Three Documents on Analysis:

Prolegomena: Brief Glances at the Concepts of
Sonata Deformations, Defaults, and Generic Centering

The Classic Multimovement Sonata:
An Overview

The Expositional Space:
The Four Fundamental Types

James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy

© 1994

Note:

No portion of this booklet, nor any analytical
terms coined therein, may be reproduced or
published without the express written permission
of the authors.

I have myself often been fascinated by the theory that classical music, like classical sculpture, measures its proportions in "golden sections". . . . Yet I have become sceptical; there are so many ways of taking your sections that I doubt whether any musical composition can avoid golden ones somewhere. . . .

I should retain more interest in such speculations if the deeper researches in them did not so often show an inability to recognize the most obvious musical facts. Such inability is far more serious than any failure to recognize subtleties. The obvious musical facts, when they are facts at all, lead of their own accord to the profoundest subtleties; and it is my hope that the lines of analysis indicated in these volumes may lead in the right direction.

<div style="text-align: right">

Donald Francis Tovey, <u>Symphonies</u> <u>and</u>
<u>Other</u> <u>Orchestral</u> <u>Works</u> [Oxford rpt. 1981],
conclusion of the "Introduction," p. 19.

</div>

That there are social implications in the works themselves [and in their very conceptions and founding principles] . . . cannot seriously be denied, although the prospect of deciphering them is one to daunt any scholar whose ambitions go beyond facile categorizations . . . and the construction . . . of merely verbal analogies. . . .   [True, we must admit that] the aesthetic and technical terms of reference are inadequate in their exclusiveness but they are equally essential, as a first stage that must on no account be skipped over.

<div style="text-align: right">

Carl Dahlhaus, "Issues in Composition,"
<u>Between</u> <u>Romanticism</u> <u>and</u> <u>Modernism</u>, p. 77

</div>

Prolegomena: Brief Glances at the Concepts of Sonata Deformations, Defaults, and Generic Centering

The central issues to be explored in the two position papers that follow may be simply posed:

1) What may we take to be the most essential structural and expressive functions of each of the four (or, originally, three) movements of a multimovement sonata, particularly as those functions had "centered" (or reified in practice)--in the hands, especially, of Haydn, Mozart, and early- and early-middle Beethoven?

2) During the same period what are the most basic structural and expressive functions of the set of four movements considered together as a more or less standardized pattern or shape?

3) What kinds of normative behavior can we expect from the expositions of historically lasting and influential sonata-form movements in this period and in its immediately surrounding decades, say, c. 1770-1830?

Even to ask these questions implies numerous prior assumptions--a basic conceptual framework and an accepted methodological background. Not all of this can be dealt with here: it would require many separate essays to lay it out adequately.   But before setting out a larger, more analytically specific sonata-theory, it might be helpful to glance at some of the background axioms and convictions that underpin it. Once again, our basic question is: To what extent can we articulate assumptions or axioms that seem clearly implied as generically conceptual models or foils for the individual "classical" works of what we are calling the centered phase of the sonata?

The argument here is grounded in the following conviction: it is most productively through an adequate conception of generic principles that the individual--and often quirky--details found in a "classical" work may be perceived as richly coherent.   (These principles remained deeply

relevant--though often in altered or updated formats--throughout the subsequent tradition, in which individual sonatas continued to be conceived as playing off the classical examples.[1] Thus once the centered model is grasped at a sufficient level of complexity, interpretive work becomes more possible in the works of the nineteenth century.)   According to this view, the nature of the social and aesthetic "game" that we identify as sonata practice was governed by a set of largely shared norms, customs, traditions, expectations, and so on, all of which we might understand as being implied by the concept of genre itself (in this case, the genre of the sonata).

It might be useful to think of the <u>genre</u> as a complex set of ever-ready possibilities or flexible guidelines for the production of individual works.   These myriad possibilities, however, does not mean that the selection of this or that one is a matter of indifference. On the contrary: it is more helpful to suppose that a composer confronts them in some sort of conceptual array, as a <u>hierarchically</u> <u>ordered</u> <u>set</u> <u>of</u> <u>default-choices</u> for every point of the individual sonata that that composer wishes to create.   Not all choices are equally normative. Some are decidedly odd and exceptional.

This notion of hierarchically ordered possibilities might be most easily approached through analogy. We might fancifully imagine, for example, the existence of a software program (**SonataMaker**TM) that governs--indeed, makes possible--any individual statement produced by a composer using that program.   By furnishing the essential layout of sonata-possibilities, by "pre-setting" the multiple configurations of traditional first-level defaults, second-level defaults, and so on, this program would supply the medium that permits an individual to do work at all.

Such a "program" should not be narrowly conceived: if it is to be effective at all (and not merely a child's toy), it must lay down neither an ironclad set of rules nor a set of simplified stereotypes that one expects to be slavishly followed in all instances ("Flash! You have just entered the development; you must now avoid the tonic, fragment your themes, and modulate")--even though such an assumption (with only slightly more flexibility) has often guided much music analysis up to the present time. Rather, our metaphorical construct, SonataMakerTM, furnishes the individual with a complex set of possibilities at every point of the sonata; it opens up <u>a</u> <u>range</u> <u>of</u> <u>standard</u> <u>options</u> to consider at each point of the individual statement; it provides one with a complex set of "pre-set" defaults at various hierarchical levels; it permits one <u>to</u> <u>alter</u> <u>or</u> <u>modify</u> <u>locally</u> <u>any</u> <u>default</u> <u>at</u> <u>any</u> <u>level</u> (either as a one-time option within an individual work or, more aggressively, as part of a broader practice of <u>crafting</u> <u>or</u> <u>customizing</u> <u>of</u> <u>a</u> <u>set</u> <u>of</u> <u>personal</u> <u>default-</u>

---

[1] The terms "updates" or "upgrades" within this discussion of genres in music history <u>should</u> <u>not</u> be taken to imply anything on the order of absolute improvements.   These terms are used here only metaphorically to imply the ever-emerging presence of an increasing number of different stylistic and structural options--a model designed to handle an ever-burgeoning complexity of compositional choice and back-referencing to the developing canon, but not necessarily one delivering more artistic "excellence" or "convenience."

levels and style preferences for present and future works within the genre)[2]; and it allows for the possibility of overriding any of the established defaults for individual special effects, although it also comes packaged with a set of "socially acceptable" limits beyond which one is advised never to proceed.

Within the practice of sonata-composition, SonataMaker™ provides the ongoing general/generic rules and standard practices of the game for each diachronic point of the structure. To compose a work within the genre (to write a symphony, quartet, etc.), one must carry on a personal dialogue with it--in fact, the finished product is that dialogue itself.   Within any individual work, however, a composer is likely, for expressive effect, to mix default-choices from various levels and to override certain other defaults altogether. Lower-level default choices (that is, notably unusual ones) and patent overridings may be considered to be **"sonata deformations"** at the level of an individual work. When certain types of low-level defaults and overridings--taken from exemplary individual cases--are imitated or adapted by subsequent composers, we may say that the once-individual sonata deformation has itself become an available default choice within an expanded program. Such occurrences and their related variants, may be grouped together as **sonata-deformation families**. Perhaps it goes without saying that in order to carry on our own interpretive dialogues
with the finished products (that is, to try to come to some kind of understanding with the work, however provisional), we, too, need to know as much as possible about the state of abstract construct--the SonataMaker™ program--under which (still metaphorically) it we consider it to have been conceived.

It is misguided, therefore, to assert that an individual sonata autonomously sets out--on its own--the fundamental principles and implications from which it will unfold.   Rather, it is more helpful to consider each individual work as an idiosyncratic variant generated and assembled from an array of conceivable, but pre-established possibilities and norms for understanding.   At this

---

2 Thus one might argue that beyond the "generic" SonataMaker™ program passed down by their immediate tradition, such composers as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (but not only these composers) had their own sense of a "standard operating procedure" (to adapt David Rosen's term) for their own compositions--in essence, a set of customized defaults and preferences crafted and stylized from the socially generic model. Cf., for example, the well-known Leeson-Levin model for the first movements of Mozart's mature concertos (which may be taken--whether or not we might accept all of its details--as a modern attempt to reconstruct the "customized defaults" implied by those concerto movements): see Daniel N. Leeson and Robert D. Levin, "On the Authenticity of K. Anh. C14.01 (297b), A Symphonia [recte: Symphonie] Concertante for Four Winds and Orchestra," in Mozart-Jahrbuch 1976/77 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1978), pp. 70-96.

Ultimately, with regard to the centering and postcentered phases of the sonata, the argument here will be--very broadly stated--that many of the aspects of Haydn's, Mozart's, and (especially) Beethoven's "personally customized" versions of the genres at hand, insofar as they were believed to be inferrable, were taken up by the emerging institution of art music in the nineteenth century to become acknowledged as the institutional norm.   And again, whether or not the "institution's" inferences were correct in this regard is quite another matter.

point we might reach momentarily beyond the computer imagery for a different metaphor.   Each individual composition may also be considered an expressively stylized or "distorted" image--an individual utterance displaying varying degrees of anamorphism.   As we approach that distortion that is the individual piece, we need a method that permits us to read or decode it: lacking a method, we will see and hear only a non-meaningful blur.

The essential argument here: it is one's own assessment and understanding of the implied genre--an awareness of the potential of SonataMaker™ in in its full complexity, if you like--that can most productively act as a lens to help "resolve" the anamorphism, (or, more normally put, to provide a basis for a defensible reading of the individual work). [3]   The choice of an adequate lens--the device that permits the resolution or reading--is therefore the most important act of hermeneutics.

 Now obviously, from certain points of view, we can choose any lens we like to decode any piece. At stake is the kind of "understanding" that we wish to come to in our dialogue with the work. Different lenses will produce different resolutions of the anamorphism--different readings. Still, it is doubtful in the extreme that all lenses are equally helpful, persuasive, or to the point. Inadequately conceived lenses--such as a "shallow" or reductive conception of the actual genre likely to be at hand--produce shallow, surface-oriented readings that will ultimately (one must hope) fail to persuade.   And finally, much as the choice of any given lens may be subjected, quite legitimately, to a critique (ideological or otherwise), such lenses must be chosen: lacking a lens, we cannot "see" the piece at all.   Nevertheless, we should continually question the lenses that we choose, along with our own reasons for choosing them. And we should be especially wary of assuming that any one lens or single reading uncovers the "real truth" about any individual composition.   We may often wish to use substantially differing, multiple lenses precisely to arrive at simultaneously differing readings--or to coax out different aspects of a work originally suppressed or ignored by our first lens-choice.

Genre definition is a complex matter, and its complexities have often eluded scholars looking for simpler explanations for the striking multiplicity of sonata-shapes in the individual works found in, say, the years 1770-1830.   In all of this, there seem to be certain common procedural errors that should be avoided from the start.   One might strive today, for example, to avoid the time-honored temptation of trying to define a genre, such as "sonata form" (or "the eighteenth-century first-movement large-binary pattern") through recourse only to a shallow empiricism or statistical positivism.   In such a practice--still all-too-frequently encountered--one simply amasses all of the varied sonatas that one can find, notes all the discrepancies and

---

[3] I have adapted the image of anamorphism and resolving lenses from Donald Preziosi, Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1989). It might be added that Preziosi's work is essentially a critique of traditional art-historical systems that claim "correct" or "truthful" resolutions, interpretations claiming to be universally true, or, as he puts it, dans le vrai.

unusual features of their acoustic surfaces (and if Haydn and C.P.E. Bach are thrown into the mix, one will find plenty of them!), and then tries to forge a compromising definition of what a classical sonata structure is, based on the few points of intersection among all of the examples.   That way lies madness: a confusion of the quirkiness of the individual statement with the more stable generic ground on which that statement must rest in order to make sense, and without which we could not perceive it as quirky at all.

It is easy to spot such interpretational confusion.   It generally takes the shape of 1) an acknowledgment that a "sonata-form" (or, for Rosen, the "sonata texture") need do only three or four essential things to qualify for this exalted rubric--usually, it should be a recognizable big-binary structure, modulate decisively by the end of the first part, and, later, accomplish some sort of "resolving" activity (different schools of though have different ways of formulating these "basics")--followed by 2) such a statement as, "Apart from this, anything can happen at any point--because Haydn's Quartet No. X does Y at point Z," and so on.   <u>Au</u> <u>contraire</u>: Haydn's X may indeed do the weird-Y at point Z--and it may indeed be notably strange--but that is no reason to think of Y as anything resembling a normative (generic) option, <u>unless</u> we start beginning to notice Y cropping up extensively elsewhere as a common variant (in which case the weird-Y will have to be considered an inbuilt default-option--perhaps a markedly lower-level option, still a "deformation"--in the ongoing modification of the sonata-program).

Above all, it is inadequate to understand any individual sonata to be ontologically co-extensive only with the articulation of its acoustic surface (what one actually "hears"). Any given sonata is more helpfully understood as an individual **dialogue** with something that is tacit, though implied--a generally more stable (though complex) social genre (or sonata-program).   Abstractly put, the ontology of a musical work ("what it <u>is</u>") lies neither in its "sound" nor in its abstract pattern in and of itself; rather, its ontology lies in its capacity to suggest <u>a process of meaningful dialogue</u> (with the genre, with prior exemplars and models, with its original audiences, with us, and so on) rather than in the plain, uninterpreted "fact" of its sounding surface. To confront any individual work adequately, one needs to hear both sides of the dialogue.   This is why an empty amassing of acoustic-surface descriptions of individual statements--considered apart from their essential generic dialogues with the complex set of defaults and standard choices that we might think of as SonataMaker^TM --will ultimately get one nowhere.

<u>The Concept of Generic Centering with Regard to Sonata Structures</u>

The concept of generic centering is extraordinarily problematic, and its full discussion will have to be deferred to another essay.   Still, because so much of the theory of sonata deformations and the classic multimovement sonata depends on the concept of an implied model and various degrees of generic centering, we cannot avoid the topic altogether. It may be possible, however, to provide a few of the conclusions of the theory, even though those conclusions are by no means fully argued below.

Musical genres are not stable things. According to the present theory, they are complex <u>constellations</u> of norms and traditions--and these conceptual forces are fluid, systems-in-motion. Genres (unlike mere, abstract "forms") also contain strong social connotations; indeed, I have argued elsewhere that "genres are socially produced, socially constructed, the products of hundreds, thousands, of producer-receiver transactions over an extended period of time."[4]   One implication of this: SonataMaker^{TM} was not the product of any individual or small group.   It was socially manufactured, "given" to the individual composer--provided the composer had the talent and discipline to master it--as one of the games encouraged by or permitted in his or her society. (Personal adaptations of the program, of course, are a different matter--but here we are dealing with local or surface modifications, the customizing of certain defaults, and so on; the program itself is a larger construct.)

At any point in its transformation-pattern (a term used here in place of "evolution" or "historical development," which might strike us as too "organic") , a genre-constellation may be considered as <u>precentered</u>, <u>centered</u>, or <u>postcentered</u> in terms of its relative stability, clarity, reification, and social/intellectual acknowledgment. Genres (such as "the sonata") differ from place to place, and they change from decade to decade: they are "historical through and through." (Thus one might speak of "the state of the genre" in this or that time or place--or in the mind of this or that composer.) Yet in the historical span of any genre-continuum that flourishes over a long period, there normally emerges what may be termed a <u>generic</u> <u>center</u> that serves to define (or better, to <u>crystallize</u> <u>the</u> <u>definition</u> of) the genre and its possibilities.   Centering the genre (unlike its original, social creation) is usually the result of the action of a single individual or, more often, a small group of influential composers: here we are referring to the production of <u>particularly</u> <u>telling,</u> <u>memorable</u> <u>individual</u> <u>statements</u> <u>that</u> <u>soon</u> <u>acquire</u> <u>enormous</u> <u>prestige</u> <u>within</u> <u>the</u> <u>subsequent</u> <u>tradition</u>.   As will be mentioned below, the heart of the centering phase of the sonata tradition occurs from about 1781 to 1802, with a decade or more of transition on either side. Most notably, the centering phase comprises the activity of the mature Haydn and Mozart, along with that of early- to early-middle Beethoven.

---

[4] Hepokoski, Unpublished typescript, "Theses on the Sociology of Genres: Bridging Hermeneutics to a Sense of the Postmodern." Some of what follows is also adapted from that paper.

Definition: Within the diachronic transformation-pattern of a
genre--as conceived within a consistent geographical or cultural
tradition--the **centering phase** occurs with the rise of a powerful generic model or set of models
that are widely regarding as having codified a "new" norm, and that then remain normative (or at
least unavoidably powerful) for subsequent creators (and receivers) within that genre.   Above all,
the new "generic-center" models are by and large viewed as definitively superseding all (or at
least most) prior models--that is, they render "predecessors" irrelevant as practical models for
further work. Hence one of the [unintended?] functions of the individual works that bring the genre
into its centering phase is to obliterate the subsequent influence of the generic, precentered
predecessors. Paradoxically, the centering-phase works seem to "cut free" from their
predecessors, even while, in practice, they were profoundly dependent on them--and perhaps
even "summarized" or "synthesized" them.   It might be added that this process of obliteration
occurs in concrete, real-life transactions between the producers and the recipients of the genres
in question. It is documentable, and it is no mere abstraction. (Thus, for example, with the
"centering" models of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven at hand--and with many of them preserved
canonically within a now-growing institution of art music--prior or less "centered" work within the
genre increasingly ceased to matter or provoke interest: it simply became forgotten, or worse,
relegated to the historian.)

> **Digression**: Because the point is easily misunderstood, I should at least reiterate
> that this concept of generic centering is not intended to be a stale perpetuation of
> simplistically organic or evolutionary models of style development. The present
> concept may be distinguished from those in the following way: genre-
> constellations cannot be considered to have an independent, "real life" of their
> own apart from concrete social practice. In this sense, genres cannot "be"
> autonomous, nor organic, nor evolutionary: it is not they that do the adapting.
> Nevertheless, socially constituted groups can and do share and perpetuate ever-
> changing ideas governing the practices of how individual utterances are to be
> formed. It is in this constant transformation of social consensus--the
> demonstrable sharing of contingent norms among production and reception
> communities--that my conviction regarding generic centering lies. Thus we are
> considering, ultimately, a process of social transformations within a certain sector
> of social experience, not, strictly speaking, the "organic evolution" of an
> autonomous form.

With regard to the multimovement sonata and the rise of "sonata form," I distinguish, then, three phases of transformation-pattern (and again, the full argument for this will be deferred to another essay):

1. The Precentered Phase: c. 1730-1780.

2. The Centering Phase: most strictly considered,

    c. 1781-1802/3

3. The Postcentered Phase: c. 1802/3 onward

The **precentered phase** encompasses the thousands of individual symphonies, sonatas, concertos, chamber works, and so on in Italy, Austria, Germany (Mannheim, Berlin, Hamburg), France, England, and so on: the galant style, the Empfindsamkeit, the Mannheimers, the Parisians, the Londoners, and so on.   Clearly, the notion of the large binary-form first movement is highly flexible during this phase, and numerous large-scale variants abound. (Thus we have the characteristic Mannheim binary form, the ritornello-influenced forms sometimes found in C. P. E. Bach, and so on--none of which survived the process of centering in any significant way, although certain of their "residues" do appear in Mozart's and Haydn's centering-phase works .) Here we find a lively economy of production-reception transactions--a testing, accepting, and rejecting of emerging defaults for the "new" genre.   (And note: "Precentered" is emphatically not intended to mean "defective.")

In his recent Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style (1991), James Webster argued passionately (and often convincingly) that many of the elements that we often consider definitional to a "mature Classicism" (p. 364) were in place--and brilliantly effective--considerably before the 1780s, and that, consequently, the traditional "periodizations" of Haydn's works--often construed as an "experimental" ascent to the "pedestal" of High Classicism--are inadequate (pp. 356-64).   We may cautiously agree, and yet it is still possible to suggest that in certain locations the looser, precentered generic situation began to change around the mid-1760s into a **late-precentered phase** merging into and blending with the centered phase itself as a kind of **transition-in**.   This is increasingly notable with certain ambitious and strong examples from Haydn, from around 1765 through the 1770s: the spate, for instance, of seven minor-key symphonies (chronologically, 34, 26, 39, 44, 45, 49, and 52), including the important "Passione" (49, F minor, 1768) and--especially--"Farewell" (45, F# minor, 1772), and the emergence of the Six Quartets, Op. 20, of 1772--nearly always considered to be some sort of landmark of "quartet texture." Shortly thereafter, 1773-75, Haydn also began to experiment more tellingly with slow introductions to his symphonies (chronologically, 50, 54, 57, 60, and 53): a "not-sonata" feature that sets off the sonata-to-come in critically important ways.

Similarly, Charles Rosen notes that "a considerable change is evident in the music of both Haydn and Mozart at about 1775, the date of Mozart's
E flat Piano Concerto, K. 271 [sic: the proper date is January 1777], perhaps the first large work in which Mozart's mature style is in complete command throughout."[5]   For Mozart, though, one might also lobby on behalf of the significance of a few slightly earlier works, such as the Symphony No. 29 in A, K. 201 (1774) and the Violin Concertos (1775).

The arguments on behalf of the distinctive quality, depth, and range of the many major works of the high **centering phase**, c. 1781-1802/3, should be obvious enough (pace Webster), and they have certainly been often enough rehearsed, though under different rubrics--the full rise of "Viennese Classicism," Rosen's "Classical Style," and so on.   Here we might only confront a few broad features of this phase and deal with some of the issues surrounding our selection of the bordering dates.   The sonata's centering phase--in the hands of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven--is concerned with many things simultaneously, but we might single out two here:

1. This period sees a pronounced drive toward increased structural, textural and contrapuntal complexity, subtlety, and depth.   Moreover, all of this new seriousness of purpose (coupled, especially in Haydn, with a sense of magisterial wit and "high play") was occurring precisely at the time that a new understanding of the "aesthetic" and the supposed "autonomy of art" was being elaborated in philosophy--not to mention the simultaneous occurrence of such things as the impact of the French Revolution, other social changes, and so on.   All of this has been observed by virtually all commentators on the period and need not be expanded upon here.

2. Above all, Haydn and Mozart seem to have been particularly concerned with finding ways to fill spectacularly large expanses of time in such a way that that the time thus filled never struck one as conceptually impoverished--or "empty".   In a sense, this was something of a musical engineering feat, like the construction of a huge, single-span bridge, "thrown out" into space.   In the 18th-century style, all this was to be done with rather simple, transparent materials--things that, in the past, had tended to produce short-winded compositions (small bridges).   One of the central drives of the mid- and late-18th century, it seems, was to produce ever more spectacular spans for occasions of special dignity, prestige, or social importance.

Generally considered, for example, one might argue that the more "important," "official," "dignified," the occasion or the function of the piece, the longer the piece was to be.   The selection of four movements for a large instrumental composition (symphony,

---

[5] Charles Rosen, The Classical Style (new York: Norton, 1971), p. 23.

quartet) is telling here: by the mid- and late-18th century this "expanded" pattern clearly made grander claims than did the arrangement of only three (as in the "domestic" piano sonata, though Beethoven would stretch this sub-genre to four movements), and this four-movement pattern was clearly a statement about its claims to prestige and its level of demonstration of the composer's skill.[6]   (For whatever reasons, though [and they remain to be investigated], it would appear that the existence of more than four movements--as in serenades, divertimenti, etc.--seemed to weaken the potential overall effect of a successfully spanned breadth into one of a mere succession ["suite"?] of separate events. Perhaps this was simply viewed as "stretching too far."   In any event, this larger pattern seems to have been generally reserved for lighter, "entertainment" music--music whose generic titles seemed to arouse more modest expectations and make smaller aesthetic claims.)[7]

In the centering phase Haydn and Mozart started to provide a series of astonishing solutions to the problem of monumentality--the creation of dazzling, architectural durations.   "How to sustain time" seems to have been a central problem in this style.[8]   In particular, Mozart's symphonies 35-41 and Haydn's symphonies from the six "Paris" Symphonies onward represent a marked advance over prior models in expansiveness and solidity.   They were manifestly intended to impress as monumental works--displays of how to sustain musical ideas over lengthy durations.   In this task, many of sonata form's most characteristic features, including such things as inbuilt repeats as generic markers of importance, had crucial roles to play (even though the

---

[6] Cf W. Dean Sutcliffe, Haydn: String Quartets, Op. 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), p. 2: "While [the string quartet] was an intimate and personal form, it also allowed for a more abstract expression of ideas and indeed sometimes took on an academic tinge. If the concerto was the genre in which an instrumental soloist might most fully display his talents, the string quartet was the form in which the composer could most easily display his craft, where social considerations were at their least pressing. . . . Haydn's example gave the string quartet a prestige as a compositional vehicle that has lasted to some extent to the present day."

[7] The expansion toward five movements that one occasionally finds in multimovement pieces of the postcentering phase--Beethoven's Pastoral Symphony, Berlioz's Symphonie fantastique, Schumann's Rhenish--is an entirely different matter, concerned, of course, with a further expansion of the reified (and centered) four-movement norm.

[8] In his celebrated 1826 discussion of the grande coupe binaire (the second volume of the Traité de haute composition musicale) Reicha would even mention this aspect, however obliquely (p. 291), as a central compositional concern within the sonata style. In Reicha's (rather unambitious) view, ideas are to be developed, but not extended beyond a point that is "considerable enough"; works that have too many phrases to develop must "sacrifice a part" in order not to extend over too long a duration, and so on.   To be sure, Reicha is concerned here with absolute durational limits, not with extraordinarily long spans, but the telling feature is the concern for absolute duration. We might refer to this aspect of composition as a striving for a "sufficiency (or propriety) of length."   Clearly, by 1826 (let us say) Beethoven, for example, had a different concept of this "sufficiency" than did Reicha.   I am grateful to Peter Hoyt for calling my attention to this passage in his unpublished typescript, "Anton Reicha's Accounts of the grande coupe binaire in Light of Neoclassical Dramatic Theory."

second repeat--development/recapitulation]-- was being inexorably done away with--perhaps for other reasons?)

For Haydn, the strategy of how to span large stretches of time seems to have been one of wit combined with an unanticipated concentration and thoroughness of "logical" motivic unfolding and development: "observe how far I can make this material extend!" His embrace of the so-called "monothematic" exposition only underscores the grand coup implicit here.   In a sense, Haydn continually defeats the tendency that his material has toward clipped, tightly coiled, brief utterances. Mozart can also proceed in this way--one must not oversimplify the matter--but his more characteristic strategy is to expand musical space through the unfurling of a breathtaking abundance of melody, coupled with an unprecedented rhythmic security, a mastery of long-range melodic and harmonic goals, and (often) the technique of expanded repetitions and paraphrasings, the "billowing-out" of the individual zones of the sonata. (Beethoven's later, early-postcentered examples--"Kreutzer," "Eroica"--might be best described as, for the time, even more spectacular illustrations of an audacious hyper-monumentality that, in effect, began to suggest a thoroughly readjusted set of length-norms. Before too long, this readjustment would be concretely ratified within the emerging liberal-humanist institution of art music.)

As for the 1781-1802/3 dates suggested here for the centering phase--and obviously they refer only to the tradition forged by the interaction of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, later ratified and taken as the new norm by the emerging institution of art music--1781 commemorates:
1) the completion of Haydn's Op. 33 Quartets, "written," as he claimed, "in a new and special way" (among those who believe Haydn's claim, what is notable here is the new contrapuntal freedom of the inner voices, or a "new perfection and maturity of the Viennese Classical style")[9]; and 2) Mozart's move from Salzburg to Vienna, along with the corresponding, often observed maturity that that move brought.   Mozart's "Haydn" Quartets, Piano Concertos, and "large" symphonies are important events of the 1780s, just as Haydn's "Paris" Symphonies seem to codify and proclaim a new monumentality and stability to the concept of the grand symphony, now more than ever a spectacularly public genre.

As for 1802/3, the key documents come from Beethoven. In addition to the (strong) evidence of the music itself--which is so obvious as to tell us all that we really need to know--we have, first, the Heiligenstadt Testament (1802) and its apparent effect on his aesthetic. And

---

[9] Sutcliffe, Haydn: String Quartets, Op. 50, p. 19.

second, we have Beethoven's famous declaration c. 1801-02 to his friend Wenzel Krumpholz--uttered, it was said, some time after the completion of the Piano Sonata, Op. 28 (according to a later report by Carl Czerny in his guide to Beethoven's piano works): "I am only a little satisfied with my previous work. From today on I shall take a new path."[10] It is worth remarking that 1801 saw Beethoven's first selection of a non-traditional key for S within a sonata movement (S is in vi in the first movement of the String Quintet in C, Op. 29), and that in 1802 he composed the important set of 3 Piano Sonatas, Op. 31 (in which, for example, the first movement of Op. 31 No. 1 moves to III for S--for the first time in Beethoven). What follows is a program of "rethinking" sonata-deformational practice to its roots, coupled with a program of hyper-monumentalization. (The path: 1802: Symphony No 2 / 1803: the gigantic--and very important--"Kreutzer" Sonata and Symphony No. 3, "Eroica" / 1804: "Waldstein" and the Triple Concerto / 1805: the Opus 54 Sonata and the "Appassionata" -- not to mention Fidelio (with overture, Leonore No. 2) / 1806: the revision of Fidelio, including the overture Leonore No. 3, Piano Concerto No. 4, the three Razumovsky Quartets, Symphony No. 4, the Violin Concerto / and so on.)

Needless to say, this change into the "second style period," however it might have been described and assessed, is fundamental to the reception tradition of Beethoven: for all practical purposes it has been universally observed among commentators. Central to this conception is the idea of the younger Beethoven absorbing and mastering the motivic and structural implications of Haydn and Mozart in smaller-scale, more "normative" works--though clearly in a more blunt, clipped, abrupt, almost schematic way, as if tying up loose ends within his own conception of those genres (or as if simplifying and schematizing those norms in order to make the existing deformations speak all the more vigorously)--and then setting out to explore what further, more "powerful," "striking," or "heroic" things might be done with those structures. Maynard Solomon's assessment of this change in Beethoven's style is characteristic, and worth quoting at some length:

> It is difficult to say whether the three Sonatas, op. 31 (composed in 1802; published 1803-04 by Nägeli in Zürich), opened an era or closed one. . . . One senses during these years, and especially in the years 1798 to 1802, Beethoven's determination to achieve a mastery of the Viennese high-Classic style within each of its major instrumental genres. . . . In the years around 1801 and 1802 he found within sonata form new, unexplored possibilities--thematic condensation; more intense, extended, and dramatic development; and the infusion of richer fantasy and improvisatory materials into an even more highly structured Classicism.

---

[10] Quoted, e.g., in Maynard Solomon, Beethoven (New York: Schirmer, 1977), p. 107.

Beethoven was now well launched upon his "new path"--a qualitative change in

his style which would become a turning point in the history of music itself. . . .[11]

Charles Rosen also makes the point of a marked stylistic and conceptual change in

Beethoven's output--"confirmed in the sonatas opus 31 and in the Eroica [that is, in 1802-03]"--

one leaving the realm of "classicism," a "classicizing tendency," or the merely "'reproductive' style"

(or the imitation or consolidation of structural norms) for the more advanced realm of (for Rosen)

a truer "classicism."[12]   In our terminology, it was early Beethoven who set the seal on the first

reification of the sonata in this so-called "classicizing" phase (a reification explicitly acknowledged,

later, as being the foundation of what we call the second reification, the "textbook" conceptions of

musical form, such as that elaborated by A.B. Marx in 1845).

The post-1802 "new path" may indeed be in a sense more "classical," although

Beethoven's contemporary, E.T.A. Hoffmann did not see it that way, nor did many others of the

time, who saw above all a set of highly idiosyncratic exaggerations and distortions of the nor.   In

fact, what seems to have occurred here was a much more serious, more elemental deformational

intent vis a vis the now-strongly reified models. As such this period, 1802-1810, may be regarded

as both a kind of confirmation of the conceptual gains made in the centering phase and the first

stirrings of works that we might consider as postcentered. In short, the period c. 1802-10 may be

considered, for Beethoven, simultaneously the onset of the **transition-out** of the centering phase

and the onset of the **transition-in** to the postcentering phase.

> Note: merely because Beethoven himself seems to have entered a postcentered
>
> conception of the sonata in his own practice does not mean that the genre
>
> "itself"--everywhere and in all places--was being equally centered. Far from it.
>
> Schubert, for example--not to mention lesser lights--seems not to have begun his
>
> compositional output in the 1810s with a postcentered conception of the sonata
>
> accomplished and in hand--though he would quickly veer in that direction.   Nor
>
> are Rossini overtures reliant on a conception of the postcentered sonata that in
>
> any way can be readily defended.
>
> This is a complex aspect of the theory of generic centering--that a genre
>
> can be differently centered among different individuals in different places, etc.--
>
> and it rests most fundamentally on the much-discussed notion of the "non-
>
> contemporaneity of the contemporaneous" (Ungleichzeitigkeit der

---

[11] Solomon, Beethoven, pp. 107-08.

[12] The key passages in Rosen are: The Classical Style, pp. 32, 381; and Sonata Forms (New York: Norton, 1980), pp. 281-82.   Rosen consistently suggests that Mozart (and not Haydn) was the primary model for Beethoven in this early phase.

Gleichzeitigkeiten): within any historical movement, not all elements exist at equal stages of transformation at any given point in time. In short, the concept of generic centering is something that might initially have to be done <u>in practice</u> by certain individuals in certain exemplary and influential compositions (working from their own conceptions of what the norms of the genre are or must be: see also the concept of personally "customized" senses of the sonata-genre, mentioned in footnote 2 above). Once the larger society, in effect, ratifies the works of those composers--awards them praise, grants them a high prestige-value, studies them, uses them as models, and so on--then the processes of centering and postcentering enter into the consciousness of musical society at large. But this is, in practice, a slow procedure. In short: differing individuals begin the process of centering and postcentering; it filters out to larger numbers of composers and society at large more slowly and more unpredictably.

We shall have little to say about the **postcentered phase** in the present essay, except that as a matter of course, composers within it generally accept the "reified," centered-phase model of the sonata as normative. At this point, the history of the sonata--in the hands of its leading composers as acknowledged within the emerging institution of art music--proceeds relatively oblivious to anything that happened in the precentered phase. Shortly into the postcentered phase, the centered nature of the sonata is confirmed in print with textbook-format model--once again, this is an important "<u>second</u> <u>reification</u>" (<u>the</u> <u>one</u> <u>in</u> <u>print</u>) following by some decades the "<u>first</u> <u>reification</u>" (<u>the</u> <u>one</u> <u>in</u> <u>practice</u>): the second's task is essentially to try to describe or codify in words the apparent principles of the first--as A.B. Marx proceeded to do so in 1838, then expanding his discussion, far more influentially, in 1845.

Certainly by this point the "sonata" was easily interpretable as a formula, a predictable "thing" of the past--a structure whose prestige and claims to seriousness could be taken for granted, but whose future as a vital form seemed uncertain. Indeed, in a famous 1839 review of three unimpressive piano sonatas by obscure composers (Heinrich Enckhausen, and so on), Schumann commented on the lack of many recent "achievements in the category of the sonata . . . for once they were the order of the day, but we see them now only by way of exception . . . [the product largely of] unknown composers." Proceeding to characterize the impression of the relatively few sonatas from the 1830s as things with "sober faces" or as mere "examples, or studies in form"--notwithstanding the sonata's <u>de</u> <u>facto</u> claim to being the most "exalted" and "distinguished form" of

music--he concluded that as a genre, the sonata was essentially played out: "Single beautiful examples in this category will surely show up here and there, and already have, but in general it appears that the form has run its course. "[13]

If by the 1830s and 1840s the concept of the sonata already seemed more than a little venerable, creaky, academic, "classical," or outdated--the nearly simultaneous appearance of Schumann's remark and A.B. Marx's verbal elaboration of sonata form can hardly be coincidental--what remained for ambitious composers with a sense of the future was an exploration of bolder ways to adapt, alter, or "deform" that now-archaic, high-prestige model still further. Hence the astonishing rise in importance, from the 1830s and 1840s onward, of sonata-deformation families.

---

[13] "Im Uebrigen aber scheint es, hat die Form ihren Lebenskreis durchlaufen." Quoted in Leon B. Plantinga, Schumann as Critic (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 149-50 (original German, p. 288-89). In the same review Schumann also tells us: that "it was Hummel who vigorously continued the Mozartean manner"; that "Beethoven's example was followed especially by Schubert, who sought after new terrain and won it; and that other sonata composers worth mentioning were Ries, Berger, and Onslow, although their works were ultimately superficial. Moreover, within the sonata, "C.M. von Weber quickly achieved a telling effect with the individual style he developed. More than any other, it is his example that the younger composers have followed. Thus the sonata stood ten years ago, and thus it stands now."

The Classic Multimovement Sonata:
An Overview

Note: The following discussion can claim to be no more than the current state of a set of provisional conclusions (or even hypotheses) being continually tested and revised.   Its primary concern: to articulate some key features of an apparently generalized horizon of expectations associated with the multimovement sonata--and especially the four-movement symphony, quartet, and related genres--during the crucial period of the genre's "**centering**."

The Individual Movements
of the Four-Movement Sonata-Cycle

1. First Movement

    --Obligatory Structure: "Grand Binary" Structure

        [this term is adapted from Reicha, 1826; it refers to that which A.B. Marx would later--1838, 1845--call "Sonata Form"]

    --Declaration of the Tonic Governing the Whole Work

    --Setting of the Proper "Tone," or the Articulation of the Importance of the Social Occasion or "Ceremony" at which the Work is To Be Performed (The Symphony, e.g., as a Marker of the Grandeur, Formality, or Splendor of Its Own Realization as a Public "Event"; Chamber Music as More "Intimate," etc.)

    --Referential Intertextual Dialogues with Past Exemplars of the Genre (Particularly with regard to the Norms and Pacing of Accepted Structural Patterns)

       Within a symphony this first-movement structure is to be carried out, in J.A.P. Schulz's words from 1774, in such a way as to become "the expression of the grand, the festive, and the noble . . . to summon up all the splendor of instrumental music." "The allegros of the best . . . symphonies contain great and bold ideas, free handling of composition, seeming disorder in the melody and harmony, strongly marked rhythms of different kinds [i.e., a notable variety of moods and textures]. . . ." To Neil Zaslaw, writing in 1989 (Mozart's Symphonies, p. 417), "the first movements represent the heroic, frequently with martial character. . . . Later [eighteenth-century symphonies] contain contrasting lyrical ideas. . . . The two sorts of ideas-- lyrical and martial--may be seen as comparable to the persistent themes of opera seria itself: love versus honour."

In terms of **tonality**: we find here the most elaborate assertion of the concept of a "tonic" in its full complexity.

(JH) The central point would seem to be: The first movement sounds the tone of importance for the entire composition, which is itself a celebration of instrumental music and its expressive capabilities; from another perspective, this movement, as a demonstration of compositional skill, demonstrates the aesthetic/expressive level at which the rest of the "game" will be played.   In the centering phase this movement is usually the most "elevated" (structurally or expressively complex) movement of the four.   The first movement thus also sets the terms of understanding (emotional preparation) for the movements to follow.   The inherent flexibility and implied "drama" within the "grand-binary" structure (especially in its "grandest" expansions) are naturally suited to this task.   Indeed, the structure was developed, it would seem, precisely to permit the accomplishment of these things.

When an **introduction** begins the movement--initially far more appropriate to symphonies and overtures than to chamber works and "domestic" piano sonatas--it is, among other things, a marker setting up, preparing for, and calling attention to the importance of the following sonata structure.   Within the important Haydn symphonic output, they begin to occur in more earnest in a spate of symphonies between 1773 and 1775 (chronologically, 50, 54, 57, 60, 53); they continue a few years later with Symphonies Nos 71, 73, and 75; and the principle seems to be even more consolidated in the "Paris" symphonies (1785-86), three of which (84, 85, 86) have slow introductions.   By the period of the twelve London symphonies introductions are normative in Haydn (except in the sole minor-mode symphony of the set, No. 95 in C minor).   Mozart, too, of course, also has his role to play in all of this (Linz Symphony [36, 1783], Nos. 38, 39; Overtures to Don Giovanni, Così fan tutte, Die Zauberflöte, and so on.)   And introductions, of course, were also much explored by many other eighteenth-century composers: however important they may have been to the subsequent tradition, Haydn and Mozart, needless to say, were expanding on the work of many predecessors.[1]

In some respects, then, introductions, too, serve as indicators of the "grandness" of the what may be called the **grand symphony**,[2] markers of the "event" and its significance.   An introduction points at the

---

[1] See Marianne Danckwardt, Die langsame Einleitung: ihre Herkunft und ihr Bau bei Haydn und Mozart, 2 vols. (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1977). Cf A. Peter Brown's review of this book, Journal of the American Musicological Society 33 (1980), 200-04.

[2] What I loosely call the genre of the **grand symphony** refers to that further development and expansion of the "concert symphony" especially characteristic of the last thirty years of the eighteenth century.   (The other extreme pole would be the 18th-century, three-movement **overture-symphony**, a brief F-S-F structure, often with interconnected movements.) I use to term **grand symphony** to indicate the largeness or **monumentality** of any symphony of mature Haydn/Mozart proportions: four movements (exception: Mozart's Prague has three), over twenty or twenty-five minutes in total length, full or augmented "classical" orchestra, and so on. The term applies even more strongly to the symphony's even further, "extreme" hyper-

sonata itself; it is a pedestal on which the grand sonata is placed.   As such, it is one of the important **"not-sonata" accretions** that had became a normative option by the centering phase of the sonata, particularly within the eighteenth-century genre of the four-movement grand symphony.

For a discussion of the **exposition types** that launch the "grand binary structure," see the following essay.

(JH) Central to the concept of the **grand symphony is an elaborate system of schematic repeat-conventions, balances, symmetries and proportions that call attention to and help to define the genre itself.**   This is why the repetitions and symmetries are there: **in large part, the emphatically "architectural" construction serves to call attention to the grandeur and splendor of the genre itself.** By implication, the "formal" structure is also a celebration of the "rational" ("Enlightenment" or "modern") culture that makes such an impressive, moving, or powerful "art" possible. The implication: this is a culture that has found a "rational," balanced means to shape and contain the fluid, raw, elemental power of music. (And, by extension, the whole process probably also represented at some level the controlling or harnessing of those impulsive, instinctive, libidinal, or "uncivilized" elements within ourselves). **Control, balance, generic identification, and, above all, formal architectural splendor: These would appear to be the central reasons why literal repetition plays such a central role in the style.**   Consequently, it must not be taken for granted, passed over lightly in analysis, or omitted in performance.   Block-repetitions an integral feature of the style, and composers can use/alter/"play with" this defining convention in a variety of ways. **Repeat signs are never insignificant**. [3]   When previously "obligatory" (or exceptionally strong first-level-default) expositional repeats begin gradually to disappear--especially in the early postcentering phase, with certain works of Beethoven (Op. 57, Op. 59 No. 1, etc.),[4] the genre itself is beginning to undergo a major rethinking.

> The usual, current arguments--Schenkerian and otherwise--that claim that some repeats are
> structurally insignificant while others are far more important (because of the unfolding of
> certain structural tones, etc., perhaps under a first-ending sign) generally miss the far larger

monumentalizations in Beethoven. See the discussion of the "centering phase" in the preceding essay.

[3] For the quintessential statement of that which the present argument opposes, see Douglass M. Green, Form in Tonal Music: An Introduction to Analysis, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1979), p. 82: "**HISTORICAL NOTE** [sic]: Ordinarily the repetition of a part is of little significance in formal analysis."

[4] There are some provocative precedents in Mozart: Symphonies Nos. 31, 34, 35 ("Haffner"); Serenades K. 320 ("Posthorn") and K. 375; etc. These examples, largely from the late-precentered phase require individual attention. It seems clear that during the 1770s--and not, it seems, in the 1780s, Mozart was exploring the possibility of the omission of the expositional repeat as a lower-level default within larger works. This needs more study.

point of repeat signs as generic identifiers. [5] Even when the "structural-tone" aspects might be convincing (but, perhaps paradoxically, only as local details; pace Uncle Heinrich!), the gist of these arguments seems to be based largely on later nineteenth-century premises, which eventually came to look on all unaltered repetition as an aesthetic error.   Obviously, such a conviction also came to affect performance.   It is not uncommon to encounter either the omitting of essential, genre-defining repeats or the insistence on a notably altered interpretation in the repeat. It may be, though, that on some levels, "saying the same thing twice" was precisely what the composer might have had in mind.

Thus the grand symphony, at its heart, was a sumptuous, high-prestige display of grand architecture, an architecture to which large-scale repetitions--and especially that of the expositional repeat in its first movement--were essential.   Notwithstanding some provocative experiments by Beethoven (with a few anticipations from Mozart), the expositional repeat, certainly up to about 1830 (or even 1840), seems to have been the essential marker, the sine qua non of the "grand symphonic style." (At present, it seems that Mendelssohn and Schumann--in only a handful of works--were some key figures in its eventual reduction to the status of a mere "archaic" option.)

It is an easy matter, of course, to object to this argument on behalf of the importance of repeats. One could strive to minimize the importance of the usual repetition schemes (or at least to treat the whole issue with skepticism) by an appeal to history: deriving them step-by-step from the earlier binary forms, and then asserting (consequently) that the persistent lingering of the repeat conventions into the 1780-1820 period of the grand symphony was an outdated survival, merely vestigial, unnecessary to either the health or the definition of the genre--something on the order of a human appendix that can be removed or overlooked without harm.

While not denying (obviously!) that focussing on this development of "sonata form" out of balanced binary structures explains historically "how" it emerged, the larger question that remains is why it persisted into the later phases of 1780-1820 period--and beyond (particularly after Beethoven's occasional experimental "removals" of the expositional repeat had clearly occurred).   The expositional repeat persisted, I suggest, because it was not merely vestigial: it continued to be genre-defining, a sign of the grandeur and formality of the genre of the symphony (or: sonata, quartet, etc.)--as opposed to, say, that of the **overture (operatic or concert)**, a smaller, trimmer, more flexible, often more "programmatic" genre, which was defined, in part, by an abandonment of the standard large-scale repeats. [6]

---

[5] Cf., e.g., Jonathan Dunsby, "The Formal Repeat," in Journal of the Royal Musical Association 112/2 (1986-1987), 196-207.

[6] Reicha, 1826, also mentions that certain finales may lack the explicit repeat, although this is rare (but not unheard of) in actual practice.

Further: of the two standard large-scale repeats (that of each "binary" half, in which 1 = "exposition" and 2 = "development/recapitulation"), it is obvious that No. 2, the longer, was by far the more vulnerable to suppression. This second repetition seems, in fact, to have been increasingly reduced to the status of an option in the 1780-1800 period.   This needs investigation (beyond the statistical surveys that have already been done).[7]

It may be that as the earlier, shorter "symphony" grew into the proportions of the grand symphony the matter of its sheer length became a factor: to repeat in all cases the entire "development-recapitulation" apparatus might have come to be viewed as unnecessary or cumbersome. (??)   In this case, concerns of length (and the inherent drama surrounding the recapitulation?) might have tended to override the genre-defining principle of architectural repetition and balance, at least with regard to this Section 2.   Perhaps the logic of the situation suggested that the absolutely obligatory repeat of Section 1 (the expositional repeat) was to be viewed as sufficient as a genre-definer (to mark the "importance" of the architectural balances of the symphony).

However we decide this matter, we should note **three things**. **First**, the issue of notationally indicating a repeat of Section 2 was still part of the concept of "grand-binary" form (within a symphonic first movement) around 1800, even when that repeat was, for whatever reason, notationally elided. Put another way, its "conceptual presence" remained there, counterpointed against the given, simpler structure--it persisted as historical-generic memory, even when it was not made physically present on the acoustic surface of the music. **Second**, any retention of Repeat 2 toward the end of the eighteenth century should be regarded as expressively significant, especially since its major composers--Haydn and Mozart--were apparently coming to believe that Repeat 2 was not as obligatory as that of Repeat 1.   (In other words, when the repeat was there, it must have been there for a reason, as in the finale of the Jupiter Symphony, where formal processes and monumentalized structural grandeur are themselves thematized).   **Third**, given a nineteenth-century work lacking an indication of that second block-repetition, any reworked referencing back to this increasingly atavistic Repeat 2 (for example, in an expanded, "developmental coda" that revisits, reanimates, or reworks through in a varied and/or encapsulated way some of the events of the development-recapitulation--the Eroica is the touchstone here) should be viewed as such, not as an innovative "addition" or "accretion" to previously postulated, differing symphonic practice.   The expanded or "developmental coda" is most probably a gesture that touches on or strikingly rekindles historical-generic memory. It normally serves to suggest the special grandness of the overall scheme actually employed (that is, as opposed to that in a movement which lacks such a thing altogether).

---

[7] See, e.g, Michael Broyles, "Organic Form and the Binary Repeat," The Musical Quarterly 66 (1980), 339-60.

2. <u>Slow</u> <u>movement</u> (Note: the slow movement is normatively placed in the second-movement position: this is the first-level default. Exceptions do occur, however, and when they do they are significant.   The most common is the "Minuet-Adagio [or Scherzo-Adagio] Switch" in which the normative movements 2 and 3 switch places with each other. Not surprisingly, several examples can be found in Haydn's middle symphonies--but not in the late ones.   Placing the slow-movement in second position of a four-movement scheme--if a four-movement scheme is present--is <u>invariable</u> in Haydn symphonies at least from the middle 30s onward, with the exceptions only of Nos. 37, 44 ["Trauer"] and 68, in all three of which the minuet is placed second. Most crucially, this switching of position affects the psychological timing of the moment of the "escape" from the tonic key. [See also No. 49, "La Passione," mentioned below, where the slow movement is placed <u>first</u>.] The same tendency to use the "switch" more sparingly--though it certainly does not disappear here entirely--may be found in Mozart's and Haydn's Quartets: the later ones do this less frequently.)

--**Non-Obligatory Structure**

--**First Level Default: Non-Tonic (an "Escape" from the Tonic)**

--**Expressive Function (often): "Anti-Type" to the First   Movement's "Type"**

Unlike the situation with a first movement, the slow movement's form is not an obligatory "given." In other words, the broad outlines of its formal plan can vary: it can be, for example, a binary structure (usually a less complex sonata or "sonata without development" (the so-called "sonatina" form), oriented toward cantabile discourse); a five-part rondo-like structure (ABACA, AB^{1}AB^{2}A) or the ternary ABA; a theme and variations or a set of double variations; and so on.

J.A.P Schulz (1774), referring to the symphony: "The andante or largo . . . has indeed not nearly so fixed a character, but is often of pleasant, pathetic, or sad expression. Yet, it must have a style that is appropriate to the dignity of the symphony. . . ."   Zaslaw (p. 417): "The andantes [in Mozart's symphonies] deal with the pastoral, as the origin of a few . . . in bucolic operatic scenes reveals."

Most important: the slow movement is the **principal movement of contrast within the four-movement cycle**. It contrasts by means of tempo, by means of (usually) persistent lyricism, by means of texture and relative contrapuntal simplicity, and, most often, by its **non-tonic** aspect. It is frequently a kind of **"anti-type"** to the first movement's **"type."** Given the more common norm of the non-tonic slow movement, there are (at least) **two basic categories of anti-type:**

1. **Slow movement in non-tonic major** (occurring in either a major- or a minor-key symphony): this is frequently an expression of **a "swinging out" to an "other" not available in the reigning tonic**. This aspect of **"escape into a cantabile or dreamlike elsewhere"** is particularly clear in slow movements with pastoral or Arcadian connotations--or, perhaps, in those speaking the erotic language of love, desire, and/or seduction. (Note: similarly--but perhaps even more poignantly--tonic-major slow movements in minor-key sonatas suggest a fleeting "escape" into the redemptive tonic: perhaps that of a premature grasping of that tonic in the major mode [false hope?]; the keys of the subsequent movements will be of crucial importance here, particularly if they return us to the minor mode)

2. **Slow movement in non-tonic minor** (usually **vi** of the reigning major key, the so-called "relative minor"): **anti-type as the gloomy, spectral, grotesque, or funereal underside of the tonic**; the tonic's confidence is shattered through a sinking into the minor. (See below for examples in Haydn: the locus classicus in Beethoven--and thenceforth in the standard repertory--is the Eroica.) (Note: the effect of tonic-minor slow movements in major-key sonatas: this is even gloomier in its sense of "no escape"--the "prison-house" effect.)

Slow-Movement Key: Proposed Order of Default-Levels (within Major-Key Sonatas): Centering Phase

1. **Non-tonic: Major IV**
2. **Non-tonic: Major V**
3. **Tonic: Minor i ("prison-house" effect: impossibility of escape)**
4. **Non-tonic: "Mediant Relations," Various modes of Major III or VI (in Haydn, especially from c. 1790 onward, also imitated by early Beethoven)**
5. **Tonic: Major I**
6. **Other**

In general, Levels 4, 5, and (especially!) 6 are rare and notable enough to be considered "deformations" during the centering and early postcentered phases. Level 3, while perhaps not rare enough to be considered a "deformation" at this time, is used much less than Levels 1 and 2, and its switching of modes provides an extremely strong effect.

To give a sense of proportion in Haydn's "normal" major-key symphonies after No. 70, sixteen move to IV for the slow movement; twelve move to V. Symphonies 46, 59, 63, and 70 are the last four of Haydn's major-key symphonies whose slow movement is in the non-tonic minor--thus producing a symphony in which all movements are centered around the same tonic pitch. (This is much more common in Haydn's earlier symphonies; the practice becomes rarer and rarer as we proceed through his symphonies. Cf. Symphony No. 62: all movements in D major!) Symphony No. 103 in E-flat major is noteworthy in moving to **VI**, C minor, for the slow movement (cf. the Eroica). Symphony 99 in E-flat is very unusual in moving to the more "remote" **III**, G major, for its slow movement! [8] (Cf. Haydn's "big" E-flat Piano Sonata from 1794, with slow movement in E major, enharmonically bII!). The general pattern is also observable--and confirmable--from Haydn's Quartets and other chamber music.

Perhaps more intrigued by CPE Bach's "eccentricities," Haydn is more of an explorer than Mozart in slow-movement keys: Mozart strongly prefers Level-1 and Level-2 defaults: anything else, especially in the more mature work, is extremely unusual (although it is found in the Level-4 slow movement of the Wind Serenade in Eb, K. 375, all movements of which are in Eb major). Beethoven, of course, will follow--and continue--Haydn's experiments.

Of these slow-movement keys, it would seem that the most difficult to conceive as an absolute "anti-type" to that of the first movement is that of the Level-2 default, the dominant. To revisit the dominant in the slow movement is to re-enter the tonal tensions already dealt with in the first movement, and also to set up the tonal return about to happen in the minuet with its proper dominant.

---

[8] Note: Haydn's interest in III and VI as slow-movement keys (or in trios of minuets)--in both major- and minor-key works can be traced back to the 1780s and early 1790s--and in this, he may have been following the example of the "strange" slow-movement keys he was finding in CPE Bach. See David Wyn-Jones's discussion of Haydn, early Beethoven, and third-related keys for slow movements in H.C. Robbins Landon, Haydn: His Life and Music (Bloomington: Univ. of Indiana, 1988), pp. 296-97. Especially important here are also two Piano Trios No. 27 in Ab (late 1780s), with slow movement in enharmonic bVI, E--apparently the first time Haydn had chosen such a key?, slow movement in E; and No. 34 in Bb (1793), slow mvmt.in vi, G. Note also the Quartet in G Minor ("Horseman"), Op. 74, No. 3 (1793), with slow movement in VI (E major!); and the Quartet in Eb, Op. 76, No. 6 in Eb (1796), with slow movement in enharmonic bVI, B major. Clearly, these sorts of choices in Haydn--and early Beethoven--are almost all from the period after Mozart's death.

Slow-Movement Key: Proposed Order of Default-Levels (within Minor-Key Sonatas): Mid- and Late-Centering Phase

1. Non-tonic: Major III

2. Non-tonic: Major VI (in works from 1790 onward)

3. Tonic: Major I ("false redemption" effect: impossibility of escape) (more common--perhaps a second-level default--in the precentering phase)

4. Tonic: Minor i (escape from the minor mode denied)

5. Other

The ordering of defaults is more difficult to do in the centering phase, because minor-mode works are relatively infrequent. The "deformations" proper would seem to begin only with Level 4.

In Haydn's mature **minor-key symphonies** (and there are not many!), the slow movement is characteristically either in **III** (as with both 78 and 95 in C minor, slow movements in E-flat major and also with the famous "Farewell" Symphony, No. 45 in F-sharp minor, slow movement in A major; cf. Mozart, Quartet in D Minor, K. 421, slow movement in F) or in **VI** (80 in D minor, slow movement in B-flat major [cf. Mozart's Symphony No. 40 and String Quintet in g, slow movements in Eb; cf. Beethoven's 9th]; 83, "La Poule" in G minor, slow movement in E-flat major). Both III and VI may be understood as havens or "escapes." (The one is the "relative major"; the other, the standard escape-zone--"if only!"--of tonal practice.) Symphonies 44 and 52 are the last two of Haydn's minor-key symphonies whose slow movement is in the non-tonic major (cf. Beethoven, Op. 2, No. 1). (and cf. Haydn, Symphony No. 49: all movements in F minor!) Again, an inventory of Haydn's Quartets generally confirms the above defaults.

However, when we are asked to confront such examples as Schubert's Piano Sonata in A Minor, "Op. 164" (from 1817), with slow movement in E major (major V) or, even more so, his Symphony No. 8 in B Minor, "Unfinished," with slow movement in E major (major IV), the first thing to be noticed is the sheer "unreality" of their keys: these are strong key-selection deformations, dreaming off into unusual fantasy-spaces. If one misses this, one misses everything. (In both cases, the keys selected would have been normative "if only" the first movement had been major--etc. etc. Thus, the usual sense of escape is compounded with a momentary denial of the modal experience of the first movement.)

3. __Minuet/Scherzo__.   (More generally, to include later nineteenth- and twentieth-century practice, identified

as __The Characteristic Movement.__ For minuets/scherzi as second movements, see No. 2 above

and the relevant discussion below)

--Return to Obligatory Structure: Typically, a Series of "Small Binary" Structures (In fact,

this is a highly schematic and virtually invariable form. Here, the structure usually

consists of two smaller "rounded binary" forms, one of which encloses [or "contains"] the

other. The "container" is usually referred to separately as the **"minuet", the "scherzo,"**

etc.; the "contained," of course, is called the **"trio."** Minuets/Scherzos with two different

trios [MT^{1}MT^{2}M] are certainly possible--as, say, in several of Mozart's serenades,

though the practice is almost unheard-of in "higher-prestige," four-movement works. In

Beethoven (most famously, perhaps, in Symphony No. 7) we sometimes find the same trio

being visited twice, STSTS, but this is a rarer pattern and to be perceived as a notable

expansion--probably with important "rotational" implications.)

--Extremely strong first-level default: Return to the tonic (reassertion of tonic control, if the

slow movement was in a non-tonic key): a tonic scherzo is virtually invariable in the

centering phase (though not later).

--**Regardless of what has preceded it, in the centering phase this is normally a movement**

given over to an enhanced charm or lightness, and usually also to a recognizably

stylized dance, rhythm, or mood. (Even in the nineteenth century--with the exception,

of course, of such special effects as minor-mode "predatory," "trapped," or "demonic"

scherzi [Beethoven, Schubert, Mahler]--the most common connotation is one of an

enhanced lightness and simplicity: a melodic lightness and a dancelike, emphatic

rhythmic swing.)

In its normative third-movement position the minuet- or scherzo-movement emphatically **re-**

establishes a principle of schematic order after the "swinging away" or "escape" of the slow movement.*

It **restores the tonic** as ruling principle of order (this is its primary "narrative" function), and in the

precentered and centering phase it also returns invariably to obligatory binary schemes. Here the binary,

repetitive schemes are multiple (usually totalling three in all, but occasionally five), and they are far more

compact, simpler, and more immediately "perceptible" than in the first movement.   Nonetheless, the

important schematic resonances with the first movement should not be overlooked: the first movement's

ruling shape is multiply resuscitated here in a series of mini-formats. This is underscored by the minuet

movement's sharing of--or return to--the key of the first movement. **In short, the characteristic movement represents the return of the main principles of the first movement--but on different terms.** When Beethoven--and then later composers--begin to write scherzi that <u>as</u> a <u>whole</u> <u>movement</u> are in dialogue more with "sonata form" proper than the usual scherzo-trio form, this may be taken as an extension of the earlier implied principle--that of **regenerating certain features of the first movement**. Similarly, the nineteenth-century deformation of the "**non-tonic scherzo**" (Beethoven, Schubert, etc.) is worthy of close attention. What is the effect of these non-tonic scherzi?   Are they "unable" to reassert tonic control? or exploring a wider fantasy-space outside the tonic? or........?

Minuets/scherzi in second-movement position, of course, present us with an altogether different situation. In this case the movement, when unfolded in a normative key, would suggest a kind of tonic-key, binary-scheme intransigence: an <u>immediate</u> reinforcing, on different terms, of the tone and posture of the first movement. Following such a tonic-reinforcement, the non-tonic slow movement in third-movement position would represent a much-delayed "escape" away from the tonic, one that is to be rectified in only a single movement--the finale--not a double-movement pair.

Note: the choice of the key for the **trio** is not obligatory, but there are some standard choices. As a <u>first-level</u> <u>default</u>: it may be in **the same "tonic" and mode as the minuet** (and as the symphony as as whole, **thus continuing to reaffirm, in these cases, the renewed authority of that tonic**). This is Haydn's almost invariable symphonic practice from Symphony No. 66 onward.[9] Second, the trio may be presented along with a <u>modal</u> <u>shift</u> from the minuet's <u>minor</u> to the trio's <u>major</u> (or vice-versa).[10]** Third, the **trio may be centered on a contrasting tonic** to that of the minuet.* When this happens, the trio's key may be--though it need not be--that of the slow movement.[11] Thus on those occasions when it is conceived in a non-tonic area **the trio can establish connections to the slow movement (it can be a parallel "swinging away" from the tonic). The minuet, on the other hand, most often parallels the first movement**.

---

[9] The two (strange!) late-period exceptions in Haydn are from the <u>London</u> Symphonies. One is No. 99 (E-flat, slow movement in G major [!], trio in C major!). The other is No. 104 (D major, slow movement in G, trio in B-flat [bVI]).   There are also three odd instances of this in the middle Haydn symphonies: No. 39 (G minor, slow movement in E-flat, trio in B-flat); No. 43 "Merkur" (E-flat, slow movement in A-flat, trio in C minor); No. 62 (D, slow movement also in D, trio--the one escape from the tonic--in G!!) As with his choice of keys for slow movements (see above), this "mediant-related" key-business for trios emerges in the 1790s: the String Quartet, Op. 74, No. 1 in C (Trio in A); and the String Quartet Op. 74, No. 2 in F (trio in Db).

[10] As in Haydn Symphony No. 46 (B major with B-minor trio); 48 "Maria Theresa" (C major with C minor trio); 49 "La Passione" (F minor with F major trio) . . . . etc.   The last Haydn symphony to do this is No. 65 (A major, trio key A minor, slow movement in D major)--all the rest after this, except for the odd 99 and 104 (see above) are in the <u>key</u> <u>and</u> <u>mode</u> of the minuet and the symphony.

[11] Trios in IV occur only in rather early Haydn symphonies: No. 35 (B-flat, slow movement and trio in E-flat); No. 38 (In C, slow movement and trio in F); No. 56 (C major, slow movement and trio in F). For contrasting-key trios not in IV, see n. 9 above.

Structurally, of course, the trio normally mirrors the rounded binary structure of the minuet that surrounds it--although the trio is often simpler, more compact in its phrase-structure. And--again, of course--the first level default in terms of mood or energy is to provide a simpler, calmer, or more "rustic" or "folk-like" trio. There are plenty of expressive variants that can be rung on this, but if a trio clearly turns sharply away from its usual character--into something brusque, complex, frenetic, or whatever--then we are probably dealing with a deformation or very low-level default.

Connotatively, in the 18th century the "minuet-movement" is probably the one most saturated with "obligatory" social content. This content includes: the atmosphere and social norms of court/aristocratic society ("old-world" norms); "breeding" and elegance; "public" expression; controlled, ritualized eroticism (aristocratic, formalized containments of the erotic pairing of the sexes); etc.   Note: **the call back to tonic-order** occurs simultaneously with an emphatic assertion of the privileged social norms of the aristocracy. Zaslaw (p. 417): "The minuets stand for the courtly side of eighteenth-century life, and an old-fashioned and formal aspect of it at that. The trios, on the other hand, often deal with the antic, thus standing in relation to the minuet as an antimasque to its masque, and providing [an] element of caricature."

On the other hand, it must also be noted that once the minuet became something of an "abstraction" in a symphony (that is, generically "reified," particularly in the later precentered phase--and certainly by the time of the centering phase), it also took on something of a life of its own. It became a musical genre subjected to the compositional craft of genre-variation, something to be handled with wit and skill--another compositional game to play.   Thus there arose some easily recognizable sub-types of the minuet: the canonic, fugal, or otherwise "learned" minuet (a display of compositional/contrapuntal ingenuity in the manner of a learned game); the stormy or pathetic minor-mode minuet; and so on. How these play into the de facto prior social connotations of the minuet remains to be explored.

Moreover, some have argued that late-eighteenth-century symphonic minuets begin more and more to resemble the faster and far less aristocratic "German dances." (One thinks of all the connotations of unbuttoned rusticity in Haydn, for example.) If this assertion is correct, this would signify a move away from aristocratic connotation toward a more "universal (or classless?) public."   Finally, it is obvious that with the increasing delegitimation of aristocratic privilege in the age of modernity, the minuet would be the most vulnerable movement of a symphony. Beethoven, for example, would transform it into a "scherzo"--which has (among other things) aspects of a critique of the traditional minuet and its social connotations.

4. <u>Finale</u>

       --Non-Obligatory Structure (but usually a moderately complex **binary ["sonata"] structure**, a rondo structure, an infiltration of the sonata with the generally lighter connotations of rondo-like returns and episodes **["sonata rondo"]**, or a theme and variations.

       --**Reaffirmation of the tonic. ("Swinging away" from the tonic for the duration of a movement is no longer permissible.)**

       --Various Possibilities of Tone c. 1800:

          --playful wrap-up

          --display of wit, charm, and/or skill

          --(increasingly, and especially after 1800) arrival at a point more "elemental," "direct," "populist-<u>völkisch</u>," or fundamentally "natural"/"stable" than that of the first movement.

Zaslaw (p. 417) on symphonies: "The finales are generally based on rustic or popular dances: gavottes, <u>contredanses</u>, jigs, or quick steps." Moreover, they often have light, jocular, or humorous connotations or effects--or coloristic, "characteristic" (<u>topos</u>-oriented) episodes. The effect is generally of a witty, highly agreeable (but rarely complex) conclusion.

As a rule, **multimovement sonatas before 1800 are <u>never</u> supposed to have slow introductions to their finales.** At the very least, such things are not part of the "SonataMaker program" (as encountered by Haydn and Mozart)--they would have to introduced as strong overrides and purposeful deformations. But, as always, there are exceptions: what happens before the "false-front" finale of Mozart's String Quintet in G Minor, K. 516 (1787), certainly strikes one as extraordinary, within a piece that has a "multimovement logic" all its own. And early Beethoven is also relevant: His Quartet, Op. 18, No 6 (1798-1800), whose finale has the celebrated "La Malinconia" <u>Adagio</u> introduction, comes immediately to mind, as does the Symphony No. 1 (1800), with its coy, playful introduction. In any event, once "serious" slow introductions begin to be written for finales later in in the nineteenth century (as in Beethoven's 9th, Beethoven's Quartet, Op. 135, Mendelssohn's 5th), the effect is generally that of re-opening a "serious" issue first broached in the first movement: the issue now has to be reconfronted in a "do-or-die" finale.

All of the remarks above concerning **repeats** and **block-repetition conventions** in first movements also apply a fortiori to finales. (We might mention once again, though, that in 1826 Reicha wrote that some "grand-binary" finales (sonata-form finales) can dispense with the expositional repeat--but in practice, among the major composers, this is rare--though not nonexistent: see, e.g, Haydn, Quartet, Op. 74, No. 2 in F, finale [1793] and Haydn, Quartet, Op. 76, No. 2 in d ["Quinten"], finale [1796-97].)   This final return to a grand reaffirmation of the principle of sumptuous balances and architectural symmetries-- whence we started, three movements ago--is a crucial element of the content of "classical" finales.   Still needing study: to what extent do finale repeat-schemes mirror or deviate from those of the the corresponding first movement? How important is this is to the architectural/expressive plan of the symphony/sonata/quartet at hand?

The main "finale-problem" of the lighter, eighteenth-century genre would be: why isn't the third movement sufficient to re-establish the tonic and thus to end the symphony? Why is this "finale" needed? This is a difficult question, but the answer might hinge on the perceived inadequacy of the minuet (with its social connotations?) to have the last word in an Enlightenment discourse. Or it may be that, "purely musically," the minuet was not felt to be of sufficient weight to balance the first movement, and that, quite simply, "more tonic" was needed. Or, it might be that, as a kind of counter-expression of Enlightenment "freedom," the rigidly schematic aspect of the minuet did not provide the right note on which to end a symphony. (Thus the last movement could be understood as something on the order of a reaffirmation of a greater flexibility and "freedom.")

The Four-Movement Cylce As a Complete Gesture

The challenge for us is **to hear/consider all four movements together as a single, ordered gesture** or at least as an expressively ordered set of complementary gestures. (We need to stretch our minds over symphonies as a whole, not merely over individual sections or individual movements.)

As a matter of reference, cf. Zaslaw's position on this (417): "Taken together, [all four movements of the symphony provide the following:] the heroic, the amorous, the pastoral, the courtly, the antic, and the rustic or popular. [These] represent the themes most often found in eighteenth-century prose, poetry, plays, and paintings. Only the religious is not regularly treated [!]. . .   Hence the symphony may be considered a stylized conspectus of the eighteenth century's favourite artistic subject matter."

Or, again, Zaslaw (416): "Most eighteenth-century composers of symphonies . . . appear to have been less interested in . . . philosophical concerns and more in pragmatic estimates of how best to entertain their audiences. For them, the symphony may have worked simply by juxtaposing movements so that

changes in tempo and mood from movement to movement--and as the century wore on, increasingly within movements--offered a pleasing variety of aural experiences."

In summary: Note the marked symmetry of parts in the two complementary "halves" of the normative symphony c. 1800:

First Movement:

Establishes Tonic.

Obligatory Binary Structure

Establishes the importance

     of its own discourse

Slow Movement:

     Often Non-Tonic ("Otherness")

Non-Obligatory Structure

(more "freedom")

"Otherness" or "Escape" in

     lyrical mood/tone;.

     (Relative "simplicity"

becomes a norm)

balanced and "resolved" by the complementary gesture:

Minuet:

Reasserts Tonic-Control

Obligatory Binary Structures [plural]

     (more rigid, but far less

     complex than 1)

Aristocratic/Erotic Social Connotations

ritualized)

Finale:

Reaffirms Tonic (declines to

     indulge in the aberration

     of the slow movement)

Non-Obligatory Structure

(but some common   (highly formalized,

     choices)

     Reasserts principle of more

       personal "flexibility" and

       wit after Minuet?

     NB: the finale often also looks

back in some respects

(often structural) to the

first movement.

Concluding note: as instrumental music makes more claims to autonomy--in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries--this generic concept of the symphony (as a set of complementary symmetries) will alter to become more "narrative" and teleological, especially with and after Beethoven. The whole symphony/sonata/ quartet, that is, will push more and more towards a **narrative conclusion in its finale, and within the standard reception conventions the work will invite us to interpret it as a more focussed, continuous discourse throughout all of its movements**.   In such a practice, we are encouraged to consider the finale to represent a "resolution" of musical, programmatic, and/or "poetic-idea" problems left unresolved in earlier movements.

The Expositional Space:
The Four Fundamental Types

By the mid-nineteenth century there seem to have arisen **four fundamental exposition patterns**:

1) The Three-Part Exposition (no clear S-theme; instead, an extended central portion of "SonataWork," or SW, that occupies most of the exposition and accomplishes the modulation)

2) The Two-Part / Four-Zone Exposition (the "2/4" Model, which designation should not be confused with a time signature; the exposition subdivides roughly in the middle--often shortly before it--and an S-theme, in a new key, begins the second part)

----

3) The (Schubertian) Three-Stage Exposition

4) The "Dutchman" Exposition

Types 1 and 2 are both eighteenth-century formats, products of the sonata's precentered and centering phase. It may well be that Type 1 (often more "motivic" and "continuous"; more concerned with Fortspinnung; and so on) historically precedes Type 2 (often more explicitly "thematic" or "lyrical" and subdivided into strongly articulated subsections), although this needs more investigation. Broadly considered, it seems that the general eighteenth-century tendency, for whatever reason, was to "produce" or "crystallize out" something approaching a 2/4 exposition as a first-level-default norm (especially, one might add, in southern Europe).

Put another way--more metaphorically--as we move through the decades of the eighteenth century, the originally more normative 3-part exposition (Type 1) seems to have had a "will" to subdivide further and stabilize out as something closer to a 2/4 exposition. (For an oddly relevant image, imagine the process of cell mitosis.) Sometimes this "will" succeeds fully (thus producing a clear "S," and hence a clear 2/4 exposition), and sometimes it succeeds only partially--"almost" producing an S, or making a passing feint at a fleeting S-like theme, etc.

Consequently: Types 1 and 2 are to be understood as extreme poles (referential "ideal types") on a rhetorical-formal continuum, with a sliding scale in between: many "classical" pieces hover or fluctuate between the 3-part model and the 2/4 model: Indeed, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven can play deliciously with feints and ambiguities. In some instances, then, one should not try to determine whether a given classical exposition is an example of either or one type or the other: it may be that the point of the exposition lies in its dialogue with both types, both of which can emerge implicitly as fluctuating implications.

With the onset of the post-centering phase (the 19th century), the "purer" examples of Type 1, already becoming something of a rarity (though Haydn was particularly fond of the 3-part model), were almost totally displaced by the Type 2 format, with its "first and second themes," and so on.   In short: Type 1, though occasionally encountered, became increasingly unavailable to composers as a normative default as decade after decade elapsed. For many composers (though not all) it seems lost from historical memory. Type 2 became the "textbook" norm.

Exposition Types 3 and 4 seem to have arisen as 19th-century elaborations of some of the implications and possibilities of Types 1 and 2. It currently seems to us that Type 3, especially associated with Schubert, may be at times be heard as a broadly thematic expansion of either Type 1 or Type 2, depending on the individual case. This aspect of Type 3's historical associations needs much further investigation, and any current speculations can be only provisional. Type 4, however, is clearly a radical contraction of Type 2. See the brief discussions of these types at the end of the present section.

Overview of Exposition Types 1 & 2
in a <u>Major-Key</u> Sonata:

The exposition is generally a three-phase tonal process:
1) the establishment of the tonic key; 2) the motion away from the tonic towards the key of the dominant; and 3) the cadential affirmation of the dominant. This basic tonal plot constitutes what we shall call the exposition's **"tonal form"**-- which may also be considered something of an "inner form."

This "tonal form" or "inner form," however, can be articulated in many different ways in terms of thematic arrangement and design, thematic type and topic, caesura and cadence treatment, dynamic and textural shape, and so on. We shall call this aspect (thematic/textural/dynamic/ generic/cadential disposition and arrangement) the exposition's **"rhetorical form"**--which may also be considered something of an "outer form,"   This "rhetorical form," then, may be disposed according to the norms and expectations of different rhetorical plots, which had accrued to the tradition of the sonata in its precentered and centering phases.

It is surely overly simple to maintain without nuances that "tonal form" is congruent in all respects with the "harmonic conception of sonata form" (for example, that "harmonic conception" often claimed to be the 18th-century view-- Koch, etc.--and that pursued [in very different ways] both by current musicologists specializing in 18th-century instrumental music and by current Schenkerians) and that "rhetorical form" is correspondingly congruent with the (19th-century/early 20th-century) thematic conception of sonata form--the conception that (not without reason) has taken such a scholarly and theoretical drubbing in the past four decades. Still, such a crude parallel can serve as a convenient starting-point for reflection--provided that one realizes that the conception of "rhetorical form" presented here vastly expands and renders more complex what is often dismissively collapsed into the phrase "the thematic conception of sonata form."

The position taken here: it is both unwise and breathtakingly incomplete to assert that sonata form is only the one thing <u>or</u> the other: <u>either</u> a purely harmonic conception <u>or</u> a purely thematic/dispositional conception. Similarly, one might be advised to be suspicious of any claim that one way of viewing that

sonata (say, "tonal" or "harmonic") is ineluctably superior to the other way (say, "rhetorical" or "thematic/dispositional"), or that only one of them is to be considered the "real" form. This is nonsense. We should never have to make such choices between equally one-sided or reductionist views. Certainly by the late precentered and centering phase, the sonata is emphatically both tonal and rhetorical--and it is often precisely in the dialogue between the two formal conceptions that the expressive crux of the piece at hand seems to lie. This is particularly true of works in which the tonal and rhetorical forms are out of synchronization with each other.

Generally considered, all four basic expositional types share the <u>same tonal form</u>. Consequently, they are primarily to be distinguished by central aspects of their rhetorical form.

In the later eighteenth century (and certainly by the late precentered and centering phases), we may identify two basic rhetorical forms for the exposition. These are considered directly below.

Type 1: The Three-Part Exposition

The three-part exposition is normally associated with the works of Haydn (throughout his career)[1] and, as such, has been cursorily treated in the scholarly literature. Most discussions of musical form--including most textbooks textbooks and the usual classes in Music Theory and Music History--focus exclusively upon the 2/4 model Type 2, (something of a "Mozart/early Beethoven paradigm," considered in more detail below).

The association of the 3-part model with Haydn is legitimate: one often finds examples of this 3-part exposition in his works--some familiar examples from late in his career would include the expositions of the first movements of Symphonies No. 99, 102, and 103, each with their own further quirks.[2] Nevertheless, the 3-part model is not limited to Haydn; both Mozart and Beethoven used it on occasion (Beethoven, it seems, much more frequently), **and, as mentioned above, many compositions fall somewhere on a sliding scale between the 2/4 and the 3-part model.** In addition, there are interesting "leakages" of the 3-part model into the 19th century that have yet to be investigated.

Generally considered, the three-part exposition correlates with the threefold tonal plot mentioned earlier (in a sense, the three-part model is somewhat more "natural" than the 2/4 model, and "historically" may have emerged first--although this has yet to be examined fully and verified). Once again:

---

[1] The classic identification of this "unusual" form in Haydn may be found in Jens Peter Larsen, "Sonatenform-Probleme," Festschrift Friedrich Blume zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Anna Amalie Abert and Wilhelm Pfannkuch (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963), pp. 221-30. Cf. Eugene K. Wolf, "The Recapitulations in Haydn's London Symphonies," The Musical Quarterly 52 (1966), 71-89; and Charles Rosen, Sonata Forms (New York: Norton, 1980) pp. 98-104 (which speaks of Haydn's "three-part organization" and "unorthodox structures").

[2] Cf. n. 1 above. One might note further that Rosen's example of "three-part organization" is an earlier work, the opening movement of the minor-mode Symphony No. 44 [E minor, "Trauer"].

> **Part 1**: Establishes the tonic.
> **Part 2**: Modulates to <u>and cadences in</u> the new key (for the moment, we are considering only major-mode works, which modulate to the dominant).
> **Part 3**: Confirms the new key.

The essential thing to bear in mind is that in the 3-part exposition-model **Part 2 occupies the bulk of the Exposition.** It exhibits not only greater length but also greater <u>structural weight</u> than the TR of the 2/4 model. It is concerned not only with <u>modulating</u> to the dominant, but also with <u>decisively cadencing</u> there, and it always concludes with a strong <u>drive to the cadence</u>. The first-level default for this cadence is V:PAC. (PAC = perfect authentic cadence.) Thus this part carries out the basic "work" of the sonata, and for that reason we refer to it as the **SonataWork (SW)**. In a "pure" three-part model, the SonataWork occupies over half the space of the Exposition; the three parts usually stand in something like a **1:4:2 proportion**. However, in "less pure" manifestations (in those pieces that lie somewhere along the sliding scale), the proportional lengths of the first and third parts may be greater.

Considered as a whole, the three parts may be referred to as the **Primary Theme Zone (P)**, the **SonataWork (SW)**, and the **Closing Zone (C)**. The salient characteristics of each part are:

1. P: Often quite brief and to the point (especially in Haydn), this generally has the same characteristics as the P-Zone of a 2/4 model. Essentially, it proposes a thematic idea as the basis for constructing a sonata. In its "pure" form, it closes with I:PAC (the first-level default); this PAC may be elided with the onset of SW.

2. SW: This typically comprises three phases or <u>events</u>. (These three events typically happen over a rather long stretch of music--notably <u>longer</u> than if we were preparing for an S theme. Characteristically at the onset of this section, <u>we cannot yet know</u> whether we are dealing with SW or TR--that is, a 3-part model or a 2/4 model.) These events can occur in succession, in a series of clearly articulated sub-zones. But there are other possibilities: the dovetailing or superimposition of

events, in such a way that two of them seem to be occurring simultaneously; the minimizing of--or even elision altogether of--Event 1; etc. Moreover, the lengths of the events can vary from case to case: they are not predictable in advance.

> Event 1: Confirmation of the tonic. Acceptance of P as the basis for the sonata, either by a) restatement of P (in Haydn's symphonies, this is often a forte, tutti restatement); or b) a developmental continuation of P. This phase often concludes I:HC.

> Event 2: The ModulationWork itself. This leads to the key of the dominant, and often cadences V:HC, but often without a sharply defined caesura.

> Event 3: The drive to the cadence, leading to a strong V:PAC. In its purest form, this phase is thematically neutral (something like an extended Fortspinnung of established motives), and it can go on for quite some time. Many 3-part expositions however, attempt to "crystallize out" an S theme during this phase; this attempt may or may not be successful, and the resulting "theme" may be either new or (as is typical of Haydn) a reshaping of P. But it is harmonically unstable (unlike the true S of the 2/4 model); moreover, it often lacks the rhetoric, length, and periodicity of the S themes in the 2/4 model. (In short, there are things about the "theme" that discourage one from insisting that it is a "real" S.)

NB: Again, this model for SW is capable of great flexibility. Phases 1 and 2 may be combined, Phase 1 may be eliminated, and so on. Phases 2 (ModulationWork) and 3, (the [perhaps thematic] drive to the cadence), though, will always be present.

3. C: This closing zone is characterized by generic closing conventions. Haydn is fond of introducing a new, symmetrical, "popular"-style theme at this point; in fact, the typical Haydnesque closing zone comprises

one or two statements of such a theme followed by a Codetta. <u>This tune should not be misinterpreted as an S-theme, even if it does provide the principal thematic contrast of the Exposition</u>. On the other hand, C may be based upon P.

Finally, NB: A 3-part Exposition may override some of its defaults in favor of those typical of the 2/4 model, or vice-versa; also, a piece may begin as a clear 2/4 model, and gradually or suddenly veer over to the 3-part end of the scale (or vice-versa). Often a good deal of the expressive content of a sonata resides in its mixture of 2/4 and 3-part conventions.

To repeat once again (very important): Types 1 and 2 (the 3-part model and the 2/4 model) should be thought of as opposite ends of a spectrum, with a "sliding scale" in between. Some expositions exhibit a "pure" 2/4 or 3-part structure, but many others fall somewhere in between, partaking in different degrees of <u>both</u> models; or a piece may start out as one type, then gradually "change its mind" to become the other.

Type 2: The Two-Part / Four-Zone Exposition (the 2/4 Model, here delineated primarily as it emerged during the centering phase)

(Dictum: if there is no 2/4 model or obvious deformation thereof, there is no S.)

This was far and away the most normative rhetorical model by the 1790s. This exposition type (again, something of a "Mozart/early Beethoven paradigm") became <u>the</u> most significant model for sonata-form expositions in the 19th century--notwithstanding the deformational Types 3 and 4 below, which derived from it--and it became the standard model passed on by textbooks. With regard to the text-tradition: The 2/4 model--our term, not theirs--is certainly the type of form outlined in Anton Reicha's famous 1826 diagram of "la grande coupe binaire," and it was most notably elaborated after this by A. B. Marx, Carl Czerny, and others. The history of this form continue with the works of composers who studied these texts.

As its name suggests, the 2/4 model divides the exposition into two large parts:

a. **Part 1** comprises both the establishment of the tonic and the motion to the dominant.

b. **Part 2** comprises the cadential affirmation of the dominant.

Moreover, each of these two large parts is itself subdivided into two <u>zones</u> of activity:

a. **Part 1** contains both the **Primary Theme Zone (P)** and the
Transitional Zone (TR).

b. **Part 2** contains both the **Secondary Theme Zone (S)** and the **Closing Zone (C)**.

The 2/4 model may thus be represented as:

Part 1   Part 2

P TR   S C

or it may be schematized as (P + TR) + (S + C).

Now, to the two parts:

The 2/4 Exposition: Part 1 (P + TR, for much of its history ending with strong caesura)

Absolutely crucial: the cadence that concludes each of the two parts. In the 18th and early 19th centuries Part 1 normally ended with a strong **caesura** on V:HC (a half-cadence in the new key); this may be considered its "first-level default." Other possibilities are I:HC as a second-level default (in this case, Part 1 has not modulated) or even V:PAC as a third (although by this point--that of a PAC instead of a HC--we should probably consider that we are dealing with some kind of caesura deformation--or even interplay between the 2/4 and 3-part models). Thus, restated: the final chord of Part 1 is generally a dominant chord, either of the "old" I or the "new" V; "ending" Part 1 with a perfect authentic cadence almost always causes some sort of "disturbance" to our expectations of how the exposition is going to proceed. With regard to the final cadence of Part 2 (the end of the exposition): in a major-mode exposition, Part 2 almost invariably ends with V:PAC.

Within Part 1, how does one determine where P concludes and TR begins? Opinions among analysts might differ here: this is frequently an interpretational matter and cannot be determined with absolute certainty. Still, not all "interpretations" are equally convincing: the interpretations thereof must be grounded both in a strong, experienced musical judgment and in a

strong awareness of the generic norms that were in place at the time the piece was composed. Thus: although composers employ various strategies here, several recur in the centering phase with noticeable frequency:

a) The modulation occurs during a **separately thematized transition**; that is, TR is built upon a new theme (the "transition theme"). In such a case, P usually concludes I:PAC (that is, P is harmonically closed).

b) The modulation occurs during a second statement or **Counterstatement (CS)** of P. In such a case, P may conclude either I:PAC or I:HC. In the first case, P is harmonically closed, and CS begins as if it is simply about to repeat P. In the second case, P is harmonically open, like an antecedent, and CS begins as if it is going to supply the consequent. In both cases, CS gives the impression of re-beginning; the listener may not suspect that the Transitional Zone is underway until the actual modulation activity begins.

c) The modulation is accomplished during a **continuation or development** of P; in such a case, P may be harmonically closed or open. The "developmental continuation" type of TR is obviously related to the "counterstatement" type, in that both are dependent transitions; that is, they are both dependent upon P for their material (the separately thematized type is often referred to as an independent transition). The "continuation" type, however, does not give the impression of rebeginning; rather, the discussion of P material has already begun, as if the piece is eager to "get on with it."

As for the phrase/cadential structure of P, it can be a period, a sentence, a single phrase, or a more complex structure; it might be a thematic group comprising several ideas (which could be labeled as p^1, p^2, etc.). In all cases, it must unambiguously establish the tonic key. Normally, it will be in dialogue with one of the standard P-theme "types," and we can also often identify certain (Ratnerian) topics here as well. It is of considerable importance to notice whether P is harmonically closed or open; that is, whether it ends with I:PAC or with I:HC.

The TR, of course, effects the modulation (in varying ways and in varying degrees of strength), and it may proceed either as a single phrase or a phrase group? It is very important to notice both **how** it cadences and how **strong** this concluding caesura is. Finally, one should notice whether the final chord or TR is followed by a rest (the first-level default in the 18th century), or whether this "implied" rest is "filled in" with melodic/rhythmic activity (a second-level default--which can at times turn notably deformational: hence the term, "caesura deformation.")

In a "pure" 2/4 model, the modulation is accomplished rather quickly, almost as if the piece is eager to get it over with and move on to its next order of generic business (namely, the Secondary Theme Zone). If during an analysis of a piece we begin to sense that a Transitional Zone appears to be going on for an inordinate amount of time (especially if it seems all out of proportion to P), we might suspect that it is not a 2/4, but a three-part exposition that is under way.

The 2/4 Exposition: Part Two (S + C leading to a concluding cadence)

The primary function of Part is to ground or stabilize the new key of the dominant. This is accomplished during two separate zones of activity: **S** and **C**.

By **S** we mean--most strictly--the entire first zone of the second tonal region, a zone provided with a strong, clearly articulated thematic initiation. (Note: in practice, we sometimes use the terms "the S theme"--or even "the second(ary) theme"--as a convenient, shorthand way of referring to the phrases that articulate that initiation and lead to the first strong cadence. Our "strict"--and more accurate--definition of S, however, is intended to differ in implication from the terms, "second theme," secondary theme," or "second group" as one encounters theme in more orthodox musicological and theoretical writing.)

In the 18th and early 19th century--and even well into the 19th--the S zone normally follows a clear caesura or caesura deformation. This caesura normally is to be found about 30-50% of the way through the exposition: anything over 50% would be most unusual. Another way of saying this: the non-tonic Part 2 (S + C) is normally longer than the tonic Part 1 (P + TR): Rothstein, quite rightly, refers to what we call Part 1 as "an area of growing instability" and Part 2 as "an area of growing stability" (Phrase Rhythm, 114)--which also helps to suggest why Part 2 might "need" to be broader and occupy more musical space.

We may characterize S somewhat more specifically: S is nearly always introduced ("the S theme") as a reduction of sonic forces from the preceding TR. To set up an S only to override it with bluff force would represent the overriding of a standard default: something of an S-deformation. This zone normally participates in a generic system of melodic S-conventions: The initial S theme may be lyrical, contrasting, or even a reshaping of P. (This last possibility results in the so-called "monothematic" sonata form, which is virtually standard with Haydn). The initial S theme may or may not be periodic, although Mozart's frequently are; thus one should be on the lookout for periods, repeated periods, double periods, and sentences.

Again, as in P, S may be a thematic group (thus, s^1, s^2, etc.). One thing, though, is de rigueur in the centering phase: **S must be harmonically and tonally stable.** If not--if S is tonally unstable, or if it is persistently undergirded with a dominant pedal or some other tension-producing device--then one is dealing with the **deformation** of a generic norm; either that or the exposition is

actually following the 3-part model. Although in the centering phase S as a whole is stable, one sometimes finds examples of what "must be" an S beginning not over the tonic chord of the new dominant key, but over another chord--usually its dominant (Mozart, Symphony No. 33, Haydn, Quartet, Op. 50, No. 1).

How long does S last? Usually, it is best to consider S as extending only up to the first strong cadence. S normally ends V:PAC--again, this is normally the first PAC in the new key. Occasionally, of course, the S is subject to immediate repetition and/or variation, and sometimes the phrases following that initial cadence seem so clearly bound to the "S" idea--either as variants, offshoots, or clear responses--that one might wish to extend to S zone to encompass these things as well. As one's first thought, though, we should begin by "assuming" that S will end with the first PAC in the new key; tinkerings and adjustments with our analytical result should be done cautiously.

Note: some analysts wish to define the boundaries of "the second theme/group" by the articulation of the middle-ground, upper-voice linear Zug in the dominant key: 5-4-3-2-1. (The basis for this judgment, of course, is rooted in Schenkerian principles.)   According to this widely accepted explanation, the "second theme" must begin where the structural 5 is sounded--indeed, this is how S is to be defined--regardless of where the caesura may or may not be placed, and regardless of the "thematic" or "initiatory" characteristics of the S-portion thus identified. Further, some Schenkerians would consider the linear Zug to be completed only by the PAC at--or very near--the end of the exposition; others would consider the PAC at the end of "the second theme/group" to mark the end of the Zug.   These are extremely valuable observations, and it is our point here neither to dispute the existence of the Zug here (far from it!) nor to try to mediate the controversy about where the Zug ends (or "ought" to end). It must be pointed out, though, that from our perspective, the term S most properly--and most helpfully--refers to aspects of **rhetorical form**, while the concept of linear Zug refers to **tonal form** (which in many ways is quite indifferent to matters of thematic/generic disposition, as Schenker himself vigorously pointed out).

Although minimizing neither type of form, we have tried clearly to distinguish between them. In short: we would consider the attempt to define any aspect of rhetorical form exclusively through the features of linear counterpoint and tonal form to be a procedural error. (And, of course, vice-versa.) In our "**dual-track" concept of form (tonal and rhetorical)** it is a mistake to confuse or conflate tracks.

Following S, the music will enter a **Closing Zone (C)** which continues to reinforce the new key and thus <u>tips the balance decisively towards the second tonal area</u>. C often participates in a generic system of closing gestures, such as repeated cadences (usually PACs) and tonic pedals. Frequently there is more than one closing idea (thus, c^1, c^2, etc.); Mozart is fond of presenting three or four such ideas, usually repeating each one (often with expansions) before going on to the next. (Anton Reicha's 1826 term for the expositional material following the "seconde idée mère" [our S] is particularly appropriate: what we call C, he called <u>idées</u> <u>accessoires</u> <u>et</u> <u>conclusion</u> <u>de</u> <u>la</u> <u>premiere</u> <u>partie</u>. For most individual cases, this description is perfect: it cannot be improved upon.)

C is also an area where brilliant passage work may occur. An individual closing idea may or may not have a strong thematic profile; if so, it is often called a <u>closing theme</u>; if not (for example, if it consists largely of thematically neutral or generic figuration), it is sometimes referred to as a <u>codetta</u>. Finally, one should be aware that composers during the centering phase-- especially, perhaps, Mozart, though not exclusively Mozart--are fond of reintroducing P during the closing zone. In part, this may help to prepare for the repeat of the exposition. When this happens, the <u>syntactical function</u> of P has changed, for it is now being used as a closing gesture.

EXPOSITION TYPES 1 AND 2 IN MINOR KEYS (CENTERING PHASE): A BRIEF NOTE

It is useful to think of minor-mode sonatas as undertaking a quite different psychological "game" from that of major-mode sonatas. A useful (if fanciful) analogy might be with the game of chess, in which different types of openings lead to substantially different middle- and end-games. (The most telling difference in chess, of course, is the competitive back-and-forth between two opposing minds and intentions, absent from the individual composer's construction of a sonata.) Opening the chess-match via Ruy Lopez is very different from whipping out the knight in a startling Reti's Opening, and it leads to different consequences. Regardless of the opening chosen, the overall "rules of the game" remain the same, but the texture and expressive significance of each moment has been altered from the beginning onward. Just so, major- and minor-mode sonatas. (And, for that matter, just so, Type 1 and Type 2 openings, various deformational patterns, etc. One could write commentaries on sonatas as one writes on chess matches: move by move.)

Although most of the general guidelines for sonata-form movements in the major mode hold true for those in minor (whether a 2/4 or a 3-part model is employed), the tonal narrative of the minor-mode sonata is often quite different.

1) The exposition of a major-mode sonata form moves from I to V_T ("tonicization" of V), while the development generally detonicizes this dominant and ends on V_A (chordally "active" V, pressing for an immediate resolution). At this point--the end of the developmental space--the harmonic interruption occurs, and the recapitulation rebegins on I. Some minor-mode sonata forms do essentially the same thing: the exposition tonicizes the minor dominant, moving from i to v_T, while the development reactivates the dominant and concludes on V_A (e.g., Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 2, No. 1, finale).

The move to minor v at the end of the exposition of a minor-mode sonata, however, is a second-level default in the centering phase and becomes increasingly rare after that (although it does crop up from time to time, for example in Mendelssohn and Brahms). Indeed, by the second quarter of the 19th century, we may well consider the choice of v to be an even lower-level default. The second-level, as it turned out, would be taken over by VI. See no. 3 below.)

2) The expositions of most minor-mode sonata-form movements move from I to III_T, the key of the major mediant (or "relative major"). This would seem to be the first-level default at all historical stages of the minor-mode sonata exposition. The tonal task of the development is then to move from this III_T to V_A, at which point the harmonic interruption and the rebeginning on i occurs. Thus the large-scale motion is still from tonic to dominant, but the dominant is not reached until the end of the development, and the path from i to V is bisected by the "third-divider" III. The III_T at the close of the Exposition is thus only a temporary goal; it is a "way station" on the path to the true tonal goal, the structural V. The resulting arpeggiation i-III-V outlines the tonic minor triad.

The expressive/emotional effect of the move from i to III_T is quite different from that of the move from I to V_T, due primarily to the significant--and unmistakable--shift from the original minor to the eventual major mode. This shift has enormous expressive consequences, inevitably outlining a situation in which a "disturbed," "painful," or otherwise "uncomfortable" minor P-idea, initially stated, is markedly contrasted with a major-mode S-zone that seems to have quite totally different expressive implications. In this modal/expressive contrast lies the crux of the

sonata-drama--and this seems to be true even of the sonata in its late precentered phase (for example, in the so-called "Sturm und Drang" years) and centering phase. (This is even more clearly true once we get to the nineteenth century, from Beethoven onward: it becomes a central part of the compositional and interpretive tradition. Not to recognize this is simply to miss the central point of this type of "chess game.")

To expand: Whereas I-V_T (say, in a major-mode sonata) generates tonal tension, i-III_T produces the effect of "escaping" from the minor mode into the major-- or, more accurately, invites us to "read" the sonata procedures as suggesting this. (This may be easily substantiated--even apart from obvious experience--by consultation of symphonic "programs," operatic overtures in minor, or implications in the titles of pieces, when they exist.) In fact, the urge to escape from or be "redeemed" (Wagner's erlöst) from minor into major forms the basic narrative paradigm of the minor-mode sonata form. The exposition offers the promise of redemption by moving to the mediant major; but the effect of true redemption can be effected only by escape into the tonic major.

Again, this lies at the core of the "semiotics of minor." Adorno's brilliant (1960) characterization of minor and major in the works of Mahler, for example, argues that that composer revitalized features of the modal system long since

"neutralized" (or overly familiarized or reified) through common practice. Whether or not one agrees totally with the thesis of a blanket neutralization, Adorno hits the minor-major nail directly on the head. We may consider extending it to prior music as well (despite Adorno's special--and well-taken--"Mahlerian" point):

> The long neutralized minor, sedimented as a formal element in the syntax of Western music, only becomes a symbol of mourning when modally awakened by the contrasting major. Its nature is that of divergence; in isolation it no longer produced this effect [is this always true??]. As a deviation, the minor defines itself equally as the not integrated, the unassimilated, the not yet established. In the contrast between the two modes in Mahler, the divergence between the particular and the general is inextricably congealed. Minor is the particular [i.e., that which strives to be assimilated?], major the general [that which assimilates?]; the Other, the deviant, is, with truth, equated with suffering. In the major-minor relationship, therefore, the expressive content is precipitated in sensuous, musical form. (Mahler, trans. Jephcott, p. 26)

3) Particularly as one moves toward and into the 19th century, various originally lower-level defaults begin to emerge as increasingly possible keys for the end of the exposition. VI is the most normative of these lower-level defaults (Beethoven's 9th Symphony, first movement, d-Bb exposition). By the second quarter of the 19th century, VI is probably the second-level default. (See no. 1 above.)

4) In all cases, apart from the tonal plot, the contrapuntal arpeggiation implied, etc., the central point is whether we move in the exposition from the initial minor mode to a major-mode "escape" key (one that is, at this point "potentially redemptive"--it is the task of the recapitulation to try to make this promise a reality). Thus the moves to major III and major VI (first and second-level defaults by the mid-nineteenth century) have something in common, despite their different tonal plots (and corresponding expressive implications). Similarly, the move to minor v for S & C is not merely "archaic" in its effect: it is a strikingly sombre choice and can often give the effect of "choking off" an expected escape into major. Moving toward III but then turning it into the minor mode, iii, is even more chilling: one is given the promise of the major-mode "light," but it is experienced as being extinguished into the minor-mode darkness (as in Beethoven, first movements of Pathétique [which manages thereafter to "escape"

after all into a major-mode III for C, though the recapitulation will overturn this escape] and Appassionata [very cruel!], and Brahms's Symphony No. 1, first movement, etc.)

Note: During the recapitulation, therefore, the composer has two options: to recapitulate major-mode material in the tonic major, thus preserving the original mode and achieving the minor-major redemption; or to recapitulate major-mode material in the tonic minor, thus altering the mode (and often the entire character of the material) and denying the minor-major redemption. In the hands of Beethoven, the minor-mode redemption paradigm grew into the per aspera ad astra (darkness to light, sickness to health, suffering to redemption, etc.) narrative trajectory so important to the 19th-century symphony. Its beginnings, however, can certainly be traced back to Haydn and Mozart--and doubtless to their predecessors and contemporaries as well. In his later minor-mode works Haydn generally turns to major at the earliest opportunity. Mozart, however, invariably recapitulates S in the tonic minor; he thus denies the promised redemption and concludes on a pessimistic note.

In instances--such as in Mozart--in which a minor-mode work or movement concludes in the minor, we may legitimately conclude that the redemption paradigm has failed, and we may speak generally of "sonata-process failure." This does not mean to imply that the the composer has somehow "failed" to produce an effective or aesthetically legitimate sonata, that somehow the sonata is poorly composed, and so on. The term "sonata-process failure" is not a criticism of the composer. What is does mean is that in the narrative that this sonata purports to tell--or invites us to understand as telling--the "heroic act" which many sonatas are designed to accomplish (the reversal of minor-mode fortunes) does not materialize. In a sense, what is implied in a "failed sonata" is that the situation limned at the outset is so negative that the social processes for which the sonata may be taken as an abstract representation are insufficient to solve or overturn it: this, too, is a perfectly legitimate, and potentially very powerful, statement.

 Finally, we should note that in such a "failed" sonata-process, a turn back to major may take place in a "redemptive" coda (though never in Mozart [but: never say never?]).   Conversely, a recapitulation that concludes in the major may be subsequently undercut by a "negative" coda (a "not-sonata" portion) that cruelly reinstates the original minor mode: this is another type of "sonata-process failure" ("The whole sonata process was in vain; the attained redemption illusory; etc.") This sort of thing is brutal stuff (Beethoven, Symphony No. 5, first movement; Schubert, Symphony No. 8, first movement). We must neither pass over it lightly nor take it for granted: Here is where the candle is snuffed out.

Once the centering-phase versions of Exposition Types 1 and 2 are understood in their various major- and minor-mode possibilities, one may confront the two most notable 19th-century exposition-deformations more efficiently.

Type 3: The (Schubertian) Three-Stage Exposition

This is a grand thematic expansion of 18th-century models, and it needs to be more thoroughly investigated from the standpoint of eighteenth-century exposition-type theory. From the standpoint of earlier sonata-theory models, though, this type has been quite extensively discussed in the literature, most influentially, perhaps, by James Webster and Charles Rosen, who have written of "three-key expositions" in Schubert and others. (This term, we shall ultimately argue, is misleading.) Whatever we call it, this deformation is indeed particularly associated with Schubert (although, of course, it is anything but an invariable practice with him), and later in the century it is revived especially in Brahms, Bruckner, and others. Oversimplified (and without regard to caesura practice, etc.), the crux of this model seems to be: three broad, thematic parts ("stages") in the exposition, each articulating a different key (although the last of the three is usually the "normative" S- or C-key). Expositions that visit the arpeggiation I-III-V, not surprisingly, are often encountered here. Often in Schubert, the "second" stage is more fluid or unstable in its "key" than are Zones 1 and 3.

It has been normative to consider the three exposition-stages to be roughly mappable onto the P, S, and C labels. Current thinking, though, suggests that with regard to Schubert expositions this is often (always?) inadequate. From the standpoint of the 2/4 model (if that is indeed the appropriate model to use in a given Schubertian case), it is often (always?) better to think of the second stage as a broadly thematic expansion of TR--something of a "thematized transition" that, even though we might initially think that it "is" S, will ultimately get us to the "real" S and the normative key later on, in the third stage. Thus Rothstein [emphasis added]:

> The length of a transitional phrase [our TR] is highly variable. . . . [Within transitions,] in extreme cases, especially where much of a transitional phrase or period is itself tonally stable (but not in the original key), a sort of false second group may emerge, the impression of a second group arising from the extended tonal stability [and, we might add, often also from the thematic character]. If the prevailing key of this passage is neither the original tonic nor the key of the

closing cadence, the result is the "three-key exposition" favored by Schubert and Brahms and described by James Webster, Rosen, and others. (Phrase Rhythm, p. 115)

But these "thematized TRs" are not always tonally stable; quite often, they are not. In the first movement of Schubert's C-major Quintet, the second stage seems to begin in bIII (Eb), but it persistently seems to want to veer back to the C-major tonic, as if deeply reluctant to leave it: in fact, the Eb barely exists at all, except as a fleeting possibility on the way to a much later, more stable G major (V) attained at the end of stage 2 and sustained in stage 3. Similarly, stage 2 in Schubert's last Piano Sonata (Bb), first movement, is all tonal flux and circularity.

If we take the 2/4 model as the normative background "against" which Schubert conceived his 3-stage expositions--on first glance, perhaps, a reasonable assumption--what we have is:

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
P-area, greatly expanded; leisurely pace, etc. Tonic. The sense of a large TR-like event leading to Stage 2 is minimized or suppressed altogether.	TR proper, beginning as a new theme, seemingly expressing a new key; tonally, it may be either fluid or relatively stable	"New" or more stabilized S and C zones in the "proper" key, though one different from that in Stage 2

Nevertheless, one can hardly ignore the potential that a "(Schubertian) 3-Stage Exposition" has for a perhaps even more telling dialogue with the Haydnesque "3-Part Exposition." This interpretation (still hypothetical at this stage of consideration) would see the Schubert model as greatly expanding and altering the Haydn model in a number of ways. Three of the most important might be:

1) Greatly expanding each of its parts (a swelling or "ballooning-out") in such a way that the originally characteristic proportions of the classical 3-part exposition are almost unrecognizable--or no longer relevant. (There are some precedents for this sort of

thing in Mozart, who was on occasion a master of this lyrical swelling of individual sub-zones: in the G-minor String Quintet, first movement, for example.)

2) Radically altering the fundamental Fortspinnung-motivic nature of the 3-part model by turning just about everything into expansive, sometimes circular and expressively repetitive, melodies. The aesthetic claim: it is legitimate, when needed, to overwhelm motivic concentration with lyrical expansion; this is particularly helpful when the goal is to produce a sonata "of heavenly length."

3) Rethinking the nature of the caesura at the end of Part 2 (true?)

Thus, we might ask ourselves a provocative question: how would our understanding of the piece differ if, for example, we understood the famous "Eb theme" at the opening of the second stage of Schubert's C-major Quintet, first movement, as the onset of the SonataWork within a three-part model? In this interpretation, the theme would not be exclusively an expositional statement in and for itself; it would simultaneously (and perhaps more tellingly) be the first step taken on the path to the eventual V, secured only much later. Because of its rhetorical position within the generic expositional model, it could then be understood, conceptually, as implicitly conveying the sense of a forward, horizontal vector, though one unfolding with exquisite (or even fatalistic?) "slowness."

A short note on the corresponding recapitulations within (Schubertian) Three-Stage Sonatas: Schubert's unusual recapitulation strategies have also been much remarked upon (by Tovey, Webster, Rosen, and so on), especially since it often happens that not all of the non-tonic material of the exposition returns in the tonic. There are many possibilities here. Stage 2, for example, can return fully (or largely so) but in a non-tonic key: in such cases it is the task of Stage 3 alone to bring us back to the tonic and "resolve" the exposition. If Stage 2 is reconceived as a deformation either of the TR of a 2/4 exposition or of the SW of a 3-part exposition, though, many of the parameters of this "problem" are more readily confronted.

Still, to the extent that a prominent "non-tonic theme" in the exposition is never granted the light of the tonic in the recapitulation, we may speak of Schubert's penchant for "**alienated themes**"--the implied metaphor may be of an "outside" statement or condition of being that is ultimately (socially) unassimilable. Other interpretations, of course, are also possible--but the "**alienated expositional theme**" (always a restatement of expositionally non-tonic material after the P-zone) is a notable, poignant deformation sometimes found in Schubertian and post-Schubertian recapitulations.

Type 4: The "Dutchman" Exposition

Arising unequivocally in 1843 with Wagner's Overture to <u>The</u> <u>Flying</u> <u>Dutchman</u>, this is a significant and widely influential mid- and late-19th-century contraction of the 2/4 model. It is primarily used in mid- late-19th-century <u>minor-mode</u> <u>sonatas</u>. As the 2/4 model became normative and reified in the 19th century, there seems to have been an increasing tendency (noted by composers, theorists, etc.) to stress, heighten, or maximize the contrast between P and S. True, there had long been a tendency for these themes to contrast--it had always been a telling options--but now that principle of "contradiction" or utter contrast was to be elevated into the central driving force of this type of sonata.

Here the basic strategy--which is particularly appropriate to <u>minor-mode</u> sonatas, particularly those following some sort of programmatic or quasi-programmatic "redemptive" narrative (of which there were many)--was: to minimize or omit almost altogether the second sub-zone, TR (in order to permit the contrast between P and S to speak all the more strikingly); often, to omit or radically shorten C. The result:

<u>Part 1</u>	<u>Part 2</u>
P (tonic minor, <u>agitato</u>) + maximally contrasting with P.	S, non-tonic major, lyrical, little or no transition
(a simple dying-away or <u>dim</u>. of P is even more follow. (In the purer types--	Often explicitly gendered feminine. C may or may not characteristic).
Often explicitly gendered masculine	<u>Dutchman</u>, the finale of Mahler, Symphony No. 1--there is no C at all.)

In short, <u>the</u> <u>crux</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>sonata</u> <u>lies</u> <u>in</u> <u>the</u> <u>dialectical</u> <u>opposition</u> <u>of</u> <u>P & S</u> (as Wagner made perfectly clear in his own writings on overtures). Considered together, the two images often invite listeners--both then and now--to understand the themes as typically romantic, Goethean metaphors, as ideological constructions of 'man' (the restless striver, the creator, the negotiator in public space) and 'woman' (the inspirational, the sacrificial, the domestic, private-space, 'eternal feminine').

The <u>Dutchman</u> model was of central importance to the subsequent symphonic tradition. One of its most telling legacies is that it seems to have become the most powerful, most influential

musical construction of gender within nineteenth-century sonata-practice. In the stark simplicity of its expositional space, in the oppositional binarism of its masculine-feminine contrast, the Dutchman-model would be adapted by dozens of composers in the ensuing decades. Particularly because of this implicit gender-overlay, this remains one of the more socially controversial types of 19th-century sonata.[3]

This programmatic or representational aspect of the "Dutchman-type" of exposition might be restated and considered further. Of all the Four Exposition Types, this is the one most pre-loaded with gendered connotations, primarily because of the actual historical tradition of its use: it seems a radically simplified structural-type explicitly devised to represent a highly romanticized and explicitly dialectical simplification of the Type-2 (2/4 model), minor-mode, per aspera ad astra type of sonata. True, in principle, the emphatically dialectical aspect of P and S fits any number of 19th-century conceptual programs: among the most important, though, would prove to be those implicated in representations of gender ("masculine" P, "feminine" S).

It is certainly possible--and sometimes explicitly invited--to overlay other programs onto this "abstract pattern," but the strongly residual, "romantic" (liberal-bourgeois) gender-connotations of the Dutchman-pattern seem never too far away and are usually, at some level, also relevant.[4]

---

[3] See JH, "Masculine-Feminine," in The Musical Times, August 1994, from which some of the present essay is adapted. The article also contains a discussion of A.B. Marx and the first, widely influential mention (1845) of "masculine" and "feminine" themes within expositions.

[4] While this claim is readily defensible for "Dutchman-type" expositions, it currently appears that it would be difficult to extend, for example, into Exposition Types 1 and 2, especially during the precentered and centering phases--that is, during the period of the "classical" sonata. The evidence for habitual exposition-gendering at that time seems simply not to be there, and hundreds of the most normative expositions of that period are difficult to fit convincingly (that is, without forcing) into a reified masculine-feminine dialectical opposition.

The "classical" Type-1 model--the 3-Part exposition--seems particularly ill-suited for any such interpretation. (We might add, though, that hermeneutic room should be made, of course, for special, exceptional, or overtly programmatic cases, should any be uncovered; we are primarily concerned here, though, with normative generic practice.) In the first place, because there is no S in the 3-part model, the claim on behalf of a thematic polarization cannot easily be defended. Moreover, in Type-1 expositions in general, we usually find an exposition more concerned with Fortspinning and/or ongoing motivic elaboration (concerned more with consistency and constant growth than with dialectical opposition), and this prolonged expositional SonataWork, in later Haydn, is usually punctuated at the end with a rustic or "folk-like" theme for C.

With regard to Type 2, the 2/4 exposition, during the "classical" period: even a cursory examination of the works of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven will uncover a wide variety of treatments, in some of which (such as, most obviously, in Haydn's "monothematic" expositions) P and S cannot be said to be thematically polarized. Further, moods and musical images within "classical" 2/4 expositions often change rapidly: many (most) of these expositions--especially, say, in Mozart--display a variety of volatile themes, not merely a contrasting set of two.

Is it the 18th-century exposition's keys, then, that might be ineradicably polarized and gendered, and not the themes? This potential claim also seems unlikely or, at least, unnecessary (notwithstanding Schoenberg's much later remark to this effect, which should probably be grasped as an utterance primarily shedding light on Schoenberg and his cultural milieu, not on the classical sonata). Any adequate response to this claim doubtless needs to be more elaborated more fully than is practical here, but, in brief, such a response might begin to unfold with observations along the following lines: as keys for S (or simply as

(Some of these other programs, many of which are explicitly <u>utopian</u> in implication: the struggle for spiritual redemption or release from torment, the granting of that redemption; the struggle for political freedom, the granting of that freedom; the struggle to produce "the great statement," the production of that statement; and so on.

More concretely, the <u>Dutchman</u>-model formula as a whole may be summarized in six principles:

1) The sonata is a minor-mode work seeking resolution into the major, a resolution that is usually granted--emphatically--in the recapitulation.

2) The exposition subdivides cleanly into two separate, <u>maximally</u> <u>contrasting</u> blocks, and the transition between the two blocks is minimized or made very brief.

3) The first theme, normally in the minor mode, is generally an aggressive, <u>forte</u> image of the tormented subject in extreme crisis: restless, agitated, disturbed, or threatened. This subject is nearly always considered either directly in the program (the Dutchman, Faust, etc.) or by implication to be masculine.

4) The second theme, sometimes slower in tempo and always <u>piano</u> when introduced (often through a treble-register solo instrument, frequently a woodwind), is the static, major-mode image of the consoling or potentially redemptive feminine--self-assured, lyrical, "beautiful," often circular, smooth, or rounded in melodic contour, and so on.

5) The exposition introduces us to the two dramatic characters, while the development sets the plight of the masculine hero into frenetic motion.

6) The resolution into the tonic of the feminine second theme in the recapitulatory space signifies a resolution of the hero's plight, and, to underscore this, the second theme normally appears here in a grand, <u>fortissimo</u> apotheosis, as the climax and <u>telos</u> of the piece or movement. (The most influential historical source of this S-apotheosis: Weber's Overture to <u>Der</u> <u>Freischütz</u> [1821].)

---

normative elements within the tonal system in general), V or III need not understood as absolute, polarized "others" to the tonic (<u>pace</u> Rosen), and there seems to be no decisive evidence that they were widely understood in the 18th century to function in this way. It seems more helpful (both more sophisticated and more historically accurate) to understand V and III as arpeggiated extensions or prolongations of the tonic-- that is, as musically representational expansions and unfurlings of the "modern 'self,'" of which the concept of tonicity may be taken to be a construction--rather than as anxious images of feared "others" that need to be purged, subjugated, or contained.