The String Quartet, 1750-1797

Mara Parker

An Ashgate Book

THE STRING QUARTET, 1750–1797

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

The String Quartet, 1750–1797

Four types of musical conversation

MARA PARKER
Widener University, USA

LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2002 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © Mara Parker 2002

The author has asserted her moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:
Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Parker, Mara
The string quartet, 1750 - 1797 : four types of musical conversation
1. String quartet 2. Music - 18th century
I.Title
785.7'194

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Parker, Mara, 1957-
The string quartet, 1750-1797 : four types of musical conversation / Mara Parker.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. String quartet – 18th century. I. Title.

ML1160.P37 2002
785'.7194'09033–dc21

2002019634

ISBN 13: 978-1-84014-682-0 (hbk)

Contents

List of musical examples vii

Preface xi

1 The string quartet as chamber music 1

2 Social aspects: from private to public 25

3 String quartet types: toward a reconsideration 47

4 The lecture 75

5 The polite conversation 127

6 The debate 183

7 The conversation 235

8 The string quartet during the second half of the eighteenth century 279

Personalia 283

Bibliography 291

Index 309

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

List of musical examples

3.1 Johann Georg Distler, Book II, Quartet No. 5 in C Major, Menuetto. 57
3.2 Johann Baptist Vanhal, Op. 1, No. 4, Mvt. II, mm 1–18. 59
3.3 Johann Georg Distler, Book II, Quartet No. 5 in C Major, Trio. 61
3.4 Felice de Giardini, Op. 14, No. 1, Mvt. IV. 62
3.5 Paul Wranitzky, Op. 23, No. 5, Mvt. I, mm 1–101. 66
3.6 Franz Hoffmeister, Op. 9, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 88–162, cello part. 73
4.1 Antonín Kammel, Op. 4, No. 6, Mvt. I, mm 1–56. 84
4.2 Ignace Pleyel, Ben 302, Mvt. I, mm 1–89. 89
4.3 Ignace Pleyel, Ben 302, Trio. 93
4.4 Franz Neubauer, Op. 7, No. 3, Mvt. II, mm 1–18. 95
4.5 Franz Neubauer, Op. 7, No. 3, Mvt. II, minore section. 95
4.6 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, K.155, Mvt. III, mm 1–32. 99
4.7 Placidus Cajetan von Camerloher, *Sinfonia a 4tro* [in C Major], Mvt. I, mm 1–70. 102
4.8 Luigi Boccherini, G220, Mvt. I. 106
4.9 Luigi Boccherini, G165, Mvt. I, mm 1–23. 111
4.10 Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. III, mm 1–34. 113
4.11 Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. III, mm 90–127. 115
4.12 Pierre Vachon, Op. 11, No. 6, Mvt. II, mm 47–64. 117
4.13 Franz Danzi, Op. 6, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 57–84. 119
4.14 Ignace Pleyel, Ben 346, Mvt. II, mm 17–32. 122
4.15 Joseph Schmitt, Op. 5, No. 2, Trio. 125
5.1a Antoine Laurent Baudron, *Sei Quartetti*, No. 2, Mvt. III, mm 5–12. 134
5.1b Antoine Laurent Baudron, *Sei Quartetti*, No. 2, Mvt. III, mm 21–26. 135
5.2 Ignace Pleyel, Ben 314, Mvt. I, mm 19–45. 136
5.3 Jean-Baptiste Sébastien Bréval, Op. 1, No. 3. Mvt. III, mm 37–61. 140
5.4 Ignace Pleyel, Ben 347, Mvt. I, mm 36–73. 144

5.5 Jean-Baptiste Sébastien Bréval, Op. 18, No. 4, Mvt. III, mm 29–66. 146
5.6 Nicolas-Joseph Chartrain, Op. 4, No. 5, Mvt. III, mm 103–122. 149
5.7 Giuseppe Maria Cambini, T57, Mvt. II. 151
5.8 Giuseppe Maria Cambini, T28, Mvt. I, mm 1–75. 157
5.9 Franz Anton Hoffmeister, Op. 9, No. 1, Mvt. I, mm 1–94. 162
5.10 Ferdinand Fränzl, Op. 1, No. 4, Mvt. I, mm 150–174. 169
5.11 Václav Pichl, Op. 13, No. 1, Mvt. I, mm 50–57. 171
5.12 Nicolas-Marie Dalayrac, Op. 8, No. 5, Mvt. I, mm 1–66. 173
5.13 Nicolas-Marie Dalayrac, Op. 8, No. 5, Mvt. I, mm 84–97. 177
5.14a Franz Krommer, Op. 4, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 68–82. 179
5.14b Franz Krommer, Op. 4, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 118–132. 180
6.1 Joseph Haydn, Op. 33, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 1–14. 190
6.2 Joseph Haydn, Op. 33, No. 2, Mvt. I, mm 42–48. 191
6.3 Franz Hoffmeister, Op. 14, No. 3, Mvt. II, mm 1–8. 192
6.4 Franz Hoffmeister, Op. 14, No. 3, Mvt. II, mm 28–54. 193
6.5 Pierre Vachon, Op. 11, No. 6, Mvt. I, mm 1–64. 196
6.6 Joseph Schmitt, "Quartetto" in G, Mvt. I, mm 1–22. 199
6.7 Hyacinthe Jadin, Op. 1, No. 1, Minuet. 202
6.8 Pierre Vachon, Op. 5, No. 2, Mvt. III, mm 1–16. 204
6.9 Carlo d'Ordonez, Op. 1, No. 1, Mvt. III, mm 9–18. 207
6.10 Carlo d'Ordonez, Op. 1, No. 1, Mvt. III, mm 26–34. 208
6.11 Anton Teyber, Op. 2, No. 3, Mvt. I, mm 1–24. 210
6.12 Gaetano Brunetti, Op. 4, No. 4, Mvt. III, mm 38–70. 213
6.13 Nicolas-Joseph Chartrain, Op. 4, No. 5, Mvt. I, mm 58–89. 216
6.14 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, K.458, Mvt. IV, mm 97–112. 220
6.15 Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, *Sei Quartetti*, Quartetto IV, Mvt. I, mm 1–46. 222
6.16 Karl Ditters von Dittersdorf, *Sei Quartetti*, Quartetto IV, Mvt. I, mm 82–109. 225
6.17 Johann Baptist Vanhal, Quartet in A Major (A1), Mvt. IV, mm 1–8. 228
6.18 Johann Baptist Vanhal, Quartet in A Major (A1), Mvt. IV, mm 17–30. 228
6.19 Franz Krommer, Op. 5, No. 1, Mvt. I, mm 1–8. 230
6.20 Franz Krommer, Op. 5, No. 1, Mvt. I, mm 29–61. 231
7.1 Luigi Boccherini, G.168, Mvt. III, mm 17–24. 240
7.2a Luigi Boccherini, G.168, Mvt. III, mm 29–30. 240
7.2b Luigi Boccherini, G.168, Mvt. III, mm 33–34. 241
7.3 Carlo d'Ordonez, Op. 1, No. 1, Mvt. I, mm 1–6. 242

7.4 Joseph Haydn, Op. 50, No. 2, Mvt. IV, mm 30–50. 244
7.5 Joseph Haydn, Op. 50, No. 2, Mvt. IV, mm 94–140. 246
7.6 Florian Leopold Gassmann, H.478, Mvt. II, mm 1–60. 251
7.7 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, K.590, Mvt. II, mm 9–28. 254
7.8 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, K.590, Mvt. II, mm 63–77. 257
7.9 Joseph Haydn, Op. 71, No. 2, Trio. 259
7.10a Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. I, mm 30–33. 260
7.10b Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. I, mm 58–62. 261
7.10c Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. I, mm 95–98. 261
7.10d Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. I, mm 115–119. 262
7.10e Gaetano Brunetti, Quartet in A Major, Mvt. I, mm 145–148. 262
7.11 Franz Krommer, Op. 5, No. 2, Mvt. III, mm 1–32. 265
7.12 Ignaz von Beecke, Quartet in C Major (M1), Mvt. I, mm 33–41. 267
7.13 Giuseppe Maria Cambini, Op. 11, No. 3 (T45), Mvt. II. 270
7.14 Luigi Boccherini, G.222, Trio. 274
7.15 Joseph Haydn, Op. 55, No. 2, Minuet. 276

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Preface

The string quartet of the second half of the eighteenth century is often presented as a medium which underwent a logical progression from first-violin dominated homophony to the conversation among four equal participants. To a certain extent, this holds true if one restricts oneself to the works of Haydn and Mozart, and some of their contemporaries. My own research initially led to me believe this be to a provable and convincing argument. Once I began examining the actual works, however, I realized my assumptions were continuously being challenged, and that things were not nearly as nice and tidy as I had expected. Increasingly, I found numerous exceptions to my model and it was not long before I realized that my hypothesis was simply wrong.

It then became incumbent upon me to create an alternate means of examining these works. Although structural analysis was helpful in understanding each composition, it did little to help solve the problem of how to treat the string quartet as a unique genre. Similarly, a simple treatment of the genre on a chronological basis was not helpful as each decade produced too many exceptions to be convincing.

As a performer of string quartets, I knew that the most important aspect was the intimate communication I experienced with the other members of the ensemble. Although musicologists pay homage to the idea that the medium is a conversation among equals, few go beyond that statement. Once I decided to work from that angle, everything fell into place. Since not all works were truly conversations among equals, the model required refinement. The compositions themselves suggested the solution. If one accepted the notion that the quartet was a form of communication, or discourse, between four players, then one could derive certain categories from this construct: lecture, polite conversation, debate, and conversation. Although these types might seem somewhat artificial and imply rigid boundaries, they served as a useful means of organizing the huge number of works written during the second half of the eighteenth century. They eliminated the danger of imposing a chronological arrangement where there really was not one, and they forced me to view the string quartet, first and foremost, as chamber music.

It should be stressed that these categories are in no way derived from contemporary eighteenth-century sources. Nor do I mean to imply that composers

consciously thought in these terms. Rather, these artificial divisions merely provide a useful means with which to study the medium. There is precedent for imposing terminology retroactively. One need only consider Goethe's famous remark linking the quartet to four intelligent people engaged in conversation. Although the remark came from the first part of the 1800s, musicologists have accepted it as fully appropriate to the eighteenth-century form of the genre. Thus my approach is simply a refined and tangible application of an accepted analogy. I make no claim for historical legitimacy; rather I have merely constructed a means by which one can examine and assess the vast string quartet repertoire of the second half of the eighteenth century.

In the process of writing this book, I imposed certain restrictions upon myself. The first was a time frame. I intentionally chose to look at works written between 1750 and 1797. The former is easy enough to understand. It is the logical place to start the second half of the eighteenth century. But why 1797? Why not 1799 or 1800? Here the answer was more complex.

1797 marks the date of Joseph Haydn's Op. 76 – his last complete set of quartets. It is also the year prior to the start of Beethoven's first essay into the genre, and I deliberately chose to exclude that composer. As so much scholarship is devoted to Mozart and Haydn at the expense of other composers, I wanted to avoid this pitfall as much as possible. The inclusion of Beethoven would only further compound the problem. Moreover, in the hands of this last named composer, the string quartet became a different animal, and it was important not to add confusion to an already new way of examining the genre.

What I strove to do was present a balanced picture of the quartet. As so many of the works existed only in either eighteenth-century prints or in manuscript, I concluded that numerous musical examples would not only provide visual assistance, but would also introduce readers to the wealth of works that were written during this time period; hence, the inclusion of approximately seventy examples, some of which are rather lengthy. When, as in the case of Haydn, Mozart, Ordonez, Vanhal, and others, quartets have been published in authoritative or critical editions, I have relied on these. But in the majority of situations, I worked from eighteenth-century prints and manuscripts.

No attempt has been made to edit, amend, or alter the works. Instead, I have transcribed them as they existed so that the reader can get a sense of what the eighteenth-century performer would have worked from. Therefore original articulations, even when they conflict between the instrumental parts, are reproduced. Moreover, the cello part, if originally labeled as basso, is indicated in this book. Only on rare occasions, when an accidental was obviously missing, did I editorially add such a marking.

The choice of composers and compositions was purely my own. After fully analyzing over 650 quartets and briefly surveying many others, I developed a list of characteristics for each work (number of movements, structure, harmonic

activity, motivic work, textural considerations, etc). As my primary goal was to categorize the compositions by discourse type, I noted which ones were the best and most representative examples of each (lecture, polite conversation, debate, and conversation). It was these that I incorporated into the tables and text. Since my goal was to put forward a different method of examination, its acceptance would be achieved only if the illustrations were clear. While I did not deliberately exclude the many examples of hybrids (mixed discourse types), I kept these to a minimum in order to avoid confusion. These works would certainly make an interesting and separate study. One might even argue that certain types of discourse were more likely to occur in certain places than others. A secondary consideration was the need to offer a balanced perspective of the genre; hence my intentional inclusion of compositions which span the entire second half of the eighteenth century by a wide variety of composers of diverse nationalities. If I found myself in a position of illustrating a point with two compositions, either by the same composer or by different ones, I always chose the latter option.

No preface is complete without thanks, and this one is no exception. To the many libraries around the world which graciously provided me with microfilms and photocopies, I can only express my sincere appreciation. Many of these were procured with financial assistance from a Provost's Grant provided by my home institution, Widener University, for which I am very grateful. Special thanks go to the staff at the Library of Congress in Washington D. C. who answered my many questions and were so helpful in providing me with access to hundreds of quartets. To Rachel Lynch and the staff at Ashgate, please accept my thanks for the opportunity to explore this topic which has fascinated me for so long. And finally, to my family members, who were extraordinarily patient with me during these last four years, and especially to Ilene Lieberman, whose unwavering support and encouragement helped me every step of the way, I cannot begin to say how much I appreciate them. It made it all worthwhile.

Mara Parker

Widener University
November 2001

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Chapter 1

The string quartet as chamber music

There is a long history of studying the eighteenth-century string quartet from a structural or formal perspective. In general, musicologists have emphasized its evolution as a four-movement genre which employs a particular sequence of forms. Many have singled out the development of "motivische Arbeit" and its central role within the sonata allegro movement as the most important aspect; for these scholars, only in the presence of these aspects can one truly have a real string quartet. The relationship between the instruments, and especially the conversational aspect, is given only minimal attention. Thus, the eighteenth-century string quartet is viewed as a metaphor for *musical classicism*, rather than as a form of chamber music.

Early studies, such as those by Adolf Sandberger (1900), Friedrich Blume (1932), Hugo Rothweiler (1934), and Ursala Lehmann (1939) formed the basis for many a later researcher.[1] Their examinations differed from contemporary ones by Edward Dent, Marc Pincherle, and Arthur Eaglefield Hull in that they no longer attempted to identify the very first quartet,[2] but rather concerned themselves with the origins of the genre and the point at which the classical string quartet reached its zenith.

Common to all is an examination of the string quartet's "evolution" from its earliest stage to its perfection in the works of Joseph Haydn. Sandberger, for example, reaches back to the seventeenth-century dance suite as the forerunner of the quartet, and classical chamber music in general. Moving forward, he traces the development of the string quartet from its immediate predecessors – the cassatio, the notturno, the quadro, and the divertimento[3] – up through Haydn's Op. 33.

---

1 Adolf Sandberger, "Zur Geschichte des Haydnschen Streichquartetts", *Altbayerische Monatsschrift* 2 (1900): 41–64; expanded in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Musikgeschichte* (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1921), pp. 224–65; Friedrich Blume, "Josef Haydns künstlerische Persönlichkeit in seinen Streichquartetten", in *Jahrbuch der Musikbiblitohek Peters* (1932): 24–48; Hugo Rothweiler, "Zur Entwicklung des Streichquartetts in Rahmen der Kammermusik des 18. Jahrhunderts" (PhD diss., University of Tübingen, 1934); and Ursula Lehmann, "Deutsches und italienisches Wesen in der Vorgeschichte des klassischen Streichquartetts" (Würzburg: Druckerei und Verlag Wissenschaftlicher Werke Konrad Triltsch, 1939).

2 See for example Edward J. Dent ("The Earliest String Quartets", *The Monthly Musical Record* 33 [1903]: 202–4) and Marc Pincherle ("On the Origins of the String Quartet", *The Musical Quarterly* 15 [1929]: 77–87) who argued for Alessandro Scarlatti and Arthur Eaglefield Hull ("The Earliest Known String Quartet", *The Musical Quarterly* 15 [1929]: 72–6) who found Gregorio Allegri as the most convincing originator.

3 Sandberger, "Zur Geschichte", pp. 44–52.

With early attempts by Christian Cannabich, Johann Christian Bach, and Pierre Vachon, and then especially with each new set coming from Haydn, the quartet logically evolves to its state of perfection: the *basso continuo* disappears, the movement type and sequence become regularized, and most importantly, the principle of thematic or motivic work ("motivische Arbeit") is established.[4] Sandberger identifies Haydn's Op. 33 as pivotal, for it contains all the necessary ingredients of a true quartet; the fact that it appears after a long pause of ten years and is written in a "new and special way" is doubly significant.

Blume's own study relies heavily on Sandberger's, but gives Haydn a near-Schoenbergian mystique. Blume sees the composer as working towards an immutable target: Op. 33.[5] In the process, he establishes all the requirements of a quartet: the regularization of a four-movement cycle, each unit with its own identity and function, and the required employment of motivic work, especially in the sonata form movements.[6]

Rothweiler also relies on Sandberger but extends his observations to include the influence of Italian composers such as Giuseppe Tartini, Giuseppe Sammartini, Antonio Sacchini, and Gaetano Pugnani. In doing so, he provides a context within which to examine the melodic style of Haydn's quartets, which are, in his view, the best examples of the genre's evolution.[7] Rothweiler concludes that the history of the string quartet lies with the way composers have reconciled the Italian melodic style with the polyphonic fugal style. He suggests that the two merge in sonata form, and the best illustration of this reconciliation appears with the works of Joseph Haydn.

Like Rothweiler, Lehmann points to Italy's importance.[8] Acknowledging the impact of Blume's writing on the formulation of her own views, Lehmann traces the quartet back to the four-part Renaissance settings and then moves forward until she reaches Haydn, whose Op. 33 represents the culmination of the "classical" string quartet.[9] Lehmann views the string quartet as a "schema", a

---

4 Ibid., p. 62.

5 Blume, "Josef Haydns künstlerische Persönlichkeit", p. 26.

6 Ibid., pp. 32–5.

7 Rothweiler, *Zur Entwicklung des Streichquartetts*, pp. 26–9, 43–4. Rothweiler, like Blume and Sandberger, focuses on the importance of Op. 33, but in his case, it is the incorporation of folk and popular elements rather than the thematic work that is of prime importance.

8 This emphasis on Italy's importance culminates with the work of Fausto Torrefranca, "Avviamento alla Storia del Quartetto Italiano, con Introduzione e Note a Cura di A. Bonaccorsi", *L'Approdo Musicale* 12 (1966): 6–181. It continues to be present in later texts as well including Sylvette Milliot's *Que Sais-Je? Le quatuor* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1986). In contrast to a vast majority of musicologists, Milliot makes no mention of the divertimento at all; rather he sees a direct line from the Italian *concerto a quattro* to the French *quatuor concertant*, which in turn leads to the works of the Mannheim symphonists, and finally to Haydn and Mozart.

9 Lehmann, "Deutsches und italienisches Wesen", pp. 57, 71.

structural idea which can be used as a representation of the classical style and as the embodiment of sonata form. Thus the development of the string quartet is strongly connected with the development of sonata form.

This persistence in both linking the string quartet and sonata form, and the centralizing of Haydn's Op. 33 culminates in Ludwig Finscher's *Studien zur Geschichte des Streichquartetts,*[10] which, to this day, remains one of the most influential texts on the eighteenth-century quartet. Finscher discusses in minute detail the pre-history of the quartet, problems of terminology, and those early forms which are crucial to our understanding of the genre. In particular, he eliminates the ensemble pieces of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as forerunners to the string quartet, and refutes earlier suggestions that works such as Gregorio Allegri's four-part *Sinfonia*, the English viol consort pieces, and Alessandro Scarlatti's *Sonate a quattro* comprise early examples of the genre. He turns instead to the quartet symphony, the church sonata, the *concerto a quattro*, the *sonata a quattro*, the quartet divertimento, the string partita, and the *quadro*. From these he isolates the divertimento as the most important. By doing so, he strengthens his case that the string quartet is an Austro-Bohemian contribution, and not an Italian one. This allows him to dismiss the works of Luigi Boccherini, as well as the French *quatuor concertant* and *quatuor brilliant*, as mere episodes.[11] The divertimento quartet thus becomes the direct predecessor of the Viennese quartet, which is synonymous with the eighteenth-century string quartet in its classic form.[12]

Without going into great detail here, Finscher traces the evolution of Haydn's quartets up through Op. 33. For him, each set builds upon the advances of the previous one in a process that is inescapable. The significance of Op. 33 lies in its embodiment of all the characteristics typically associated with "musical classicism": its new popular tone, its simplicity and clarity, and its thematic development. It is the culmination of a whole evolutionary process.[13] For the first time, we can speak of a distinct genre. Only after this set do we see a virtual explosion in the production of quartets by a host of other composers. The reason, according to Finscher, is that for the first time, there is a style to be imitated, one which meshes the popular and learned styles, and one which presents a

---

[10] Ludwig Finscher, *Studien zur Geschichte des Streichquartetts: Die Enstehung des klassischen Streichquartetts von den Vorformen zur Grundlegung durch Joseph Haydn* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1974).

[11] Finscher's view (Ibid., pp. 13–14) holds that Boccherini's first set of quartets (composed 1761, published 1767/68) paved the way for the *quatuor concertant* as represented in the works of Cambini. By the time of Haydn's Op. 33, however, this French form was replaced by the *quatuor brillant*, which was little more than a solo violin with accompanying instruments. Both types were completely overshadowed by the Viennese quartet.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., pp. 14–15, 18, 238–75.

schematized sonata form with established rules. Thus Haydn is credited with the creation of the classical string quartet both in tone and manner.[14]

Even though Finscher's book appeared over a quarter century ago, no other research has focused effectively on the eighteenth-century form of the genre.[15] Paul Griffiths' *The String Quartet*,[16] which covers the medium up to the present day, provides only a cursory examination of the eighteenth-century contributions.[17] We have, however, seen a burgeoning of research on various aspects of the string quartet, and classical chamber music in general. Studies such as Warren Kirkendale's *Fugue and Fugato in Rococo and Classical Chamber Music*[18] and Reginald Barrett-Ayres's *Joseph Haydn and the String Quartet*[19] look at the divertimento but then focus solely on the Viennese tradition. Specialized studies devoted to the French *quatuor concertant*,[20] the relationship between the divertimento and quartet,[21] and works of one composer or a group of

14 Despite criticism and further studies by others, Finscher has maintained this position. As late as 1988, in his "Corelli, Haydn und die klassischen Gattungen der Kammermusik", in *Gattungen der Musik und ihre Klassiker* (ed. by Hermann Danuser; Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1988), pp. 185–95, Finscher still assigns a monumental place to Haydn's Op. 33. As the long-awaited resolution of the Op. 20 crisis, Op. 33 establishes the differentiation of movement characters, the special use of the minuet, the importance of thematic work, and the ideal of the four-voice conversation.

15 Wulf Konold's *The String Quartet From its Beginnings to Franz Schubert* (trans. by Susan Hellauer; New York: Heinrichshofen, 1983) relies heavily on Finscher and offers little that is new.

16 New York: Thames and Hudson, Inc., 1983.

17 See also John Herschel Baron, *Intimate Music: A History of the Idea of Chamber Music* (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1998) for another brief survey.

18 2nd edition, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1979.

19 London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1974.

20 The two classic studies are those by Dieter Lutz Trimpert, *Die Quatuors concertants von Giuseppe Cambini* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1967) and Janet Muriel Levy, "The Quatuor Concertant in Paris in the latter Half of the Eighteenth Century" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1971).

21 See Eve R. Meyer, "Florian Gassmann and the Viennese Divertimento" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1963); Gayle Alen Henrotte, "The Ensemble Divertimento in Pre-Classic Vienna" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1967); James Carson Webster, "The Bass Part in Haydn's Early String Quartets and in Austrian Chamber Music 1750–1780" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1973); and Roger Charles Hickman, "Six Bohemian Masters of the String Quartet in the Late Eighteenth Century" (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1979).

closely related ones,[22] are particularly welcomed, but still leave us without an understanding of how everything fits together.

In spite of these recent efforts, Finscher's history has remained the standard and has strongly influenced all successive studies. Common to nearly every one of them is a concentration on the structural aspects of the string quartet. Musicologists have focused on the genre as a cycle of four movements, each with a particular function, the use of thematic development, and a delight in harmonic experimentation; thus individual pieces are analyzed in light of musical theory of the second half of the eighteenth century. Since the string quartet is seen as one of the main achievements of the classical period, evaluations are based on the inclusion of those characteristics normally viewed as key to this time period: use of sonata form, motivic development, and the appearance of folk and popular elements. It is not unusual to read an overview of the string quartet which emphasizes Haydn as its creator, the evolution from the five-movement divertimento to the four-movement unified cycle, the overshadowing of the Viennese quartet above all other types, and the isolation of the early 1780s as the peak of the classical string quartet.[23]

There are of course exceptions to the evolutionary approach; most notable are the writings of Roger Hickman and James Webster. Hickman criticizes the developmental approach, stating that the idea that Haydn invented the string quartet and single-handedly advanced the genre is based on only a vague notion of the true history of the eighteenth-century genre.[24] In a number of articles, Hickman argues for the recognition of various types of quartet, each of which can be related to and distinguished from each other, and whose popularity and prominence rises and falls.[25] Similarly, Webster cautions against viewing the quartet as a unified genre. He contends that the whole concept of a classical string quartet was really a creation of the 1790s and early 1800s, due to the glorification of Mozart (after his death) and late Haydn: "Haydn did not synthesize the

---

22 See for example, A. Peter Brown's series of publications on Carlo d'Ordoñez, Klaus Fischer's work on G. B. Viotti, Orin Moe's work on Haydn's quartets, Fiona Little's excellent *The String Quartet at the Oettingen-Wallerstein Court: Ignaz von Beecke and his Contemporaries* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), and my own "Soloistic Chamber Music at the Court of Friedrich Wilhelm II: 1786–1797" (PhD diss., University of Indiana, Bloomington, 1995).

23 See Hubert Unverricht, *Die Kammermusik* (Köln: Arno Volk Verlag, 1972), pp. 11–13, and Ulrich Mazurowicz, *Das Streichduett in Wien von 1760 bis zum Tode Joseph Haydns* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1982), pp. 180–83.

24 Roger Hickman, "Joseph Haydn and the String Quartet", *Notes* 32 (Dec. 1975): 292.

25 See "The Nascent Viennese String Quartet", *The Musical Quarterly* 67 (1981): 193–212; "Haydn and the 'Symphony in Miniature'", *Music Review* 43 (1982): 15–23; "Kozeluch and the Viennese '*Quatuor Concertant*'", *College Music Symposium* 26 (1986): 42–52; and "The Flowering of the Viennese String Quartet in the late Eighteenth Century", *Music Review* 50 (1989): 157–80.

elements of preclassical chamber music to create the quartet; rather his individual solution to a local problem later became the central element in a historical aesthetic model of the rise of the genre".[26]

Regardless of whether or not one takes an evolutionary stance, inherent in nearly every approach has been the desire to equate the eighteenth-century string quartet with musical classicism. Thus one can make a persuasive argument for the highlighting of Haydn's Op. 33 if the criteria is based solely on the musical style of the second half of the eighteenth century. Each quartet of the set is a four-movement cycle, and each portion fulfills a particular function. The sonata form movements exhibit a polarity between two closely related keys and motivic development. The entire collection features four soloistic string instruments, none of which can be dispensed with. But these characteristics do not automatically transform Op. 33 into the epitome of the eighteenth-century string quartet. What is needed is an evaluation of the work, and the many others written during this time period, *as chamber music.*

To do this, it is necessary to set aside our expectations as to what a piece written during this time period should contain. If we approach a composition looking for a particular structure, melodic construction, or harmonic progression, we immediately examine it from a theoretical and formal perspective. Our expectations may or may not be met. Nonetheless, we have looked at such quartet in terms of musical style of the second half of the eighteenth century. We have not examined it as chamber music. In order to take this second approach (the piece *as* chamber music), it is important to consider the actual meaning of the term "chamber music" and the conventions in place at the end of the eighteenth century.

Toward a contemporary definition of chamber music

Several musicological studies draw extensively on the writings of such eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century theorists as Meinrad Spiess, Johann Mattheson, Heinrich Koch, and Johann Daube to form the basis for a discussion of chamber music. Among the more notable ones are those by Warren Kirkendale, Leonard

[26] Webster, "The Bass Part", p. 12. This thesis is central in many of Webster's contributions. See also "Towards a History of Viennese Chamber music in the Early Classical Period", *Journal of the American Musicological Society* (hereafter referred to as *JAMS*) 27 (1974): 212–47; and "Violoncello and Double Bass in the Chamber Music of Haydn and his Viennese Contemporaries, 1750–1780", *The Musical Quarterly* 29 (1976): 413–38. For Webster's most strongly worded objection to the myth of a unified classical style, see his *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 335–73.

Ratner, and Ruth Rowen.[27] A summation of the eighteenth-century conception of chamber music is given below.

In its original sense, "chamber music" simply meant music which belonged to the nobility at court as opposed to music of the church or theater. This is confirmed in the contemporary writings of Johann Walter (*Musicalisches Lexikon*, 1732), Meinrado Spiess (*Tractatus Musicus Compositorio-Practicus*, 1745), and Heinrich Koch (*Musikalisches Lexikon*, 1802). By the mid-eighteenth century, it also was heard in the common household and served as a form of relatively inexpensive private entertainment.[28] Although our current convention is to use the term to designate a medium which requires but one person to a part, during the 1700s, "chamber music" denoted something different.

Eighteenth-century musicians and theorists recognized three functions of music: to enhance worship in church (*ecclesiasticus*), to heighten the drama in the theater (*theatralis*), and to provide entertainment in the court or chamber (*cubicularis*). This distinction was maintained well into the last quarter of the eighteenth-century, not only amongst theorists but by the general public as well.[29] Daube himself made this differentiation throughout his *Der Musikalische Dilettant*, identifying those compositional styles appropriate for church, chamber, and theater. Although scholars stressed that the real difference between these three lay in the location of performance, others argued that the actual character of the music had to agree with the site. Johann Mattheson wrote that in practice, the classification of music into church, chamber, and theater styles applied only to the work itself and not to the place of performance.

> One has the wrong idea if one thinks that the word church, etc. would only be used here for the classification of the styles merely as regards the place and time; for it is very different, namely it relates to the worship service itself, to the sacred performances and to the actual prayers or devotions, not the building or the walls of the temple; for, wherever God's word is taught and heard, be it sung or spoken, there incontestably is God's house. When Paul preached in Athens, the theater was his church.

---

27 See Kirkendale, *Fugue and Fugato*; Leonard Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980); Ruth Rowen, *Early Chamber Music* (with a new preface and supplementary bibliography by the author; New York: Da Capo Press, 1949; reprinted, 1974), and Rowen, "Some Eighteenth-Century Classifications of Musical Style", *The Musical Quarterly* 33 (1947): 90–101.

28 Rowen, "Some Eighteenth-Century Classifications", pp. 90–92.

29 See von Trattner's announcement of Daube's *Der Musikalische Dilettant* in the April 1773 issue of the *Wienerisches Diarium* cited in Susan P. Snook-Luther, trans., *The Musical Dilettante: A Treatise on Composition by J. F. Daube* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 12. This distinction was still being made as late as 1799 by the Viennese publisher Traeg in his catalogue. See Unverricht, *Die Kammermusik*, p. 8.

> It is precisely the same with the theater and the chamber: neither place nor time are of special consideration here. In a hall, a sacred piece can just as well be performed as a dinner concert; hence it is well if we describe the chamber style through the adjective domestic, in the event consideration is directed toward moral things and matters, just as the morals teacher Ecclesiasticus is likewise called a domestic tutor; not because of the dwellings or the time and place, but on account of his special or private instruction in good manners and morals.[30]

The true meaning of the music should emerge regardless of setting.[31] Location did not always determine the style. Rather, each type of music had its own specific requirements; chamber music evolved its individual set of "technical procedures, tonal and emotional textures, and patterns of design characteristically different from those [obtained] in church or theater music".[32]

Eighteenth-century practice allowed most instrumental genres to be included under the title "chamber music": sonata, concerto, symphony, etc. Thus it was not necessarily soloistic; concert music of many types could be subsumed under the designation. The term "sonata" has been a source of puzzlement, for we find it employed in church music as well.[33] Therefore, any discussion of the three functions of music requires us to address the confusion between those sonatas labeled "sonata da chiesa" and "sonata da camera". Although works for the church are most frequently associated with performance within that institution, by 1700, there were many *da chiesa* works performed as secular domestic music as well; terminological clarification can be obtained only with an examination of the period prior to this time.

By the 1630s, the sonata was defined as a serious, abstract sectional work; it served as a replacement for the term "canzona", which earlier had designated instrumental ensemble works. By the 1650s, publishers began to attach the modifiers *da chiesa* or *da camera* to the title pages of their editions; this occurred at precisely the time that instrumental music played less of a role in publications containing sacred or secular vocal music. Specific affixations to individual works were rare. In this sense, the *da camera/da chiesa* dichotomy was one established

---

30 Johann Mattheson, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (Hamburg, 1739; facsimile reprint, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1954), p. 69, sec. 7–8. English translation in Ernest C. Harriss, *Johann Mattheson's "Der vollkommene Capellmeister": A Revised Translation with Critical Commentary* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981), pp. 190–91.

31 For further discussion of Mattheson's views, see Rowen, "Some Eighteenth-Century Classifications", p. 94; and Kirkendale, *Fugue and Fugato*, p. 35.

32 Rowen, *Early Chamber Music*, p. 14.

33 This statement also applies to the term "symphony".

by commercial demands rather than by composer specifications.[34] These words were descriptive, not restrictive.

The traditional view of the *sonata da chiesa* as seen with Arcangelo Corelli's Op. 1 (1681) and Op. 3 (1689) holds that it is a four-movement work with the tempo sequence slow-fast-slow-fast. It is a serious composition with one movement, often the second slow one, outside the home key. While the first, third, and final movements are homophonic, the second – the weightiest – is fugal in texture.[35]

Originally *da camera* simply meant "for use at court". This definition was soon widened to include non-church, secular and diversional, and chamber music.[36] The *da camera* modifier, most often used in conjunction with dance music publications, was really quite versatile. Up to the 1680s, it also designated the single, often stylized dance piece. John Daverio's examination of seventeenth-century sources led him to conclude that the term "sonata da camera" referred mainly to the single dance and not to an entire dance group. A single dance was a sonata by virtue of the fact that it was an individual instrumental piece.

> There is no connection between the *da camera* modifier and the appearance of dance groups. Most . . . publications mix grouped and ungrouped dances indiscriminately. In collections like Bononcini's of 1667 and 1669, and Polaroli's of 1673, which consist entirely or largely of ungrouped dances, *sonata da camera* must refer to the individual dance, not the dance group. Even in publications which contain a sufficient number of dance groups, there is no indication that *sonata da camera* is to be equated with *suite*.[37]

The meaning of the term changed only with Corelli's Op. 2 of 1685. In this collection, each dance group was labeled "sonata" in the print itself, a departure from previous practice in which only the title page bore such a designation.[38] This set marked the first time *sonata da camera* was used to designate an entire dance group. From this point on, that term became synonymous with "dance group". By way of illustration, Sebastian de Brossard, in his *Dictionaire de Musique*

---

34 John J. Daverio, "Formal Design and Terminology in the Pre-Corellian 'Sonata' and Related Instrumental Forms in the Printed Sources" (PhD diss., Boston University, 1983), pp. v, 17, 31–2.

35 A summation of the traditional conception of the "sonata da chiesa" is given in William S. Newman, *The Sonata in the Baroque Era* (4th ed.; New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1983), p. 34.

36 For an overview of "da camera" see Newman, *Sonata in the Baroque Era*, p. 35.

37 Daverio, "Formal Design", p. 45.

38 Ibid., p. 202.

(1705), described the *sonata da camera* as the equivalent of a suite of dance pieces.[39]

Although writers and publishers continued to differentiate between *da camera* and *da chiesa* sonatas, the styles and types soon overlapped. Once again, Corelli's sonatas were pivotal. Church sonatas invariably concluded with a disguised dance movement, most often a gigue; *da camera* works incorporated abstract elements. Eventually the two were virtually indistinguishable on a stylistic basis. The determining factor between the church and chamber sonata was the first *Allegro* movement, for only the second movement of the former was always polyphonic in *all* parts and conceived without reference to dance types.[40]

By 1700, the *da camera/da chiesa* distinction disappeared. Works for dancing were designated as *balletto da camera* or some related term, while the *da chiesa* modifier was dropped from the church sonatas. The term "sonata" became more inclusive and implied diversional chamber music that could be used in either the church or chamber. For composers, the location of performance and the function of music was no longer of consequence in the determination of musical style, which became paramount. This concentration on a "chamber style" was also reflected in the musical treatises of the eighteenth century.

Theorists such as Meinrad Spiess specifically identified the chamber style as fluent, delicate, charming and balanced. It was equated with the galant style:

> Chamber music, also called *galanterie-music*, takes its name from the rooms and salons of the nobility, where it is usually performed. Whoever looks for delight, artifice, invention, art taste, affection (tendresse) will find them all in the so-called Concerti Grossi, Sonatas da Camera, etc. in which one cannot fail entirely to be pleased to hear all the high, middle, and low voices concert with each other, imitate each other, and compete for attention, all with neatness and zest.[41]

Chamber music carried with it certain restrictions due to the size of the room in which it was played. But this provided the composer with the chance to experiment and work with subtle nuances not possible in music for the larger church or theater setting. It also required greater care on the part of the performer:

> This style in the chamber also requires far more diligence and perfection than elsewhere, and must have pleasant, clear interior parts which as it were continually contend for precedence with the upper parts in an

39 Sebastian de Brossard, *Dictionaire de Musique* (Paris: Ballard, 1705), pp. 118–19. See also Newman's description of the third edition to Brossard's work in which he further elaborates on the *da camera/da chiesa* distinction in *Sonata in the Baroque Era*, pp. 24–5.

40 Newman, *Sonata in the Baroque Era*, pp. 67–94; Rowen, *Early Chamber Music*, pp. 92–6.

41 Meinrad Spiess, *Tractatus Musicus compositorio-practicus* (Augsburg, 1746), p. 162. For an English translation, see Ratner, *Classic Music*, p. 7.

> agreeable manner. Slurs, syncopations, arpeggios, alternations between *tutti* and *solo*, between *adagio* and *allegro*, etc., are such essential and characteristic things that one for the most part seeks them in vain in churches and on the stage; because there is more reliance upon the prominence of the human voices, and the instrumental style is only used there to improve and to accompany or strengthen; whereas it clearly asserts superiority in the chamber; indeed, even if the melody should occasionally suffer a little thereby, it is still embellished, ornamented and effervescent. That is its distinctiveness.[42]

In its original sense, the word "camera" denoted the "administration of the princely residence". Chamber music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was for the nobility, and the term signified music performed in a salon or private chamber, or in the concert room of a noble establishment. Daube equated it with music for connoisseurs and amateurs; the concerting voices reflected the polite dialogues of elegant society.[43]

Most instrumental genres could be included under the heading "chamber music" – sonata, concerto, symphony, etc. The number of players in a given group or per individual part was unspecified. Initially the term simply denoted music which was to be played in a chamber (small room) as opposed to either a church or theater. This music could, and did, include orchestral as well as soloistic music, as well as non-staged secular vocal music. Thus the term referred to the location, not the genre.[44] It was only toward the end of the century that a sharper distinction was drawn between soloistic chamber music – one to a part – and orchestral music.[45] The term "chamber style" was coined to designate this

---

42 Mattheson, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, p. 91, sec. 106. English translation in Harriss, *Johann Mattheson*, p. 222.

43 Snook-Luther, *The Musical Dilettante*, p. 19.

44 James Webster, "The Scoring of Mozart's Chamber Music for Strings", in *Music in the Classic Period: Essays in Honor of Barry S. Brook* (ed. by Allan Atlas, New York: Pendragon Press, 1985), p. 263.

45 Thus the present custom of assuming a soloistic performance took hold only later. Unverricht (*Die Kammermusik*, pp. 8–9) argues that the eighteenth century is a grey area with regard to instrumentation and that an insistence on chamber music as solely soloistic is an imposition of nineteenth-century ideals on an earlier period. He cautions that it is easy to confuse *Hausmusik* with chamber music, the former of which had only minimal demands and was not designed for a specific situation or function. Unverricht argues that soloistic chamber music does not really appear until 1830. See "Das Divertimento für Streicher", in *Zur Entwicklung der Kammermusik in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Blankenburg: Michaelstein, 1986), pp. 68–9. See also Roger Hickman, "The Nascent Viennese String Quartet", p. 194, who argues for "orchestral" chamber music prior to the late 1760s based on stylistic grounds. For a contrasting view, see Webster's numerous writings on mid-eighteenth century chamber music (bibliography).

genre and this definition has held to the present day.[46] Mattheson also noted this soloistic vs. orchestral distinction, for in both his *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre* (Hamburg, 1713) and *Das beschützte Orchestre* (Hamburg, 1717) he referred to the *Stylus Phantasticus*, a subdivision of the *Stylus Symphoniacus*, which included the idea of chamber music with one instrument per part.[47]

Writers of the late-eighteenth century still distinguished between the three uses of music – theater, church, and court – but only court society actively cultivated music as a function.[48] As late as 1802, chamber music was still closely associated with the nobility as illustrated by Koch's description:

> Chamber music is in the real sense of the word, such music as is only customary in courts, and to which, since it is merely arranged for the private entertainment of the reigning princes, no one without special permission is allowed entrance as an auditor. But at various courts they still tend to designate by this expression the so-called court-concerts, which indeed are meant really only for the court and what is connected to it, but where also other persons may take part as listeners in the concert-salon isolated from the court.[49]

He differentiated the chamber style from that of the church, which expressed religious ideas, and the theater, which expressed moral emotions. Chamber music was intended solely to be performed in the room, with few instruments, for the pleasure of the princes. Due to these requirements, Koch wrote, chamber music placed more requirements on the performers with regard to nuance and technique.[50] This corresponds to Mattheson's own description as noted above.

Although chamber music was initially the domain of the aristocracy, it was soon available to many. It was an inexpensive form of entertainment accessible to the general public in coffee houses, homes, or open rooms.[51] Amateur chamber music organizations such as the Friday Academy, established in Berlin during Frederick the Great's reign, became commonplace.[52] Participation in instrumental chamber music blossomed, particularly during the last half of the eighteenth century. The university collegium musicum flourished in Germany as did literary and artistic academies in Italy. We also know of the existence of

---

46 Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Musikalisches Lexikon* (Frankfurt am Main: August Hermann den Jüngern, 1802), col. 1454.

47 See in particular Mattheson, *Das beschutzte Orchestre*, p. 137.

48 William S. Newman, *The Sonata in the Classic Era* (3rd ed., New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1983), p. 43.

49 Koch, *Lexikon*, cols 820–21. English translation in Rowen, "Some Early-Eighteenth Century Classifications", p. 91.

50 Koch, *Lexikon,* cols 820–21.

51 Kirkendale, *Fugue and Fugato*, p. 43.

52 Snook-Luther, *The Musical Dilettante*, p. 2.

musical clubs in England such as those at Oxford or that of Thomas Britton in London.[53]

The divertimento

Chamber music of the mid-eighteenth century was known under a variety of names: divertimento, concerto, quartet, symphony, cassatio, notturno, serenade, and partita. Idioms were undefined. Aspects such as mode of performance, number of people per part, and style of writing were not clearly established; they were often interchangeable.[54] A *sonata a quattro* or *quadro*, for example, might be performed either one to a part or as a chamber symphony simply by doubling the parts.

Nomenclature during the period ca.1740–ca.1780 was particularly vague. Various terms were used with few specifications. Initially ensemble works, most of which were trio sonatas, were labeled partita, sonata, trio, divertimento, or sinfonia. There was great flexibility with regard to terminology during this period, although partita was the most common title until 1760 when it was superseded by divertimento as the term of choice. For the next two decades, divertimento was the main designation for all non-orchestral music, including not only the classical string quartet and quintet, but the cassation, the partita, the sonata for melodic instrument and basso, and those pieces with obligato scoring for wind instruments.[55] It was not until after 1780 that "string quartet" supplanted the divertimento. Webster credits this change to the move from private to public musical culture and to the rise of native publishing firms around 1780.[56]

---

53 See especially, Stanley Sadie, "British Chamber Music, 1720–90" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1958), and Simon McVeigh, *Concert Life in London from Mozart to Haydn* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

54 The differences between the terms are murky and confusing. Webster, in "The Bass Part", PhD diss., pp. 35–6, relates this to eighteenth-century practices where theoretical works prior to 1780 almost ignore the terms. For further elaboration, see the discussions by Sandberger, Rowen, Engel, Henrotte, Seidel, Hausswald, Finscher, Meyer, and Webster (bibliography).

55 See Webster, "Towards a History", pp. 218–19, 244–7. Although Webster's comments focus on Viennese composers and practices, his conclusions allow us to draw comparisons with other contemporary approaches. Webster's series of articles on Viennese chamber music and the bass part (see bibliography) as well as Finscher's *Studien zur Geschichte des Streichquartetts*, Kirkendale's *Fugue and Fugato*, and Hickman's "Six Bohemian Masters" provided the basis for the following discussion.

56 Webster, "Towards a History", pp. 246–7. Finscher (*Studien zur Geschichte*, p. 105) notes that once Viennese publishers had established themselves, they also used the Parisian designation (*quatuor*).

Just as the terminology is confusing, so too is the relationship between the divertimento and the string quartet. While some view the former as the forerunner to the latter,[57] or as closely related but known under different titles,[58] others argue strongly in favor of two distinct entities.[59] Eve Meyer, for example, warns against viewing the divertimento as a "stepping stone" to the quartet and symphony, noting that it was an entirely independent form of music.[60] Gayle Henrotte cautions against the evolutionary approach, for in viewing the divertimento as a transition to the string quartet, one loses sight of that genre's own individuality and uniqueness:

> The majority of scholarly discussions about the divertimento tend to regard Haydn's works in this genre as the pivotal point. From this point they tend to look backward and try to determine what could have led to the divertimento as it existed in Haydn's time. As a group, the scholars also tend to forget that one may also look forward, and by constantly looking backward, they disregard the fact that the divertimento has continued its own humble course into the twentieth century.[61]

Meyer notes that while the divertimento is usually described as chamber music with one or two people per part, it can also be realized by a small orchestra of fifteen to twenty-five players. This is in keeping with the loose distinction between chamber and orchestra at the time. Thus the term tells us little about instrumentation. Haydn, for example, used the word for a variety of works: string quartets, trios, duos, solos, baryton trios, clavier sonatas, concerto-like works, and small orchestral pieces.[62] Instrumentation should not be viewed as a divertimento's primary trait. Rather it is characterized by a homophonic texture with melody in the top voice; the bass voice, which rarely has thematic material, supplies the harmonic foundation, often through the use of repeated eighth notes (*Trommelbass*) or long-held pedal points. The inner voices are blended and may move in parallel thirds, sixths, or tenths, with each other or with the melody.

---

57 For a discussion of the primary supporters of this theory see the beginning of this chapter; see especially Finscher's *Studien zur Geschichte* for the most convincing and complete argument. See also Hubert Unverricht, "Das Divertimento für Streicher", in *Zur Entwicklung der Kammermusik in der zweiten Halfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Blankenburg: Michaelstein, 1986), pp. 66, 70–71, who notes that the "change" occurs when the textural problems are worked out.

58 See the various writings of James Webster, noted in footnotes and in bibliography.

59 See Meyer , "Florian Gassmann", and the various articles and dissertation by Roger Hickman (bibliography).

60 Meyer, "Florian Gassmann", pp. 11–12.

61 Henrotte, "The Ensemble Divertimento", pp. 17–18.

62 Ibid., pp. 167–9.

Sometimes melodic motives are shared between the upper parts;[63] the emphasis is on simplicity and clarity. Divertimenti often contain a balanced, symmetrical movement scheme, and are filled with diatonic harmonies, restricted keys, and uncomplicated binary and ternary structures.[64]

Meyer distinguishes between two types of divertimento: a larger one for winds, strings or mixed ensemble, and a smaller one for string trio or quartet, possibly with flute or oboe, piano-violin duos, or solo keyboard. While the former, intended for festive occasions and possibly for outdoor use, comprises four to nine movements, the latter, designed for indoor performance, at small garden parties, or possibly on the streets of Vienna, consists of two to four movements. Sound quality further differentiates the two types. The larger divertimento reveals a connection to orchestral music with its use of scale passages, horn-call style themes, arpeggiation, energetic crescendi, dynamic contrast, antiphonal effects, themes which derive from rhythmic and harmonic figuration, and popular themes. The smaller type exhibits a more intimate and charming character. It is often indistinguishable from other types of chamber music and leans toward a greater equalization of parts. Meyer suggests that the divertimento, both large and small, peaked during the period 1755–1780; once the string quartet was fully established, there was less need for the chamber divertimento. The larger type remained in use for various social occasions, although by the 1780s, it had become too unwieldy and decreased in popularity.[65]

A separation between divertimento and string quartet may also be argued on the basis of movement types and sequence, and mode of performance. While the string quartet usually consists of three to four movements in a symphonic plan, with the outer ones nearly always fast, the divertimento has many possible combinations and may contain anywhere from three to five (or more) movements.

> Regardless of its format, the divertimento reflects a unity of conception which clearly separates it from the string quartet. Like the other "pre-quartet" genres . . . the divertimento does not embody the three defining criteria of a "true" string quartet – obligatory solo performance, freedom from the basso continuo, and scoring for two violins, viola, and cello. Rather, the divertimento is essentially orchestral and could be played by either a large ensemble or soloists.[66]

Realization of parts is also useful as a point of distinction. Meyer, who cautions against reading too much into the chamber concept, especially when regarding a divertimento, suggests that the word "chamber" merely refers to

---

63 Eve Meyer, "The Viennese Divertimento", *The Music Review* 28 (1967): 168.

64 Orin Moe, Jr., "Texture in Haydn's Early Quartets", *The Music Review* 35 (1975): 4.

65 Ibid., pp. 169–70. See also Meyer, "Florian Gassmann", pp. 13–14, 16, 128.

66 Hickman, "Six Bohemian Masters", p. 13.

private music-making – music which can be played in the chamber or private apartment of a sovereign or ruling prince. It tells us nothing about the number of performers per part.[67] While the divertimento may be realized by an orchestra, the string quartet must be executed by four individuals. This orchestral/quartet performance option for the divertimento becomes central when one examines the stylistic approach to the string instruments.

The mid-century orchestral conception includes such characteristics as homophony, repetitive rhythms, abrupt dynamic changes, simple harmonies, disjunct thematic material, use of tremelos, doubling of viola and bass, and a limited range for the instruments. Roger Hickman argues that these same features appear in the mid-century divertimento, making that genre amenable to large ensemble performance. In contrast, the solo string quartet style is filled with subtle dynamic nuances, independent lines, lyric, conjunct melodies, difficult figuration, and inclusion of long, sustained notes. These features are not found in divertimenti, nor can they be successfully rendered by several performers on each part.[68]

Hickman concluded that the string quartet proper appeared in Vienna only in the late 1760s, distinct from the divertimento which remained an independent genre. The divertimento did not succumb completely to the dominance of the quartet but maintained an independent existence, especially in the hands of a master such as Florian Gassmann. It was not merely a step in the evolution of the string quartet; it was a "related but independent genre conceived in an entirely different spirit".[69]

A contrasting view is presented by James Webster who argues against viewing the divertimento as a separate genre and in favor of soloistic realization.[70] Webster stresses that during the period 1750–1780, there was a great flexibility with regard to titles and terminology. Divertimento was the most commonly used, especially after 1760. By adding the modifier *a quattro* after divertimento, one has a piece which "in no way implies that the work which bears it is anything other than a full-fledged string quartet".[71] Thus for Webster, the word divertimento means nothing more than "composition" or "ensemble music" and implies no specific sequence or number of movements. It is not a genre, nor does it suggest stylistic or functional limitations; neither is it a transition between the Baroque suite and the classical symphony, between older types of chamber music and the string quartet. Instead, the term simply means multi-movement ensemble music of an informal character.[72]

---

[67] Meyer, "Florian Gassmann", p. 47.

[68] Ibid., p. 21. See also Hickman, "The Nascent Viennese String Quartet", pp. 195–200.

[69] Hickman, "Six Bohemian Masters", p. 23; "The Nascent Viennese String Quartet", p. 211.

[70] For a similar view, see Henrotte, "The Ensemble Divertimento."

[71] Webster, "The Bass Part" (PhD diss.), p. 55.

[72] Webster, "Towards a History", pp. 215–16, 225–6.

Dismissing the Baroque suite-symphony connection, Webster argues that the divertimento was performed soloistically, and in fact could only have been transmitted in this fashion. "The theoretically tenable position that the single title *Divertimento* might have transmitted both soloistic and informal orchestral music founders on the lack of evidence for the latter's existence."[73] The case for soloistic scoring can be made with reports in letters, diaries, autobiographies, and anecdotes such as Dittersdorf's regarding the performance of Richter's Op. 5, Haydn's for the party at Baron Fürnberg's, and Dr. Burney's which describes a performance which took place in Vienna on 4 September 1772.[74] Furthermore, if one assumes that the title "divertimento" implies orchestral scoring, one would have to conclude that Haydn, who did not use titles such as "quartet" until the 1780s, did not write soloistic music until that time.

Webster concluded that there was no difference between the string quartet and the *divertimento a quattro*. The *a quattro* affixation merely specified four distinct parts. Chamber music with this title was a string quartet in everything but name. Even by 1781, the term *divertimento a quadro* was used in lieu of string quartet on the title page of published chamber works as for example, with Haydn's Op. 33. The two terms were used interchangeably until the 1780s.[75] At this point the terminology changed for a variety of reasons: as a reflection of the rise of music printing in Vienna, of French practices, and the more public focus and performance mode. Only then did the divertimento assume an identity as a separate genre, used for different purposes, performed in different settings, and disseminated by different methods.[76]

Both views offer cogent arguments but neither is totally convincing. There is much to be said for viewing the string quartet as a "divertimento with a name change", especially as it provides a sense of continuity and explanation of relationship between the two. Likewise, the stylistic differences between orchestral and chamber styles allow us to regard the divertimento as distinct from the string quartet, thereby presenting the divertimento as a separate and equally worthy medium for study. Perhaps the answer lies somewhere in between. If we accept the notion that initially the word divertimento was used as a catch-all

---

73 Ibid., p. 235.

74 Ibid. See also Webster's discussion in "The Bass Part" (PhD diss.), pp. 391–3.

75 James Webster, "The Bass Part in Haydn's Early String Quartets," *The Musical Quarterly* 63 (1977): 394–5. Webster contends that prior to 1770, the string quartet was simply called divertimento. It is only in the 1780s that the usage of the former overrode that of the latter. This nomenclature change (from divertimento to string quartet) occurs simultaneously with the gradual specificity of the bass line (from basso to violoncello), which did not indicate a change in scoring, but rather a move toward terminological precision (see below). See Webster, "The Bass Part" (PhD diss.), pp. 303–4, 310–11; "Towards a History", pp. 229–30; and "Violoncello and Double Bass in the Chamber Music of Haydn and his Viennese Contemporaries, 1750–1780", *The Musical Quarterly* 29 (1976): 425–6.

76 Webster, "The Bass Part" (PhD diss.), pp. 41, 73–4.

category for all types of chamber music, then not only would the as yet unnamed string quartet come under this terminology, but so would a host of other types of chamber music. As terminology became more specific, many of the vaguely specified chamber works assumed a particular identity, and developed a history and set of characteristics unique to them. Such is the case with the string quartet. What is important though, is to understand that the term divertimento and works designated as such did not die out. As the divertimento "membership" diminished, the term came to refer more specifically to those types of works which remained. The weeding out of different genres allowed the divertimento to achieve its own specificity because fewer and fewer different forms of chamber music were subsumed under that heading. Thus the divertimento did not die out once designation of certain types of works as string quartet became commonplace. It simply relinquished its ability to be connected to those works for two violins, viola, and cello.

Lacking in the above, however, is a consideration of the role of the one ingredient central to chamber music: interaction between the participants. If we accept the view that a string quartet represents a form of interaction between four participants, we are forced to look beyond the traditionally presented arguments. This, coupled with the difficulties in pinpointing the emergence of the quartet, require us to turn to the eighteenth-century string quartet and view it, not as the embodiment of musical classicism, but as chamber music.

The string quartet as chamber music

The historical roots of the string quartet are difficult to pinpoint as there is neither a single specific event or idea which stands out as central, nor is the terminology clear. There is a history of four-part writing for strings in the *sonata a quattro*, the *concerto* and *concertino a quattro*, the Italian sinfonia, the French *sonate en quatuor*, the *symphonie en quatuor*, and the *ouverture à quatre*, the divertimento, the cassation, the notturno, the serenade, the *quartettsymphonie*, and the *quartettdivertimento*.[77] However, Finscher argues that none of these scorings or genres proved stable, nor did any one unite all the features that we typically associate with the string quartet of the second half of the eighteenth century: the obligatory soloistic scoring with cello, the four-movement cyclic pattern featuring

---

77 See Finscher, *Studien zur Geschichte des Streichquartetts*, pp. 44–89 and Kirkendale, *Fugue and Fugato*, pp. 15–17, for a discussion of these roots. Webster suggests five genres as the most likely precursors of the string quartet: *symphony a 4* in Italy, France, Austria, and Southern Germany; the *concerto a 4* in France and Italy; the *sonata a 4* in Italy and *concertino a 4* in France; the *quadro* in Northern Germany; and the various soloistic ensemble genres in Austria. See Webster's review of Finscher's *Studien zur Geschichte des Streichquartetts* in *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 28 (1975): 544.