

Draft of Position Paper
 This version: © 29 January 1995
 James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy

Expositional Caesuras and Cadences

As Heinrich Christoph Koch made clear in the 1780s and 1790s, varying degrees of punctuation--cadences, breaks, and so on--are central both to what came to be called the classical style and to the mid- and late-eighteenth-century sense of form. It is the contention of SonataMaker theory that an analysis of such cadences (especially the crucial PACs) and major punctuation-breaks (structural caesuras) leads one into the heart of a productive, defensible sonata-form theory.

Such a contention is not new. Musical scholars, particularly those in dialogue with the pioneering work of Leonard Ratner and others, have been familiar with the idea for decades: what differs among them is the degree to which this feature is to be emphasized in the construction of a model to be used in analysis. Karol Berger, for example, has recently made one of the strongest statements in its behalf in a discussion of Koch and the primacy of "punctuation form" in the classical style.

Koch's thinking about musical composition rests on a single central notion, namely, the idea of punctuation. . . . Koch's is a rhetorical idea of musical composition, a vision of music as a discourse which, like speech, is articulated into a hierarchy of parts. The hierarchical articulation is achieved by means of the more or less noticeable resting points in the discourse. . . . The most general conclusion that can be derived from Koch concerning competent hearing in the late eighteenth century is that fundamental to this hearing was the experience of punctuation articulating a composition into a hierarchy of parts. . . . More

fundamental than either the harmonic plan or the thematic argument was the experience of punctuation.¹

Charles Rosen acknowledged a similar point in his discussion of Sonata Forms:

To comprehend the structure of any individual movement, we must ask where the breaks in texture occur and how they are coordinated with the large-scale harmonic form and the thematic order. This is, somewhat more broadly put, the position of the eighteenth-century theorist: he asked largely where and how the cadences were placed. In the sonata, the cadences are reinforced by a brief pause [= "caesura"], sudden changes of harmonic rhythm, or the appearance of a new theme.²

Nor has the current institution of music theory been silent on this issue. In a recent, much-noted inquiry into classical structures, including "sonata form," from a Schenkerian perspective, William Rothstein begins with fundamental principles:

For Koch, form is [closely] identified with cadence structure: according to his definition, only a section of music ending with a perfect authentic cadence may be termed a 'period.'

As Ratner rightly emphasizes, the 18th-century view of sonata form stresses cadences--the ends of sections--rather than thematic statements, which generally sound like beginnings (partly because they tend to occur just after important cadences. . . . This emphasis on cadential goals matches perfectly Schenker's conception of sonata form. . . .

As Ratner has noted, the polarity between tonic and dominant strengthened appreciably in the latter part of the 18th

¹ Berger, "Toward a History of Hearing: The Classic Concerto, A Sample Case," Convention in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Music: Essays in Honor of Leonard G. Ratner, ed. Wye J. Allanbrook, Janet M. Levy, and William P. Mahrt (Stuyvesant, N.Y.: Pendragon, 1992), pp. 405-29. The quotations are taken from pp. 411-413.

² Rosen, Sonata Forms, rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1988), p. 99.

century. . . . In this new, more highly differentiated harmonic environment, the dominant could function as a long-range goal even without tonicization, that is, as a half-cadence. Koch's limitation in this area is his failure to recognize that a half-cadence may serve as the goal of a large period; in this, however, he may simply be reflecting the practice of an earlier time.³

SonataMaker theory begins with a consideration of how the differing treatment of cadences and caesuras produced differing exposition types in the eighteenth century. Two points are closely related to this: 1) the various exposition types are primarily identifiable on the basis of their array of cadences and caesuras; cadence- and caesura-types alone permit us to distinguish differing exposition types; 2) the different exposition types, even qua "ideal types" (not to mention the numerous concrete variants that are played upon them in the classical period), have different implications for structural and hermeneutic understanding; identifying the proper type with which an exposition is in dialogue, therefore, is the first step toward a responsible hermeneutics. Hermeneutic readings disregarding this step strike one as premature, vulnerable, insufficiently grounded, harder to defend.

Coming to terms with the notion of a musical "caesura" (literally implying a break, gap, or cut, from the Latin *caedere*, to cut down, though the term has also been widely used for centuries in poetic analysis) can at times be an easy matter: there exist many instances of unequivocal mid-exposition caesuras in the classical repertory. Problems begin to arise, however, when we consider such

³ Rothstein, *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music* (New York: Schirmer, 1989), pp. 111-13. The "period" (Koch's term) that Rothstein wishes to admit as concluding with a half-cadence is, of course, what we would call the development section. As is well known, according to Schenkerian theory, developments characteristically end with a harmonic interruption on an active dominant chord, and this interruption (setting up the subsequent recapitulatory rebeginning) effects the primary, two-part division of the movement as a whole. (In dividing the movement at this point, the Schenkerians differ from Koch; but this is precisely Rothstein's point.) We should note, however, that Rothstein's larger--and doubtless correct--point, that of a phrase or section leading to a half-cadence, could also be applicable to the standard caesura-moment at the end of TR and just before S.

things as: a) mid-eighteenth century, smaller-scale "sonatas" (or incipient sonatas) in which caesura-strength is often much weaker than the unequivocal instances that we use as reference-points for our first understanding of the term; b) the many variants and gradations of strength and certainty that we find in centered-phase expositional caesuras (Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven); c) the possibility within the classical style of a "caesura deformation" for a particular expressive purpose--an implied caesura that is altered, stretched, or overridden in one way or another.

We might start with an elementary proto-definition and then remind ourselves of several examples of the most unequivocal caesuras. In its most characteristic appearances, a caesura is a brief break or gap (general pause, GP) that serves to break an exposition into two separate parts, tonic and dominant (or tonic and mediant, in minor-key sonatas). The effect is usually that of an emphatic pause for breath before the rebeginning or relaunching of the exposition in a second part. We shall call this kind of structural caesura--the emphatic "breath" dividing an exposition into two parts--a MEDIAL CAESURA.

Sonata form is, among other things, a device permitting the spanning of ever larger expanses of time with a relatively restricted musical/harmonic language--like the spanning of a bridge over empty space. It is a feat of engineering. The notion of relaunch or restart in a separately articulated second part ("S theme") is a crucial strategy in this spanning-procedure. (The main alternative strategy is that of an ongoing Fortspinnung.) This second-launch strategy seems to date back at least to the 1730s and 1740s, with the "dramatized" first movements of certain opera overtures by such composers as Leo and Jommelli. It soon became a standard feature of certain types of "expositions" within early symphonic practice.

The most normative medial caesuras and their surrounding environments may be described even more precisely at this level of first understanding. Within a two-part exposition a medial caesura

marks the end-point (and goal) of the TR. At the point of the caesura, the first-level-default dynamic is forte, the texture full, vigorous, and energetic. The effect is of an unmistakable, forte set-up for what follows: a medial caesura usually articulates a strong HC, which is often prolonged and reiterated ostentatiously for rhetorical emphasis. What follows is usually a sharp textural change: a drop to piano dynamics and the onset of (often new) thematic material with any of the possible characteristics of S-rhetoric (these characteristics differ slightly from Haydn to Mozart to Beethoven, etc.) All of these things are part of the general caesura environment, and a severe disturbance in any one of them (particularly in the type of material that follows) might make us question the structural validity of the caesura itself.

The parenthetical assertion in the preceding sentence is especially important, because a medial caesura's effect and functioning-power is inextricably linked to what follows it. It is possible for a seemingly unequivocal medial caesura's dividing effect to be retrospectively undone if it is immediately followed by material that seems aggressively to "refuse" to take on the normative role for S--that, in its strong overriding of S-norms, seems to refuse to accept the preceding caesura as binding. (But more on these difficult or exceptional cases later, under "caesura deformations." For the moment, we shall be dealing with normative cases.)

Since a medial caesura--virtually by definition--is the emphatic end-point of a TR within a two-part exposition, it must be articulated either by an HC or by a PAC. Because the TR consists of phrases and is by definition construed as driving toward an end, or arrival-point, the end-point (caesura) must articulate the end of a phrase. And again, this is only HC or PAC. This corresponds perfectly with normative (perhaps invariable) practice in the eighteenth century. It is true that a gap may be produced after a Deceptive Cadence (DC)--as in that brilliant, sudden gasp in Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony, first movement, m. 55--or that "caesura-like things" might happen on pre-cadential harmonies such as II, IV, or V of V of V. But since these harmonies do not end phrases, they

cannot, as a rule, be considered medial caesuras--they cannot divide an exposition into two parts.

(True, one can conceive of the possibility of a caesura deformation that might exempt a cleverly executed musical moment from the above definition--within musical "high play" all manner of things can happen--but one should think hard and long before suggesting seriously that the moment in question is really a medial caesura. The non-normative decision would have to be one conditioned by strong, overriding factors: collateral evidence viewed as overwhelming. We may be sure, though, that somewhere in Haydn a wonderful, witty exception can be found. But not many!)

Before proceeding further, then, it is best to keep in mind a few instances of this caesura-break that are unequivocal--that follow the above description perfectly. Once these are in mind, our task will be to devise a definition that can permit us to identify somewhat weakened or altered medial caesuras--but things that are medial caesuras nonetheless. Some unequivocal examples from expositions, then:

- 1) Haydn, Symphony No. 104 in D, "London," first movement, caesura (V:HC) at m. 64, onset of S at 65. Notice the big forte set-up, with 4-#4-5 at 56-57, and the strong laying-down of the "new" dominant, 57-64, even ending with the typical three "hammer-blows" that one often finds at the caesura point. The Haydnesque first-level-default for S immediately ensues after the breath (3/4 of a bar): a drop to piano and a relaunch with a restatement, or varied restatement, of the P theme as the S (65).
- 2) Mozart, Symphony No. 40 in G Minor, K. 550, first movement, caesura (III:HC) at mm. 42-43, onset of S at 44. Again, a big, energetic, forte build, driving to the prolonged, emphatic V of III (38-42), with reiterative inner motivic figures--leading this time to a set-up with two hammer blows, not three. The caesura (gap) lasts for 1 1/4 bars. The mid- late-Mozartian first-level-

default for S immediately ensues after the breath: a drop to piano and a relaunch with a new, contrasting theme (44).

These examples could be multiplied at length: unequivocal medial caesuras immediately followed by piano S-themes launching a second part are easy to find in the classical repertory. Cf. Mozart, Serenade, Eine Kleine Nachtmusik, K. 525, first movement, m. 27 (I:HC); Mozart, String Quartet in G, K. 387, first movement, m. 24 (V:HC, with an even briefer gap and a dynamic nuancing of the caesura set-up); Beethoven, Symphony No. 1, first movement, m. 52 (I:HC); and so on. Keep these prototypical examples in mind as the nuances start to multiply below.

At more conscientious levels, defining the term "caesura" turns out to be no easy matter, particularly because we encounter caesuras in various strengths, positions, and formats. Still, this is not an issue to be evaded or finessed, because few elements of eighteenth-century "sonata form" are more central to the style. Why? Again: The presence of a medial caesura--as a crucial point of punctuation--is a primary factor in the articulation (and hence, differentiation) of three of the principal eighteenth-century exposition types (the two-part, three-zone exposition, the two-part, four-zone exposition, and the continuous exposition with delayed [in this case, post-medial], compensatory HC caesura). Conversely, it is the absence of such a caesura that is the primary definer of yet another important expositional type, the continuous exposition--those that contain an expanded post-P section that we are designating as SonataWork (SW).

Our main focus here will be on medial HC caesuras. These principles are easily expandable to encompass the less frequently encountered, and more problematic, medial V or III:PAC caesura (a level-three default caesura in any two-part exposition). Most of the principles that define a medial HC caesura can be readily adapted to characterize a PAC caesura; the main difference is that the structural consequences for the exposition in question are likely to be quite different. (Further, these principles may also be used to

determine such things as post-medial HC caesuras, those that occur late in the exposition-game as a strong textural break in an ongoing SonataWork section--compensatory caesuras, and the like.)

So: back to basics. The questions to be answered, now on a deeper level, are:

1. What creates a medial HC-caesura? How does such a caesura differ from a simple HC?
2. What creates a medial HC-caesura deformation? What are the necessary conditions for such a deformation?

Again, the answers are crucial, because in many cases the most basic features of one's interpretation of the exposition depends upon whether we hear a caesura (Hepokoski's Dictum: "If there is no medial caesura, there is no S") or--to cite another option--whether we hear a caesura deformation (Darcy's Dictum: "If there is a medial caesura deformation, there may be no S."). If there is no structural caesura in the exposition at all, the case is clear: it will be regarded as a continuous exposition. But if there is a caesura, the choice of "2/4" (with caesura at the normative point), for example, as opposed to "continuous" (not to mention other possibilities--such as the continuous exposition with post-medial, compensatory caesura) depends in large part upon whether we hear a sufficiently strong deformation of that caesura. Thus, with some trepidation, we might begin:

WHAT CREATES A MEDIAL HC-CAESURA?

A simple HC (whether V:HC or I:HC) is generally insufficient to create a medial caesura, at least a caesura proportionate in strength to the length of the preceding material (P plus TR, or P plus the first sub-zone(s) of SW). Something more is needed.

Thus: A MEDIAL HC-CAESURA IS CREATED WHEN AN HC IS REINFORCED--AT A PROPORTIONALLY APPROPRIATE MOMENT WITHIN THE EXPOSITION--THROUGH ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- a. approach to the V via an applied chord (V/V, V⁷/V, vii^o/V, or vii^{o7}/V in root position or inversion). Frequently #4 (the leading-tone to V) is in the bass, so the bass line is often 4-#4-5).
- b. approach to the V via an augmented sixth chord. In this case, the typical bass line is b6-5. This is really a different version of the same general principle as condition a: perhaps a and b should be considered subsets of the same condition.
- c. reiteration of the HC. The music "goes through the cadence" several times--reapproaching and rearticulating it (as, for example, in Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 2, No. 1, first movement).
- d. prolongation of V, perhaps by neighbor motion. This often involves alternating the V with a "neighboring" 6/4, so that we have both 3-4-3 and 5-6-5 neighbor motion; sometimes this double-neighbor motion is supported by 1 in the bass, creating an "apparent" V-I-V alternation. (This should not be confused with a reiteration of the HC, condition c above.)
- e. a general pause, or rest in all voices. (This is one of the main hallmarks of an unequivocal medial caesura.)
- f. a sudden change of texture following the HC--and in particular, a texture-change (and, usually, a precipitous drop from an energetic forte to piano) that strongly suggests the immediate emergence of a normative-rhetorical melodic candidate for S-status, the launching of the second part of the exposition.

The more conditions involved, the stronger the caesura.

Examples of the above:

1. Haydn Sonata No. 1 in C: I:HC reinforced by conditions a and e.
2. Haydn Sonata No. 2 in Bb: V:HC reinforced by conditions b and c.
3. Haydn Sonata No. 8 in G: I:HC reinforced by condition a alone.
4. Haydn Sonata No. 10 in C: I:HC reinforced by condition e alone.
5. Mozart Quartet K. 387 in G: V:HC reinforced by conditions c, e, and f.
6. Beethoven Sonata op. 2 no. 1: III:HC reinforced by conditions a and c.
7. Mozart Symphony No. 39 in Eb: V:HC reinforced by conditions a and d.

And so forth. It becomes possible to specify exactly how many different conditions reinforce the HC, thus enabling one to calculate fairly precisely the overall strength of the medial caesura.

But: THE STRENGTH OF A MEDIAL CAESURA IS RELATIVE TO THE OVERALL PROPORTIONS OF THE EXPOSITION. Thus, one must always bear in mind the following proposition: THE LARGER THE PROPORTIONS OF THE EXPOSITION, THE MORE CONDITIONS IT MUST MEET IN ORDER TO QUALIFY AS A STRONG CAESURA. For this reason, we might modify Hepokoski's (now-notorious) dictum as follows: IF THERE IS NO MEDIAL CAESURA PROPORTIONATE TO THE LENGTH OF THE EXPOSITION, THERE IS NO S.

By this principle an HC-caesura reinforced only by a single condition might sound relatively strong within a small-scale

exposition (e.g., Haydn Piano Sonata No. 8 in G, first movement, I:HC reinforced only by condition a, bass-motion 4-#4-5), but sound relatively weak within a much larger exposition (Haydn Sym. 93, first movement, V:HC at m. 61--end of SW2 or MW--again reinforced only by condition a).

Condition (e) above, of course, is the cadence reinforcer that we identify as the general pause, or GP. This pause in all voices is usually quite short--lasting at most a mere bar or two or, even more frequently, less than a bar. But sometimes that brief gap--whose very frequency in the mid-eighteenth-century sonata gave rise to the term "caesura" in the first place--is filled in by bridging-material in one or more voices. This bridging material might be, for example, a held dominant in the upper parts, a short melodic descent leading to the initial tonic of S, and so on. The term for this is CAESURA-FILL.

A classic instance of caesura-fill occurs in Haydn, Symphony No. 100, "Military," first movement. Here the caesura point is unequivocally reached at the downbeat of m. 73. Most of the orchestra stops playing at this point--producing the usual caesura gap or break (GP). Above, however, the flute begins a two-bar trill (73-74) bridging the gap, and two oboes are added as harmonic reinforcers of the V7 in m. 74. S itself begins directly at m. 75, in the same flutes and oboes: the first-level default S for Haydn [but not for Mozart]--a "rebeginning" with a variant of the P-theme. Mm. 73-74 imply silence (GP) but in fact are filled in. This is perhaps as clear an example of caesura fill as one can find. In this and all similar cases, we would not consider caesura-fill itself to be a deformation: it is merely one (lower-level-default) way of articulating a GP.

A somewhat trickier instance of caesura-fill occurs in Beethoven, Symphony No. 2, first movement, mm. 71-72. The preceding measures (for example, from m. 61 onward) have clearly been driving toward a presumably unequivocal medial caesura. (At least, that is what we are given to expect.) All the normal

signs are there: the increased energy, the reiterated motivic-work (suggesting minor v, a common classical ploy in the energetic drive to the caesura point), the prolonged V of V, and so on. At the sf downbeat of 71 we land at the standard, expected medial-caesura point, and the most unequivocally normative thing for Beethoven to have done here would have been to provide the stereotypical three hammer blows on the dominant (each a quarter-note in duration, and the first two followed by a quarter-rest, the last of them, landing on the downbeat on m. 72, followed by a quarter-rest and a half-rest--the standard set-up "gap" or "breath" before S. Instead, impetuously, the ongoing motion and dynamic level charge right through the caesura point (more accurately, mm. 71 and 72), though they do not negate its medial-caesura effect (which, as it were, one "hears" through all the bluster of the moment). The expressive point, of course, is the sheer impetuosity and energy that has been built up: this is something, Beethoven seems to be suggesting, that is not going to be easily containable. (One senses in such effects a key feature of Beethoven as he enters what we usually call the "middle period"--the sense of exploding or cracking through conventional generic containers, thus submitting the earlier "Enlightenment" generic rhetoric to a stormy, individualistic critique.) Hence the caesura point is "filled"--and hence we have caesura-fill for a particular expressive effect (in this case almost a deformational effect), but one that does not erase the presence of a structural caesura. This is confirmed by what follows: the normative drop to piano and sudden change of texture for S at 73--a "new theme." (We might notice, though, that the energy-level has been built to such a point that this highly energetic S virtually erupts out of its piano casing with the ff consequent at 77. Very strange caesura and S-behavior! Given the norm, though, it is likely that this is precisely what we are supposed to feel at this point; this, we may suppose, was Beethoven's aim.)

Another potentially tricky instance occurs when the caesura-fill leads from the articulated V:HC down the tonic pitch of the newly

established V--as though the fill's task were to lay down the tonic platform on which S will make its appearance. At times this caesura-fill might suggest something cadential (that is, the V:HC is being led to an implied authentic cadence in V); but such an event might be better considered a secondary, linear move that serves to direct our attention from the harmonic interruption on V (the caesura) to the restart on the new tonic that follows. For the simplest of examples, see Mozart's Symphony No. 22 in C major, finale: V:HC caesura, m. 19; caesura-fill (lower strings) with cello-bass linear motion 5-6-5-4-3-2-1 in G major, mm. 19-20; S begins in G with upbeat to m. 21. A more celebrated--and considerably expanded--version of this occurs in Mozart's Symphony No. 39 in E-flat, K. 543, first movement: V:HC caesura, m. 90, but one insufficient to stop the momentum; expanded ("diesel-down") caesura-fill, with linear motion 4-3-2-1 in Bb, arriving on the tonic sfz, mm. 91-97, with pseudo-cadential effect; S (with "head spinning" from what has preceded it) begins in Bb, m. 98.

One can also find situations in which the brief caesura-gap--which should only last a moment--is not only filled but stretched out, prolonged, and so on. In effect, this deforms the caesura gap by pulling it apart: expanding it and delaying the onset of S. This can be done for a variety of expressive reasons: one example, mentioned in the above paragraph, occurs in Mozart, Symphony No. 39 (but not in the example mentioned just before it, Mozart, Symphony No. 22). This type of expansive caesura-fill, pulling apart the gap and delaying the S, belongs most normally to the family of caesura deformations that are considered below. But do notice that caesura-fill--normally a mild bridging effect--and caesura deformation are two different things, even though the composer seeking the effect of a caesura deformation also uses caesura-fill--as he or she must (that is, we need sound)--to accomplish his/her expressive ends.

Now, let us consider the second question:

2. WHAT CREATES A MEDIAL HC-CAESURA DEFORMATION?

We may begin with another dictum: THE STRONGER THE MEDIAL CAESURA (OR POTENTIAL MEDIAL CAESURA), THE STRONGER THE FORCES NEEDED TO DEFORM IT.

In considering this deformation we are presuming, on the basis of some experience with the style, that there does exist a point in the music at which the listener (rightly) concludes, however momentarily, "This is the HC-caesura point"--that is, let us assume that the HC-caesura--or something that could clearly serve as one--has been articulated. In this case, an HC-caesura may be deformed in one of two ways:

- a. Melodic/rhythmic energy continues past the presumably set-up and "announced" caesura point: this continued energy either prolongs the V or resolves it to I (in which case we also have a cadence deformation, because an anticipated--here, announced--HC has been supplanted by an unexpected, non-normative PAC). By the time the next musical phrase begins, it may be too late for that phrase to function as an unproblematic S: the music, in terms of proportion and rhetoric has passed the "point of no return."

Example: Haydn Piano Sonata No. 20 in C minor, where the expected caesura-point (III:HC) is reached at the downbeat of m. 19. But what ensues, given the proportions of the piece, is a caesura deformation: we have the V of III prolonged for an extraordinarily long time (mm. 19-26), and the succeeding phrase (mm. 26-31)--after the fermata (in m. 26)--must by that point be considered (pace Larsen) as the SW "drive to the cadence." Once we conclude this, we have also, by definition, concluded that m. 19 was not permitted to function as a medial caesura--that it was overridden, and that the two-part exposition model has been abandoned. By this point, mm. 26-27, we should realize that we are dealing with an exposition that Haydn is converting to one of the continuous

subtypes. We won't know which subtype until we come to the ensuing PAC--to see whether anything post-caential follows it.

But if the deformation does not go on for too long, it is possible for the music to "recover" and (much shaken, perhaps badly wounded) present an S-zone.

This is probably what happens in Mozart's Symphony No. 39, in E-flat, K. 543--also discussed above--after the "dieseling-down" has deformed the V:HC by leading it to what seems to be a V:PAC. This suggests the concept of "2/4 recovery." Lacking this notion, we would have to view this as an SW exposition, which seems counterintuitive here. True, S here does arrive notably late in the game; but, to judge from its rhetoric, it certainly does seem to be an S.

- b. A new phrase begins immediately; however, this phrase (at first considered the potential S) at once undercuts the strength of the HC-caesura, usually through harmonic instability and a "drive-to-cadence" effect. The classic example here is Beethoven, Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2 no. 1, where the strong III:HC-caesura is undercut by the following phrase's dominant pedal, modal mixture, and high dissonance level.

Note: the very strength of the preceding caesura necessitates the high disturbance-level of the following phrase (THE STRONGER THE CAESURA, THE STRONGER THE FORCES NEEDED TO DEFORM IT).

Another option is to begin a supposed S "in the wrong key" (for example, back in the tonic), only to have it immediately rejected as "wrong." This means that the sheer insufficiency of the once-presumed S-arrival forces us to reconsider the caesura that we have just heard. A "bad S"--if sufficiently aberrational either tonally or rhetorically--can force us conceptually to undo the presumed medial caesura ("No, I guess that wasn't it after all!"). Our term for this is retrospective deformation, implying that the medial caesura has

been articulated and interpreted as such, but that subsequent events oblige us to revise that interpretation. The usual strategy in the music immediately following such a retrospective medial-caesura deformation is to seek the "real" medial caesura as soon as possible. But clearly, at this point "time is running out," for we will soon approach the "point of no return," at which we renounce the possibility of providing a medial caesura (and hence a two-part exposition) at all.

A locus classicus occurs in Haydn's Symphony No. 103 in E-flat, "Drum Roll," first movement, mm. 59-60, where a normatively prepared I:HC (presumed) medial caesura (overlaid with 1 1/2 measures of the most rudimentary caesura-fill, static, ticking eighth notes in the oboes, sustaining elements of the dominant chord) leads to the first notes of the presumed S-theme (upbeat to m. 61, = P, as normally in Haydn), but sounded in the tonic! The tonic "S-theme" is cast aside at once by the rest of the orchestra ("No way!"), and at that point the medial cadence--along with the subsequent theme's proposed candidacy for S--is conceptually undone. Thus we set out at once to seek another medial cadence. This passage and some of the adventures that follow are also discussed below, in the considerations of ways of passing the point of no return, including "Bait-and Switch" methods (type 3).

Cf. also the first-"proposed" I:HC-caesura point in Mozart's "Haffner" Symphony, first movement, m. 35. At this point, judging on the basis of strong conventions, we expect some sort of break followed by an immediate S. Instead, we get, elided, P in inversion [!], which pulls us unequivocally back to the tonic key, D major, mm. 38-41. At this point we realize that we have been only "baited" by the explicit caesura set-up at (and just before) 35; but Mozart has "switched" his strategy immediately at the caesura-point, thus denying us the S and obliging us conceptually to "undo" the caesura effect at m. 35--and either to await a "real" S--presumably fairly soon--or to continue the elaboration

process further past the ultimate "point of no return" and into further SonataWork.)

The two examples above have either had caesura-fill plugging the caesura-gap ("Drum-Roll") or a new, elided phrase erasing the implied gap ("Haffner"). Is a retrospective deformation possible if an HC-caesura is actually reinforced by a GP--one of the strongest of caesura reinforcers? If so, this would be, a gesture reopening or nullifying the structural effect of that caesura. And indeed, such a thing is possible, if the succeeding phrase is sufficiently unstable and/or disruptive. In such a case, we would again be talking about a "retrospective deformation." We should note, though, that the caesura deformation discussed just above in Haydn's Symphony No. 103, first movement, mm. 59-60, comes close to fulfilling all of these conditions. The only difference: in this case the gap (the GP) is sonically plugged with the most innocuous of caesura-fills. This may help to explain what that fill is doing there (helping, however mildly, to undo the GP effect?).

On the other hand, if a strong HC-caesura is heard at the S-point, and if the following phrase is harmonically and tonally stable in the expected key and mode, that phrase should in most cases (as a first-level default for our judgment) be heard and understood as S. This seems obvious enough, and the problem cases arise only when what follows the presumed medial caesura is rhetorically unusual (when it does not at the moment have the rhetorical features of a typical S for that composer)--a sudden outburst of bluster, for instance, instead of the drop to piano. This does not happen often, but it does happen in some well-known pieces. Sometimes this is to be regarded as a mere S-deformation, in which S's normative (first-level-default) rhetoric is overridden for particular expressive purposes. When the evidence persuades us that this is likely to be the case, the "unusual" S-deformation should be considered as something in dialogue with the S-principle in the proper S-space.

A difficult analytical problem may emerge, however, when the "deformed" potential-S is then itself followed by a melodic event

that is clearly much more normatively delivered in S-rhetoric. The events after the caesura in Haydn's 85th Symphony, La Reine, first movement, provide the locus classicus, and that "Farewell-like" outburst after the medial caesura is probably best considered an interruption or interpolation "from outside" the sonata, as it were--especially since a perfectly normative S is soon to follow. But here the post-caesura outburst occurs, at first, in the minor dominant--that is, the expected mode itself is cancelled. Such more "obvious" cases are few and relatively easily handled.

But what about similar cases of unusual candidates for S in which the proper key and mode are retained? These are difficult and must be handled individually--and often with a full, up-front awareness of the possibility of multiple interpretations.

Example: Mozart's "Dissonance" Quartet, K. 465, first movement: the TR's concluding V:HC-caesura, m. 55, is followed by a passage of brilliant passagework (56-71, sealed off at the end with a seemingly structural V:PAC), beginning, most problematically, with a forte impulse (I) and continuing in a Fortspinnung manner that is not typical of Mozartian S-themes. And--the most important clue in this case--what follows after its V:PAC is a gavotte-like theme in more Mozart-normative S-rhetoric (72-79). On the level of rhetorical form, the vigorous 56-71 passage causes a problem, although not on the level of tonal form. Tonally, of course, this passagework does emerge from the outset in the proper key and mode, however (unlike the case, say, in Haydn's La Reine, first movement); moreover--and here is the difference--it is and remains harmonically and tonally stable, and does lead to a strong PAC sixteen bars later. From one perspective (one that particularly values rhetorical signals), one can imagine considering this a non sequitur interpolation "from outside"--prolonging TR, perhaps, though leading to a (default-level 3) PAC! (71)--especially because of that more normative "S-like" theme (72-79) that follows directly after the PAC. The case might be a delicate one to make convincingly, but provided one is aware of and sympathetic with the basics of deformation theory, it could be made. Moreover, the

case would serve to isolate the strangeness of this passage as central to this exposition (clearly, however we interpret it, Mozart must have intended us to hear it as unusual), and all of this could--and should--play into one's hermeneutic reading of the piece.

On the other hand, one could also argue that the 56-71 passagework should be regarded as S--perhaps as an S-deformation in which the typical S-rhetoric has been overridden by passagework and Fortspinnung-like vigor for some special expressive effect (as though, having once heard the normative caesura, it wanted to reopen the question of the potential for more ["SonataWork"] activity--and somehow that wish has been substituted for S.) All of this presents analytical and hermeneutic problems: To be sure, what follows is a parallel period much more S-like in nature (72-79), but if we insist on letting tonal considerations have the upper hand in this "difficult" case, the following, piano-lyrical theme would then be as C1, since it is post-caesural--the defining feature of C as a zone. In this interpretation--moving onward to hermeneutics--one might suggest that C1 retrospectively tries to recapture the flavor of the "lost" S-rhetoric.

A Note on Continuous Expositions

Now, one thing that all subtypes of the Continuous Exposition have in common is that the ongoing TR (for at the outset, we assume that this zone will be a TR) continues past the S-point, or the "point of no return" (thus forcing our reassessment of the TR as an SW precisely at the moment when that point is acknowledged as passed).

At the basis of this notion, of course, is the assumption that a knowledgeable listener (one adequate to the basic demands of the piece) would and actually does sense such a point of no return. This concept may have to be dealt with in extenso elsewhere, but for the moment we might say that sensing such a thing depends both on a solid experience of listening to many examples of the style--having

a vast inventory of normative exemplars at hand--and on the basic proportions that a composer seems to promise at or near a piece's outset (that is, how big a musical "bridge" will be spanned over empty space/time). It is important to realize that one function of the opening ideas of each sonata form is to "predict" the rhetorical proportions that we are to assume will follow: some sonatas are brief; others are monumentalized.

Once we have attained the ability to sense the proportion-to-come, though (something attainable only on the basis of experience with the style), there does come a point in the TR where we begin to expect a modulation and caesura. ("It ought to be happening at any time...") Sometimes (indeed, often) the composer will underscore this moment by making a feint in the direction of a caesura to come, then veering elsewhere. This is, above all, a favorite trick of Haydn. (See No. 2 below: "Bait and Switch.")

Now, the TR/SW can get "past" the point of no return in one of three ways:

1. SW moves past the S-point without our noticing it. In other words, we eventually come to realize that we have somehow gone past the S-point: it is now, by all reasonable standards, too late for an S theme, but we don't remember having passed by its potential moment. And the reason we don't remember it is that there was no articulation--no caesura--at the S-point. Even were we mentally to "scroll back" through the SW, we would be unable to pinpoint an S-point; the most we could say is perhaps: "Well, given the overall proportions, S should have occurred around here." But there is no S-marker--no caesura--to mark the "point of no return."
2. The Bait and Switch Tactic. Creating the expectation of a caesura by providing what sounds (unmistakably) like a drive to caesura ("We're going to get there in a bar or two! [or even a beat or two!]", but then moving away from it for more Fortspinnung or other elaboration. Just how close we get to the

precise caesura-point varies from case to case. This practice is almost invariable in mature Haydn Continuous Expositions.

In many cases we do not actually get to the caesura point proper (the strong dominant)--but the pre-cadential "baiting" gestures are nonetheless there.

In Haydn's Symphony No. 97 in C major, first movement, for example, we begin what we believe is the TR (launched by a typical forte affirmation) with the elided PAC on m. 40. This supposed TR introduces #4 in m. 47 and #1 a few bars later, m. 52: the modulation to V is perfectly normative and it would be easy to imagine a four-impulse V:HC medial caesura (four quarter notes plus two beats of rest) somewhere in the vicinity of mm. 52-53, even though the dominant is nowhere strictly "laid down." Haydn has constructed this moment of the piece to give us this feeling of normal subdivision into parts around this point. But once we are "baited" into expecting a caesura, Haydn's strategy "switches" into more Fortspinnung-style eighth- and sixteenth-notes, beginning with a circle-of-fifths spin that totally effaces the possibility of that medial caesura. After a few measures of this (say, by around mm. 57-60? or shortly thereafter?) we realize that, now past the point of no return, Haydn has renounced the medial caesura altogether: we reconceptualize what we have been hearing as SW, not TR, and we now find ourselves in a Continuous Exposition. (As it turns out, Haydn continues the high play by shortly thereafter providing a post-medial, "compensatory" HC caesura at m. 74 and leading directly into C-rhetoric (not S-rhetoric!) material at 76. We conceptualize this theme at 76 as SW^C (not C--and certainly not S), because, despite its Haydn-style C-rhetoric, the SW function should not be considered completed until it attains a PAC cadence: this occurs, most emphatically, at m. 103.⁴ The result of all this, of course, is to have produced

not a "three-part exposition" per se but an "apparent three-part exposition [P/SW/SWC]" Jens Peter Larsen, though, used this movement as one of the standard examples of what he called the three-part exposition.)

Haydn's Symphony No. 97, first movement, shares many features with Symphony No. 82 in C, "L'Ours." These the including triadic, triple-time opening theme (forte), the bait-and-switch TR/SW, and the strong post-medial caesura with succeeding SW^C. It may be that 97 was in part modeled after 82. The two works should be considered together.

Examples in Mozart? In general, Mozart strongly prefers the two-part exposition over the continuous exposition, but instances of continuous expositions--passing the "point of no return"--certainly do exist, especially in the earlier work. One particularly clear, instructive example occurs in the first movement of Symphony No. 23 in D Major, K. 181. Here TR (or what we still think is TR) begins with the reanimation of the texture at m. 31, reinforced with the forte affirmation, contrapuntal variant at 39. We shift toward V in mm. 44-45 and drive doggedly toward what we think will be the caesura point--and, in fact, that point is reached with the V of V at m. 49 (notice the characteristic 4-#4-5 motion in the bass, m. 48): one can imagine the stereotypical three "hammer blows", V:HC, in the vicinity of mm. 49 and 50, with S beginning at 51. But this does not happen. Instead, Mozart "holds open" the caesura-gap--in essence, holding the potential caesura in suspense--by prolonging V (notice the inverted pedal in the second violins, reinforced by horns and trumpets) from mm. 49-59/60. Throughout all of this we could imagine a final articulation of the caesura and an ensuing S. But at 61, with the rushing sixteenths in the first violins, Mozart abandons the notion of medial caesura and second theme: instead, without caesura, he proceeds headlong into what is clearly an SW thematic drive to cadence--explicitly showing us that the caesura-

all the way to the PAC in m. 103. What follows is a five-measure C (post-cadential) of the mere "codetta" type.

⁴ Not at m. 83: although this is certainly a PAC, what follows is a varied repetition of the SWC theme. Thematic repetitions, in effect, "undo" the PACs that precede them: they are, among other things, strategies of reopening. Here the drive of the repetition is toward a cadence in m. 91, undermined by elision. In short, we move

point has been past. The structural PAC occurs at 69 with reiterations filling in the implied GP after it. The theme at 70 is C1, repeated at 74. C2 follows at 78, and the exposition ends with the downbeat of 86. The theme at 70 occurs too late in the game to be considered S: m. 70 of 86 mm, or 81% of the way through. (Its brevity and immediate repetition also help to confirm its C-status.)

At the most extreme point of the bait-and-switch tactic--we find the dominant actually laid down and virtually at the point of solidification into the "promised," normative caesura-gap, whereupon the music slyly slips out of the loop and overrides the caesura, thus proceeding into a Continuous Exposition with SonataForm. (We convert our prediction of the exposition type at the moment of this slippage.) Haydn's String Quartet, Op. 33, No. 2, first movement, m. 19, is both the locus classicus and the ne plus ultra of this last-moment evasion. Indeed, this is so extreme that it is only a hair short--if that!--of being better classified as in No. 3 below, the case in which a caesura is actually laid down.)

3. The most extreme variant of the bait and switch--one in which the "baiting" actually articulates a medial caesura. Here TR (for we still think that it is a TR) moves to the S-point and marks it with a caesura, on either V:HC or I:HC, and then deliberately deforms that caesura somehow, so that what follows is not heard as S.

Here a serviceable example would be Haydn, Symphony No. 103, "Drum Roll," first movement. Here the events should be followed step by step. The first issue we have dealt with earlier, under "caesura deformations," but we might reconsider it here. We first get a "false" medial caesura in mm. 59-60: it is a normatively approached, second-level-default I:HC--so far, no problem--but immediately after, the oboe, upbeat to m. 61, begins to sound the first notes of a pseudo-S (= P) in the tonic, that is, in the wrong

key (whereupon Haydn immediately has the orchestra "object," mm. 61-62.) This misfired S has the effect of undoing the presumed medial caesura--because it follows a planted caesura, it is a retrospective caesura deformation). This type-3 bait-and-switch, as it turns out, is not itself sufficient to plunge us into an inexorable SW. We are not yet proportionally past the point of no return, as Haydn shows us by beginning to seek another caesura--presumably one that will stick.

Thus in the area 60-70, we are given one the impression of trying once again to crystallize out a real medial caesura (as proportional time for one is running out!), and this impression is especially strong around mm. 68-70. Haydn now "baits" a second time, but less emphatically: we don't get as close to the caesura point. (Thus this instance is actually an example of less extreme bait-and-switch tactic mentioned in the above number.) But this second, "real" caesura, as it turns out, cannot be attained, whereupon (after the body-blow diminished seventh in 71 ["Ooffff!"] and subsequent scrambling about) we realize that by now, by all standards of expositional proportion (and considering that we have been "unable" to effect either of two possible caesuras), we have definitively passed the point of no return, and everything is to be reconceptualized along the lines of a Continuous Exposition. The SW (now realized as such) continues with a thematic drive to cadence, mm. 74-79 (here, based on material from the Introduction).

Sometimes what follows the presumed caesura is not a false or misfired S but a simple SW thematic drive to the cadence. In this case, as with the more extreme versions of the bait-and-switch tactic, we are quite clear where the point of no return is--we feel it as we go by--almost like a road sign marking the "path not taken." And this is exactly where a significant part of the interplay with the 2/4 model takes place. Up to this point, the piece could easily be a two-part exposition. But we come to that fork in the road, and one sign reads "2/4 exposition" and the other

reads "SW exposition." And the road we take is determined largely by the presence or absence of a caesura deformation.

Additional Terms, Definitions

STRUCTURAL CAESURA

PART-LEVEL CAESURAS: The strongest expositional caesuras in a two-part exposition are the **MEDIAL** and **FINAL CAESURAS** (the latter sealing off the end of the exposition.) These are the most powerful types of **STRUCTURAL CAESURAS** because it is by observing them that we are able to determine with which type of exposition we are dealing. Often when one uses the term "structural caesura" casually, it is this type of caesura to which one refers.

ZONE-LEVEL CAESURAS: Another type of **STRUCTURAL CAESURA** might be used to separate one or more additional zones of the 2/4 expositional model. Sometimes, for example, P is bracketed off from TR by a caesura with full, unmistakable GP. (Example: Mozart, Symphony in G Minor, No. 25, K. 183, m. 28 (i:HC, actually marking the end of a "Sturm-und-Drang" P theme that seems prematurely to have run out of energy.). Such a caesura must be considered significantly structural, since it does separate out major zones of an exposition: such a caesura marks structure. But the presence of caesuras marking off the zones is not a necessity within any type of exposition: they may occur or they may not (usually they do not). Hence this type is of a lower structural order than the medial or final caesura.

PHRASE-LEVEL CAESURAS: An even lower type of structural caesura can occur at the phrase level. This is simply a pause (in all voices) that coincides with a PAC, IAC, or HC. We often

find them in antecedents, consequents, and so on. Since they are gaps or breaths that do articulate structure, they are **STRUCTURAL CAESURAS**. But they do not define either an expositional type or a zone type. Hence they represent the "mere" third tier of structural caesuras--unless, of course, the phrase in question is the one that produces either the medial or the final caesural

A **NON-STRUCTURAL CAESURA** is a pause (in all voices) that does not coincide with a PAC, IAC, or HC; it thus is purely rhetorical in nature, and serves momentarily to interrupt interrupt the progress of a phrase (which progress is resumed after the caesura). A non-structural caesura can thus be considered a type of "phrase deformation." Such a non-structural caesura could coincide with a DC, the DC cadence itself being considered a type of "cadence deformation"(see below) [Some examples: Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony, m. 55; or the gaps in the opening theme of Haydn's "Trauer" Symphony]. Because it falls in the middle of a phrase, A **NON-STRUCTURAL CAESURA CANNOT TERMINATE A MAJOR ZONE OF ACTIVITY, SUCH AS SW OR S.**

Issues of Cadence within Expositions

A **SIMPLE CADENCE** is a non-elided PAC, IAC, or HC that does not involve a caesura. In other words, the following phrase begins on the next beat with no pause.

A **CADENCE DEFORMATION** may involve one or two phrases, and usually is built around an expected PAC:

1. Single-phrase deformations:

- a. The expected PAC is undercut in some way (perhaps by a DC, but not necessarily); the phrase is extended past the expected cadence point, but eventually does reach a PAC. The promise is kept, but the delivery is late.
- b. The expected PAC is undercut in some way (perhaps by a DC, but not necessarily); the phrase is extended past the expected cadence point, and eventually terminates in either a true HC or a "hanging" V⁷ chord--the opposite of what was originally promised! [N.B.: A single-phrase deformation may be emphasized through the use of a non-structural caesura!]

2. Double-phrase deformations:

- a. The expected PAC is elided with the beginning of the next phrase, but the cadence itself is not weakened or undercut. The onset of the next phrase, however, may be made the focus of attention through dynamics, instrumentation, etc. (cf. the generic forte affirmation that often begins a symphonic TR).
- b. The expected PAC is elided with the beginning of the next phrase, but the cadence itself is weakened or undercut in some way (register, dynamics, texture, etc.). A common trick is to draw out the cadential chords (perhaps by interspersing them with rests) and to begin the new phrase (which provides the final tonic of the previous phrase) with a new texture, thematic idea, dynamic, etc. THIS SHOULD NOT BE CONFUSED WITH THE HC SET-UP FOR AN S THEME.

Normally, a repeated HC or PAC does not constitute a cadence deformation; such repetition serves merely to extend the phrase (an expected strong caesura following such a repeated cadence may be deformed, however). But if, for example, a repeated PAC were

eventually to lead to a HC, one could consider that the original PAC had been deformed, if only in retrospect.

Typical Defaults for the Principal Exposition Types:

THE 2/4 EXPOSITION (centering period): (P + TR) + (S + C)

1. P may or may not end with a strong structural caesura (on PAC or HC). Often it is elided with the beginning of TR (cadence deformation 2.a).
2. TR typically ends with a strong structural caesura on V:HC or I:HC (medial caesura). This may be subjected to a caesura deformation.
3. S typically ends V:PAC, but may or may not end with a strong structural caesura. Its V:PAC may be subjected to a cadence deformation (e.g., an elision with C).
4. C typically ends with a strong structural caesura (final caesura) on V:PAC. This may be subjected to cadential and/or caesura deformation (e.g., involving a retransition back to the repeat or into the Development, an elision with the repeat or the Development, etc.).

THE CONTINUOUS EXPOSITION WITH POST-CADENTIAL C (centering period):
P + SW + C (often producing an "apparent three-part exposition")

1. P may or may not end with a strong structural caesura (on PAC or HC). Often it is elided with the beginning of SW (cadence deformation).

2. SW typically ends V:PAC, but may or may not end with a strong structural caesura. Its V:PAC may be subjected to a cadence deformation (e.g., an elision with C).
3. C typically ends with a strong structural caesura on V:PAC. This may be subjected to cadential and/or caesura deformation (e.g., involving a retransition back to the repeat or into the Development, an elision with the repeat or the Development, etc.).

THE CONTINUOUS EXPOSITION WITH NO SIGNIFICANT POST-CADENTIAL MATERIAL (centering period): P + SW

1. P may or may not end with a strong structural caesura (on PAC or HC). Often it is elided with the beginning of SW (cadence deformation).
2. SW typically ends with a strong structural caesura on V:PAC. This may be subjected to cadential and/or caesura deformation (e.g., involving a retransition back to the repeat or into the Development, an elision with the repeat or the Development, etc.).

Expositional Themes and Cadences

William Rothstein differentiates between cadential themes (those that lead to the first PAC in the new key) and closing themes (those that follow the first PAC in the new key). This distinction, however valuable, might be slightly improved, because it switches without acknowledgement from tonal function ("cadential" theme) to rhetorical function ("closing" theme). As it now stands, we would prefer to distinguish between a cadential theme and a post-cadential theme, on the tonal track; on the rhetorical track, these would normally be called S and C, and with each of the major composers

there are characteristic S- and C-rhetoric strategies that are of central importance in assessing the thematic material that they have presented to us. As might be expected, tonal and rhetorical tracks sometimes diverge.

To keep confusions from abounding, it is best, and certainly most efficient, to consider S as cadential; it is set-up with an HC, and by this definition its function (an extremely important one) is to lead to the first PAC in the new key. In this sense, S is simply defined as that "specialized theme" (with S-rhetoric) after the caesura that confirms and solidifies the new key with a perfect authentic cadence. S thus shoulders a tremendous responsibility. Thus in most cases--to keep things simple--S's tonal function is coextensive with its rhetorical function. In most cases such a definition will present no analytical problems.

Let us put the definition in slightly different words: normally, as a first-level interpretive default--and excluding for the moment the instances in which we find a strong overriding of normative S-rhetoric--S is that expositional portion from the medial caesura to the first PAC, barring immediate thematic repetitions and the like. Trying to define the rhetorical-S in this way seems not only justified for its own sake, but it also simplifies the conceptual overlay of tonal and rhetorical tracks (which we would never wish to diverge unnecessarily--without sufficient reason). This manner of defining S seems preferable to the older, and vaguer, notion of "second thematic group," in which one could conceptually extend an S past several PACs and through several different themes, though not according to any clear principle to distinguish it from the onset of a "closing group."

Moreover, it seems both more historically accurate to define S in this "first-cadential" way, and it is also more in touch with current music-theoretical (and Schenkerian) principles. William Rothstein's recent discussion of this conception of S is exemplary. There are more nuances to all of this than are cited below, but here are some key extracts:

Both [Koch and Reicha] distinguish sharply between any passages preceding the first perfect cadence in the goal key of the exposition and any passages following that cadence. . . . Following the reasoning of these older theorists, we will term as closing theme, or in some cases codetta, only the suffix or suffixes to the exposition--that is, only those portions of the second group following the first strongly articulated perfect cadence in the goal key. . . .

Analyzing the second group on the basis of its closing cadence does not entirely relieve the analyst of ambiguities, because there may be some question as to which of two or three cadences is the closing cadence. Normally, it is the first perfect cadence in the key of the second group. However, there may be a series of perfect cadences, each one stronger than the last. In such cases it is still usually best to identify the first of the series as the closing cadence, even if . . . the cadential note in the melody is omitted. The cadences that come later may be considered reinforcements of the closing cadence; their purpose is often to satisfy some element of closure left incomplete in the closing cadence itself. . . .

Emphasis on the first perfect cadence in the second group as the critical point in the its form corresponds closely to the ideas of Koch and Reicha. It also conforms to the usual analytical practice of Schenker.⁵

Now, when S is itself preceded with a PAC medial caesura (Default 3 in a 2/4 exposition), it is stripped of this responsibility; it becomes merely post-cadential. Its own PAC is redundant. What is the expressive effect of thus stripping S of its birthright, so to speak? To say that the first PAC was merely a motion into an inner voice, and that the linear Zug has not yet

descended, might be interpreted as a desperate attempt on the part of the Schenkerians to restore to S its normally cadential function--its birthright. But it may be that the ploy is misplaced. At any rate, this must be carefully rethought: it remains a significant conceptual problem to be addressed.

Apparently, C is always, by definition, set-up with a PAC; it is thus always post-cadential. As we have suggested elsewhere, the post-cadential C can vary widely, from the status of a mere tag or "codetta," to a full-scale separate theme, to a lengthy series of separate themes. Although its "rhetorical" responsibility might prove to be of immense significance, C shoulders no strong "tonal-structural" responsibility, other than that of marking time (thus providing some sort of proportional balance to the rhetoric), exuberantly celebrating the attainment of the new key (as with Mozart's occasional razzle-dazzle, expanded C areas, for example--and most extraordinarily--in the first movement of his "Paris" Symphony, No. 31), or "merely" reinforcing the new key with further cadences, and so on. The main sonata-task has been accomplished (and has been concluded by S).

But what about SW^C in a Continuous Exposition with delayed, compensatory caesura (Haydn, Symphonies 82, 97, first movements)? In this case, a theme with closing-style rhetoric (C-rhetoric) is made to shoulder an unaccustomed burden: it must lead to the first PAC in the new key. What is the expressive effect of taking an idea that would normally be post-cadential, and forcing upon it a cadential function? This, too, needs to be carefully considered.

Thus: S is normally cadential; but it sometimes is demoted to post-cadential status. C is always post-cadential. SW^C represents a normally post-cadential rhetorical idea that is forced to be cadential. And a final question, yet to be resolved: can the PAC that always terminates S and always precedes C ever be overridden? That is, can we conceive of a cadence deformation that would strip S of its cadential power and force C to become cadential? Or is this impossible in view of the way in which we have defined S and C? All this remains to be ironed out.

⁵ Rothstein, *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*, pp. 116-17.