1760s: Galant expositions in early Mozart, Michael Haydn, and J.C. Bach

[1.1] To begin the framing discussion of examples from the 1760s, consider an early Mozart finale, from his Symphony No. 5 in B-flat Major, K. 22 (1765). At this time, as Robert Gjerdingen (2007, 333ff.) notes, the nine-year-old Wolfgang was traveling throughout Europe with his family and hearing music by various Galant composers. After an expanded compound period typical of a rondo-form refrain (or A section; mm 1–20), the material that follows hardly seems like a sonata "transition and Subordinate theme," from a Classical standpoint, due to its brevity (see **Example 3**). It modulates briskly to the dominant key of F major, cadencing there after just 10 measures before the refrain returns, and there is no medial caesura or textural break to set up a Subordinate theme in the Subordinate key; this is a requirement for an S theme in Hepokoski and Darcy's Sonata Theory, but in William Caplin's formal-functional terms, it could be read as a Transition/Subordinate theme fusion (1998, 203). Yet, Poundie Burstein (2020, 12) has recently cautioned against using modern terminology such as first theme, transition, and secondary theme

to label sections in works from this period; indeed, at this time, the sonata-form standards we are familiar with now were still taking shape and were not yet standardized.

[1.2] Burstein instead proposes Kochian terms such as *Grundabsatz*, *Schlußsatz*, and *Quintabsatz* for passages ending on tonic harmony (*Grundabsatz* and *Schlußsatz*) and dominant harmony (*Quintabsatz*).(6) Approaching K. 22's second section from this perspective, as shown in the "Galant" row in **Example 4**, mm. 21–24 would be a *Quintabsatz* in I, featuring a modulating Prinner that takes us from B♭ major to F major. The six measures that follow are a *Schlußsatz* in V, cast in a compressed sentence structure (two 2-measure basic ideas followed by a compressed two-measure continuation/cadential phrase). Although compact, this initial rotation, laid out in the first row of Example 4, appears to be an exposition in the *Galant* sense—a *Grundabsatz* in the tonic ("A"), a *Quintabsatz* in the tonic, and a *Schlußsatz* in the dominant ("B"); thus, once A returns in the tonic in m. 31, what we now know as a sonata-rondo form appears to be in the making, allowing for the Galant-style expositional rotation.(7) However, following the second couplet ("C," featuring a ii–I Fonte sequence followed by a cadential unit concluding on the dominant), A's return in m. 67 does not lead to a recapitulation of B materials in the tonic. Rather, a Coda consisting of two *Quiescenzas* and a closing flourish reinforces the tonic and brings the piece to its conclusion.(8)

[1.3] Overall, then, is this form simply a five-part rondo (ABACA), or *rondeau* as Hepokoski and Darcy might term it,(9) or some kind of sonata-rondo (allowing for the Galant "exposition") that changes course midstream or is left incomplete? To describe movements like this one, I propose the term "five-part expositional rondo." A prototype is offered in **Example 5**, which captures both the movement's clear five-part rondo form as well as its sonata elements (in the context of the 1760s when it was written) in its first rotation, while implicitly acknowledging that its lack of a recapitulation is neither a flaw nor a thwarted expectation.(10)

[1.4] Let us next consider the finale of Michael Haydn's Symphony in G, MH designation 26, composed in 1763, just two years before Mozart's K. 22 symphony (**Examples 6 and 7**). At first glance, it appears to be a simple five-part rondo, and by later 18th-century standards this is certainly a plausible reading; however, the expositional quality of the A and B sections can also suggests an expositional rondo. Following the square-cut A section, a superimposition of two *Galant* schemata in mm. 9–12 leads from the tonic harmony to a tonicized dominant harmony: a Fonte (or stepwise descending sequence) tonicizing E minor then D major, in tandem with a modulating Prinner, in which the voices descend stepwise by a fourth.(11) Since this 4-measure passage culminates in a dominant harmony, it could be labelled as a *Quintabsatz* in the home key. Following this, a six-measure passage in the dominant key, D major, outlines first a two-measure idea (repeated with slight ornamentation), then a two-measure cadential progression that leads to a deceptive cadence (vi) before repeating and resolving correctly to the (local) tonic harmony in m. 20; thus, this is a *Schlußsatz* in V. Although compact, this initial rotation (A + B) appears to be an exposition in the *Galant* sense, as shown in the outline in Example 6—a *Grundabsatz* in the tonic, a *Quintabsatz* in the tonic, and a *Schlußsatz* in the dominant. Since the movement does not articulate a medial caesura, Hepokoski and Darcy would not consider mm. 13–20 to be a Secondary Theme,(12) while William Caplin (2013) *would* likely identify this passage as a Transition-Subordinate theme complex.(13) As was the case in Mozart K. 22, however, the passages in the dominant key never return after the third refrain to create a full recapitulation, so a reading of even an early, Galant sonata-rondo is out of the question. Yet as Yust (2017) points out, three other finales Michael Haydn wrote during this period also have "expositional" first rotations, and in one of them—Symphony MH 62—the exposition *does* return in the tonic key during the third rotation, to create a recapitulation—yielding what he cites as one of the first sonata-rondo forms.(14)

[1.5] To demonstrate that the expositional rondo regularly occurs during this time period (as opposed to being a rare, anomalous formal type), we will next consider works written by other composers not discussed as often as Mozart and Joseph Haydn, who also cast finales as five-part expositional rondos. The finale of Johann Christian Bach's Symphony in C major, op. 3, no. 2 (1765), a five-part expositional rondo, has remarkable proportions (see **Examples 8 and 9**): the four-measure *Quintabsatz* that opens the B section (m. 17ff.) is followed by a textural break (or *förmliche Absatz*), after which no less than four *Sätze* (three of which are demarcated by clear cadences) explore different topics and harmonic devices.(15) The first is a sequence with a sequential

presentation (a Fonte) leading to a half cadence (a *passo di mezzo*, to borrow another of Burstein's *Galant* terms);[16] the second a martial, tonic-heavy passage using the refrain motive (*rauschend*)[17] and ending with a V:PAC; the third features eight measures of standing on the dominant (*ponte*); and the fourth a repeated eight-measure cadential phrase, or *Schlußsatz*. Alternatively, one could consider the third and fourth *Sätze* in tandem as one theme, a 16-measure (compound) sentence with a repeated continuation phrase. In neither of these examples do the post-A materials return later in the piece, but from a modern perspective, the sonata elements in their opening rotations seem stronger than in the previous examples and again suggest that they are not simple five-part rondos.

[1.6] **Example 10** shows a chronological roster of expositional rondos found in works by Joseph Haydn, Michael Haydn, J. C. Bach, and Mozart composed during the 1760s (including related forms, three- and seven-part expositional rondos),[18] as well as full sonata-rondos (with an expositional first rotation as defined here) in which non-tonic materials from the B section return in the third rotation in tonic (these are shown in the rightmost column). The fact that all of these forms, as well as simple (non-expositional) rondos (of which I have located five in this decade by the same four composers)[19] appeared fairly regularly suggests that in these early years of the Classical rondo form, there was no standard or default rondo-based form, and that composers were experimenting with various ways of mixing sonata elements into rondo forms to varying degrees on a continuum ranging from no sonata elements (regular rondos), to sonata elements in an expositional sense only (Expositional rondos), to sonata elements in an expositional *and* recapitulation context (sonata-rondos).

2. 1770s

Chevalier St. Georges

[2.1] In the following decade, the 1770s, the expositional rondo finale (as well as rondo finales in general) became more common.[20] Early in the decade, Joseph Bologne, the Chevalier St. Georges, employed this form in the finales of his first published set of Violin Sonatas, op. 1a (ca. 1770): each is laid out as a five-part expositional rondo, and these expositional rondos are characterized by a variety of compositional strategies in their expositions. All of their refrains (A) are cast in simple binary (ab) form, and the first and second sonatas both open their B sections with a modulating Prinner. The first (see **Example 11**) employs a variant of this schema that I (Hunt 2024) refer to as an incomplete "leaping" modulating Prinner, found in mm. 31–33 (see **Example 12**), with the bass moving from $\hat{4}$ to $\hat{3}$ in the subordinate key but then leaping down to $\hat{5}$ rather than going to $\hat{2}$, and omitting the final step, $\hat{1}$.[21] Following several measures of dominant prolongation, a half cadence in V is reached in m. 40, followed by a "Subordinate theme" (*Grundabsatz* in V) cast as a compound sentence with a repeated continuation. The second sonata's finale (**Examples 13** and **14**) employs a more normative modulating Prinner to initiate the B section, but does not reach a V:HC as the first did; rather, the initial four-measure *Quintabsatz* in I simply leads to the "Subordinate theme" in V, laid out as a sentence with an expanded continuation phrase. The finale of the third sonata contains a B section (see **Example 15**) that simply modulates to V, without ending in a cadence, in its opening *Quintabsatz* (which, perhaps, has a subtle modulating Prinner implied in the thin texture—see **Example 16**).[22] The Subordinate theme/*Grundabsatz* then directly follows in m. 36. Thus, each of these five-part expositional rondos uses the modulating Prinner as a "transition" from the material in the home key to the material in the subordinate key (although the second and third lack a concluding half cadence and textural break, and the first's modulating Prinner is incomplete). However, these expositions very much resemble the numerous *Galant* expositions in contemporaneous pieces explored by Burstein (2020). One other feature shared by all three of these pieces is the use of "*Da capo*" indications to repeat the A section at the end of each episode (B and C), and the "*Fine*" indication at the end of A to indicate whether to proceed to the next couplet or to end the piece. This notation would become common throughout the next decade for expositional rondos, particularly those written by Muzio Clementi.[23]

Joseph Haydn

[2.2] The presence of expositional qualities did not go unnoticed in the "battleground" Haydn works of the 1770s—his 64th, 66th, and 69th symphonies—over which Stephen Fisher and Malcolm Cole waged a spirited debate (Cole 1964, 1982; Fisher 1992). While Cole acknowledged the clear sonata-form elements even as he labelled these movements five- or seven-part rondos (ABACA or ABACADA, respectively), Fisher advocated for a broader criteria for sonata-rondo forms, noting that he would "accept any rondo movement with well-defined sonata exposition procedures as a sonata-rondo even if the recapitulation does not satisfy the criteria normally applied to sonata-form movements" (1992, 105). However, I stop short of calling the works from the 1760s and 1770s examined thus far sonata-rondos like he does, preferring the five-part expositional rondo form I propose in this study due to the lack of a true recapitulation. Cole does, however, lay out a useful spectrum, a "continuum of possibilities. . . if one places less weight on the recapitulation," similar to the one noted above, ranging from: no recapitulation of the first couplet to a partial recapitulation to a full recapitulation (1982, 98). Of course, the first of his categories—no recapitulation—corresponds with the expositional rondo.

[2.3] Haydn's triumvirate of Symphonies—Nos. 64, 66, and 69—add materials after or during the third refrain, but as we will explore shortly, they do not add *recapitulatory* material (**Example 17** outlines their overall forms). In addition, their first couplets, while beginning similarly to the examples from the previous decade, are much more expansive. They all employ four-measure modulating Prinners in their transitions—a Galant *Quintabsatz* in the tonic (in Nos. 64 and 66, these begin B; in No. 69, it is preceded by a six-measure *Grundabsatz* but followed by lengthy passages in the dominant key). For example, in No. 64 (**Example 18**), the passage from m. 21 onward is a transition, similar to one that would have been found in Haydn's sonata-form movements composed around this same time.(24) It features a greatly expanded sentence, whose presentation could be labelled a *Grundabsatz* in V (prolonging tonic in the subordinate key). Its continuation is expanded through a circle-of-fifths sequence (mm. 32–34) that leads to a cadential progression. An evaded cadence in m. 35 is followed by a "one-more-time" extension that repeats the sequence (mm. 35–37), finally reaching a dominant arrival in m. 39 (the 7th in the first violins and oboes prevents it from being a half cadence by Caplin's definition); thus, the passage could be designated as a *Quintabsatz* in V. The textural gap in m. 39, of course, creates a medial caesura, and as is typical of Haydn, a "monothematic" Subordinate theme follows—a repeat of the Main Theme in the dominant, retaining the Main Theme's melodic-motivic content as well as its theme type, a period with six-measure constituent phrases (antecedent and consequent). However, the expected PAC in m. 51 is undermined by a "lights-out"(25) minor-mode jolt on the downbeat, which launches a repeat of the continuation phrase of the transition (cf. m. 29). The following passage turns out not to be another Subordinate theme, but rather a brisk retransition that reaches a fully-diminished leading-tone seventh chord of the home key in m. 55, rather than the expected dominant harmony.(26) Overall, then, this Transition/Subordinate-theme complex is similar to one found in an opening-movement sonata exposition of Haydn's other works—a transition, a medial caesura, a Main Theme-based Subordinate theme with a cadential deviation (again, the minor-mode "lights-out" effect).(27)

[2.4] The expositional sections of Symphonies No. 66 and 69 exemplify other expositional techniques employed by Haydn in his sonata-form movements at the time—in No. 66, the four-measure modulating Prinner that borrows a motive from the Main Theme moves briskly to a V:HC, creating the familiar Galant *Quintabsatz* in V but also articulating a seemingly early medial caesura in m. 32 (see **Example 19**). Indeed, the Subordinate theme that follows, also based on the MT-based motive that began B, opens with a two-measure Fonte sequence and moves into a typical Haydnesque *Fortspinnung*, a "spinning-out" of activity which reaches a V:PAC in m. 51—an 18-measure Subordinate theme (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 51).(28) Symphony No. 69's B section opens with a six-measure *Grundabsatz* in the tonic key that evokes the military rhetoric related to the "Laudon" nickname,(29) rather than a *Quintabsatz*, as in the beginning of the B sections explored thus far. The passage that follows begins with a modulating Prinner, housing a variant of the Main Theme in the dominant in mm. 27–30 (see **Example 20**). This passage has generated different formal interpretations; Cole says that unlike in Symphonies 64 and 66, this passage articulates a "stable. . ., distinct 'second' theme. . . derived from, but not identical with, the main theme," while acknowledging that "strictly speaking, the transition [mm. 21–26]. . . does not prepare the new [key] area; it remains in the tonic" (1982, 132). Fisher (1992, 99), on the other hand, sees the entire

passage from mm. 27–51 as a transition followed by a closing section, implicitly invoking what Hepokoski and Darcy would later label a "continuous exposition," one without a medial caesura and thus without a Secondary Theme. It is unclear exactly where—if at all—Fillion divides Transition from Subordinate theme, noting that the "TR and secondary theme in the dominant combine to create a characteristic episode (mm. 21–50)," also implying a continuous exposition in Sonata Theory terms (Fillion 2012, 199). A form-functional approach would interpret this passage as "Transition/Subordinate theme fusion," which begins as a transition in m. 27 (an expanded sentence) and concludes with a subordinate-key PAC (m. 51) before proceeding to a second Subordinate theme (mm. 51–68).[30] Regardless of these varying interpretations of this section's internal divisions, all previous analyses agree that this is either a "characteristic" sonata exposition or "sonata-like" couplet.

[2.5] As seen previously (Example 17), none of these clearly expositional materials return after the third refrain (A'). However, rather than simply moving to a fourth rotation A' section and/or Coda (as in the previous five-part expositional rondos), Haydn adds additional material *before* proceeding to a final A' section and Coda. As shown in **Example 21**, the third refrain in Symphony No. 64, which starts in m. 113, is truncated to only the first section of the initial binary form (|: a **b** :|).[31] The following section is a minor-mode variant of the refrain theme, which modulates to C major, cadencing there in m. 136. A re-transition then leads back to the fourth rotation: a full repeat of the A section in m. 150 before the Coda. What, then, do we make of measures 125–149? Is the passage a third couplet or D section, as Fisher and Cole designate it, by which Haydn "has managed, without a recapitulation per se, [to] exquisitely. . . balance the dominant pressure of the first couplet and. . . to enrich the stable tonic with a fresh modal flavor" (Cole 1982, 132)? My reading is that this passage is instead a "balancing" section within the third rotation that rhetorically and proportionally matches the 51-measure first rotation with a 37-measure third rotation and is Haydn's "witty" way of avoiding repeating the refrain verbatim, replacing the expected b section with the modal variant of the a section in m. 125ff. It could also be, as Cole suggests, meant to replace or overwrite a recapitulation of the off-tonic B materials.

[2.6] In Symphony No. 66 (**Example 22**), the third A section reprises the entire aba' form of the original refrain, and the section that follows provides a tonic-based variation of the refrain (as opposed to the dominant-key-based variation of the refrain in the B section or the modal variation of A in Symphony No. 64's balancing section). Following the bassoons' three-measure variation of the Main Theme, whose last two measures are echoed by the violins and then the oboes, an expanded sentence begins in m. 192. The sentence's presentation yields yet another variant of the refrain's opening rhythmic motive, and its continuation features a ii–I Fonte sequence that takes on re-transitional function when its twice-repeated cadential phrase leads to a half cadence in m. 205, followed by the final return of the refrain in m. 208; this, too, could also be considered a balancing section.

[2.7] In Symphony No. 69 (**Example 23**), rather than adding an additional section after the 3rd refrain, Haydn *expands* it from within, first by slithering away from the expected PAC at the end of a' to a deceptive cadence (m. 189), then, much like the balancing section seen in Symphony No. 66, with a sentence-structured variation of A.[32] Also similar to Symphony No. 66, this variation's continuation features a ii–I Fonte, which is repeated before proceeding to the final refrain in m. 214. However, unlike Symphony No. 66, Symphony No. 69 does not have an independent or external balancing section; rather, the A section is expanded internally, essentially balancing the "missing" B section from *within*—an internal balancing. As we will see in the examples from the 1780s onwards, composers employing the five-part expositional rondo form would occasionally use external or internal balancing techniques in the form's third rotation.

[2.8] These balancing techniques could be seen as a way to avoid the "station to station" *dal segno* rondo forms where the second and subsequent A sections were not written out but rather indicated by "*dal segno*" at the end of each couplet (as seen, for example, in the Bologne examples, as well as several by Clementi). Yet, given the presence of the five-part expositional rondos lacking any hint of a recapitulation, it could also simply be Haydn's way of providing extra variation to his refrain theme while not creating a full third episode or couplet.[33] In sum, I believe Symphonies No. 64,

66, and 69 simply represent Joseph Haydn's first examples of expositional five-part rondos with the added feature of a balancing section.(34)

[2.9] **Example 24** shows expositional rondos and sonata-rondo finales from the 1770s; note the prevalence of both five-part expositional rondos and sonata rondos (nearly the same amount of each). The increased presence of sonata-rondos in the 1770s and 1780s suggests the idea mentioned earlier that by now, the presence of an expositional first rotation created the expectation of a possible recapitulation.(35)

[2.10] Fillion also remarks on the sonata-like qualities of Haydn's Symphonies No. 64, 66, and 69 (and others like them, including the examples from the London Symphonies to be discussed at the end of this article), but somewhat condescendingly notes that their truncated expositions "inspired heroic efforts to justify them as traditional sonata-rondos" (2012, 198). She instead sees the truncation as the solution to a potential "redundancy" of recapitulating a "monothematic" exposition in the tonic, and thus a perfectly logical thing to do. I would counter this, however, with examples where Haydn *did* recapitulate "monothematic" expositional materials in full sonata-rondos, such as the finales of the Hob. XVI: 48 Piano Sonata and Symphony No. 85. Furthermore, as will be discussed more below, the term "monothematic" has been questioned in recent *Formenlehre* scholarship (for example, Miyake 2021), and becomes problematic when considering form-functional analyses of Main and Subordinate themes that share the same melodic-motivic material. For example, while the period theme type of Symphony No. 64's refrain is retained in the Subordinate theme, Symphony No. 66's tight-knit period refrain theme is changed to a different theme type—a highly expanded sentence (including a sequential presentation and an expanded continuation). I would also argue that the expositional five-part rondo is a more fitting label than Czerny's "lesser sonata-rondo" label, which Fillion adopts for pieces like Haydn's 64th symphony.

3. 1780s

Joseph Haydn

[3.1] In the following decade, the 1780s, during which sonata-rondo finales became even more frequent (see **Example 25**), the five-part expositional sonata-rondo continued to appear just as frequently, as did the internal and external balancing strategies mentioned in the previous section. As shown in **Example 26**, the B section of Haydn's Cello Concerto No. 2 in D Major, Hob VIIb: 2 (1783) starts in m. 50, and like our previous examples, employs a modulating Prinner (mm. 54–55). Rather than beginning the transition section, however, the Prinner is instead used as the continuation phrase of a sentence, leading to a converging V:HC in m. 57.(36) The Subordinate theme in the dominant then follows, a compound sentence with an expanded cadential progression (67–80) culminating in the V:PAC in m. 80. The form proceeds through a highly truncated return of the refrain (**a ~~b a'~~**), and a's consequent immediately turns to the parallel minor to set up an expansive *minore* C episode (mm. 111–71). After another abbreviated return of the refrain in m. 172—the complete a section only—a variant of the main theme's consequent phrase begins in m. 188 with the presentation of a "hunt" topic in the oboes and horns (**Example 27**), followed by a virtuosic four-measure continuation by the solo cello in mm. 192ff., recalling the rapid passagework that opened the B section (mm. 50–56). This eight-measure passage is repeated (with the full orchestra joining the virtuoso passage with *forte* dynamics) and the movement concludes with a brief codetta (mm. 202–5) for the full orchestra.

[3.2] As shown in the formal outline in **Example 28**, on the one hand, this passage from m. 188 to the end could simply be considered a (compensatory) refrain-based coda typical of rondo forms at the time.(37) Considering the balancing sections previously discussed, however, it could also be seen as an external balancing section that offsets either the lack of a return of the expositional materials from mm. 50–80 (particularly given m. 192's subtle reference to the virtuosic cello passagework that opened the transition), or the truncation of the refrain in each of its two returns.(38) Additionally, the material that follows this passage (mm. 202ff.) seems readable as a (small) coda section.

Mozart

[3.3] Mozart's Violin Sonata K. 380, outlined in **Example 29**, offers a rare example of an internal balancing section, similar to Haydn's 69th symphony, discussed above.(39) The initial refrain (**Example 30**), a rounded-binary form with written-out repeats, consists of a period-structured a section (first presented by the piano, then repeated in the violin with piano accompaniment), a contrasting middle (b) prolonging dominant harmony, and a return of the a section's consequent, with a chromatically altered secondary chord (V^6_5/V) in m. 26. Both b and the abbreviated return of a are then repeated. As in the previous examples, a transition follows starting in m. 40, starting the B section, leading to a Subordinate theme—a highly expanded sentence in the dominant (mm. 54ff.) that leads to a V:PAC in m. 81, followed by a closing section that dissolves into retransition (C⇒RT or C "becoming" RT), setting up the return of A in m. 89.(40) The second A is truncated, the (written-out) repeat's consequent dissolving into the relative minor for the C episode. After a hesitant retransition (mm. 141–52), the third A begins as the previous two did (**Example 31**), completing the **a** section's period with the PAC in m. 168. Rather than the initial refrain's dominant-heavy b section, however, the passage that follows brings back a motive from the retransition (compare mm. 168ff. with mm. 144ff.), leading to a tonicized half cadence (m. 174) prolonged by four measures of standing on the dominant. The a' section of the refrain then returns, including the altered chord from m. 26, implying that the b section from the initial a b a' form has been overwritten and expanded with the passage in mm. 168–77. Further expansion takes place in the a' consequent, which initially ends with an IAC (m. 181), after which the violin returns, attempting to reach the PAC, but two abandoned cadences further delay the PAC until m. 189, where a brief coda section closes out the movement. So, while a recapitulation of expositional materials has not occurred here, the delays and expansions in this final section of the refrain (a highly expanded cadential progression starting in m. 70, a deceptive cadence in m. 77, and a one-more-time extension(41) before the final V:PAC in m. 81) are reminiscent of Subordinate theme–like loosenings from the exposition. In sum, this piece shows an example of balancing the lack of a recapitulation of post-Main Theme expositional materials either by expanding the third refrain from within or simply using a variant of A to avoid a literal repetition of the refrain.

Clementi

[3.4] One further example from this decade offers ambiguity between an expositional five-part rondo and sonata-rondo reading: Clementi's Piano Sonata in E-flat major, op. 12, no. 2, composed in 1784 (**Example 32**). The initial refrain is an eight-measure sentential antecedent ending with a tonicized half cadence, suggesting that a compound (sixteen-measure) period is unfolding. However, the apparent consequent phrase, starting in m. 9 (**Example 33**) is reinterpreted as transitional during its continuation phrase, which modulates to the dominant key, culminating in a tonicized V:HC in m. 16.(42) A Subordinate theme then follows, initiating another sentence-structured theme opening with the motive from the refrain's basic idea in the dominant. This theme's virtuosic continuation, featuring driving 32nd notes at first, however, is expanded in a manner typical of a sonata-form Subordinate theme before leading to a V:PAC in m. 48. Like the B section, the C section also begins as a dissolving (or failed) consequent following the return of A, this time modulating to the relative minor (C minor) during another highly expanded continuation. Thus, when the third A returns (**Example 34**), the beginning of the consequent ostensibly begins a new section in m. 93. This time it remains in the tonic key and its continuation motivically references the continuation of the Subordinate theme (compare mm. 97ff. with mm. 20ff.), hinting at a possible recapitulation of expositional materials in the tonic, and opening the possibility of an overall sonata-rondo reading. Though only a partial reference to expositional materials, several sonata-form first movement recapitulations composed around this time, particularly by Haydn, feature significantly shortened returns of expositional material, so this interpretation would certainly not be far-fetched.(43) Thus, this movement seems to hover between an expositional five-part rondo with an external balancing section and a true sonata-rondo form. Another possible interpretation in the earlier examples with external balancing sections, indicated by the "D" label in the formal outline, is that mm. 94–113 is a third episode (D), thus creating an expositional seven-part rondo. Finally, it is significant that the E♭ PAC in m. 112 is the first home-key PAC in the entire piece, because of the refrain's concluding half cadence—this is highly

unusual in rondo-based forms of the Classical period and undermines the rondo form's sectionality.(44)

4. 1790s

Joseph Haydn's London Symphonies

[4.1] With this context of five-part expositional rondos in hand, we now return to the finales of Haydn's "London" symphonies from the 1790s, with which this article opened. These symphonies, of course, were geared toward the more sophisticated London audiences, and Haydn hoped that the works would "rivet [himself] in their favor."(45) In particular, as mentioned before, the finales of Symphonies Nos. 97 and 101 have resisted unambiguous formal interpretations in previous literature on rondo forms; however, their designs resemble those of the expositional five-part rondos explored thus far, though on a greatly expanded scale.

[4.2] Symphony No. 97's refrain (see **Examples 35 and 36**) is a robust 50-measure rounded binary form |: **a** :|: **b a'** :| whose **a'** section is expanded through the appearance of a new dotted motive in m. 40, which will become significant later in the movement. It is followed by an eight-measure closing section (mm. 50–58). The B section proper begins in m. 58 with a transition-like section, a *tutti-affirmation* launch, based on the dotted motive from m. 40 (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 94). Its modulation to the dominant key (G major) culminates with a dominant harmony in m. 81 that is sustained for 2 measures; however, there is no textural break after it. The upper strings fly up over the dominant pedal before immediately stating a Subordinate theme in G major, cast in a sentence structure and based on the dotted rhythmic figure from the end of the A section. Though this moment might have sparked an admonishment by A. Peter Brown that the section lacks a "strong identity" (2001, 269), and there is no literal medial caesura, m. 84 brings clear initiating function in form-functional terms: two two-measure basic ideas prolonging tonic, an expanded continuation with fragmentation and a descending-third sequence (mm. 88–93), and the cadential progression reaching the V:PAC in m. 97, which completes the expanded sentence theme. A brief closing section follows—notably based on the melodic-motivic material from the closing section after the Main Theme (m. 50ff.)—before a retransition ushers in the (truncated) second A section.

[4.3] However, this B section, or Transition-Subordinate Complex, will not return in the third rotation following the return of the refrain (complete, but with no repeats) in measures 196–245. Instead, as shown in **Example 37**, a brief link begins in m. 246, featuring a minor-mode repeat of the m. 47 dotted motive, crystallizing into a iv6 pre-dominant harmony in m. 248, which sets up a fourth repeat of the refrain motive in m. 255. However, this recurrence stalls briefly with a fermata-extended tonicization of the submediant (mm. 258–60) but is reinvigorated by a sequential recurrence of the dotted motive (mm. 262–68) and further prolongations of tonic (mm. 269–79). The section that follows (mm. 280–319) reaches a home-key PAC in m. 303 and is followed by more hesitant dominant-tonic fermata progressions, followed by another PAC in m. 319 that leads to one final tonic-confirming section (mm. 319–33).

[4.4] These brief references to the dotted motive from m. 47, which itself was the basis of the Subordinate theme's melodic-motivic material (mm. 84–87), are essentially the only "recapitulation" of the B section in the tonic, so this questionable recapitulatory section is instead an external balancing section, similar to those in the previous examples, within an overall expositional five-part rondo form (albeit one on a much more expansive overall scale).(46) Previous analysts have had different interpretations: Cole (1982, 116) labels it a five-part (or "two-couplet," as he puts it) ABACA rondo, but one of the last in a long series of symphonic finales (including Symphony No. 101) whose "design evolved from a sectional, variation solution in which the dominant is rarely the goal of the first couplet [as, for example, in Symphony No. 55], to one that in tonal scheme, disposition of the first couplet, and developmental second couplet rivalled. . . the mature sonata-rondo in integration and complexity" (120). Fillion (2012, 191) files Symphony No. 97 as one of her "'lesser' sonata-rondos," along with the previously discussed finales of Symphonies No. 64, 66, and 69, and both she and A. Peter Brown (2001, 269) designate it a "monothematic" form, although Brown hesitates to call it a sonata-rondo due to the first episode

(B)'s aforementioned "lack of a strong identity." Here, Brown might either be pointing to the lack of a "new" theme in the B episode that could function as a Subordinate theme (despite Haydn's propensity to base clear Subordinate themes in his expositions on the Main Theme throughout his sonata-form movements), or the lack of a clean breaking point (Hepokoski and Darcy's medial caesura) to set up such a Subordinate theme, or both. Hepokoski and Darcy themselves designate the movement a Type 4 sonata-rondo, but one with "radicalized recomposition of recapitulatory space" (2006, 416). In the context of the current study, this finale provides an example of a five-part expositional rondo with larger overall proportions than the earlier examples, but which still follows the principles of an expositional first rotation, and an external balancing section in the third rotation.

[4.5] The Finale of Symphony No. 101 (the "Clock") has sparked even more heterogenous analytical parsings, which will be discussed as we explore the third rotation in more detail. Its refrain (mm. 1–28), a bit more compact than that of Symphony No. 97, is also cast in a ||: a :||: b a' :|| form, and it elides directly with the onset of the beginning of the B section, another "tutti affirmation" *forte* explosion in the full orchestra in m. 28 (see **Example 38**). As an exposition, the B section is less "inconvenient" (a term Miyake 2020 has used for similarly ambiguous Haydn finales) or problematic than that of 97: its transition, after several active measures of tonic prolongation, seems to initiate a modulating Prinner in m. 46, whose bass descends from D in m. 46 to C♯ (the second phase of an MP, $\hat{3}$ in the new key of A major in m. 48). However, after four measures prolonging the Subordinate key's I^6 harmony, the bass does a "U-turn," moving back up by step to set up a converging half-cadence in m. 56 (D–D♯–E in the bass) and prolonged by four measures of standing on the dominant.(47) A medial caesura is then articulated in mm. 60–61, with caesura-fill in the first violins; the first of two Subordinate themes then begins, based on the A-section's main motive. However, while the original Main Theme was a hybrid theme (antecedent + continuation) this setting is a sentence—the first basic idea over dominant harmony, and the second over tonic harmony (with a dominant pedal in the bass), followed by a continuation that leads to another converging V:HC in measure 73. A second sentential theme based on the refrain's motive appears in measure 75, although this theme reverses the harmonic syntax of the first Subordinate theme (first b.i. over tonic, second b.i. over dominant). Its continuation is highly expanded, in a manner typical of a sonata-form Subordinate theme, through an expanded cadential progression beginning in m. 85, and it culminates in an attenuated V:PAC in m. 94,(48) eliding with a Closing/Retransition section.

[4.6] The monothematicism of this exposition is worth pausing over: comparing the three versions of the refrain's melody from a form-functional perspective shows three different theme types (see **Example 39**). The original version (Version "a") is a period, whose antecedent opens with an incomplete *Romanesca* and whose consequent, while retaining the basic idea's motive, changes the harmony from tonic prolongation to an inverted dominant on the downbeat before a tonicization of ii.(49) By contrast, the version that appears as the first Subordinate theme (Version "b," starting in m. 62), while retaining the main motive in the violins (under a dominant cover tone in the oboe, held over from the MC), is a sentence theme over a dominant pedal. The first basic idea prolongs the dominant through a voice exchange between the 1st violin and viola, and then the tonic through another voice exchange, still over the dominant pedal. The sentence's continuation, itself expanded, stretches out the subdominant harmony for five measures (mm. 66–70), before the secondary leading tone harmony (mm. 71–72) leads to V, completing the converging half cadence in A major (m. 73). Thus, the harmonic content and theme type are quite different from those of the original setting in the Main Theme, problematizing the label of monothematic. Furthermore, the version that follows soon after as Subordinate theme part 2 (Version "c," mm. 75ff.), while still a sentence, has a stronger harmonic underpinning than that of Subordinate theme part 1, and reverses the harmonies of the two basic ideas—I in root position for the first basic idea (again prolonged through a voice exchange) and V in root position for the second basic idea. These theme types will become significant when we approach this piece's third rotation, as well as when we consider the idea of monothematic "redundancy" that previous authors have used to explain the lack of recapitulations in these expositional rondos.

[4.7] As discussed earlier, Symphony No. 101's strong expositional qualities set the expectation for a tonic recapitulation during the third rotation to complete a Type 4 sonata-rondo, particularly

since Type 4 sonata-rondos were common in finales in the early. However, when the third A section begins (see **Example 40**) in m. 189, something is already amiss—the main motive has been modified yet again, and rather than appearing as a period or sentence theme as before, it is used as the subject for an elaborate, lengthy *fugato* section. This section (mm. 189–249) lasts nearly twice as long as the original A section. **Example 41** offers an overall outline of the movement, which has generated considerable analytical discourse (it is even used as an extreme example in a textbook on form and analysis). Cole maintains that this is a five-part rondo, though "not far removed" from a sonata-rondo form (1982, 136). While Fisher acknowledges the expositional nature of both this and Symphony No. 97, he notes that even though the *fugato* section replaces a "literal return" of the Subordinate theme, "there is nothing formally incomplete" about this movement, since the exposition's Subordinate theme was "clearly derived from the main theme in the first place" (Fisher 1992, 99).

[4.8] Indeed, Cole notes that the second couplet in the C section "recapitulates" the Subordinate theme in the mediant key (F major); to be specific, it replays elements of both versions of the sentential Subordinate themes, first in m. 156 with the tonic-dominant presentation from Version "c" (originally seen in m. 75), then in m. 160 with the continuation phrase from Version "b," expanding subdominant harmony, and finally in m. 164 by the tonic-heavy continuation from Version "c." Thus, he too notes that having done this "in an unexpected place, Haydn apparently felt no obligation to recapitulate [the original Subordinate theme or B] in the tonic in its expected place" (Cole 1982, 156). Again, I would refute this "monothematic" or "redundancy" argument, not only due to the form-functional difference between the three versions of the Main Theme explored above (i.e., the Main Theme and Subordinate themes need not be swept under a monothematic rug), but because of clear sonata-rondo forms whose Subordinate theme is based on the Main Theme (i.e., "monothematic"), that *did* return these expositional materials in the third rotation, such as the Piano Sonata No. 48 and Symphony No. 85, as mentioned above.(50)

[4.9] Fillion, classifying this as one of her "lesser" sonata-rondos (one with a missing or incomplete recapitulation) notes that it "explores new territory in its recapitulation, which in length and invention counterbalances the weighty exposition" (2012, 198–99). Hepokoski and Darcy include this as a Type 4 sonata-rondo subtype, one with a "more radically recomposed recapitulatory space" (2006, 416). They note that

> The Type 43 outlines are clear enough through the developmental rotation. . . the **presumed recapitulatory** space, however, is completely reconceived as a brilliant fugato based on the Prf [refrain/Main Theme] head-motive, with, at best, only the most passing of potential allusions, if any at all, to figuration originally heard in later parts of the exposition. This "recapitulation-substitute" is broadly symmetrical with the exposition in its normative position within the movement in its P-references, and in its thorough grounding of the tonic, D. But as something that can give the impression of a "new" fugal episode, it is certainly not a normative recapitulation. (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 416, my emphasis)

Matthew Santa, in his textbook *Hearing Form*, advances this finale as a "model-defying form" in his chapter on sonata-rondo forms, noting that it

> proceeds as a sonata-rondo. . . until about m. 198, but then fails to deliver the recapitulation. . . that one would expect in a sonata-rondo. Instead it enters into what sounds a lot like a **coda**. Because of this, one might decide that the label of a **five-part rondo** is more appropriate. . . however, this understanding ignores the character of those contrasting sections: the passage in mm. 60–75 sounds like a **second theme**. . . and the music in mm. 138–231 sounds very much like a development. . . Ultimately, whether one calls this a sonata-rondo or a five-part rondo is immaterial; what matters is that one recognizes those elements that relate to sonata forms and those that relate to rondo forms, and recognizes how those have been combined in a different way here. (2016, 123–24, my emphasis)

While one could make the argument that this section does in fact represent a recapitulation as some of these authors have, given the pieces we have looked at in this study, I would propose that the Clock symphony's finale is a five-part expositional rondo whose third rotation balances the piece's

proportions—and then some—with the massive *fugato* episode. Furthermore, like its contemporary in the 97th symphony, it is a successor to the earlier five-part expositional rondos from the previous three decades, especially those that added a balancing section in the third rotation instead than a "proper" recapitulation of expositional materials in the tonic key.

Conclusion

[5.1] In sum, I argue that "problematic" movements such as the finales explored in this paper, as well as those listed in **Example 42**,(51) should be defined neither negatively (as "flawed" or "lesser" sonata-rondo forms) nor experientially (as a midstream "conversion" from Type 4 to rondo), but rather as descendants of the expositional rondo that originated in finales as early as the 1760s in pieces by Mozart, Joseph and Michael Haydn, J.C. Bach, and Bologne. Doing so through the lens of *Galant* expositional norms outlined by Burstein (2020) provides a view of these earlier examples as the seeds for "incomplete" sonata-rondo forms due to the expositional qualities of their B sections. I propose, given the frequency with which it occurs throughout the late 18th century, that this form was a default formal option for finales, just as much as (and perhaps more so at certain times) the sonata-rondo through the 1780s. This newly proposed form also offers a unifying thread for these elusive finales, most notably those in the finale of two of Haydn's crowning achievements, the London Symphonies.

Graham G. Hunt
The University of Texas at Arlington
2214 Clearspring Drive N.
Irving, TX 75063
gghunt@uta.edu

Works Cited

Brown, A. Peter. 2001. *The Symphonic Repertoire, Volume 2: The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony*. Indiana University Press.

Burstein, Poundie. 2020. *Journeys through Galant Expositions*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190083991.001.0001.

Caplin, William. 1998. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195104806.001.0001.

————————. 2013. *Analyzing Classical Form: An Approach for the Classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Cole, Malcolm. 1964. *The Development of the Instrumental Rondo Finale from 1750 to 1800*. PhD diss., Princeton University.

————————. 1982. "Haydn's Symphonic Rondo Finales: Their Structural and Stylistic Evolution." *Haydn Yearbook* 13: 113–42.

Czerny, Carl. 1848 [reprint 1979]. *School of Practical Composition*, op. 600. Da Capo.

Fillion, Michelle. 2012. "Form, Rhetoric, and the Reception of Haydn's Rondo Finales." In *Engaging Haydn: Culture, Context, and Criticism*, ed. Mary Hunter and Richard Will, 187–210. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139057714.011.

Fisher, Stephen. 1992. "Further Thoughts on Haydn's Symphonic Rondo Finales." *Haydn Yearbook* 17: 85–107.

Galand, Joel. 1995. "Form, Genre, and Style in the Eighteenth-Century Rondo." *Music Theory Spectrum* 17 (1): 27–52. https://doi.org/10.2307/745763.

Gjerdingen, Robert. 2007. *Music in the Galant Style*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195313710.001.0001.

Hepokoski, James and Darcy, Warren. 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195146400.001.0001.

Huguet, Joan. 2015. *Formal Functions and Voice-Leading Structures in Beethoven's Early Sonata-Rondo Finales*. PhD diss., University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music.

Hunt, Graham. 2014. "'How Much is Enough?': Structural and Formal Ramifications of the Abbreviated Second A Section in Rondo Finales from Haydn to Brahms." *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* 8: 5–50.

————————. 2024. "The Prinner as Transition(?) in Sonata-Form Arias by Haydn and Mozart." Paper presented at the Society of Music Theory Annual Meeting, Jacksonville, FL.

Kerman, Joseph. 1979. *The Beethoven Quartets*. W. W. Norton.

Martin, Nathan John. 2016. "The Prinner Transition in Mozart." Paper presented at the Music Theory Midwest Annual Meeting, Fayetteville, AR.

Martin, Nathan John, and Ulrich Kaiser. 2023. "Models for Mozart's Transitions: A Transatlantic Exchange." *Music Theory Spectrum* 45 (2): 336–56. https://doi.org/10.1093/mts/mtad012.

Martin, Nathan John, and Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers. 2015. "The Mozartean Half Cadence." In *What is a Cadence? Theoretical and Analytical Perspectives on Cadences in the Classical Repertoire*, ed. Markus Neuwirth and Pieter Bergé, 185–214. Leuven University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt14jxt45.9.

Miyake, Jan. 2020. "Formal Problems as Opportune Inconveniences in Haydn's Late Piano Trios." Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the American Musicological Society and Society for Music Theory, virtual.

————————. 2021. "Implications of Thematic Reuse in Haydn's Sonata Forms." *Proceedings of the Future Directions of Music Cognition International Conference*. https://doi.org/10.18061/FDMC.2021.0010.

Papendiek, Charlotte Louise Henrietta. 1887. *Court and Private Life in the Time of Queen Charlotte: Being the Journals of Mrs. Papendiek, Assistant Keeper of the Wardrobe and Reader to Her Majesty*. Edited by Vernon Delves Broughton. London.

Santa, Matthew. 2016. *Hearing Form: Musical Analysis with and without the Score*. Routledge.

Schmalfeldt, Janet. 2011. *In the Process of Becoming: Analytical and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music*. Oxford University Press.

Segall, Christopher. 2018. "Rondo=>Sonata Conversion: The Finale of Beethoven's String Quartet in C minor, op. 18 no. 4." *Music Theory and Analysis* 5 (2): 203–15. https://doi.org/10.11116/MTA.5.2.5.

Yust, Jason. 2017. "Michael Haydn, Mozart, and the Invention of Sonata-Rondo." Paper presented at the Music Theory Society of New York State Annual Meeting, Geneva, NY.

Footnotes

* I wish to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments on this article. In particular, I appreciate the candid and astute thoughts Joan Huguet offered.
Return to text

1. Unless otherwise indicated, all movements in this paper are final movements of the work. In addition, when "Haydn" is mentioned without a first name, it refers to Joseph Haydn.
Return to text

2. The 97th symphony lacks a clear medial caesura in its exposition but does offer a clear Subordinate or Secondary theme in m. 83; it could still be parsed as a continuous exposition (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 51), or from a formal-function standpoint, simply an exposition whose

transition does not conclude with a cadence.
Return to text

3. Hepokoski and Darcy, for example, mention conversion (though not this specific type) throughout *Elements of Sonata Theory*, such as a Type 5 converting to a Type 4-1 expanded form in Mozart's K. 415 finale (2006, 423). Christopher Segall (2018) proposes a "[seven-part] rondo=>sonata" conversion, specifically in the finale of Beethoven's String Quartet, op. 18, no. 4. Segall's conversion, of course, draws on Janet Schmalfeldt's concept of "becoming" (2011).
Return to text

4. Yust proposes that the first sonata-rondo composed actually pre-dates the hotly debated Mozart and Haydn finales from the 1770s, over which Malcolm Cole (1982) and Stephen Fisher (1992) waged a spirited debate, and which Hepokoski and Darcy discounted in *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006). Adopting an implicitly broader concept of the sonata elements, Yust proposes that Haydn's younger brother, Michael, in fact penned the first sonata-rondo in his 1763 Symphony No. 4 (MH 62). Miyake (2020), focusing on later piano trio finales by Haydn, sees the formal ambiguities therein as "opportune inconveniences," which create the opportunity for fresh analytical approaches, such as the one this article proposes.
Return to text

5. Fillion (2012, 198) uses this label for some of the Haydn finales analyzed in this paper, as well as for other movements with similar layouts.
Return to text

6. Burstein notes that *Grundabsätze* and *Quintabsätze* sometimes do conclude with what "in modern parlance" would be called a cadence, but this is not a requirement (2020, 32–33).
Return to text

7. While the sonata-rondo was not yet a standardized formal option at this time, Galant expositions in a sonata-rondo finale were quite common in pieces composed around this time, such as Joseph Haydn's Symphonies No. 27, 32, and 33, and the String Quartets, op. 2, nos. 1, 2, 4, and 6.
Return to text

8. The formal outline and the musical examples do, in addition to the Satz labels, include the "modern" labels as well—Main Theme, Transition, and Subordinate Theme—but only to help contextualize these early examples when we look at the later examples which conform more clearly to the standard sonata-form labels.
Return to text

9. Hepokoski and Darcy's main distinction between rondeaux and rondos is that the former consists of simple period- or sentence-form sections alternating with contrasting episodes, with few, if any, retransitions, while the latter displays more complex internal forms, such as binary or rounded binary, with elaborate retransitions that set up the returns of A (2006, 390ff.). K. 22, with its simpler internal forms and brief (one-measure) retransition sections (m. 30 and m. 67) thus leans towards the rondeau in their typology.
Return to text

10. Hepokoski and Darcy note that all rondo forms, including the sonata-rondo (their Type 4 sonata) are "in dialogue with the rotational principle. Each successive appearance of the refrains ('A'). . . begins a rotation. Each rotation is marked by a similar opening, even though what follows in the remainder can differ from one rotation to the next" (2006, 390). For a critique of this in relation to sonata-rondo form, see Huguet 2015, who contends that "the application of Sonata Theory's concept of rotation to sonata-rondo form is problematic. . . with the exception of the recapitulation, the returns in a sonata-rondo do not present complete or even partial rotations of the exposition's layout, but only the refrain" (2015, 21). While Huguet's argument is quite valid, the formal outlines in this paper will, for convenience, number the rotations as 1 (Exposition), 2 (Refrain and central episode "C"), 3 (Refrain), and, if the coda revisits refrain material, rotation 4.
Return to text

11. These stepwise descents are shown in the score with the encircled numbers above and below the staff; note in its first phrase, the 1st/3rd scale degrees in the home key are retrospectively re-interpreted as the 4th/6th scale degrees in the dominant key once the modulation is complete. For more on modulating prinners in transition sections, see Hunt 2024, Martin 2016, and Martin and Kaiser 2023.
Return to text

12. Though Hepokoski and Darcy do not explicitly analyze this movement or Mozart's K. 22, they discount two similar Mozart rondos written seven years later that do bring back their B sections in the tonic, and whose B sections are Galant expositions much like K. 22: the K. 157 String Quartet and the K. 181 symphony. They say they do not qualify as Type 4 sonatas because of the lack of a clear transition and MC, lack of re-transitions before the A sections, and lack of internal "complex" forms such as aba'. They call them "symmetrical three-couplet rondos," while acknowledging the "Type 4" features of their first rotation—i.e. the suggestion of a sonata-like exposition, saying they "register. . . the effects of modest sonata urgings" (2006, 394).
Return to text

13. However, he would likely hesitate to call the first rotation an exposition due to the lack of a recapitulation of Subordinate-theme material: "it would not be wrong to speak of an 'exposition' when Couplet 1 is a Subordinate-Theme complex [i.e. transition and subordinate theme]. But this terminological practice is not widespread since no comparable 'recapitulation' is found in that form" (Caplin 2013, 651).
Return to text

14. I found an example from one year earlier, J.C. Bach's Keyboard Concerto, op. 1, no. 4, whose "exposition" has a clear textural break after the first post-A section, a *Quintabsatz* in V ("TR"), which is followed by a *Schlußsatz* in V ("ST") that is repeated by the orchestra before return of A in the tonic. This "Subordinate Theme" returns in the third rotation in the tonic key, albeit without the "transition" section, thus arguably creating the first example of a sonata-rondo that I am aware of.
Return to text

15. The labels in Example 8 employ Caplin's intrathematic labeling system where PACs separate, for example, Subordinate Theme 1 from Subordinate Theme 2, whereas other divisions separate, for example, Subordinate Theme 1 part 1 from Subordinate Theme 1 part 2. Compare, for example, Caplin 2013, Example 12.3 (359) with Example 12.5 (365).
Return to text

16. Burstein adopts the term from Galeazzi, who emphasizes "thematic character" more so than Koch and Riepel; the *passo di mezzo* begins in the subordinate key, is typically "Gentle, expressive, tender," and is "'conspicuously detached' from the preceding passage (=medial caesura)" (2020, 92).
Return to text

17. This term Burstein takes from Koch, and it translates roughly to "'swooshing or lively'" and can also connote "energy-gain," as a contrast to the lyrical, "gentler" *passo di mezzo* (2020, 61).
Return to text

18. Please note that the dates of composition for Joseph Haydn's works, particularly the symphonies, are often approximations, in this case based on Brown's (2001) dating. Also, pieces examined in detail in this study are identified in bold in the chart.
Return to text

19. These examples are: Haydn's Symphony No. 2 (five-part), Mozart's 4-hand Piano Sonata K. 19D (nine-part), Haydn's Symphony No. 30 (five-part, missing 2nd A section), Haydn's Piano Sonata (five-part), and Mozart's Serenade K. 100 (seven-part). Note that I do not distinguish between rondeau and rondo forms, as Fillion and Hepokoski and Darcy do; as noted earlier, the main differences between these two forms according to Hepokoski and Darcy are the presence of retransitions before the refrains and/or the complexity of the internal sections. The list of pieces is

not meant to be exhaustive, merely what I have found in a survey of works by the four composers listed.
Return to text

20. True sonata-rondos, or Type 4 sonatas, along with the expositional five-part rondo, were the most common rondo-based form found in the finales surveyed for this study in the 1770s; 23 of the latter and 22 of the former were found in the finales of Mozart, Joseph Haydn, Clementi, and Bologne.
Return to text

21. Compare this with the normative Modulating Prinner seen in Example 7 by Michael Haydn, mm. 9–12. My study focuses on opera arias from the same time period whose sonata expositions typically had smaller proportions than instrumental sonatas and employ various galant schemata during the transition section.
Return to text

22. For Caplin (2013) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), transitions normally conclude with a cadence, whereas, as noted earlier in footnote 6, Burstein's (2020) *Sätze* do not necessarily end with cadences, rather with a (local) tonic harmony (in a *Grundabsatz*) or a (local) dominant harmony (in a *Quintabsatz*).
Return to text

23. This practice was also used in several examples of seven-part expositional rondos that Bologne composed in this decade, such as the op. 3 concerti. The third couplet (D section) of these pieces feature virtuoso passagework for the violin soloist (Bologne himself) in the tonic key. While these sections do not create a recapitulation, and thus an overall sonata-rondo form, they are significant when considering the large number of sonata-rondo finales written in this decade (such as Mozart's K. 155 and 157 String Quartets from 1772), as well as later in this paper when looking at balancing sections in the third rotations of expositional rondos.
Return to text

24. For example, the first movements of his Symphonies No. 58 or 60, his Piano Trio Hob. XV: 36, or the Piano Sonatas XVI: 27, 28, or 29.
Return to text

25. Hepokoski and Darcy refer to the "lights-out" technique (2006, 142) and Cole refers to this motive as a "rocket idea" (1964, 166).
Return to text

26. Note that this recalls the unusual addition to the seventh of the dominant harmony in m. 39 just before the MC.
Return to text

27. While Haydn was also known for what Hepokoski and Darcy term a "continuous exposition," one without a medial caesura, he did also write several 2-part expositions with medial caesuras during this same period; examples include the first movements of these same symphonies (Nos. 64, 66, and 69) as well as those of Symphonies No. 67, 68, and 70.
Return to text

28. Although Sonata Theory typically uses *Fortspinnung* in the context of "continuous expositions," those with no medial caesura nor Secondary Theme; here, of course, the possible V:HC MC in m. 32 could create a two-part exposition, albeit one with an unusually early MC. Again, if we retain the Galant labels here, we could simply call mm. 29–32 the *Quintabsatz* in V, and a massive *Schlußsatz* in V from mm. 33–51.
Return to text

29. Fillion (2012, 199) noting the nickname which referred to Austrian Field-Marshal Gideon Ernst Freiherr von Laudon, and which Haydn himself "tolerated" a decade later, per a letter to the Artaria publishers (n32), cogently notes the contrast between the pastoral, "rustic *contredanse*" of the A theme and the military rhetoric of the B section, beginning with the "loud brass fanfares" in

this opening six-measure phrase (199). A. Peter Brown (2001, 166) notes that this might have been financially motivated, as he noted that "the word (Laudon) will contribute more to the sale than [any] ten finales'" when he said the finale could be omitted by Artaria in the soon-to-be-published keyboard arrangement of the symphony.
Return to text

30. A four-measure presentation (mm. 27–30) with b.i. – b.i. (response), followed by a seeming cadential progression beginning in m. 31 (with $\hat{3}$ in the bass) that is abandoned in favor of a rising sequence (mm. 31–36), which leads to a highly expanded continuation, featuring modal mixture in mm. 38ff., and moving to the initiation of another thematic unit in m. 50. Ultimately, the V:PAC that concludes this "Transition-Subordinate Theme complex" arrives in m. 68.
Return to text

31. I discuss the ramifications of truncated returns of the refrain from various perspectives in Hunt 2014, including the often problematic identification of these movements' overall forms.
Return to text

32. Fillion (2012, 199) calls the section starting at m. 194 a Coda, whereas I read the return of the "military" rhetoric in m. 228 as the true Coda. Interestingly, she refers to the third refrain (mm. 170ff.) as a recapitulation, though one "restricted to the refrain."
Return to text

33. Seven-part expositional rondos, of course, did include this third episode, including Bologne's violin concerto, composed in the same year as Haydn's three symphonies just discussed, which featured a full third couplet with virtuosic display. This also occurred in two seven-part expositional rondos written by Mozart around this same time, the Sonata for two bassoons K. 292 and Violin Concerto K. 211, although the D sections of these works are not as expansive as those in Bologne' concerti. In K. 292, the D section (mm. 71–92) refers to the motives from the B section, though in the subdominant key, and in the Violin Concerto, the D section (mm. 154–68) follows four measures of virtuosic passagework for the soloist with variations of the refrain motive before the final A returns in m. 169. In a third Mozart finale from the same period, the K. 159 string quartet, the D section (mm. 65–96) is a *minore* couplet in the tonic minor key (the C section was also *minore* couplet, but in the relative minor key). Furthermore, there is a possible "fourth couplet" in mm. 113–28 that has what Hepokoski and Darcy term coda-rhetoric interpolation (CRI)", creating for them an overall four-couplet rondeau form (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 393–94).
Return to text

34. As Joel Galand (1995, 28n8) posited, it is also possible that Haydn was "exploiting formal possibilities that were in the air" written by other composers at the time.
Return to text

35. Note that the pieces listed as sonata-rondos in this chart and the one in Example 10 include an expositional first rotation as outlined here, with a recapitulation of some or all materials in the tonic in the third rotation; some, of course, would not be widely accepted as sonata-rondos or Type 4 sonatas in recent *Formenlehre* scholarship, because their "expositions" might be considered problematic or ambiguous, but are included here with the proposed *galant* expositional characteristics discussed above.
Return to text

36. As defined by Robert Gjerdingen (2007, 160–62) and refined by Nathan Martin and Julie Pednault-Deslauriers (2015, 186ff.), the converging half cadence features the top and bottom voices "converging" on the dominant harmony—the bass rising from $\hat{4}$- $\sharp\hat{4}$-$\hat{5}$ and the top voice descending from $\hat{2}$-$\hat{1}$-$\hat{7}$; Martin and Pednault-Deslauriers define this as one of several typical half-cadential types employed by Mozart, along with the "expanding 6–8" half cadence, the "simple I–V half cadence" and the "*doppia* half cadence."
Return to text

37. Examples of discussions of the compensatory function of codas include Kerman 1979, 179, and Caplin 1998, 227–29.

Return to text

38. Examples of other expositional rondos composed in the 1780s that employ an external balancing section between the final A section and coda include: Haydn's Piano Trio No. 23, Hob. XV: 10, mm. 213–63; Haydn's Piano Sonata No. 43, Hob. XVI: 43, mm. 156–82; Mozart's Horn Quintet K. 407, mm. 143–67; and Mozart's Piano Sonata K. 545, mm. 61–68. As is the case with the Cello Concerto, an alternative reading could include these sections as part of the coda that follows.
Return to text

39. Other examples of internal balancing sections within the final A section include Haydn's String Quartet op. 55, no. 1, mm. 116–28; this tonic-heavy passage seems to overwrite the b section of the initial |: a :|: b a' :| refrain, as it is bookended by the refrain's a section; and Clementi's Piano Sonata op. 12, no. 2 , which will be discussed shortly.
Return to text

40. While Hepokoski and Darcy use the "⇒" symbol to denote a "merger" of Closing and Retransition (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 193), they implicitly adopt Schmalfeldt's concept of retrospective formal reinterpretation, or "becoming" (Schmalfeldt 2011, 9, 79, 84). Schmalfeldt, to my knowledge, does not specifically designate C⇒RT, but Hepokoski and Darcy's use of it strongly resembles the other examples of becoming that appear throughout her study.
Return to text

41. While Schmalfeldt (2011, 48) restricts her use of the one-more-time technique to follow evaded cadences, I extend its application here to follow the deceptive cadence.
Return to text

42. This is an example of Caplin's "failed consequent" strategy frequently used to begin a transition (2013, 310–11).
Return to text

43. Examples include the first movements of Haydn's Piano Trios Hob. XVI: 6 and 11, the first movement of his Symphony No. 70, the second movement of Dussek's Piano Sonata op. 10, no. 3, and the first movement of Mozart's Piano Sonata K. 576. In Haydn's Piano Trios and Dussek's Piano Sonata, the expositional material jettisoned was one of several Subordinate Themes (part of Hepokoski and Darcy's "trimodular blocks" which feature two medial caesuras, each setting up a Subordinate Theme), but notably a theme that was a "monothematic" Subordinate Theme—based on the Main Theme's melodic-motivic material. In these examples, the other off-tonic expositional materials return in the recapitulation.
Return to text

44. I am grateful to the anonymous reviewer who pointed out the highly unusual nature of this lack of a PAC.
Return to text

45. From Haydn's words to concertmaster Johann Peter Solomon, documented by the Queen's lady-in-waiting (Papendiek 1887, 290, quoted in Brown 2001, 243).
Return to text

46. Again, this section could simply be designated a third couplet, or D section, but its hesitant, transitory nature distances it from a true third couplet, as would be seen in seven-part rondos (expositional or non-exposition), such as Mozart's String Quartet K. 159 (mentioned in an earlier footnote).
Return to text

47. This is an example of my "abandoned Modulating Prinner" (Hunt 2024), which borrows the term from Caplin's analogous abandoned cadential progression, which involves "the failure to realize an implied authentic cadence by eliminating the cadential dominant in root position" (2013, 703). Typically, in Caplin's abandoned cadential progression, the bassline of a cadential progression fails to arrive on $\hat{5}$, or if it does, it does not support the root-position dominant harmony; similarly, Hunt's abandoned Modulating Prinner fails to realize a full Prinner by not

arriving on $\hat{1}/\hat{3}$ for its final phase. Examples from opera sonatas include Mozart's "Al desio chi t'adoro" (#28a from *Le Nozze di Figaro*), "Troppa briga" (#3 from *La Finta Semplice*) and Haydn's "Il lavaro" (#2 from *Orlando Paladino*).
Return to text

48. The dynamic drop and textural gap between V and I also suggest that this could be an evaded cadence.
Return to text

49. Gjerdingen (2007, 25ff.); in the full version of this schema, the bass has $\hat{7}$ in the "stepwise" version, or $\hat{5}$ in the "leaping" version. The most notable appearance of the former is in Pachelbel's *Canon in D*, P. 37. Caplin (1998, 80) reads this as a period without problematization, despite the sharply different harmonic profile of the beginnings of the antecedent and the consequent just noted. However, the top-voice motive and rhythmic profile remain identical, and other than the different harmonic support under m. 5, there are not enough elements of a continuation to label this, say, a hybrid (antecedent + continuation).
Return to text

50. Fisher (1992) does acknowledge the fact that "Haydn frequently omits such materials ["monothematic" B sections] in sonata-form movements and in undoubted sonata-rondos" (99).
Return to text

51. This chart is a list of three-, five-, and seven-part expositional rondo finales found in a selective survey of late 18th-century rondo finales, mostly works of Mozart and Haydn, but also of Clementi, Michael Haydn, J.C. Bach, and Bologne. It is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather a representative sample from the relevant time period.
Return to text

Prepared by Amy King, Editorial Assistant