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Programme:

Joseph Haydn (1732-1809): String Quartet in F minor, Opus20, no. 5 (1772)
   Allegro moderato – Menuetto – Adagio – Finale (Fuga a 2 soggetti)

Wolfgang Amadè Mozart (1756-1791): String Quartet in G major ‘Spring’ K387 (1782)
   Allegro vivace assai – Menuetto – Andante cantabile – Molto allegro

Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827): String Quartet in C major, Opus59, no. 3 (1806)
   Introduzione (Andante con moto) – Allegro vivace – Andante con moto quasi
   allegretto – Menuetto (Grazioso) & Trio – Allegro molto

***

The ‘String Quartet’ could be defined in various ways. In the era implied by the name ‘Revolutionary Drawing Room’, roughly 1770–1815, its form was like a symphony with a compressed texture. At first, even for early Haydn, it was a ‘divertimento’, and played in relatively small venues and before small audiences by amateurs or professionals employed by a rich patron. By the time of Beethoven, and then through Schubert, Mendelssohn, Brahms, to later masters of the medium such as Bartók, it became increasingly the province of professional ensembles, and was the preferred ensemble for some of the most complex musical thought in Western Europe at that time.

The texture of the quartet has been defined as a civilized conversation among equals. It’s a beguiling thought, if not one that can be applied throughout every work. The quartet is above all a flexible medium that can exploit all kinds of musical textures, of which conversation is only one. Quartets include passages that are showpieces for the first violin, the leader. When the great violinist and composer Ludwig Spohr played Beethoven quartets, he was, in his own words, ‘accompanied by’ the second violin, viola, and cello. This seems strange in connection with Beethoven, but perhaps it is less so with Haydn. The transition is well represented by Mozart. Haydn had a first-rate violinist at Eszterháza, Luigi Tomasini. Their patron, Prince Esterházy, liked to hear his players strut their stuff. So Tomasini’s fine technique had to be accommodated, even in serious quartets like Haydn’s Opus 20 No. 5. Before coming to the Esterházy court, Tomasini had studied with Leopold Mozart in Salzburg in 1760 – so the 4-year-old Wolfgang could have heard him play. Tomasini became a close friend of Haydn – and was evidently content to allow the other three players in a quartet some of the limelight.
Conversation suggests dialogue, an uncompetitive exchange of musical ideas, rather than the rigours of counterpoint in which all the parts, ideally, have interesting and independent material. Stringed instruments are well equipped to play independent lines, as indeed they did in Baroque trio sonatas, where the two violin parts are equal – or almost equal – and are supported by a bass line, melodic in its own way and so a participant in the contrapuntal texture.

Fugue, around which the Revolutionary Drawing Room programme is designed, is a special kind of counterpoint. The parts enter successively with the same subject while those already in develop lines in counterpoint, usually called counter-subjects. Fugue is by no means an intrinsic element in a string quartet, but this programme shows three composers – who occupied the same part of Europe, and knew each other – tackling the quartet, and the fugue within the quartet, in their own markedly different ways.

Haydn published most of his quartets in sets of six. A unique feature of his Opus 20 (completed in 1772 and published in 1774) is that three of the six end with fugues by way finale. The string quartet was a modern medium; but fugue by Haydn’s time was classified as a learned style and was mostly used in religious music; it could seem to be backward-looking. However, the suitability of the string quartet for fugue was already recognized, in Austrian chamber music; quartets by Karl von Ordonez (1734–86) written in the 1760s showed a predilection for fugue. Before Haydn published his Op. 20, the 17-year-old Mozart composed a fugal finale to one of his early quartets, in D minor (K. 173). Most of Mozart’s fugues were composed for the sacred music he turned out for Salzburg Cathedral, and are diatonic. But the quartet shows another kind of learned style, involving chromaticism, like the theme Frederick the Great supplied for Bach’s Musical Offering; this is the fugue subject on cello, answered by the viola.

Unlike Mozart’s early quartets, Haydn’s were published, and widely distributed. And in his hands, the fugue is one aspect of what may seem a revolution in chamber music. Reaching, as it were, outside the aristocratic drawing room, Haydn’s quartets appropriate the fugue from sacred music, and both the solo aria and the idea of conversation from opera. But these styles usually feature in different movements of a four-movement quartet. Mozart took a different approach to the fugal finale, not in that early D minor quartet, but in the first of the six dedicated to Haydn, K. 387. Mozart synthesized sonata form and fugue. Beethoven followed his lead, in this respect, but not at all in the character of his fugal writing.
Haydn: Quartet in F minor Op. 20 no. 5

Equally important in Haydn’s Op. 20 is that he found ways to make the individual movements longer, except for the Minuet. He achieves length by extending individual sections. In a sonata form, the exposition of themes can be extended by including more of them, perhaps, or introducing longer transitions between themes: Mozart followed him faithfully in this respect. Haydn extends the middle section, usually known as the development, generally proportionately longer in Haydn than in Mozart. The third part of a sonata form recapitulates the exposition section, after which Haydn sometimes added a coda, to close down the movement more decisively, though in sonata theory this is optional.

The American scholar Leonard Ratner mentions this Haydn quartet in connection with the style identified as Sturm und Drang – usually translated ‘Storm and Stress’, the ‘impetus’ might be better for Drang. But this term tries to cover too much of the serious music of the ‘Classical’ style to be useful. Clive McClelland, who has published books on ‘Ombra’ and ‘Tempeasts’, has pointed out that the first movement of Op. 20 no. 5 ‘is rather lacking in the stormy characteristics that ought to define this topic [Sturm und Drang], the restless nature of this music having more in common with Empfandsamer Stil’ – that is, the style of feeling, of sensibility, associated with Carl Philip Emanuel Bach, whom Haydn greatly admired. So this is what might be called a ‘quartetto serioso’.

The opening, certainly, is no conversation of equals but a singing style with the first violin as singer, and with the simplest of rhythmic support. This texture is just as prominent in ‘classical’ quartet-writing; so if all instruments are equal, we must add that some are more equal than others. This is serioso music, and the tempo is Allegro moderato – not very fast, enabling every detail to be appreciated. The melody shows Haydn’s developmental technique: from the start, small intervals get wider while repeating a rhythmic pattern. After four bars (‘antecedent’ phrase) the next four (‘consequent’) start the same way. Interesting here is that the semiquaver flourish that closes the antecedent seems to generate the decoration that partly disguises the fact that bars 5–6 are essentially the same as bars 1–2 (see the arrows in the extract below).
The music moves into calmer waters – the relative major, A flat. After one of Haydn’s little silences, the first theme seems to return, varied, but for two bars still the essentially same musical idea.

However, this is not one of Haydn’s often-noted ‘monothematic’ movements, in which the new key-area is defined by a version of the first theme. Here, there is a distinct second theme, still in A flat. The rhythmic physiognomy is different, and the lower parts are not just support, but use the same rhythm while moving in contrary motion.

The development section concentrates on the first theme, and on a conversation between the two violins. An allusion to the second theme begins the transition back home, which again is preceded by silences. In the recapitulation Haydn chooses the ‘serious’ option: he could have put the major-key second theme into F major, which he often does. But this quartet is truly serioso, so he gives it in the minor. Finally, the movement is extended by a coda, based mainly on the second theme, and exploring new harmonic territory.

II Minuet

After such intensity, a simple Minuet could be a relief. But though short, it is still serioso – in F minor, and stern in character. Contrast is supplied by the central ‘Trio’, in F major and lighter in texture; it is mainly a solo for Tomasini – though towards the end the lower parts have a say in the thematic action. The Minuet is then repeated to round off the movement.

III Adagio

The slow movement is marked Adagio: which is seriously slow. However, it’s in the major, and has a lilting rhythm, perhaps related to the Siciliano. The accompaniment is light, marked staccato. The dynamic is ‘mezza voce’: neither soft nor loud.
The second violin is allowed to repeat the tune; but the first violin asserts itself – remaining more equal – by decorative flourishes. Towards the end of the two sections – the first ending in C, the second in F – there is a more homophonic passage marked by sforzando: then a playful use of silences, the notes in unexpected places, before the end – not quite yet a ‘Joke’ quartet (that’s in Opus 33), but clearly the same mind is at work.

### IV Fugue

Back to F minor for the Finale, which is headed *Fuga a due Soggetti*: Fugue with two subjects. This means that the second subject is introduced before the first is quite finished. This procedure is more typical of Italian style, and hence of the Italian-trained Handel, than it is of J. S. Bach. The first subject is a conventional tag, much used in serious sacred music. Variants of it appear in Handel’s Messiah (‘And with his stripes’), in Bach’s Cantata no. 106 (*Actus tragicus*, the chorus ‘Es ist der alte Bund’), and the Kyrie of Mozart’s Requiem. Its characteristic is the wide interval – a diminished seventh between the note below the tonic, here F, and the note above the dominant, C (arrows in the example). This tag had its effect on late Beethoven: the A minor quartet, the C sharp minor quartet, and the Great Fugue.

The second subject is stepwise, and provides rhythmic impetus. This time Haydn wrote *sempre sotto voce*, although later in the movement he allows a louder dynamic. The first violin makes no attempt to hijack the proceedings: the four voices really are about as equal as possible.
Haydn kindly points out when the theme is heard upside down (bar 92), and when it is in close imitation, or *stretto*, after a pause (bar 112):

![Inversion and original played together (bar 92)](image1)

![STRETTO (bar 112) after a crescendo and pause](image2)

And then as he approaches the vigorous ending, Haydn offers the subject in canon – exact imitation – and over nearly 20 bars, *fortissimo*. A silence, a quiet settling, and a decisive ending.

![CANON bar 145 (with moving inner parts)](image3)

Mozart: *Quartet in G major K387 (1782)*

The G major quartet is the first of six published in 1785 as Opus 10, and dedicated to Haydn. For some reason unknown this is sometimes called the ‘Spring’ quartet; as with the ‘Jupiter’ symphony, however, we can be sure this nickname has no connection with Mozart.

**I. Allegro vivace assai**

Mozart did write a spring song, in 1791; its tune was also used for the finale of his last piano concerto (K. 595). But it’s a very simple piece. In the quartet, the opening may seem genial, even spring-like, but not for long. And it is certainly not simple. The dynamics are extremely detailed: the first and third bars are marked *forte*, and the second and fourth *piano*. A chromatic shape follows; it and its relations are important in all except the slow movement (thematic connection of movements in string quartets was not new, however; it goes back to Ordonez, in the 1760s). And the theme is differently constructed from Haydn’s. Haydn’s *fifth* bar corresponds to his first bar – in the pattern called antecedent, consequent. Mozart’s fifth bar is a new shape, offered by the viola and answered by the second violin before the first violin picks it up: a truly conversational texture, probably indebted to the subtle conversational methods of Haydn’s Opus 33 quartets – published before Mozart set about writing Op. 10 with, as he said, considerable labour. The shape is very like one near the start of Op. 33 No. 1, with the same rhythm (crotchet, four semiquavers, then a slurred crotchet onto a quaver).
Mozart replays his first theme, still in the home key but with enriched texture, and embarks on a transition based mainly on the chromatic slide of bar 4. Once arrived in D major, the dominant (which is almost a requirement of sonata forms in major keys), where Haydn varied his first theme, Mozart introduces a completely new idea. The second violin begins it, with the cello being supportive but, as it were, chatty, as if joining the conversation.

Then come passages in a brilliant style, and a cadence figure – quite unlike anything that’s gone before (in a dotted rhythm); Mozart uses this to punctuate the development (where it appears in E minor), and it closes the movement so that the end of the recapitulation rhymes with the exposition; there’s no coda.

II. Minuet (Allegretto)

Mozart chose to write a considerably longer Minuet than Haydn’s. It is thematically related to the first movement in that first two notes are G-D, reversing the first movement’s D-G, and in that the answering phrase is a chromatic slide. This one has outré dynamics: the first violin,
unaccompanied, has *piano* and *forte* on alternate notes, marking a heard duple accentuation, whereas Minuets are in triple metre. The cello enters with the same idea, but descending.

In the middle, the four instruments cooperate to form a rising arpeggio, which seems to generate the theme of the Trio. As with Haydn, the Trio is contrasted in character, but where Haydn’s is more relaxed, Mozart is turbulent, in the minor key, its theme a stern unison.

Mozart’s music is filled with effects of light and shade: *chiaroscuro*, a concept important to him, and mentioned in his letters. The brief storm of the Trio quickly clears, returns, clears again, and quietens prior to the return of the Minuet.

### III. Andante cantabile

The slow movement is not an Adagio, but the character *cantabile* means a ‘singing Andante’ rather than a more literal interpretation of the word (which means ‘walking’). The melody is definitely a violin solo, with a supporting bass, not a contrapuntal bass line, so as not to distract our attention from the melody. As the movement develops, the other instruments take part in thematic activity: a new falling figure is introduced by second violin, copied by viola, then first violin. Nevertheless the first violin has the lion’s share of the delicately wrought ornamentation.

### IV. Finale: Allegro molto

This Finale is a pièce de résistance, both fugue and sonata. In this, it anticipates the finale to Mozart’s ‘Jupiter’ symphony; but there are important differences. Both movements start with a conventional ‘tag’ in long, equal notes: a sort of ‘Cantus firmus’ (again, appropriated but more from the contrapuntal training of Fux’s *Gradus ad Parnassum* that from religious music: Mozart, however, used Fux in his teaching, as we know from the work-book of his English student Thomas Attwood). The four-note ‘Jupiter’ tag turns up in several Mozart pieces including his very first symphony. As the ‘Jupiter’ finale opens, however, the four notes form the tune, with a simple accompaniment. The fugue starts later. With the Quartet, Mozart did it the other way round; the opening tag is treated fugally from the outset, and the texture ceases to be fugal once all the instruments are playing. This is
of course different, again, from Haydn whose austere Opus 20 fugues remain fugal nearly all the way through. Mozart effects a synthesis of the learned style – fugal, pedagogical, even sacred – with modern styles largely derived from Italian comic opera – \textit{opera buffa} – and the dashing and brilliant style. Haydn was well acquainted with all such styles, but kept them out of his Op. 20 fugues.

A refrain in Mozart’s correspondence is his longing to compose operas. When he was working on the quartets dedicated to Haydn, he was also searching for a good comic libretto, and feeling frustrated as after reading a hundred-odd he had found almost nothing. He started two comedies that didn’t get far; and it was only in 1785, the year the quartets were published, that he finally got what he wanted, and started work on \textit{Le nozze di Figaro}.

The fugal finale is introduced by the second violin, which then plays a simple counter-subject (providing, like Haydn’s second subject, additional momentum), while the first violin takes the subject.

![Mozart's Opus 20 Fugue Finale](image)

When cello and viola have repeated this an octave down (the violins continuing) Mozart abandons his fugue, replacing it with brilliant passage-work. Then (bar 51) he introduces an entirely new theme, which proves to be a second fugue subject – with its own exposition.

![New Theme](image)

This is not like Haydn’s quasi-Italian two-subject fugue; it is more like Bach’s method in several fugues of the ‘Well-tempered Clavier’ or ‘48’. By this time Mozart, thanks to Baron van Swieten, knew a lot of Bach’s music, and had composed several fugues, often in a dissonant style that owes more to Bach than to Italian models. Naturally the two subjects are almost immediately combined (bar 69 the dynamic still \textit{forte}, another difference from Haydn’s \textit{sotto voce}).

![Combined Theme](image)

Then comes \textit{opera buffa}: a cheeky little tune, confined to the first violin with a simple
accompaniment; it is immediately repeated with decorative diminutions that make it cheekier still.

The development explores what one might call labyrinthine harmonic adventures, beginning with the chromatic slide that reminds us of the Minuet. The first fugue subject dominates, though simply accompanied rather than imitated fugally, and distorted in shape. But with so much of that subject, Mozart must have decided that a conventionally literal recapitulation of the opening would be superfluous. We become conscious that we are in the recapitulation when the second fugue subject returns, after a flourish of the brilliant material and a version of the original transition from first to second subjects. This time it is immediately combined with the first subject. Later, the cheeky tune changes octave, and reaches the highest register of the first violin. After the essential action of recapitulation there is coda, based on the chromatic slide and the first fugue subject, with a delicious throw-away ending.

Beethoven: Quartet in C major, Opus 59, no. 3

(known as the ‘Third Rasumovsky’ or ‘Rasumovsky No. 3’).

Joseph Kerman, in his fine book on Beethoven’s quartets, heads his material on Opus 59 ‘after the Eroica’. These quartets belong to what is often called Beethoven’s ‘heroic’ middle period. The Eroica Symphony dates from 1803; Beethoven worked on his only opera, Fidelio, completing the first version (still called Leonora) in 1805; the Rasumovsky quartets followed soon after, completed in 1806 and published in 1808. In another more recent fine book, published by Cambridge University Press in the series Music in Context, Nancy November discusses the middle period quartets – Op. 59, 74, and 95 – with the interesting title: ‘Beethoven’s theatrical quartets’. The Third Rasumovsky, she reminds us, has been called ‘Helden-Quartett’ (Heroic Quartet). She associates it with Beethoven’s efforts to write his mostly serious German opera, a contrast to Mozart whose quartets are more readily related to Italian opera buffa than to opera seria.

Beethoven’s Fidelio is of course an opera of Revolution: its origins were in revolutionary France, its story a heroic defiance of arbitrary tyranny. How does that translate into a string quartet? – one so difficult that it’s hard to imagine it being played in a pre-Revolutionary drawing room. In fact, the Op. 59 quartets were not intended for the princes and other amateurs who may have purchased Haydn’s and Mozart’s quartets. They’re meant for professionals, led by Schuppanzigh, his equivalent to Tomasini, and given before a paying public.

The finale of Op. 59 no 3 signals Beethoven’s increasing interest in fugue, which plays an important role in his late sonatas and string quartets, as well as in the Ninth Symphony. It is the only middle-period quartet with a fugal finale. Fugues are not common in theatre music. However, at the end of Mozart’s Don Giovanni the singers step out of character and sing the moral, in a short fugue before
the brilliant-style conclusion. Beethoven disapproved of Mozart’s comic operas on ethical grounds, and he wasn’t the only person to deplore the apparent frivolity of Così fan tutte. But at least in Don Giovanni moral decorum is restored: the rake is punished.

I First movement Introduzione (Andante con moto) – Allegro vivace

This is the only quartet of the set, and of this programme, with a slow introduction – something more usual in a symphony (this quartet has often been considered orchestral in texture, like some of Mendelssohn’s quartets). The introduction proposes a harmonic mystery, in this recalling the opening of Mozart’s C major quartet, the so-called ‘Dissonance’ K. 465. Mozart, however, observes a semblance of decorum by starting with a firm keynote, repeated Cs in the cello. Beethoven also avoids establishing the key, opening with the most ambiguous chord in his armoury, a diminished seventh. The chord in bar 3 looks (and sounds!) like the dominant of B flat; the chord in bar 5, however, implies the key of A minor (the previous E flat has been treated as if it were D sharp). And so on, the chord in bar 8 being one that could easily resolve onto G, and so proceed to the tonic C, but this resolution is evaded.

Like Mozart in K. 465, Beethoven seems to intend chiaroscuro; from a deliberately foggy opening (the mystery enhanced by dynamics), the Allegro comes like sunshine, but with some remaining uncertainty. Unlike Mozart, he introduces the main theme with a very short upbeat C chord, the dominant (G7) chord (on which the slow music ended) being accented; and the theme then ducks away from the main key, C, to be repeated a step higher (implicitly D minor) before big chords bring what in a symphony would surely be a full-blooded tutti –the cello supplying the timpani part, the heroic trumpets left to our imagination.

Throughout the movement, vigorous and brilliant passages are varied by passages of utmost delicacy. But the movement a stronger sense of continuity than Haydn’s or Mozart’s. There are contrasts, but it would be hard, and unnecessary, to identify exactly which passage is the ‘second subject’ beloved of
textbook analysis. The first contrasting material is in the tonic key, so cannot qualify, and Beethoven keeps returning to versions of the upbeat pattern of the first theme, shown above. Only after brilliant passage-work and a trill does the texture clear for an imitative passage, foretaste of counterpoint to come. The cello offers a vigorous motive, immediately imitated by viola and first violin, signals the end of the exposition.

II Andante con moto quasi allegretto

The movement is in the relative, A minor, and in 6/8 like Haydn’s slow movement. But there is no resemblance to a dance, and the tempo is more flowing, not Adagio. The cello pizzicato is peculiarly ominous, and directs the first change of key in the second-time bar.

It is time to recall another factor in Beethoven’s Rasumovsky Quartets. – Count Rasumovsky asked him to include Russian melodies. Presumably he supplied examples. In Op. 59 no. 1, the finale, and in Op. 59 no. 2 the Trio of the Scherzo, Beethoven carefully labelled the music ‘Thème russe’: Russian theme. He did not identify any Russian theme in No. 3. So is there a Russian element? Perhaps Beethoven found nothing to his other purposes and, being Beethoven, got away with this breach-of-contract. There’s been quite a debate about this. Recently, however, this question may have been resolved. Nancy November points out that rather than literally quoting a song, Beethoven appears to have based his slow movement on an original idea that nevertheless derives from a Russian song.

The two melodies show affinities of rhythm and pitch, and the bass could well have inspired
Beethoven’s bodeful *pizzicato*; some of groupings of notes are nearly identical. And as the song, which was published with a German translation in 1804, is a story of *rescue* – like *Fidelio* – November’s idea fits with Beethoven’s preoccupations about this time.

The slow movement of the first Rasumovsky is a lament; that of the second is hymn-like. These are both slow movement types familiar from Haydn, as well as earlier Beethoven. This one is not a type we find in earlier works. Joseph Kerman points out that it is characterized by ‘hypnotic repetitions’. Nancy November refers to ‘labyrinthine wanderings’ in the harmony. Labyrinthine harmony recalls the slow introduction, and Mozart’s finale; and such sections, in ostensibly ‘classical’ pieces, anticipate the harmonic preoccupations of later generations.

**III Minuet Menuetto (Grazioso) & Trio**

After this slow movement, the Minuet seems comparatively relaxed, even a little modest for its surroundings. The other Rasumovsky quartets have faster central movements; in no. 1, a movement (the second) of unclassifiable form, and in no. 2, a full-blown Scherzo. This Minuet seems reticent in comparison – a harking back to a pre-Revolutionary age. But Beethoven had his reasons. After a livelier Trio, in styles both rustic and brilliant, he returns as normal to the Minuet. But it leads into the Finale without a break. Something similar happens in the Op. 59 no. 1, where the doom-laden slow movement breaks into trills and leads into the sunny finale with its ‘Thème russe’. But in no. 3, the doom-laden slow movement came second. The link here is done by an unusual feature, a Coda to the Minuet that muddies the clear waters of the Minuet theme by playing it in the minor mode – another case of *chiaroscuro*.

The Minuet provides a broader contrast, as it’s medium paced, whereas the finale is very fast indeed. And it’s a fugue, thoroughly clearing away the mists that have fallen with this beautiful minor-key linking passage.

**IV Allegro molto**

The fugue owes more to the Mozartian synthesis of fugue and sonata than it does to Haydn, and like the Mozart, it is marked ‘Allegro molto’, *very* lively. But while Beethoven combines fugue and sonata form, counterpoint and the brilliant style, he does not employ an inherited tag as his main theme; there’s no second subject to combine with the first, and no hint of the learned style implied in Haydn’s inversions, stretto, and canon.

Instead of a sort of *Cantus firmus* Beethoven uses an original theme, led off by the viola and in brilliant style from the start. Rather than contrasting themes, or a second subject, he breaks up his theme into fragments, and puts these through their developmental paces in a variety of textures.

Still, formal boundaries of the sonata are perceptible. The development section reaches a dramatic pause, and as with Haydn, this marks a boundary in the form: in this case, the recapitulation. At this point the viola again has the main subject, but the first violin joins it with a new chromatic counter-subject.
Just as Mozart seemed to allude in passing to Haydn in K. 387, so here Beethoven seems to allude to his predecessors. A few bars on from the passage quoted, the viola counterpoint includes the diminished 7th interval, as if alluding to the inversion of Haydn’s main fugue subject. Much later (bar 398) the second violin counterpoints the scurrying first with long, equal notes, each the length of a whole bar; this almost quotes Mozart’s finale.

In sum: Three quartets with major and minor key music differently distributed: Haydn’s three minor movements, Mozart’s minor-key trio, Beethoven’s minor-key slow movement and Minuet coda. Three quartets that evoke the name of Bach: Haydn’s Empfindsamkeit (from C.P.E.), Mozart’s style galant (from Johann Christian, the ‘London Bach’), and Mozart and Beethoven from the giant figure of Johann Sebastian. Three quartets with very different fugal finales: Haydn strict throughout, Mozart strict yet synthesized with sonata form and opera buffa, Beethoven after movements heroic, doom-laden, and nostalgic (minuet), adopting the brilliant style for the fugue subject itself. We have moved from the Esterházy palace via Mozart’s apartment (drawing-room?) where his ‘Haydn’ quartets were first tried out with the dedicatee playing along with Mozart and two other composers, to professional performance in some kind of concert hall; and the whole range of revolutionary musical classicism is before us: its integration of styles old and new, and its blend of the serious, even tragic, with comedy and delight.