

2 The Late Eighteenth Century: Mozart and Haydn

FOLLOWING his early experiments with the accompanied sonata Mozart delayed for over ten years before again embarking on concerted chamber works for one or more strings and piano. During the intervening period the string quartet was the chamber form which principally engaged his attention, together with the solo piano sonata. When, in 1778, he began again to explore the combination of piano and strings, it was particularly to the violin sonata that he turned, his interest having been sparked by a new constructive principle, the elements of which he had encountered in some sonatas (*Divertimenti da camera*) by the Saxon Kapellmeister Joseph Schuster. A reference to this discovery occurs in a letter which he sent to his father from Munich on 6 October 1777. 'Schuster's sonatas', he wrote, 'are not bad . . . if I stay on I shall write six myself in the same style, as they are very popular here.'¹ The new structural device which Mozart identified in these works, and sought to develop in his own violin sonatas (his 'Clavierduetti mit Violin' as he called them), was a crucially important one. It involved the elevation of the violin from its customary accompanying role to one of near-equal partnership with the keyboard, by entrusting it with a large share of the melodic material in alternation with the piano, and with the opportunity to contribute significantly to the whole texture by means of imitations, counterthemes, and transitional passage-work.² In relation to chamber music with piano this new technique brought about a revitalization akin to that produced in the string quartet by Haydn's energetic exploration of textural

integration and motivic development from his Op. 20 set of 1772 onwards.

The only Mozart composition to involve the piano trio combination at this period was the *Divertimento* in B flat, K254, dated August 1776. Though customarily regarded as the first of the developed Mozart trios, this work is hardly more than an elaborate accompanied sonata. Composed over a year before the Schuster-inspired violin sonatas, it is notable for its unusually active violin part, particularly in the second and third movements;³ but not surprisingly it shows little sign of alternation and exchange of ideas between the instruments in the mature sonata manner. Furthermore the cello's role is a very humble one, amounting to little more than a doubling of the keyboard bass-line at the unison or the octave below. No special significance attaches, incidentally, to Mozart's use of the term 'divertimento' for this work, which has a full-scale sonata structure; the expression was commonly used for major chamber compositions of all types at this period and carries with it no implication of lightness of style or musical intention.⁴ The titles adopted by Mozart for his mature trios of the 1780s are 'Terzett' and, exceptionally (in the autograph of K496 only), 'Sonata'. The designation 'Piano Trio' appears not to have been in general use at the time, though a version of it is to be found in a letter by Leopold Mozart, of January 1778, in which he refers to his son's *Divertimento* K254, as '*Trio für Clavier ex B und recht, recht vortreflich*' (Trio in B flat for piano and very, very splendid).

During the 1770s Haydn was also engaged in writing simple trios of the accompanied sonata type, for harpsichord, violin, and cello, which he too described by the term 'divertimento' or sometimes 'partita'.⁵ Though by no means insignificant these works give few indications of the powerful piano trio style he was to cultivate during the last decade of the century. Rather surprisingly, Haydn appears to have neglected the violin sonata; no fully authenticated example of the genre by him has

¹ E. Anderson (ed.), *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, 2nd edn., rev. M. Carlson and A. H. King (London, 1966), I, 300.

² For a discussion of the developing role of the violin in Mozart's duo sonatas, see W. Fischer, 'Mozarts Weg von der begleiteten Klavier-sonate zur Kammermusik mit Klavier', *Mozart Jahrbuch* (1956), 16.

³ Fischer, in 'Mozarts Weg', p. 30, points to the increased equality between the violin and keyboard roles in this work, citing in particular the opening of the rondo finale.

⁴ See J. Webster, 'Towards a History of Viennese Chamber Music in the Early Classical Period', *The Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 27 (1974), 212.

⁵ See M. Fillion, 'The Accompanied Keyboard Divertimenti of Haydn and his Contemporaries, c. 1750-1780', Cornell Univ. diss. 1982.

survived,⁶ and consequently, he never wholly absorbed the Mozartian system for parcelling out thematic material between the keyboard and one or more stringed instruments. This appears to have been one important instance where the interaction of ideas between the two composers, so clearly evident in the symphony and string quartet, failed to operate. As a result, when they came at the end of their careers and at the height of their powers to make their most significant contributions to the piano trio form, they approached their task from quite different viewpoints. For Mozart, essential scope had to be provided for all three instruments to combine, alternate, imitate, and vie with each other on equal terms and in numerous ingenious and expressive ways. The piano he treated, logically enough, as a concertante instrument on the basis of his experience with the piano concerto, but always with the restraint necessary to allow the strings their full share of the musical argument. In effect he applied to the trio the classical criteria regarding integrity and equality of interest in the parts with much the same rigour as both he and Haydn had already done in relation to the string quartet. Haydn, on the other hand, took the keyboard part as the core of the piano trio, providing for it music of great brilliance and formal subtlety. The strings he was content to confine to a largely colouristic role, as a means of adding warmth to the melodic lines and imparting strength to the bass, but never of dictating the formal structure in any significant way. The violin is granted some independence in the later trios, sometimes taking short solo passages and often supplying beautifully crafted inner parts or imitative counter-points; but the cello rarely has more than a very restricted role, functioning mainly in support of the bass-line in the manner of the older accompanied sonatas. In the process he deliberately cultivated an old-fashioned, even somewhat 'crippled' form; but through his imaginative treatment of it he managed to imbue it with entirely new life. Mozart's system, when expanded by Beethoven, became the accepted ideal for virtually all later trio

⁶ A violin sonata in G major by Haydn, available in several modern editions, is almost certainly an unauthentic version of a piano trio (Hob. XV. 32); see A. Tyson, 'New Light on a Haydn Trio (XV:32)', *Haydn Yearbook*, 1 (1962), 203. Tyson conjectures that the trio, which was issued in London by Preston (possibly in conjunction with another publisher, Bland) in 1794, at the time of Haydn's second visit to England, may actually have been composed in 1792, during his first visit. The apparently spurious version, for violin and cello alone, can be traced to an edition produced by Artaria in Vienna, also during 1794.

composition. But Haydn also, by the example of his masterful piano writing and structural inventiveness, exerted a profound influence on the future of the genre, aspects of his style reappearing transformed in the work of numerous trio composers of the succeeding generation.

The five great piano trios of Mozart were produced, according to his personal catalogue (the autograph *Verzeichniss aller meine Werke*), during a two-year period from 1786 to 1788 in the following succession: K496 in G, K498 in E flat (the clarinet trio), and K502 in B flat in July, August, and November respectively of 1786; and K542 in E and K548 in C in June and July of 1788. In addition to these works there exist also the little G major trio, K564, apparently also dating from 1788, but of uncertain origin, and a surprisingly large amount of 'workshop debris' in the form of sketches and trio fragments, which bear clear witness to the difficulties the composer experienced with the medium.⁷

We are not perhaps sufficiently accustomed to the idea of Mozart as a composer who had to work hard at composition, to struggle with intractable material, to reject first thoughts and constantly refashion his ideas in the manner of Beethoven. But the evidence suggests that chamber music, in particular, may have caused him much difficulty. An obvious example, somewhat parallel to that of the piano trios, is provided by the six string quartets which he dedicated to Haydn in 1785. In his dedicatory letter he described his offering as the 'fruit of long and strenuous endeavour', an assertion borne out not only by the two-year period needed to complete the works but also by the numerous false starts, modifications, and corrections to be seen in the manuscript sources. It is possibly significant that the two smaller of the surviving trio fragments, each consisting of some twenty bars of sketch before breaking off, are in the same keys—G major and B flat major—as the two standard trios completed in 1786. Whether or not they were first attempts at these works—and there is no positive evidence one way or the other—it is not difficult to see why the composer should have abandoned them. The B flat fragment (K Anhang 51) starts exactly like an old-style accompanied sonata, with unison and octave doublings and interpolated harmony notes for the violin, and clearly provides

⁷ All the trios, the fragments included, are available in the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe*, Serie VIII, Werksgruppe 22/2, (Kassel 1955-).

little if any scope for the new concept of trio writing which was lurking in Mozart's imagination. And the G major section (K Anhang 52) consists of a fourteen-bar theme, apparently for piano alone, which seems to afford the strings minimal opportunity for integrated contributions, suggesting only a simple repetition from bar 15, with the violin leading.

However, even in the completed G major trio of 1786, the problems of integrating the strings are by no means always satisfactorily resolved. Like the G major fragment, mentioned above, the first movement begins with an extended piano solo, a rambling seventeen-bar theme which is more akin to transitional material than a principal subject. Subsequently, during the exposition, there is considerable exchange of thematic ideas between the violin and the piano, but little of substance for the cello to do beyond doubling the bass.⁸ After the double bar, during a diffuse and surprisingly awkward development (which lingers too long for its own good in the flat supertonic), the cello suddenly comes to the fore with independent contributions, mainly scalar passages in an imitative duet with the piano left hand (see Ex. 3). This has been hailed as the moment when the piano trio first came to full maturity: but it was something of a false dawn.⁹ Although the rather mechanical imitative passages bring the cello to some degree of prominence, they do little to solve the deeper problems of combining all three instruments in a genuine trio structure. Too inflexible to allow much scope for truly idiomatic writing, the section resembles nothing so much as a passage for string quartet, with the strands of its texture distributed in a basic fashion between the two string players and the two hands of the pianist. More effective is the division of material between the instruments in the slow movement, particularly in a modulatory section during the development (from bar 52), where the strings link together in octaves and thirds to form a colourful partnership in opposition to the piano, and move the music progressively from E flat to the dominant of A minor. The finale, a set of six variations and coda on an extended binary-form theme, contains, as we have seen earlier, a striking range of instrumental and

⁸ The autograph of K 496, now in Paris in private hands, shows Mozart's use of red and black inks for the string parts. This, in Einstein's view, was to remind him not to neglect either of them. See A. Einstein, *Mozart: His Character, His Work* (London, 1946), 271.

⁹ Einstein, *Mozart*, 271-2.

EX. 3
[Allegro]

mock-vocal styles. But it affords the cello only one contribution of real independence. This occurs during a strange passage in the fourth (*minore*) variation, where separate ostinato patterns are allotted to the violin and cello, while the piano weaves against them contrapuntal strands of a repetitive character. In a decidedly unusual manoeuvre Mozart recalls this idea, in a major/minor version, at the end of the final variation, providing, before the final coda, a further brief chance for the cello to take the limelight.

The experimental, even technically rather insecure, character of this G major trio is not easily explainable. Only four months after its completion date (as given in the composer's catalogue) Mozart produced his B flat trio K 502, in which all stylistic and technical difficulties appear to have melted away. And during the two years preceding K 496 the composer had written a whole series of chamber works with piano, such as the piano and wind quintet K 452, and the two piano quartets K 478 in G minor and K 493 in E flat, which reveal a total mastery of their respective media. Are we to suppose, then, that Mozart found trio composition particularly problematic—perhaps because, with only two string players (unlike the piano quartet) it did not provide a harmonically

balanced string ensemble to set against the piano? Or is it possible that the bulk of the G major work was actually written considerably earlier than is indicated in Mozart's catalogue, and that the date given there refers only to its final completion, perhaps after a new movement had been substituted for an earlier one which had failed to satisfy the composer? Some support for this latter theory is provided by the existence among the surviving fragments of a substantial, but incomplete, movement in G major, a *minuet en rondeau* of a type quite frequently employed by Mozart for his finales. It is not unlikely, as Alfred Einstein conjectured, that this fragment was intended originally as the last movement of K496, but was rejected because of its unsuitably 'amorous' character.¹⁰

In fact the trio fragment in question eventually found a 'home' (and not altogether comfortably) as the middle movement of the so-called piano trio in D minor, K442. This is actually a compilation of three substantial, and almost certainly quite unrelated, trio fragments which were completed by the Abbé Maximilian Stadler and later, in 1797, issued as an apparently unified work by the publisher Johann André of Offenbach. Stadler, who was an accomplished musician and a close friend of both Mozart and Haydn, made a very reasonable attempt at completing the trio movements, though his success was understandably proportionate to the amount already supplied in each case by Mozart. The first movement fragment in D minor consists of fifty-five bars from Mozart's hand, ending with the opening phrase of the second subject, a scalar theme somewhat similar to that in the equivalent place in the first movement of K452, the piano and wind quintet. Stadler supplies an effective completion of the exposition, but is less happy with his attempt to provide a development section; excessively long and repetitious, it is too much concerned with treating each of the main themes in turn to be convincingly Mozartian. Also uncharacteristic is the way the second theme appears in a minor-key (C minor) version in the development and subsequently in the tonic major during the recapitulation—a reversal, very largely, of Mozart's normal practice. The G major fragment, which ended up as the middle movement, is a more substantial torso, comprising nearly a hundred and fifty bars of piano part and only slightly less of the string parts, and must

¹⁰ Einstein, *Mozart* 272.

therefore have been relatively easy to reconstruct. The cello part shows some signs of independence, characteristically enough in the development section (from bar 112), but only for a brief spell before the string parts become fragmentary and the whole sketch is terminated. The main theme bears a considerable likeness to that at the start of the middle movement of Mozart's D major piano sonata, K284, of 1775, the so-called 'Durnitz' sonata; but the resemblance cannot be taken as in any way indicative of the date of origin of the sketch: 1783 is more likely or even slightly later.¹¹

The third movement of the reconstructed trio presents us, perhaps, with the biggest problem of all. It is a full-scale sonata movement, and may therefore have been intended as a first movement rather than a finale, though its 6/8 time, 'hunting-horn' style is usual enough in Mozart's last movements. The composer's sketch was completed in the piano part up to the point of recapitulation, and in the string parts only slightly more fragmentarily. The task of reconstruction must therefore have been a simple, almost automatic, undertaking for Stadler, since he needed to invent nothing of significance. The resulting piece, which is probably very close to Mozart's exact intention, is one of the very finest of the composer's trio movements, and can hardly be dated earlier than 1788. Superb technically, and full of vigour and inevitability, it uses the medium in a wholly confident, fully balanced way. The cello is almost entirely emancipated, the keyboard writing is brilliantly effective, and the formal structure is finely proportioned, with a powerfully focused development section which is notable for its colourful modulatory processes and recurrent passages of imitative writing to enrich the argument. The mystery about the movement is why Mozart failed to finish it and incorporate it into a complete, published trio.

The composition which appears to have done most to unleash the new ideas about trio writing, which were germinating in Mozart's mind in 1786, was the E flat trio K498, for clarinet, viola, and piano—the so-called 'Kegelestart' (skittle-alley) Trio. The work was almost certainly prompted, like the clarinet quintet K581, and the clarinet concerto K622, by the outstanding skill of

¹¹ The date of composition conventionally applied to the so-called D minor trio is 1783. Stylistic evidence supports this date, or one slightly later, for the first two movements, but suggests one considerably later, at least 1788, for the third movement.

the composer's clarinetist friend, Anton Stadler; and it is highly likely that its original performers were, in addition to Stadler, the composer himself as viola-player, and his greatly admired pupil, Franziska Jacquin, as pianist.¹² In order to deal effectively with an ensemble of so novel a character, Mozart was forced to reconsider several aspects of blend, sonority, and the disposition of material in a way which was to prove significant for all his later trio writing. With a clarinet as the principal melody instrument, one which positively demanded an idiomatic role, the problems of sharing with the keyboard were given a new focus; and with the viola in partnership fresh emphasis was necessarily placed on the tenor area of the texture, rather than the bass to which the cello, particularly at this period, was more naturally inclined. In order to simplify the structure, and thus throw increased emphasis upon the textural and scoring aspects of the work, Mozart eliminated the customary sonata-form movement at the start and replaced it with a flowing Andante of song-like character. In addition the work, in this opening movement, with two contrasted yet complementary themes, one built in short segments and particularly suitable for providing clearly defined scoring contrasts, and the other more sustained and cantabile in style and thus appropriate for extended presentation in each of the basic instrumental colours in turn. The trio reveals to a remarkable extent Mozart's capacity for grasping intuitively the essence of a demanding new chamber medium. Once established, and with its potentialities so impressively demonstrated, this new genre (sometimes with cello replacing the viola) provided a challenge which many later composers, as we shall see, were eager to accept.

The liberating effect which we have ascribed to Mozart's work on the clarinet trio is evident enough in the three great piano trios of standard scoring which followed, those in B flat, E major, and C major. With these works the piano trio came finally of age as a fully developed genre, significant not solely for its own time but also for its promise of later development. Although an eighteen-month gap (from November 1786 to June 1788) separated the composition of the first of these works from the other two, it is hard not to regard the three trios as a unified group, particularly as they culminate, like several other Mozartian series—the D2

¹² See the preface to the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe*, VII, 22/2, xi.

Ponte operas, the quartets dedicated to Haydn, and the last three symphonies, for instance—in a work in the key of C major.¹³ Whether or not 'culminate' is too strong a word to use in connection with the last trio is perhaps open to question—one to which we shall return for later consideration.

Certain general characteristics, common to all three works, may be usefully summarized here. The trios are all large-scale and in three movements (fast-slow-fast), with a structural pattern consisting normally of sonata-simple rondo-sonata rondo, the only exception being the middle movement of the C major trio which is also in sonata form. And all of them reveal to some extent the influence of the piano concerto, partly in their overall structure (three movements only, in contrast to the four-movement pattern of the contemporary symphony and string quartet) and partly also in the somewhat dominant role allotted to the keyboard, including a considerable amount of rapid passage-work against slower-moving strings. The string parts none the less display greater independence and a more subtle interrelationship with the piano than those in any earlier trios, and virtually all the thematic material is designed to be readily interchangeable between the instruments.¹⁴ In none of the works does the cello abandon entirely its traditional role of strengthening the bass, but increasingly throughout the series the instrument emerges as an individual 'voice', presenting melodies, enriching textures, and contributing important counterthemes on a near-equal basis with its partners in the ensemble. A noteworthy example occurs in bars 61 to 64 of the second movement of K502, where the cello provides a finely crafted interior strand in the tenor register, reminiscent of some of the viola passages in the clarinet trio (see Ex. 4).

Mozart's new approach to thematic integration can be seen by comparing the beginning of the B flat trio with that of K496 in G, previously discussed. In contrast to the long, somewhat discursive theme with which the earlier work starts, the opening of K502 (shown in Ex. 5) provides a clearly etched, one-and-a-half bar phrase for the piano, supported by a sustained tonic note on the cello and answered immediately by a brief countermotif from the

¹³ The three trios were in fact published together, as Op. 15, by Artaria in 1788.

¹⁴ See K. Komlos, 'The Viennese Keyboard Trio in the 1780s: Studies in Texture and Instrumentation', Cornell Univ. diss., 1966, 239-62.

the composer's clarinetist friend, Anton Stadler; and it is highly likely that its original performers were, in addition to Stadler, the composer himself as viola-player, and his greatly admired pupil, Franziska Jacquin, as pianist.¹² In order to deal effectively with an ensemble of so novel a character, Mozart was forced to reconsider several aspects of blend, sonority, and the disposition of material in a way which was to prove significant for all his later trio writing. With a clarinet as the principal melody instrument, one which positively demanded an idiomatic role, the problems of sharing with the keyboard were given a new focus; and with the viola in partnership fresh emphasis was necessarily placed on the tenor area of the texture, rather than the bass to which the cello, particularly at this period, was more naturally inclined. In order to simplify the structure, and thus throw increased emphasis upon the textural and scoring aspects of the work, Mozart eliminated the customary sonata-form movement at the start and replaced it with a flowing Andante of song-like character. In addition he worked, in this opening movement, with two contrasted yet complementary themes, one built in short segments and particularly suitable for providing clearly defined scoring contrasts, and the other more sustained and cantabile in style and thus appropriate for extended presentation in each of the basic instrumental colours in turn. The trio reveals to a remarkable extent Mozart's capacity for grasping intuitively the essence of a demanding new chamber medium. Once established, and with its potentialities so impressively demonstrated, this new genre (sometimes with a cello replacing the viola) provided a challenge which many later composers, as we shall see, were eager to accept.

The liberating effect which we have ascribed to Mozart's work on the clarinet trio is evident enough in the three great piano trios of standard scoring which followed, those in B flat, E major, and C major. With these works the piano trio came finally of age as a fully developed genre, significant not solely for its own time but also for its promise of later development. Although an eighteen-month gap (from November 1786 to June 1788) separated the composition of the first of these works from the other two, it is hard not to regard the three trios as a unified group, particularly as they culminate, like several other Mozartian series—the Da

¹² See the preface to the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe*, VIII, 22/2, xi.

Ponte operas, the quartets dedicated to Haydn, and the last three symphonies, for instance—in a work in the key of C major.¹³ Whether or not 'culminate' is too strong a word to use in connection with the last trio is perhaps open to question—one to which we shall return for later consideration.

Certain general characteristics, common to all three works, may be usefully summarized here. The trios are all large-scale and in three movements (fast-slow-fast), with a structural pattern consisting normally of sonata-simple rondo-sonata rondo, the only exception being the middle movement of the C major trio which is also in sonata form. And all of them reveal to some extent the influence of the piano concerto, partly in their overall structure (three movements only, in contrast to the four-movement pattern of the contemporary symphony and string quartet) and partly also in the somewhat dominant role allotted to the keyboard, including a considerable amount of rapid passage-work against slower-moving strings. The string parts none the less display greater independence and a more subtle interrelationship with the piano than those in any earlier trios, and virtually all the thematic material is designed to be readily interchangeable between the instruments.¹⁴ In none of the works does the cello abandon entirely its traditional role of strengthening the bass, but increasingly throughout the series the instrument emerges as an individual 'voice', presenting melodies, enriching textures, and contributing important counterthemes on a near-equal basis with its partners in the ensemble. A noteworthy example occurs in bars 61 to 64 of the second movement of K502, where the cello provides a finely crafted interior strand in the tenor register, reminiscent of some of the viola passages in the clarinet trio (see Ex. 4).

Mozart's new approach to thematic integration can be seen by comparing the beginning of the B flat trio with that of K496 in G, previously discussed. In contrast to the long, somewhat discursive theme with which the earlier work starts, the opening of K502 (shown in Ex. 5) provides a clearly etched, one-and-a-half bar phrase for the piano, supported by a sustained tonic note on the cello and answered immediately by a brief countermotif from the

¹³ The three trios were in fact published together, as Op. 15, by Artaria in 1788.

¹⁴ See K. Kornblös, 'The Viennese Keyboard Trio in the 1780s: Studies in Texture and Instrumentation', Cornell Univ. diss. 1986, 239-62.

Ex. 4 [Larghetto]

violin (marked x), forming a tautly constructed phrase. Subsequently, the violin motif, which sounds at first like a tiny link, almost a 'fill-in', between the two limbs of the piano's initial theme, grows in importance to a point where it dominates the transition to the second subject group and plays a leading role in the development. In general, the principal theme and its counter-motif are treated separately; but at one place, in bar 117, immediately before the recapitulation, the two are joined contrapuntally in a pointed and witty manner (see Ex. 6).

Concerto influence is much in evidence in the second and third movements of the B flat trio. Both are in rondo form and both begin, typically, with a thematic presentation by the piano alone, followed by a 'tutti' restatement involving the whole ensemble. In the slow movement the successive returns of the rondo theme invite increasing elaboration, both in melodic detail and accompanimental texture. Particularly impressive is the second reprise (at bar 84) where the piano's decorated version of the main theme

Ex. 5 Allegro

Ex. 6 [Allegro]

is enriched by strong interior countermelodies on the strings, with an unusually high-lying cello part. The effect is not unlike that of a concerto reprise where, for example, wind instruments may be introduced to add warmth and colour to the scoring. In the finale the concerto effect is still further enhanced by the exceptional athleticism of the piano part; but skilful contrapuntal treatment ensures that the strings are not neglected and a texture of notable strength and purposefulness results.

The E major trio is remarkable for its clarity of structure and directness of expression. A particular characteristic of the work is its thematic repetition, often involving the statement of a melody in 'one instrumental colour and its immediate reprise with different scoring and a beautifully varied or extended continuation. The beginning of the first movement provides a good example of the procedure.¹⁵ After its initial presentation by the piano alone, the twelve-bar principal theme is repeated by the full ensemble with many new points of detail, and then radiantly expanded to twenty-two bars before arriving at a full close in the tonic. As a means of clarifying and refining the texture, rests are used extensively in the string parts, and in the process superfluous doublings (particularly by the cello) are avoided and important entries emphasized. An impressive example in the first movement is the cello's dramatic entry in bar 74, by way of a V/V¹⁷ interrupted cadence, after five bars of rest—a moment made even

¹⁵ It should be noted that some modern editions provide slightly bowdlerized versions of the first and last movements of K. 542. Significant discrepancies occur, as comparison with the text given in the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* (based on the autograph MS) shows, in I, bars 3 and 138, and III, bars 64–5.

more memorable by the tangled complex of contrapuntal imitations and chromatic harmonies which succeeds it (see Ex. 7). The simple rondo structure of the slow movement provides a framework for the exploitation of a single captivating melody, supported by delicately varied harmony. Again emphasizing repetition, the opening idea, with its charmingly phrased rising motif (C sharp to E), occurs twelve times during the course of the movement; and at each main entry it is given a new perspective by subtle variations in the surrounding imitative patterns on the strings. Effective contrast is provided by a central episode in the

Ex. 7 [Allegro]

tonic minor, still based on the original theme, where Mozart moves suddenly and delightfully into fresh territory, with elegant new turns of melody and harmony of a decidedly Schubertian character.

A sketch, some sixty bars in length, has survived of a discarded first attempt at a finale for K 542. Although only a rudimentary outline, which would clearly have been much altered in any final form, the fragment shows the beginning of a rondo movement in 6/8 time, with the promise of string parts of considerable independence, the usual touchstone of Mozart's mature trio style. It seems not unlikely that the composer's rejection of this initial attempt was prompted by the over-square, unduly repetitious nature of its opening eight-bar theme. But curiously enough, in the movement which eventually replaced the sketch, a similar rigidity of outline is apparent in the main theme, though its repetitions are more widely spaced and its second four-bar phrase (reminiscent of parts of the 'Jupiter' Symphony minuet) provides an effective foil to the opening idea. Certain aspects of the movement, generally, are problematic. The gentle, ambulating nature of the rondo theme (marked 'dolce' in the score) seems to be at odds with the allegro tempo indication; the cello has a rather surprisingly sparse role to play; and the second subject group introduces an untypical, and rather unwelcome, element of showiness, with extended solo passages for the violin and piano in turn, the first in triplets and the second (a variation of the first) in very rapid semiquavers. Neither passage is easy to play at the stated allegro tempo, though the fast keyboard figuration would certainly have been more manageable on the shallow-touch Stein piano of Mozart's day than it is on a modern concert grand; and neither of them fits very happily into the gentle, 'conversational' style of the music as a whole. But, undeniably, the movement also contains many delightful features, such as the splendidly contrapuntal development section, the beautiful episode in C sharp minor from bar 120, with its charming exploitation of flat supertonic harmony, and the finely judged climax at the end, during which in a moment of extreme exaltation the cello is taken up to c' sharp (with the violin a tenth above), its highest point in any of the Mozart trios.

In contrast to the E major trio, which has always won warm critical acclaim, the final work in the series, K 548 in C major, has

been consistently undervalued—ever since Einstein declared that it 'lacked the vitality of invention . . . and thematic richness' of the other trios. It is difficult to agree with this verdict. The trio is typical of Mozart in the key of C major—abstract, lofty in ideas, and beautifully crafted—and it contains some of the composer's most successful scoring for the trio medium. While it is true that its first-movement themes show a degree of classical detachment, they can no more be said to lack 'thematic richness' than can the corresponding ideas in the 'Jupiter' Symphony or the C major piano concerto K503, with their reliance on plain tonic and dominant statements. Moreover, 'vitality of invention' is abundantly evident in the first movement development, an intricate contrapuntal mosaic built from tiny melodic fragments, which achieves special expressive force from the contrast between its plaintive, minor-key chromaticisms and the forthright major-key style of the surrounding sections (see Ex. 8).

An impressive instance of motivic distribution, and its use for constructive purposes, is provided by the sonata-form slow movement, one of the most profound of all Mozart's trio movements. The crucial thematic fragment in this case (marked ② in Ex. 9) is drawn from the third bar of the opening theme of the movement, and consists of an arched scale passage on the piano, largely in demisemiquavers. During the development this figure is taken over in a dialogue between the strings, providing a filigreed background against which the piano, in concerto style, meditates lyrically on parts of the second theme of the movement (marked ③ in Ex. 9), passing in rapid succession through E flat, C minor, and G minor to the dominant of D minor. Subsequently, the return to F major for the recapitulation from an A major chord is as striking as it is unexpected. A fine contrast is created by the work's rondo finale, a light and witty example of the French style. Like its predecessor in K542, it employs an abridged sonata rondo scheme in which the normal return of the principal theme at the recapitulation is side-stepped in favour of a recurrence of the second subject in the tonic key. The resulting compression adds, in the case of both works, to the intensity of the musical argument and increases the scope for a vividly climactic coda. Whether or not literally a 'culmination' to the great trio series, the C major work uncovers a new and distinctive vein in Mozart's approach to trio composition, complementing its fellow works

Ex. 8
[Allegro]

Ex. 9
[Andante cantabile]

by the variety of its expression and at least matching them in its technical assurance.

Mozart's only other piano trio, K564 in G, is an altogether different matter. A work of slender pretensions, it was possibly intended as a practice setting for beginners in ensemble playing, analogous to the *sonates faciles* which many composers of the period wrote for their piano pupils. The view, once held, that the work may originally have been a solo piano sonata, of earlier date, which Mozart, in 1788, reworked as a trio, has in recent times been challenged. Wilhelm Weismann,¹⁶ for example, has attempted to trace the trio's origins to a chamber work—possibly a violin sonata—from the composer's Mannheim period, while Karl Marguerre,¹⁷ on somewhat surer grounds, has inclined to the view that the work originated, in virtually the exact form in which it has survived, in 1788, believing that the peculiarities evident in its partial autograph (the addition in Mozart's hand of violin and cello parts to a pre-existent, non-autograph copy of the keyboard part) may have resulted from an attempt by the composer to restore from memory string parts which had been mislaid. The evidence remains, however, decidedly inconclusive.¹⁸ Even more puzzling are the stylistic discrepancies apparent in some parts of the work. The second movement, a theme and variations, and the rondo finale, though surprisingly slight for the period in structure and substance, are characteristic enough and effectively arranged for the medium. But the first movement contains at least two features which raise doubts about its authenticity: one is a second subject which is merely a free variant (as opposed to a 'monothematic' recurrence) of the opening theme, and the other a restatement of the whole of the second subject group, unvaried apart from a move to the subdominant,

¹⁶ W. Weismann, 'Zur Urfassung von Mozarts Klaviertrio, KV 564', in W. Vetter (ed.), *Deutsches Jahrbuch der Musikwissenschaft für 1958* (Leipzig, 1959), 35.

¹⁷ K. Marguerre, 'Mozarts Klaviertrios', *Mozart Jahrbuch*, 1960-1, 192.

¹⁸ The supposition, now generally discarded, that the work was originally a solo piano sonata derived support at one time from the sining of the violin and cello parts in the original 'amended' score, respectively, above and below the keyboard part. However, Mozart's other trio autographs show clearly that this was his standard practice. A further indication that K564 was very possibly intended from the start as a trio is its inclusion in Mozart's personal catalogue of his works, not normally used to list arrangements. Extra details about the conflicting arguments and conjectures surrounding the work's origins can be found in the preface to the *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* VIII, 22/2. xiii.

in the middle of the development section—both decidedly unusual procedures for Mozart.

The mature trios of Mozart represent one classical pinnacle of the trio genre. They reveal a fine balance between structure and scoring, and a blend of sonorities, which were inevitably to become attenuated during the following century. 'Inevitably' because, through the technical development of the piano, and to a lesser extent the strings, and through the continued expansion of sonata structures, the nineteenth-century trio became virtually a different genre, larger and richer in conception but often lacking in the refinement and precision characteristic of the Mozartian era. The other classical pinnacle is to be found, despite their different nature, in the piano trios of Haydn. Haydn's contribution to the repertoire, produced over a period of more than thirty years, is much larger than Mozart's, and embraces the whole range of trio development from the Baroque trio sonata to the brink of the fully fledged classical type. But even at his latest stage of development, with Mozart's example before him, Haydn never advanced beyond the traditional accompanied sonata concept, with its prominent keyboard role and limited string parts. His last fifteen trios, all written after Mozart's death, resemble enhanced piano sonatas in which the background support of the strings does much to compensate for the tonal limitations and lack of sustaining power of the instruments of the period. Large in scale, the works teem with original ideas and reveal a brilliance of keyboard writing rarely matched in contemporary works for the piano alone.¹⁹ Haydn's reasons for not liberating the strings in his last works can only be conjectured. Possibly he preferred to continue working in a style and form which he had already cultivated extensively; and he must also have recognized that any emancipation of the strings must inevitably involve some limitation of the keyboard texture, and that this could hardly fail to detract from his basic aim of writing brilliant and demanding piano music. In any case, it is unlikely that either he or Mozart were greatly concerned with the probable influence of their works on the subsequent course of trio development. Their objective was simply to supply what musicians of the time (many

¹⁹ See A. P. Brown, 'The Solo and Ensemble Keyboard Sonatas of Joseph Haydn: A Study of Style and Structure', Northwestern Univ. diss. 1970.

of whom were their friends) wanted to play—and, of course, publishers to publish.

Certain problems of dating and authentication have made it difficult to establish a clear picture of Haydn's works in trio form. Some of the older editions, still in current use (those particularly of Peters, Litolf, and Bretkopf and Härtel), give a total of thirty-one works, of which twenty-nine are now known to be authentic Haydn and the other two probably the work of his pupil Ignaz Pleyel. More recently, Anthony van Hoboken, in his definitive catalogue of Haydn's works, includes a further ten trios, but acknowledges that some of the additional ones are of uncertain origin.²⁰ And H. C. Robbins Landon, in the Doblinger edition, probably the one most commonly used nowadays, gives an extended list of forty-five trios, not all of which have survived or are indisputably authentic.²¹ The record is perhaps best clarified by working backwards from the fully recognized works of Haydn's maturity towards the more controversial ones assigned to his earlier years. In all there are fifteen late trios written between 1794 and 1797, chiefly during the period of Haydn's second visit to London, all of which were intended for the piano rather than the harpsichord. A further fourteen works, composed between 1784 and 1790, were designed mainly for harpsichord, and include three flute trios and an arrangement made in 1785 of an earlier barryton trio. The other sixteen works listed by Robbins Landon are of less certain date and authenticity. Eleven of them are 'attributed' works, with considerable claims to be regarded as genuine; and of the remaining five, one is of doubtful origin, two are almost certainly spurious, and two are known only from their mention in catalogues of the period.²² For the purpose of our present survey we shall disregard all the trios written before 1784, and focus our attention mainly on the works from the composer's second London period *post* 1794.

²⁰ A. van Hoboken, *Joseph Haydn, Thematisch-bibliographisches Verzeichnis* (Mainz, 1957-71).

²¹ See H. C. Robbins Landon, Preface to *Die Klaviertrios von Joseph Haydn*, the first complete critical edition (Vienna, 1970). Ten of the attributed works, which Haydn entitled either 'Partita' or 'Divertimento', are included in vol. I, ser. xvii of the *New Haydn Edition*. See also the worklist under 'Haydn, Joseph', in S. Sadie (ed.), *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (London, 1983).

²² See G. Feder, 'Haydn's frühe Klaviertrios: eine Untersuchung zur Echtheit und Chronologie', *Haydn-Studien* 2 (1970), 289.

Haydn's trios are more varied in structure than Mozart's. Though he normally wrote three-movement works, with a central slow movement, there are no less than nine among the trios written after 1784 which have only two movements—either slow followed by fast, or both fast. Where a slow movement is placed first, it sometimes serves as an introduction as in Hob. XV. 21 in C major; but more usually it is a full-length variation movement, similar to those found at the opening of some of the composer's string quartets, based either on one theme or on a pair of themes. A familiar example of the single-theme type is the opening Andante of Hob. XV. 25 (the G major trio with a final rondo 'in the Gypsies style') which has four variations on an extended binary-form melody, the first and third in minor keys (G minor and E minor) and the others in the tonic major. The third variation, in E minor, provides an example of unusually elaborate, concerto-style, violin writing, to which the piano, for once, supplies only the most reticent of chordal accompaniments (see Ex. 10). The double-theme type of variations, typical of Haydn's most mature manner, is to be found in the impressive

Ex. 10

[Andante]

opening movements of Hob. XV. 23 in D minor and Hob. XV. 31 in E flat minor; the second theme of the 'pair', in both instances, is in the tonic major, and in the case of the E flat minor movement forms an ingenious melodic inversion of the original *minore* melody.

Many of the finales in the late works employ rondo form, either of the simple, sectional type with contrasted episodes, or the more elaborate sonata kind. The simple rondo is used very effectively in several minuet-style finales found among the post-1784 trios, containing dance rhythms and clear-cut construction. A fine example occurs in Hob. XV. 26 in F sharp minor which, despite its serious, even rather sombre, main theme, consistently retains a lively, dance-like character. The setting of the main theme, shown in Example 11, provides some interesting insights into Haydn's methods of utilizing the strings in the ensemble. The violin's double-stopped chords at the opening add warmth by reflecting upwards the harmonic progression in the piano left hand, while the cello's position an octave below the keyboard bass serves to provide extra sonority; then, in bars 2, 3, and 4, the violin strengthens the low-pitched keyboard melody while the cello lightens the texture by moving up to coincide with the piano's bass-line. And finally, in the repeat, the cello remains at low pitch in bar 7 so as to emphasize the dark colouring at that point and to throw into relief the important bass entry in bar 8. Unlike the majority of the trios with minuet finales which, being early works tend to have only two movements, the F sharp minor trio has a complete three-movement structure. Its middle movement, interestingly enough, is a transcription of the slow movement of Haydn's symphony No. 102 in B flat, transposed up a semitone (to F sharp major), which is notable for the way it reproduces in terms of the chamber medium much detail from the original orchestral score. The preservation of the same tonic (minor and major) throughout, found also in several of Haydn's solo piano sonatas, is comparatively rare in the trios. More usually, in three-movement works, the composer changes key for the middle movement, and in a surprisingly large number of cases moves to one which is only distantly related. Among the various patterns found are: C major-A major-C major (in Hob. XV. 27), G major-E major-G major (in Hob. XV. 25), and D minor-B flat major-D major (in Hob. XV. 23), each of which favours the

Ex. 11
Tempo di minuetto

third-related keys which were later to prove so attractive to Beethoven. Also pointing forward to Beethoven (of the 'Archduke' Trio) is the device of linking movements, which Haydn employs effectively on a number of occasions, for example between the slow movement and finale of Hob. XV. 30 in E flat major.

In his final group of trios there is abundant evidence of the pleasure which Haydn took in the exercise of his mature powers. As in the 'London' symphonies of the same period, he aims

continually to delight and surprise with novel turns of harmony, form, and instrumentation, all executed with complete technical assurance, and designed to intrigue the connoisseurs by thwarting their musical expectations in subtle and captivating ways. One striking example is the swerve into E (= F flat) major for a 'false recapitulation' in the finale of Hob. XV. 22 in E flat, a device which, as we shall see later, may very possibly have influenced Beethoven at a similar point in the first of his Op. 1 trios. And another is the colourful change from B major to G major, through a V/Vi^b cadential progression during the second-subject group in the first movement of Hob. XV. 28, in E major (see Ex. 12), a move which corresponds quite closely to the fine cello entry at the equivalent place in Mozart's E major trio discussed earlier. Even more remarkable, however, is the extravagantly fanciful, capricious style of composition evident in some of the last trios, with piano writing of an untrammelled character not matched elsewhere in Haydn's keyboard music, not even in his last solo piano sonatas. The extract in Example 13 from the finale of Hob. XV. 31 in E flat minor, with its wayward chromatic scales and gruff interjections in the bass from the pianist's right hand provides a splendid impression of the general style involved.

The virtuosic element of many of the 'London' trios may well have been encouraged by the keyboard skills of two ladies resident in the city, who were particularly close friends of Haydn—Rebecca Schroeter and Theresa Bartolozzi (née Jansen). Whether or not it is fair to assess the ladies' relative abilities by the character of the music dedicated to them is debatable: but the exceptional demands of the three trios ascribed to Mrs Bartolozzi

Ex. 12
[Allegro moderato]

Ex. 13
[Allegro]

(Hob. XV. 27, 28, and 29) suggest that she, in particular, was a pianist of outstanding ability. Notable features are the rapid octaves and thirds for the right hand in the first two movements, respectively, of the C major trio (Hob. XV. 27), and the swift passage-work (reminiscent of an *opera buffa* finale) and testing hand-crossings in the last movement of the same work. Elsewhere there are challenging cross-rhythms and enharmonic changes, together with numerous short cadenzas demanding neatness of execution, and an unusually full style of keyboard writing for the period. Prominent among the works dedicated to Rebecca Schroeter is the famous 'Gypsy' rondo (the finale of Hob. XV. 25) which calls for considerable resolution to preserve its *moto perpetuo* style, and to control its fast passages in thirds in the first *minor* episode.

Because of his self-imposed restrictions Haydn's string parts are necessarily more limited in scope; yet they contain many points of interest. Violin doublings of the surface of the keyboard part, though common, are rarely undertaken in a routine fashion;

much variety is obtained through the choice of unison or octave doublings, or by passages in thirds, sixths, or tenths in relation to the accompanied lines. Also, in some cases expressively shaped string phrases result from the free movement of unison doublings from one strand of the keyboard part to another—top, middle, and even, if it is high enough, the bass. Doublings represent, however, only a relatively small part of the violin's contributions; instances also constantly occur of finely etched counterthemes, often linked imitatively to the keyboard part, of harmonic enrichment through held notes and double-stopped chords, soft or loud according to context, and of extended solo passages. A delightful example of the type of textural richness achievable within the constraints of the style can be seen in the extract from the slow movement of Hob. XV. 27, given in Example 14. Against the second phrase of the charming principal melody, presented on the piano, both strings contribute parts of considerable independence, the cello providing colour by its movement in thirds with the keyboard bass in the second half of the first bar, and the violin inserting a delicate touch of contrapuntal interest by its initial imitative demisemiquavers. There is clearly no question of slavish doubling here.

Solo melodic passages for the violin usually involve self-sufficient paragraphs of considerable length, with the piano temporarily relegated to a subordinate accompanying role. The range of moods and styles which Haydn encompasses in these sections may be seen by comparing the sweetly lyrical melody, in bars 20 to 28 of the second movement of Hob. XV. 27, with the vigorous E flat minor theme, of Beethovenian character, in the

Ex. 14

[Andante]

Vn.

Vc.

Pf.

finale of Hob. XV. 30, from bar 41, and the concerto-style, free variation in E minor from the first movement of Hob. XV. 25 (shown in Ex. 10), this last passage providing, with both repeats, no less than thirty bars of decorative solo writing. In these final trios the violin clearly fulfils an increasingly independent role; yet its contribution to the music's structure remains limited, an adjunct, even though a highly decorative one, to a largely self-sufficient piano part.

Much less independent, though far from indispensable, are the cello parts in the trios. These, contrary to commonly held opinion, do not function simply as relics of the continuo era, automatically doubling the bass-line at the unison, but serve a quite different purpose. Whereas in baroque practice it is the stringed instrument which provides the true bass-line, while the keyboard completes the harmony above it, in Haydn's trios it is the piano which is entrusted with the essential bass, while the cello contributes special strength and articulation to it according to context. Consequently there is in the cello writing a surprising amount of scope for intelligent scoring. A choice, for example, between unison and octave doublings can be significant for the sonority of the whole ensemble; the occasional doubling of an inner line in the texture can produce an unusual warmth of expression; the use of rests and register changes in the string part can shape the bass-line in a variety of telling ways; and cello support can provide effective emphasis to important, and particularly high-pitched, melodic entries in the bass. All these usages are brought together with strikingly beautiful results in the slow movement of Hob. XV. 27 in C major, a *locus classicus* of Haydn's cello writing in the trios (see Ex. 14, above).

By 1797, when the last of Haydn's piano trios appeared, Beethoven had already published his Op. 1 piano trios and set the genre on course for major new developments. However, at this period, Beethoven was by no means alone in continuing to cultivate the trio; during the next two decades examples were produced by numerous lesser figures, including J. L. Dussek, Anton Eberl, Prince Louis Ferdinand, J. N. Hummel, and Beethoven's pupil and protégé, Ferdinand Ries. Dussek was the most prolific trio composer of the group, publishing at least fifteen examples of the form; but these are for the most part early works and indebted largely to the conventional accompanied sonata

style. More characteristic of the period generally are the six trios by Hummel, composed between c.1799 and 1822, which well exemplify the colourful, virtuosic, but rather uneven, style typical of the minor figures of the time.²³

Hummel, who was a remarkable child prodigy, and a pupil of Mozart (sporadically between 1785 and 1788), won international fame as a virtuoso pianist, particularly on the tours he made as a boy to various parts of Europe, including visits to Edinburgh and London. Subsequently he gained widespread recognition as a composer, and eventually, in 1804, succeeded to Haydn's former post as Kapellmeister to the Esterházy court, an appointment he held for some seven years. Also, later in his career, he made an important contribution to piano technique with his three-volume 'Piano School' (*Ausführlich Anweisung zum Piano-forte Spiel*), published in 1828. His trios appear to have been modelled most closely, on those of Mozart, with three-movement structures consisting typically of a sonata allegro, an aria-style slow movement in a simple sectional form, and a rondo finale, often with dance characteristics. Mozartian influence is apparent also in the concertante style of his piano writing, though, with his virtuoso background, he often ranges beyond the natural artistic restraints of his model and includes display passages of much brilliance but little matching musical substance. His trios are nevertheless genuine chamber music in which the strings are accorded a full and lively share in the proceedings. In general his first movements show good technical resource, but tend to be immoderately long for the musical ideas they are expected to support. For example, the opening movement of his Op. 83 in E major, based on some not very impressive thematic material, has an exposition section of no less than 170 bars (allegro, 3/4 time), fifteen more than the equivalent section in Beethoven's 'Eroica' Symphony. In his slow movements, on the other hand, the simpler, more sectional structures seem to work more to his advantage; his themes are more striking—indeed, often genuinely shapely and expressive—and his treatment of them brings into play rich harmonic schemes, elaborate modulatory processes, and many effective touches of scoring. Some idea of the gracefulness of the overall style can be gained from Example 15, showing part of the ending

²³ See D. G. Brock, 'The Instrumental Music of Hummel', Univ. of Sheffield diss. 1976.

EX. 15 [Andante]

of the slow movement of Op. 93 in E flat major. For his finales Hummel usually adopts a somewhat lighter style, often incorporating popular dance elements, with or without 'nationalist' traits. In his E flat trio, Op. 96, for instance, the last movement is marked 'Rondo alla Russa', and teems with lively and attractive melodic ideas. Written in 1823 it may possibly have been intended to reflect the composer's impressions of the visit he paid to St Petersburg in the previous year, though similar mildly exotic terms—*alla Polacca*, *all'Onegrese*, and *alla Turca*—were by no means uncommon in Viennese music of the time. Particularly interesting are the leaping chordal basses and dotted-rhythm figuration characteristic of this and some other of Hummel's finales, since they recall precisely the type of writing which Beethoven had already exploited so effectively in the last movement of the 'Archduke Trio'.