
 JAMES A. HEPOKOSKI

 SONATA THEORY, SECONDARY THEMES AND CONTINUOUS EXPOSITIONS:
 DIALOGUES WITH FORM-FUNCTIONAL THEORY

In their engaging essay in this issue, William E. Caplin and Nathan John Martin have demonstrated that what Sonata Theory's analytical approach regards as a continuous exposition – and certainly the touchstone cases of it from Haydn and Mozart cited in *Elements of Sonata Theory* – can be translated into the form-functional concept of transition/subordinate-theme fusion. Of that, of course, there had never been any doubt: the groundwork for it had been laid out in Caplin's trailblazing *Classical Form* of 1998. Were it only a matter of wording, one might imagine that his analytical method might be willing to accept 'continuous exposition' as a shorthand way of describing such blurred-boundary cases ('What is produced thereby is what Sonata Theory calls a continuous exposition'). Or, conversely, one might imagine proponents of Sonata Theory acknowledging (as I do) that when form-functional theory observes mid-expositional blurred boundaries, we see why that approach does so, although we go on to embrace the term 'continuous exposition' in order to identify the resulting expositional format as rhetorically and expressively notable.

While all this is evident and opens the door for a long-overdue *rapprochement* between the two systems, the larger implication of Caplin and Martin's article is that, for the repertory in question, form-functional terminology carries such explanatory heft as to displace any need for Sonata Theory's formulation. The form-functional method can dismiss the continuous-exposition concept, since what the term designates is handily managed without going outside its own system. The sticking point must be that 'continuous exposition' is not a neutral descriptor. On the contrary, along with 'medial caesura' and Sonata Theory's understanding of a 'secondary theme', the term carries a pressing connotational load with regard to how Classical sonata form might most profitably be construed. The same can be said of form-functional theory's preferred descriptors. In both cases, individual words or catchphrases are the workable, sometimes blunt surface categories generated out of a more intricate sub-structural network of grounding conceptions. Using the one term ('continuous exposition') rather than either of the others ('blurred boundaries' or 'form-functional fusion') can trigger an implied resonance with the deeper convictions that gave rise to the term in the first place. And so, shrugging away the discrepancy as reducible to terminology alone can mask the divergent conceptions that generated each approach's wordings, charged terminological

signals that orientate readers to the manner in which each system reads the structural roles of the passages at hand.

The larger differences lie in our foundational concepts, and it might as well be admitted from the start that by now neither side is likely to obtain a theoretical monopoly that bars attention to what the other side is saying. Although divergent in some respects (by no means in all), both approaches have much to contribute to our understanding of Classical form. They provide us with different sets of analytical tools appropriate for addressing often different types of analytical questions. (I have gained much from the form-functional system, which acutely sharpens our perception with regard to questions of thematic grouping and harmonic function.) To engage in a real conversation between the two systems is to seek to understand the reasons that each side construes things as it does. Rather than dwelling only on conflicting perceptual analyses of selected passages ('They see it *that* way, but I see it *this* way' – as with the psychologist Joseph Jastrow's rabbit-duck figure) – it may be more productive to reflect on the conceptual roots of some of those differences.

The present essay began as a public response to Caplin and Martin's 'Continuous Exposition' paper and still bears some features of that reply: a clarification and defence of Sonata Theory's views on these topics, along with some alternative readings of the pieces in question. Since that inception as a conference-keynote *pièce d'occasion*, however, the response has grown into something more generalised. What follows is less a point-by-point reply than a complementary essay that spends some time on the pivotal issues on which discussions of continuous exposition and secondary theme hang. From my vantage point these include: Sonata Theory's understanding of later eighteenth-century expositions as successions of spatially articulated, generic action-zones, each of which has a distinct structural role to play; our differing concepts of 'theme'; the not uncommon presence within continuous expositions of what Sonata Theory regards as 'thematically profiled drives to a V:PAC' (not secondary themes *per se*); and the three potential structural functions of the first mid-expositional V:PAC within major-mode expositions (one of which can be to serve as a medial caesura preceding a secondary theme proper).

What follows explores the conceptual underpinnings of our apparent divergences and also presents some updated thinking within Sonata Theory – not with the aim of establishing some sort of temporary dominion over the debate, but seeking only to clarify our understanding of how and perhaps why the two approaches differ. In short, it seeks to facilitate a more productive conversation between them.

I start with a point of agreement. In Caplin and Martin's essay, and in Caplin's recent writings on Classical form, the authors agree both that such things as medial caesuras exist and that one can locate large numbers of expositions featuring a medial caesura (MC) in their interiors. They also agree that we are sometimes presented with expositions of the kind that Sonata Theory identifies

as the first type of continuous exposition. (Warren Darcy and I distinguish two types [2006, pp. 51–64].) But here is where the differences set in. One aspect of Caplin and Martin's argument is that any *structural* distinctions that we might wish to make between two-part expositions with an explicitly articulated MC and those blurred-boundary cases that lack one are problematic. From the form-functional perspective, such distinctions do not impinge on basic questions of form, because all of these expositional variants, including the two-part instances, accomplish the same syntactic-functional thing: the ordered attainment of certain generically specified cadences (some of which, such as instances of blurred boundaries, might not be achieved within an individual exposition). Within that approach a medial caesura, while sometimes rhetorically clarifying, is irrelevant to the question of whether or not a subordinate theme exists. In the form-functional approach such a theme is conceived as a subordinate-theme *function* – one functional purpose of which is to move towards a non-tonic PAC – and every normative exposition will contain at least one.¹

At the basis of such a reading is an appeal to a grounding principle, 'local harmonic progression', which in turn is a major factor in the assessment of the thematic formal functions and grouping structures that are at the centre of the system.² More expansive forms are built by linking together smaller units that display intrathematic (or phrase) functions, especially beginning, middle and ending functions (which functions are sometimes supplemented by others – 'before the beginning' and 'after the end' – and are also applicable to larger-scale, interthematic [or simply thematic] relationships). Markus Neuwirth (2011, p. 201) has aptly characterised this concept of form as a 'bottom-up' approach.³ Needless to say, that approach has a distinguished pedigree. The analytical commitment to reading a larger structure, such as an exposition, 'from below' resonates sympathetically with Heinrich Christoph Koch's late eighteenth-century concept of form. It is also compatible with much mid-twentieth-century form theory – that of Schoenberg, Ratz, Ratner and others – which considered internal motivic and/or thematic ('generative') burgeoning and harmonic articulation to be the most telling determinants of what we should mean by musical form, thus subordinating to them other musical parameters (thematic character, rhetorical and generic disposition, positional placement of ideas, rhythm, texture, dynamics, and the like).

Sonata Theory is also attentive to questions of thematic grouping and the expected expositional paths of cadential attainment (or non-attainment); but into those vital issues it blends a 'top-down' perspective additionally concerned with thematic content (in the more traditional sense of 'theme', giving weight to the self-identifying aspects of normative thematic beginnings), with spatial-block or 'action-zone' construals of expositions, with ongoing dialogues with culturally established generic defaults, and with the structural potential of other rhetorical factors within an exposition. Whether one favours the 'top-down' over the 'bottom-up' approach, or perhaps seeks a creative back-and-forth shuttling between the two, is a matter of both personal choice (analytical comfort or

familiarity) and the relevance of each approach to the pursuit of the formal or interpretative question at hand.

The Medial Caesura and Secondary Theme: Clarification and Update

Since the secondary-theme guideline laid down in *Elements of Sonata Theory* has become something of a waved red flag, it is prudent to begin by taking a closer look at it. Here's one version: 'If there is no MC, there is no S. If there is no medial caesura, we are confronting not a two-part exposition but a continuous exposition for which the concept of S is inappropriate' (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, p. 117).⁴ About this admittedly strong dictum there are some things to clarify – and, a decade later, to update.

No matter how unequivocal that isolated passage appears when plucked out of context, it was never our intention to insist upon it as binding in all cases. This declaration is not an instance of cautious, after-the-fact hedging. At the heart of the analytical procedures proposed in the *Elements* is the repeated conviction that no standard norm, no rule or guideline, is to be rigidly enforced. In free-compositional practice, no default or norm is inviolable. All are capable of being exceptionally treated, cleverly obscured or deformationally overridden. This is made clear in the footnote immediately appended to that statement: 'Any exception to this principle – a self-evident S that is not prepared by a clear MC (and that must be judged as an S for other compelling reasons) – should be regarded as both highly unusual and deformational'; and we go on to cite the secondary theme of the finale of Beethoven's Eighth Symphony as an example (2006, p. 117 n. 1).⁵ Moreover, the possibility of potential S-themes not prepared by a clear MC had also been dealt with in the *Elements* in an earlier, little-noticed section of the chapter on the medial caesura, the section called 'Troubleshooting MC Identifications' (pp. 48–50), which adduced a number of examples, particularly under the category of 'an overriding of the norm – a medial caesura deformation', even though 'unequivocal S themes lacking a preceding MC are very rare'. The Sonata Theory approach is keen to notice and register non-normative, unprepared entrances of intuitively clear S-ideas, for it is an awareness of the norm that invites us to perceive and explicate the exceptions.⁶ Within the larger context of the *Elements*, what the statement of 'no MC, no S' sought to do was succinctly and memorably to articulate an extraordinarily strong norm that is nearly always applicable and about which one should think long and hard before overriding.

Scattered liberally throughout our book, such caveats urge us not to fall captive to any logic that insists that uncommonly strong norms are commands to which we must never admit exceptions. Instead, they are to be understood as steering us towards a recognition of creative realisations – including non-realizations, which can bring with them a pronounced degree of ambiguity along with a legitimate potential for alternative hearings. Imaginative flexibility and an aversion to any

dogged adherence to supposedly inviolable analytical categories: these are two of the driving principles that animate the Sonata Theory project.⁷ That project sought to be an engaging mode of flexible inquiry, a dialogic, hermeneutic endeavour in search of musically satisfying, historically and contextually sensitive readings of compositional choices.

Now, several years after the publication of the *Elements*, I also welcome the concept of medial caesuras that are implied as such but are acoustically ‘composed over’ – a tweaking or filling-out, perhaps, of the familiar concept of caesura-fill. For an example of this (and here I rethink an example described differently in the *Elements*), consider Caplin and Martin’s Ex. 2, the opening Allegro of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E_b major, Hob. XVI:52.⁸ In this movement the transition (TR) begins in bar 9 and leads to a half cadence at bar 14, followed by three bars over V (Ratz’s and Caplin’s ‘standing on the dominant’) along with a seemingly self-evident secondary theme at bar 17. (At least it appears to be self-evident, since it deploys Haydn’s characteristic P-based S.) But is there really no medial-caesura gesture here? To be sure, the texture appears to be continuous – in both hands – and there is no literal gap to be found, but on a more attentive hearing one can sense the gesturing at an MC on the downbeat of bar 16. With Sonata Theory’s foundational concept of dialogic form in mind, one might say that bar 16 is manifestly ‘in dialogue’ with more generically normative treatments of the MC moment. And by this advanced state of the genre, Haydn might be inviting us to understand that, in this case, the mere gesture towards it is being made to suffice. What is clear is that the reiterative approach to it in the preceding two bars (bars 14–15) is formulaically typical: beats 2, 3 and 4 of bar 16 sound much like a composed-over or chordal caesura-fill, particularly in the drifting upper-voice chromatic descent f²–e²–e^{b2} drifting into bar 17 and the secondary theme in B_b major. We might also note the decrescendo below those three beats in bar 16 – notationally signalling the characteristic energy loss associated with caesura-fill. In sum, Haydn masks the MC reference in bar 16, but once it is pointed out, one can readily hear it this way.⁹

The Exposition as a Succession of Action-Zones

The MC-S guideline is not an absolute rule; rather, it is heuristically definitional. As we were carrying out the research for the *Elements*, Darcy and I became convinced that the most musically responsive decision was to define S as *that type of typically contrasting thematic material in a new key that is normally (almost always) signalled by the presence of a preceding medial caesura (MC) or deformation thereof*.¹⁰ Why do we regard the MC as so important? The topic is labyrinthine in its historical and structural complications, and within the limits of this essay I can neither treat it fully nor deck it out with copious examples. Still, by way of providing a general orientation it might be helpful to sketch out a way of thinking basic to Sonata Theory, one that differs from that of form-functional

theory and one that led us to regard the MC as a significant structural factor within mid- to late eighteenth-century expositions (and often, residually, for many decades beyond). For the present purposes I provide a newly formulated thumbnail outline of current convictions – hypotheses, if you like. Together they provide a more explicitly articulated foundation for Sonata Theory’s analytical perspective.

- Within instrumental works, particularly sonatas and symphonies, the expositional medial caesura, certainly by the 1750s and in a handful of influential musical circles, had become a culturally accepted musical signal, an optional but generic mark of reinforced rhetorical punctuation.¹¹ While not restricted to Allegro movements, it was notably developed and recognisable in them, where it was often presented as the final, emphatically articulated goal of a dominant-lock (Caplin’s ‘standing on the dominant’). An MC declares the compositional intention rhetorically to divide what we now call an exposition into two distinct parts. The first part comprises the initial thematic idea and the drive to the MC – the primary theme and transition (P-TR); the second part normatively begins in a non-tonic area with the ‘new idea’ or ‘restart’ impression provided by the launch of a characteristically marked secondary theme (S) that, following an adequate cadential close, might or might not be followed by subsequent closing material (C). The MC exists to lay down the mid-expositional effect of a rhetorical stop or expectant breath. Its structural role, Part 1 having been brought to a dramatic close, is now to shift the scene to what one expects will be the arrival of the new-key thematic entry that begins Part 2, which itself, normatively, will also conclude with a strong, clearly defined break.
- Within an exposition thus constructed, the medial and final caesuras serve as that exposition’s two *hard breaks*. In terms of dramatised punctuation (to use Koch’s language), they provide the most pronounced ‘degree[s] of rest’ (*Grad[e] der Ruhe*) or the most sensorially experienced ‘principal resting points of the mind (or spirit)’ (*Hauptruhepunkte des Geistes*).¹² By the last third of the eighteenth century – and perhaps especially (but by no means exclusively) in orchestral compositions – both rhetorical hard breaks are strongly normative: the final caesura from the beginning of the *galant* sonata’s origins, and the medial caesura increasingly after mid-century, with its more expanded ‘expositions’. Still, neither was ever mandatory. From time to time, for particular discursive effects, a composer could decide not to set one or both of them into place. Instead, either or both could be smoothed over or erased, bypassing the option of the increasingly deployed punctuational gap – driving the music through and past the generic moments of its possibility. In those cases in which the first of the potential hard breaks, the medial caesura, is unarticulated, declined, evaded or undone, that absence could strike the listener as marked. This

would be especially the case within a (post–circa 1760) cultural horizon of expectations in which the exposition with MC had grown to become an ever more common strategy – a first-level default. Under such conditions of production and reception, the absence of an MC could be registered as a marked structural and expressive aspect of that exposition.

- When did the medial caesura become historically available as a common compositional device? At present, this is unclear. One might suppose that, as an emerging and optional feature in certain sonatas and symphonies of the 1740s and 1750s, the MC + S strategy probably arose out of a desire to produce a grander rhetorical expansion and internal expressive contrast within the first half of a typical binary format. It is possible that this may have been a more attractive effect within orchestral music than within sonatas or chamber music, though that issue remains to be investigated. In the 1740s and 1750s, then, this kind of temporal extension may have arisen as an alternative to the perhaps more challenging enterprise of expansion within a purely *Fortspinnung*-based exposition or one based on a simple concatenation of differing modules – which types of exposition nonetheless continued to persist alongside the sleeker, presumably more modern two-part model.
- The MC's immediate effect was to partition an otherwise through-composed exposition into what Sonata Theory identifies as two parts and four action-zones, {P TR}'{S/C} – assuming that closing material (C) is present. This must have marked an important conceptual shift in how a sonata exposition could be constructed. Separated by that often dramatised gap in the centre, the two parts invited different, positionally appropriate musical treatments of these two structurally distinct *spatial* areas, each of which, in turn, was potentially, perhaps inevitably, subdivisible. With their broader rhetorical arcs and dramatic energy shapes, the two parts and four zones came to be an increasingly common way of constructing a sonata exposition. It rapidly became an internalised, broad-scale script or schema.¹³
- By at least the last third of the eighteenth century, if not earlier, the MC-induced partition of an exposition into distinct action-zones effected a conceptual merger of the older concept of formal process as a linear proceeding through an ordered set of harmonic or cadential stations with an implicit 'zonal' three- or four-stage concept of expositional rhetoric. The 'bottom-up' or 'journey' view of expositional composition is relatable to Koch's four 'principal resting points' of what we now call a sonata-form exposition (his 'first section' or 'first period'): a tonic-key, authentic-cadence *Grundabsatz*, two half-cadence *Quintabsätze* (one in I and one in V), and one dominant-key PAC *Schlußsatz*, with any music beyond the *Schlußsatz* regarded as an *Anhang* (appendix) or, if extended, an *erklärende Periode*.¹⁴ But once an MC had been placed in the centre of the exposition, this 'bottom-up' understanding, this directed,

moment-by-moment unfolding towards the generically proper cadence, could now also be construed as ‘top-down’ when considered from the perspective of the normative expectations imposed by the generically standardised rhetorical configuration of the whole – the exposition spatially and schematically pre-envisaged as a ready-at-hand action-zone format.¹⁵ This reconceptualisation resulted in a potentially ambiguous figure: the ‘bottom-up’ rabbit, in a real sense still there, was now capable of being perceptually flipped into a ‘top-down’ duck.

- It seems likely that by mid-century what composers were often confronting in the task of structural planning was a conceptual merger of what Koch described as a harmonic-linear journey with the de facto two-part, four-stage zonal format. The zonal concept was easy to overlay on the tonal-journey concept. It could happen almost automatically, perhaps even below the threshold of (or need for) conscious formulation: the MC-occasioned, zonal-architectonic concept had the cadential-station journey practice built into it. It did not so much replace the cadential-journey concept – much less invalidate it – as incorporate it into what would become a more spatially oriented practice, which thereafter carried its own implications for execution and modification. In this more schematic approach, one compositional challenge was to proceed successively through each of the four expositional zones, {P TR}’{S/C} – in that sense recasting the concept of a journey – realising each of them with engaging, action-space-appropriate material. (The music within these smaller, zonal levels often responds well to Caplin’s concept of intrathematic (or phrase) functions and thematic groupings: beginnings, middles, ends, and so on.) Ultimately, it is zone theory, which includes a willingness to acknowledge exceptional zonal treatments, that helps us to grasp seemingly self-evident secondary themes that are not prepared by clear medial caesuras.
- Not all eighteenth- and nineteenth-century expositions feature an MC effect. Normally, we call those that do not ‘continuous’. Most continuous expositions are heirs to the older, more traditional practice of through-composition or thematic-modular concatenation. Sonata Theory recognises that from the 1740s and 1750s there exist a number of cases that fall in between these two options: lighter mid-expositional cadential (HC) breaks – or even gaps – followed by what might be regarded as insufficiently new or characteristic thematic material.¹⁶ Especially in the 1740s and 1750s, the later, seemingly binary opposition between a continuous and two-part exposition is anything but absolute. Consequently – and above all for these earlier repertoires – one might imagine something along the lines of a continuum of MC + S clarity. Still, at least by the last three decades of the eighteenth century, and especially in the hands of the mature Haydn, Mozart and early and middle Beethoven, the relative smoothness of that continuum had undergone an aesthetically magnetic pull, drawing much of centre-space options towards the extremes – leaving that space considerably

less populated with examples and encouraging those ‘ambiguous’ examples increasingly to be read as in dialogue with the extremes. What was once a generous continuum of possibilities (in the linear ‘bottom-up journey’) had largely given way to a set of expositional options more profitably construed as a separation into two broad and flexible types: those deploying the MC articulation (‘two-part expositions’), which was by now far more common, and those that chose not to do so (‘continuous expositions’), thereby producing a largely unbroken, at times breathless, rhetorical flow.

- From the zonal perspective, the first step in grasping a two-part sonata exposition is to understand in which action-space one participates at any given point and what the generic (rhetorical and harmonic) limits and purposes of that action-space are. In normative cases it is inappropriate to suggest that S material, whose definitional role from this vantage point is to open Part 2, sets forth towards the end of pre-MC TR-space, particularly since any such posited pre-MC S material will soon lead to a pronounced caesura-gap (the MC proper), and what follows that gap is likely to bear the thematic, tonal and rhetorical characteristics of the opening of a secondary theme typical for the composer at hand.
- Particularly in Allegro compositions, the MC’s mid-expositional bravura is a decisive rhetorical gesture, all the more so if it is set up by one of the stylised, immediately recognisable terminal gestures ending a dominant-lock (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 30–4). Although the MC, literally construed, is the caesura-gap following the end-of-TR set-up, that set-up is a major factor in our perception of it. As such, the MC proper – the gap – is described according to the harmonic or cadential procedures through which it is prepared and executed: the concluding portion of TR that participates in its projection.
- The expositional MC is usually built around a half cadence (I:HC MC + S or V:HC MC + S) or dominant arrival, although, especially (but not exclusively) in the 1750s and 1760s, an exposition could also feature a medial caesura articulated by a perfect authentic cadence (V:PAC MC + S). In the recapitulation this option can emerge as I:PAC MC + S. Thus the beginning of a secondary theme (the opening of the exposition’s Part 2) could be prepared by a perfect authentic cadence, and that PAC MC (pre-S) may be preceded by a set of thematically grouped, zone-concluding modules characterised below as not as S but rather as a *thematically profiled drive to cadence*. The harmonically problematic potential for the PAC MC + S option persisted into the last third of the eighteenth century, though it became less and less frequent. Nonetheless, numerous examples of it may be located in Haydn, Mozart, and others. I return to the issue of the PAC MC + S at the end of this essay.
- In most ‘classical’ cases – assuming that the composition at hand is in dialogue with the persistent high-*galant* norms in place by the mid-century

decades and mostly uncontested for the rest of the century – an exposition's Part 1 should be understood as sufficiently concluding with characteristic musical signals before Part 2 space can be opened with S. The MC is the clearest indicator that Part 1 (and thus TR) has been provided with a positionally apposite ending, one that also serves as a preparatory upbeat or expectant breath for what the listener assumes is likely to follow: a launch of the new key and secondary theme. If, within this repertory, Part 1 does not display a clear ending, it is normally the case that a Part 2 (or S) cannot emerge. We are then to understand that we are dealing with a continuous exposition.

- For this reason Sonata Theory's concept of a secondary theme within the high-*galant* style is wedded to that of the two-part exposition, for in all normative (non-deformational) instances – that is to say, in almost all instances – its central functional role is to begin the second part by *accepting* the offered medial caesura as such. This understanding of a secondary theme makes one's perception of the structural sections and thematic and formal processes of an exposition clear, precise and, I believe, musically intuitive.¹⁷
- It may also happen that the presentation of an MC offer might be *declined* by the music that follows, which would keep the transition open (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 45–7). It is therefore essential that what we are to regard as S begin in a new, non-tonic key with a sense of a genuine thematic onset following the Part 1 rhetorical closure effected by the MC. This is an extraordinarily strong first-level default. Within Sonata Theory guidelines the beginning of S should provide the listener with a thematic salience, an unmistakable sense of a refreshed turning towards a new idea – something different from what we have been hearing in the bars immediately preceding.¹⁸ This concept of a secondary theme expects it to be more than a merely initiatory, en route recasting of modules and motives already established as in progress. To be sure, that 'new-idea' onset may not always bear the signs of an initiating function in Caplin's terms: it may begin with what the form-functional approach regards as a continuation function or even a closing function. However it begins, it should strike the listener as *rhetorically initiatory* – a turning towards a new thematic idea, nearly always after the action-zone process of TR has been brought to an end with a medial caesura.
- In seeking to locate the onset of S, one should be capable of distinguishing between a thematic grouping's *harmonic function* and its *rhetorical function* (its signs of post-MC 'new-idea' initiation as outlined above). Normally these two functions are synchronised. On occasion, however, they are not, as when, following an MC, S starts over V, begins as a sequence or can be construed from its beginning as an expanded cadential progression.

When Does a Transition Featuring a Dominant-Lock and MC End?

As emerges from Caplin and Martin's reading of the exposition of Mozart's K. 458/i (and elsewhere in their essay), one of the matters relevant to the continuous-exposition question is that of where a transition may be said to end. While the outlines of the Sonata Theory viewpoint are evident from the preceding pages, it is worth a brief excursus to highlight this issue for further consideration.

Consider, then, a common situation within broad-scale expositions. (For simplicity's sake I refer throughout to major-mode situations as well as to those cases in which S accepts, rather than declines, a medial-caesura offer.) This is the normative state of affairs where a transition drives towards a half cadence or dominant arrival, then continues with a prolonging passage over that V – a location-specialised variant of what Gjerdingen, following Joseph Riepel, calls the 'Ponte' schema (2007, pp. 197–216).¹⁹ It usually produces a medial caesura at its end – a literal or implied gap – followed by a normatively viable secondary theme in the new key. Following Erwin Ratz, Caplin calls the prolonging passage a 'standing on the dominant'; Sonata Theory calls it a 'dominant-lock'. The form-functional view is that the transition attains syntactic-structural closure – that is, it ends – at the moment of the HC or dominant arrival. As Caplin and Martin put it near the conclusion of their essay (p. 00): 'In fact, the medial caesura has *no essential form-functional consequences*: it is neither responsible for ending the transition (that is the role of the HC), nor is it a necessary condition for the existence of a subordinate theme (that is the role of the theme's constituent phrase functions).'

Elsewhere Caplin has noted that there are relevant nuances in cases where a standing on the dominant is present. In his article 'The Classical Cadence', he observed that while the transition (*function*) is considered to be complete with the HC 'cadential event', this subsequent extension is to be regarded as a 'postcadential event that still logically groups with the [preceding] formal unit as [a] whole' (2004, p. 57 n. 15). Caplin also distinguishes between 'ending' and 'stopping': the syntactic ending of the transition is located at the half cadence, and its rhetorical stopping (its 'moment of rhythmic/textural closure') at the medial caesura (p. 100; more generally, pp. 97–103 and 106–12). Similarly, from his textbook *Analyzing Classical Form*: '[I]t is important to distinguish between [such transitions'] *structural* end and their *literal* end. The former arises with the moment of half cadence or dominant arrival; the latter occurs just before the entrance of the subordinate theme and is often associated with a medial caesura' (2013, p. 336).²⁰

On this view, transitions can provide us with two endings, albeit in two different registers of closure. Since the 'literal end' is only a post-cadential suffix (or *Anhang*), it plays only an 'after-the-end' role, one to which form-functional theory does not grant a determinatively structural status. Still, notwithstanding the post-cadential material's after-the-end syntactic-functional role (which often

terminates with an MC), in at least some respects it does serve as an ‘end’, the point in time at which the ‘rhythmic/textural’ elements or thematic-grouping constituents at hand ‘stop’. Thus the form-functional approach also understands a transition with V-lock and MC (considered in terms of thematic grouping or other ‘rhythmic/textural’ factors) as something not entirely dissimilar to the action-zone model of it proposed by Sonata Theory, though of course in such cases the MC is not considered as anything like Sonata Theory’s guideline for the determination of an S.

Sonata Theory’s zone-theory interpretation of these events gives more structural weight to the dominant-lock and MC. From this point of view the dominant-lock’s functional role is to serve as a rhetorical sign of the generic acceptance and ratification of the preceding half cadence – a sign that the composer, having driven the music to the half-cadential harmonic goal, is now pushing the musical process to what is expected to be the transition-zone’s last phase, one that unequivocally ends the exposition’s first part. In this scenario the half cadence or dominant arrival serves as a trigger propelling that same dominant, now secured and on track, towards the anticipated medial-caesura offer and subsequent secondary theme. So long as that lock persists, it also suggests that, as a coherent action-zone, the transition should not normally be considered to be complete – and that a secondary theme cannot normally emerge – until that MC mission is successfully carried out.

Sonata Theory’s way of hearing this, then, is that, far from being over and done with at the moment of its arrival, the half cadence is held on to, sustained, prolonged: we have the effect of a single harmonic ending dramatically diffused over several bars.²¹ We certainly understand why form-functional theory regards a dominant-lock as having an ‘after-the-end’ or *Anhang* function – which from the ‘bottom-up’ point of view it does – but would also suggest, from the ‘top-down’ point of view, that that claimed end (the arrival at the HC) is by no means final. One is audibly shown that that moment is not yet to be regarded as a satisfyingly viable *Hauptruhepunct des Geistes*, for we are about to hear it trumped by a more explicit one within only a few bars: the rhetorical hard break that is the medial caesura. In other words, the composer shows that the HC arrival – a dramatised point of attainment, a harmonic goal grasped onto, finally produced – is now gratifyingly extended in time, as the now secured dominant continues to drive towards the transition-zone’s real end. And until that real end is realised, that zone’s formal/schematic process is not yet complete, not yet brought to an expectant resting point with a medial caesura or varied treatment thereof. It is the medial caesura – the most palpable divider, the punctuational *Hauptruhepunct* proper – that is the most telling element in this sequence of events. From the Sonata Theory perspective, it is only at this point that, normatively, a secondary theme can follow, announcing the onset of the exposition’s second part.

Thematically Profiled Drives to Cadence (PAC): Three Sonata Theory Alternatives

From the discussion above, it follows that if an ongoing dominant-lock does not produce a transition-closing medial caesura, then for the Sonata Theorist that transition normally gives the impression of remaining open, even if what follows provides a thematic initiation over that dominant-lock in the new key. This is what happens in the first movement of Mozart's Quartet in B \flat major, K. 458. (For the score, see Caplin and Martin's Ex. 6.) As an extended process, the HC event in K. 458/i begins at bar 36, and the dominant-lock proper begins at bar 42, after the half cadence has been playfully gone through a number of times, grasped and regrasped, beginning at bar 36. Those seemingly innocent half-cadential circularities from bar 36 to bar 42 trigger a quasi-comic round of reiterative stammerings and circular repetitions that will now persist for several bars.

Given the half-cadence reiterations that have preceded the bar 42 dominant-lock, Mozart now stages that lock as being placed on hold, stammering and stalling in bars 42–46, as if in a state of indecision – in neutral gear, so to speak: what to do next? That unusual dominant-lock persists into bars 47–50, when the gears clench once again – decision made! – to end the stalling and to reassume a renewed sense of forward motion. From the Sonata Theory perspective, it is not that a new, second dominant-lock (or standing on the dominant) starts here: rather, it's the same one, being held on to but now treated differently once the gears clench. Above, in bars 47 and following, we do have a thematic initiation of sorts – one certainly can not deny that – but complementing the sustained dominant-lock (which is soon unfrozen at the theme's continuation in bar 51), the sentential material is not new in terms of its constituent particles, but only takes up and expands the ongoing stammering figure that has been multiply repeated in the preceding bars.

By these lights, bar 47 is best not regarded as a secondary theme but rather as something not uncommonly encountered as a concluding gesture of transitions: within a continuous textural flow, a gathering up of one's forces to produce *a revitalised, thematically profiled drive to cadence*. This is not to minimise the significance of this moment: on the contrary, the sense of renewed sentential initiation at bar 47 is palpable and vital, and one must agree that it shares some prominent attributes that form-functional theory identifies with subordinate-theme behaviour. But it is to distinguish this type of situation (an en route, thematically profiled drive towards the first V:PAC) from the garden variety of (post-MC) secondary theme that Sonata Theory is normally unwilling to grant S status to it. Bolstering such a reading is its role in continuing the ongoing 'stammering' script. The V:PAC at bar 54 initiates no fewer than three more repetitions of the same perfect authentic cadence (still stammering – bars 60, 66 and 69), until this frustratingly circular process, getting us nowhere, is called to a halt with three mock-anguished diminished-seventh chords several bars later.²²

Since this line of approach considers the arrival point of the half cadence insufficient to close the TR-zone, it is all the more clear that if the half-cadence or dominant arrival is not attained at all, that zone remains similarly open – that is, it is not brought to a generically sufficient completion. These would be situations of Caplin and Martin’s blurred-boundary types 1 and 3, instances in which ‘the transition lacks an ending function’, ones that Sonata Theory reads as the first type of continuous exposition.

Such is the case with the first movement of Haydn’s Symphony No. 45 in F# minor (Caplin and Martin’s Exs 5a–b). Here the transition begins in bar 17, in the tonic, and Haydn stages it as soon pulling itself up, vigorously and normatively, to A major, the mediant, though not yet fully securing that proposed key with a cadence. Normally, at this point one would expect that a half cadence in A major will soon ensue, as the preparation for a secondary theme. But on the way to any such anticipated half cadence (and certainly before any medial-caesura effect), the music slips off the rails into an unforeseen collapse to A *minor* at bar 38 – rendered all the more surprising since it enters on a notably weak hypermetrical bar, following what has been a predictably stable succession of four four-bar units from at least bar 17 through to bar 32. At bar 38, following an unsettling, asymmetrical five-bar climb, the A minor music hurls out an obvious reference to the once-expected P-based S, but this is a thematic initiation now entering totally unprepared, in a purposely awkward hypermetrical place and in the wrong mode.

In the midst of this extravagantly hectic activity, what we might experience is the staging of a thematic misfire. It is certainly the case that at bar 38, as Caplin and Martin put it (p. 00), a ‘newly enlarged grouping structure’ begins (along with a ‘root-position tonic prolongation’ that serves as the ‘functional initiation of a new thematic process’), but for Sonata Theory the more compelling musical point is that with this A minor moment of slippage, we realise that no A major relief is going to be forthcoming. Consequently, A major is now lost to us. At bar 38 the bubble bursts with a high-stress, pseudo-tragic misfire, and the exposition has no other recourse but to drive onwards as a continuous exposition to the only remaining tonal option, the far grimmer minor dominant, C# minor. And this is exactly what happens. In sum: at bar 38 we get not a secondary theme proper, but rather a negative reference to a secondary theme that might have been. From the perspective of rhetorical and cadential punctuation, its larger point is that, improperly prepared, this ‘new thematic process’ cannot function here as a secondary theme. This is why the ongoing torrent rushes onwards continuously, slavishly (like Esterházy’s overworked musicians in the famous tale of what motivated the Symphony in the first place). From the Sonata Theory perspective, noting this unrelenting surge, the mere emergence of a newly enlarged grouping structure, here even with a propulsively new initiating function, tonic-prolongational in a non-tonic key, is not enough to mark bar 38 as a secondary theme.

Within extended mid-expositional spans – that is, within the broad centre sections of Sonata Theory’s ‘continuous expositions’ – such thematically profiled, initiating functions (and new grouping structures) are not uncommon. They are another way of keeping the energy going, freshly propulsive moments of renewal, new melodic-rhetorical energy bursts in the ongoing relay. These mid-expositional initiating functions can also occur near the end of an extended span, where they can serve as that span’s thematically profiled drive to the secondary-key PAC (or EEC) as its conclusion. Within MC-absent, continuous-exposition situations, an interior or concluding portion of the mid-expositional span (TR ⇒ FS) may be thematically profiled: that is, it may be perceptible as the articulation of a new grouping unit, and it not infrequently is. It may even be shaped as a sentence, launched with its own initiating-function module, in the secondary-key area. But from the ‘top-down’ perspective this is not sufficient to turn it into a secondary theme. The impression provided by this kind of new thematic grouping is that it provides a decisive end to the central expositional span, not that it opens the door to something decisively new, such as a secondary theme.

This is also what happens in the finale to Haydn’s Quartet in B minor, Op. 33 No. 1 (see Caplin and Martin’s Ex. 1). I agree that bar 32 can be read as the onset of an expanded cadential progression that is soon abandoned, only to re-stabilise with a new one starting at bar 43. The only dissimilarity in our views is that form-functional theory wishes to classify this cadential-module reinvigoration around bar 32 – or perhaps even slightly before – as the point at which ‘the temporal world of a subordinate theme’ is projected,²³ while Sonata Theory would regard it, in the absence of a medial caesura, as a by no means unusual production of (the temporal world of) a thematically profiled drive to cadence at the end of a characteristically Haydnesque continuous exposition.

It is worth underscoring the larger point: *when it comes to most ‘continuous expositions’, form-functional theory and Sonata Theory perceive the same modular-thematic proceedings on the ground. We sense the same localised, PAC-oriented ‘temporal world’ before the first V:PAC.* In almost all cases there is agreement on the harmonic, textural and thematic processes at hand. Neither approach overlooks crucial functional details or thematic groupings, though each method has its own way of accounting for them. The most obvious differences lie only in each system’s preferred perspective – ‘bottom-up’ or ‘top-down’. The more pertinent issue is to grasp on what grounds and under which assumptions each approach favours the reading that it does – not to take up partisan arms to discredit either the one or the other.

‘Themes’ and V:PACs: Differences in Definitions and Conclusions

From the above it is clear that Sonata Theory would assess form-functional theory’s subordinate-theme case to be even more tenuous when the claimed S preceding the V:PAC begins not with an initiating function but rather with

a continuational or cadential one: in Caplin and Martin's third type of blurred boundaries, the 'transition lacks an ending and the subordinate theme lacks a beginning' (p. 00). What makes the form-functional reading possible, though, is its reconstrual of the concept of 'theme', differing from what Sonata Theory regards as the traditional understanding of that term – thematic salience, the suitable zonal placement for structural themes, the importance of melodic returns, and so on.

As Caplin put it some years ago (2001, p. 196), following a critique of the traditional concept of theme: 'I would propose, however, that for the purposes of formal analysis, the concept of theme should be broadened to embrace a more comprehensive musical unit. Such a theme would comprise, in addition to its melodic-motivic content, a series of harmonic progressions, its accompanimental patterns, a multi-phrase grouping structure, and, above all, cadential closure.' More pointedly, some years later: 'thematic content, or what I prefer to call "melodic-motivic material" [...] plays only a minimal role' in the task of 'identifying formal functionality' (Caplin, Hepokoski and Webster 2009, p. 31).²⁴ One way of understanding this is to recognise its resonance with a number of mid-twentieth-century reconceptualisations of form that also sought to correct what was regarded as an analytical overemphasis on themes within sonata form.

Within form-functional theory, then, 'theme' is freshly conceptualised to mean thematic *function*. This is why, by those lights, every exposition must contain a subordinate theme, or at least crucial features of such a theme. Because one governing S-theme function is to lead to a V:PAC, and because all normative major-mode expositions produce mid- or late-expositional V:PACs, all expositions will project either an unequivocal subordinate theme prior to it or sufficient traces of its 'temporal-world' function. This leads to the procedure followed in Caplin's and Martin's essay: once the first V:PAC in the exposition is located, the analyst seeks evidence of the subordinate theme (or subordinate-theme function) that preceded it. In some cases this leads to blurred-boundary explanations.

The form-functional system maintains that a mid- or late-expositional V:PAC can have only one purpose: to signal the end of the (first) subordinate theme (or thematic function). Sonata Theory agrees that this is often its structural role, indeed its most familiar one, but recognises other possible roles for such a V:PAC. When pursuing this method, upon encountering the first V:PAC, one should inquire whether it was produced by an S-theme or by some other expositional procedure. There are at least two of these other procedures: (1) within a continuous exposition it can serve as the closing cadence of an extended mid-expositional span (TR \Rightarrow FS, producing the V:PAC/EEC, perhaps effected by a thematically profiled drive to cadence), leading at once to the closing zone (C); and (2) within a two-part exposition, a V:PAC can also on occasion serve as a V:PAC MC marking the end of TR and leading to the onset of the secondary theme proper (S).

Sonata Theory's V:PAC MC + S Option

Within the world of Sonata Theory (though not in form-functional theory), this last possibility – the TR-concluding V:PAC MC and subsequent onset of a secondary theme – is a very real option in eighteenth-century practice (III:PAC MC or v:PAC MC in minor mode). The starting point for Sonata Theory's viewpoint is grounded in the literal meaning of 'medial caesura'. In these situations the music normally presents us with a mid-expositional V:PAC that is also marked with a pronounced gap or hard break (literally, a *caesura* in the *middle* of the exposition, a *medial caesura*) and the non-elided launch of a theme type that we would generally have no trouble grasping as a characteristic beginning of S had it occurred after a V:HC MC.²⁵ In other words, the V:PAC MC situation results in a medial-caesura impression at a temporally suitable expositional spot, whether or not one wishes to regard what precedes it as a subordinate theme. A medial caesura is still present.

As Poundie Burstein has recently helped to demonstrate, the case for the V:PAC MC + S (meaning the beginning of S) is defensible on historical, theoretical and experiential grounds. 'In many of Haydn's sonata-form movements – especially those from around the 1760s', he concludes, 'the end of the transition is [...] articulated by a firm perfect authentic cadence. [...] Furthermore, [in the 1760s] these situations occur so frequently that a perfect cadence at the end of a transition section may well be regarded a type of first- or second-level default option for this repertoire' (2010, pp. 91 and 93). Historically considered, this makes sense. As outlined above, in the 1740s and 1750s the MC strategy was introduced into the first half of the standard but now expanding binary format. When deployed, this structural approach effectively divided up the exposition into clear and separate action-zones {P TR}'{S/C}. Under such circumstances the question must have arisen: what are the available, cadence-orientated ways in which the TR-zone end of Part 1 can be signalled? The normative options rapidly arrayed themselves: (1) V:HC without dominant-lock; (2) I:HC without dominant-lock; (3) V:HC with dominant-lock, as a stronger signal of the end of Part 1; (4) I:HC with dominant-lock; and (5) V:PAC.²⁶

While options 1–4, differing treatments of what Koch would call *Quintabsätze*, present us with little problem, the potential difficulty with the fifth option, the V:PAC MC, is that the music is made to articulate the cadential marker of a potential *Schlußsatz* prematurely: with only half (or less) of the exposition completed, we have already arrived at a syntactic sign of what one might initially take to be the ultimate destination of the Kochian *Ruhepunkt* journey. At mid-century, however, the availability of the V:PAC MC to conclude Part 1 was doubtless associable with the intention of following it by setting out (in Part 2) on a renewed, secondary and nontonic expositional journey, supplied with another Part 2 trajectory to the real *Schlußsatz* and possible subsequent *Anhänge* or *erklärende Periode* (Sonata Theory's S and C). In such circumstances the V:PAC at the MC point could be conceptually converted to what Koch might

have considered to be a *Grundabsatz* in V (an interior authentic cadence not functioning as a *Schlußsatz*), and the journey towards a true *Schlußsatz* and any subsequent *Anhänge* would begin again after the MC. In some, though not all, instances this post-V:PAC MC trajectory even includes its own *Quintabsatz* in V. This latter possibility (an S with an interior V:HC or other *Quintabsatz* candidate: see the discussion of Mozart's K. 589/i below) might be read as an annulling or superseding of the closural effect of the preceding V:PAC MC, since one possible implication of such a *Quintabsatz* in V is that of scrolling back the ongoing harmonic-syntactic situation to pre-V:PAC MC space.²⁷ The potential cadential redundancy of the seemingly premature V:PAC MC was probably a factor in its less frequent usage after 1770, although by no means did it disappear altogether. Its appearances in J. C. Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, and others reflect, for whatever reason, a desire for a particularly decisive closure to the TR action-zone.

It remains to comment on a few examples that the Sonata Theory perspective considers to be evidence in favour of the PAC MC + S concept. In each of these instances the form-functional approach would locate a subordinate theme (or its related function) preceding that PAC MC. The Sonata Theory view is that a reading favouring the TR-concluding PAC MC + S solution is more grounded in such interactive aspects as eighteenth-century rhetorical punctuation and generically characteristic secondary-theme types and their strategic onsets.

Situation 1: V:PAC + S in the Exposition; I:PAC + S in the Recapitulation

The first movement of Mozart's Quartet in B \flat major, K. 589 (1790), provides a telling example of this situation. Here I identify the secondary theme as beginning with the upbeat to bar 46, following a V:PAC MC in bar 45.²⁸ Bar 46 displays all the thematic salience that we would expect to find with an S-launch: it is preceded by a clearly articulated gap or breath (bar 45) that helps to dramatise its entry; its sense of newness – an unmistakable thematic initiation – contrasts with what immediately precedes it. It is a recognisably Mozartian type of lyrically orientated secondary theme, readily relatable to hundreds of other noncontroversial S-theme onsets in the composer's output.

Form-functional analysts would doubtless favour an earlier identification of an S-theme on the basis of the emergence of the compound-sentential idea – undeniably present – that begins at bar 27 with the first violin's triplet figuration at bar 27, the moment of the V:HC and the onset of the dominant-lock. This hearing, like mine, regards bars 27–30/31 as a smooth-gliding compound-presentation module, b.i. + c.i. (basic idea + contrasting idea), prolonging V⁷, with internal elision (bar 29) and elided with the next compound-presentation module, bars 31–34/35, which shifts to the typical neighbouring $\frac{6}{4}$ over the dominant. Sonata Theory, though, recognises this as a standard operating procedure within a TR-concluding dominant-lock. A third compound presentation, bars 35–38/39, returns us to the prolonged V⁷. On this reading, each of the three presentation modules synchronises with a single sustained chord

over the dominant, shifting to a different chord only with the merger into the elided subsequent presentation. (This reading also hears bars 27, 31 and 35 as hypermetrical downbeats: two bars of triplet intensity, b.i., plus two bars of gliding relaxation, c.i.) What follows in bars 39–45 is an expanded cadential progression concluding with the V:PAC MC at bar 45.

It is true that the whole passage, bars 27–46, is situated within F major, ends with a V:PAC and is likely to be heard as a compound-sentential thematic grouping. But from the Sonata Theory perspective, the combined presence of these features is still not a sufficient signal for the onset of an S-theme, still less so when they coincide with the onset of a dominant-lock. Instead, what we have is another well-crafted example of a thematically profiled drive to cadence. Within a relaxed and expansive melodic-lyrical context, Mozart shaped the dominant-lock conclusion of TR (which had started at bar 21) as a seesawing, melodically repetitive unit in its own right. Most notable is what happens to the dominant-lock after it has been sustained for twelve bars (bars 27–38). Any V/V-lock generically suggests that the music is being vectored forwards to a V:HC MC. But at bar 39 Mozart stages the music as ‘changing its mind’ or becoming ‘unfrozen’ (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 27–8) – something that happens from time to time within this repertory (and something that had also happened in K. 458/i, discussed above).²⁹ At bar 39 the ongoing motivic repetition is continued (first violin) – c.i. compression and fragmentation slipped into via linkage from bars 37–38 – and the harmonic support shifts to an expanded cadential progression. In other words, while the music at first seemed to have a V:HC MC in its sights, it winds up being redirected to a more emphatic V:PAC MC. This concludes the TR (bar 45) and opens the door to the onset of a typically Mozartian secondary theme – one that produces an unmistakable V:HC at the end of its first phrase, a compound antecedent, bars 46–53 (a *Quintabsatz* in V that, as mentioned above, could be read as implying the cancelling out of the authentic-cadence closure articulated with the V:PAC MC at bar 45 by reverting to an earlier cadential station in the pre-ordered sequence of cadence attainment).

The first movement of Mozart’s Bassoon Concerto in B \flat major, K. 191 (1774), provides us with even more explicit evidence of the viability of the expositional V:PAC + S. Grasping what it shows depends on a secure understanding of how Mozart normatively constructed the first movements (Type 5 sonatas) of his many concertos. In brief: any extensive opening tutti (or ritornello, ‘R1’ in Sonata Theory’s designation), even while remaining wholly in the tonic, typically lays out a proposed two-part, four-zone thematic framework for the subsequent solo exposition (which usually expands upon or otherwise alters that framework here and there). Identifying the opening tutti’s proposed S-theme (albeit there in the tonic) is never a difficult task. In this case, the tonic-key R1:\S is introduced with the upbeat to bar 12, preceded by a converging half cadence (I:HC MC) at bar 10, followed by a bar and a half of caesura-fill (bars 10–11).

Once R1 is completed (bar 34), the solo exposition (Solo 1 or ‘S1’) begins with P played by the bassoon (bar 35). Solo 1’s P-zone concludes with a formulaic

tonic-key tutti interjection at bars 42–44 (formulaically reiterating R1:\C², bars 32–34, a common procedure), whereupon the music enters the transition-zone. In Mozart's concertos such TRs sometimes begin with a new thematic idea presented by the soloist – what Sonata Theory, following Théodore de Wyzewa and Georges de Saint-Foix, calls a *sujet libre*.³⁰ Mozart treats these in a generous variety of ways. In this instance S1:\TR (bar 45), a typical *sujet libre*, begins, uncommonly, directly in the dominant key. In the context of Mozart's concerto practice it would be wrong to consider this to be the beginning of the secondary theme: P has just concluded, and within concerto first movements Mozart never omits a TR-zone. Moreover, and clarifyingly, its non-S TR status is confirmed in the recapitulation, where the same *sujet libre* TR begins not in the tonic – which it would do, were it a secondary theme – but rather on the subdominant, bar 112. An awareness of Mozart's typical S1:\TR *sujet libre* treatments makes it evident that we have entered a conventional melodically grounded TR-zone within Solo 1, *even though in this case TR plays out entirely in the dominant key*. That TR-zone ends with a decisive V:PAC (MC) at bar 58, followed by the bar and a half of caesura-fill that we had initially heard in the opening tutti at bars 10–11. Solo 1's secondary theme follows this V:PAC MC and fill with the upbeat into bar 60. In sum, the S-idea that had been preceded by an I:HC MC in R1 is now preceded by a V:PAC MC in Solo 1: the solo-expositional medial caesura is effected by a perfect authentic cadence in the dominant. This is paralleled in the recapitulation, where the secondary-theme-zone, starting with the upbeats to bar 139, is preceded by a I:PAC MC at bar 137.

Situation 2: V:HC MC + S in the Exposition; I:PAC MC + S in the Recapitulation

Somewhat analogous to the K. 191 situation discussed above, there are cases where, in structurally parallel portions of the score (exposition and recapitulation), the same S onset is preceded by two different qualities of MC. While these cases by no means demonstrate an indifferent exchangeability of the HC and PAC basis for the articulation of the medial caesura, they do show us in a uniquely conclusive way that each was an available *Hauptruhepunkt* option to end a TR-zone. In these instances, the opening of the secondary theme is defined in the exposition by its appearance after a V:HC MC (and here, since we are dealing with the most normative types of expositions, I presume that analysts would agree that this is in fact where S begins). Its reappearance in the recapitulation following a I:PAC MC does not mean that a different, now earlier secondary theme has been made to precede it, but rather that a secondary-theme onset may in some circumstances be preceded by a PAC MC.³¹ When the PAC MC occurs in the recapitulation, this may suggest that it has a stronger, more emphatic implication (more appropriate, that is, to a recapitulation than to an exposition).

As Burstein noted, examples of this are easy to find in mid-century compositions, and they are especially numerous in compositions from the

third quarter of the eighteenth century. While Burstein selected examples from Haydn's symphonies, I shall mention three instances from the works of J. C. Bach. The first two are taken from Bach's set of Six Symphonies, Op. 3 (published in 1765). In the first movement of the Symphony in D major, Op. 3 No. 1, few listeners would fail to conclude that the secondary theme begins at bar 33, with a sudden drop to *pianissimo* (albeit over the dominant key's V – and thus what Sonata Theory would label as an S^{1.0} module; S^{1.1} shoots forwards at bar 39).³² This S is prepared by a converging V:HC at bar 28, followed by five bars of dominant-lock, ending the TR with a clearly articulated V:HC MC in bar 32. In the parallel spot in the recapitulatory rotation, S^{1.0} (again over V) begins in bar 113 after an emphatic I:PAC MC at bar 112.³³ The lesson: a span-dividing MC could be built around either an HC or a PAC. While presumably not casually interchangeable, the one could substitute for the other in different thematic portions of the Sonata. The same situation occurs in the first movement of the Symphony in C major, Op. 3 No. 2. In the exposition the V:HC MC at bar 35 (concluding a dominant-lock) opens up to a secondary theme in the dominant at bar 36. In the structurally analogous recapitulation, the same S, bar 122, is preceded by a I:PAC MC in bar 121. This is also what we find in the first movement of Bach's Keyboard Sonata in D major, Op. 5 No. 2 (published in 1766 and arranged by the young Mozart in 1772 as the Piano Concerto, K. 107 No. 1). Here S starts in bar 19, preceded by a dominant-lock and a V:HC MC in bar 18. The same S emerges in the recapitulation at bar 88, preceded by a TR-ending I:PAC in bar 87.

Situation 3: V:PAC MC + S in the Exposition; I:HC MC + S in the Recapitulation

While the above instances demonstrate Sonata Theory's case for the PAC MC, one might wonder whether such HC/PAC exchanges are limited to allowing the HC in the exposition and the PAC in the recapitulation. Does the reverse ever occur? Indeed it does. The first movement, Presto, of Haydn's Symphony No. 101 in D ('The Clock'; 1793–4), is instructive in this regard, and it is of special interest as a late-century occurrence of the situation: V:PAC MC in the exposition and I:HC MC in the recapitulation.

In the first movement of the Symphony we find an emphatic *forte* and tutti V:PAC MC at bar 80, followed by a sudden drop to *piano* and Haydn's typical P-based S at bar 81. Since this reading would doubtless be challenged by form-functional theory, it requires additional explanation. The V:PAC MC at bar 80 is preceded by a prolonged dominant-lock initiated by a converging HC on E (V of V), bars 63–71. As was also the case in Mozart's K. 589, this dominant-lock is 'unfrozen' by a thematically profiled drive to cadence, bars 72–80. Moreover, bar 72 marks the unmistakable beginning of a new thematic grouping, shaped as a perfectly clear sentence: presentation, bars 72–73 and 74–75; and cadential modules, bars 76–80.³⁴

One might be tempted to regard bars 72–80 as the onset of S, since it is sententially shaped, begins with an initiating function, bears a thematic salience

and drives towards the first V:PAC. What, then, is the case for considering it to be the concluding unit of TR? First, the thematic unit, bars 72–80, while in some senses new, does not provide a strong contrast with what immediately precedes it. It entails no change of dynamics, no notable change of tutti texture, and no flagging of energy. It appears in the midst of an ongoing stream of music, continuing an action in progress and ploughing doggedly forwards, now – having broken free from the dominant-lock – with a different but still clear end in view. Its musical sense is that of an emphatic conclusion, not that of a new beginning. Its two presentation modules, bars 72–73 and 74–75, and the first bars of what follows, can be heard as a strong wind-up for the sense of release achieved through the strong V:PAC in bar 80: the driving of the final TR stake into the ground. Far from challenging the ongoing, single-minded process of drive towards the MC, it only confirms it by means of an even stronger, joyously boisterous thematic decision. Its melodic character, its forward-rushing context and its short-windedness (leading to a notable caesura-gap in bar 80 – the only such gap, and thereby the most obvious rhetorical *Hauptruhepunct*, in the exposition) mark it as a zone-concluding idea, not as the en route opening to a new expositional space.

Second, the decisive, tutti V:PAC MC in bar 80 gives way at once to an easily recognisable instance of Haydn's most typical *piano*, P-based S-themes. The theme at bar 81 is generically the kind of secondary theme that we most expect from Haydn, all the more so after the *Hauptruhepunct* silent gap or breath in bar 80.

Third, the carved-out, sentential thematic grouping sounded in bars 72–80 fails to appear anywhere in the recapitulation. If these bars were to be regarded as the beginning of a subordinate theme, one would be hard-pressed to account for why it is omitted from the recapitulation. It is unclear why an event that might be claimed to have such syntactic importance in the exposition would be absent altogether in the recapitulation.³⁵ This, too, suggests that bars 72–80 serve as a clearly bounded, thematically profiled drive to cadence, the final, thematised concluding gesture of the ongoing TR, producing an exemplary instance of the V:PAC + S situation.

Finally, what can thus be regarded as the start of the secondary theme in the exposition, in bar 81, does reappear in the recapitulation, at bar 250 – now in the tonic, where it even more unmistakably carries out that same S-initiating function. As is typical of Haydn, the theme is recast, but it is surely to be heard as the varied recurrence of the same thematic idea, proceeding here under a different treatment. Most important for the present discussion, the recapitulation's bar 250 recurrence of S is preceded by a I:HC MC, led into by a converging I:HC at bar 241 and no fewer than nine bars of dominant-lock before the TR-concluding I:HC MC is articulated in bar 249.

What is at stake in the debate between the Sonata Theory and form-functional approaches? As indicated at the outset of this essay, in many analytical situations they are fully compatible. There are broad areas of practical-analysis agreement

with regard to the many varieties and strengths of cadences, the grounding of much thematic-grouping material in sentences, periods and their variants and the general concept of intrathematic functions. But the two methods proceed from different assumptions. They also employ certain words differently, and that sometimes leads to dissimilar ‘interthematic’ (broader-scale) interpretations: rabbit or duck, ‘bottom-up’ or ‘top-down’. Moreover, at least with regard to the matters dealt with in this essay, the two systems can ask us to notice and call forth as structurally important different aspects of an exposition, aspects that condition the manner in which we apprehend the compositions of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and many others. Nonetheless, one could envisage imaginative strategies through which at least some of these differences might be navigated, even as each approach continues to pursue its own convictions and ways of dealing with analytical problems.

More difficult to reconcile might be the presentational register and purpose with which any analysis is carried out. In published analyses thus far, form-functional theory and Sonata Theory have pursued different styles of discursive explication. Is this also a relevant factor? For Sonata Theory, at least, it is an important one: ‘Even though analysis, with all of its technical terminology and lumber-room mechanisms, looms large at the initial stage of one’s inquiry, that first stage is no end in itself. Rather, all analysis should [ultimately] be directed toward the larger goal of a hermeneutic understanding of music as a communicative system, a cultural discourse implicated in issues of humanness, worldview, and ideology, widely construed’ (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, p. 603). This places value on the encouragement provided by any analytical system to lead one into questions of larger significance – the ‘why’ questions of gestural content or representation, deployment of musical topic, metaphorical or narrative implication and modular coherence, historically conditioned musical statement, and the like (see Hepokoski 2014). But still, at bottom, the assessment of which system appeals more – or how the two approaches might more profitably interact with each other – is left where it properly belongs: in the hands and specific interests of the individual analyst.

NOTES

1. Caplin (1998), p. 257, makes this explicit in his glossary definition of a subordinate theme: ‘An interthematic *function* that confirms a subordinate key by closing with a perfect authentic cadence. It [also] loosens the formal organization in order to solidify the new key in relation to the home key’ (italics added). Caplin (2013), p. 713, essentially replicates this definition, replacing ‘interthematic function’ with ‘thematic function’.
2. ‘*The theory emphasises the role of local harmonic progression as a determinant of form.* Theorists and historians widely recognize that the form of a classical work is determined in large part by its pitch organization. [...] In my

theory, local harmonic progression is held to be the most important factor in expressing formal functions in themes (or theme-like units)' (Caplin 1998, p. 4, italics in original).

3. Neuwirth (2011) contrasts this with Sonata Theory's 'top-down' approach. While critical of certain aspects of Sonata Theory, he concludes with an appeal on behalf of its potential compatibility with form-functional theory.
4. The dictum that is perhaps more often cited is the one from p. 52, there italicised for emphasis: '*If there is no medial caesura, there is no secondary theme.*'
5. Some 'other compelling reasons' for deciding on behalf of an S not preceded by a literal MC can include such things as a sudden, sharp change in texture from, say, the active, tutti turbulence found in many standard transitions to the more subdued, lyrical and emphatically melodic character so typical of many secondary themes. As always with analyses of moments that swerve from the usual options of normative practice, such decisions are judgement calls, and one cannot suppose that all analysts would agree with them. See also n. 25.
6. On the obviously problematic 'intuitively clear' see nn. 5 and 25.
7. 'Notwithstanding its many postulates and axioms, Sonata Theory is no mechanical system. Rather, in proper application it is an art that requires training, musical sensitivity, and much experience with the repertory in question' (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 12–13). And: 'Our intention is not to lay down binding laws or invariant rules concerning either the parts of a sonata or the sonata as a whole. Instead, we are trying to sketch the outlines of a complex set of common options or generic defaults' (p. 8).
8. The original reading of this movement, now superseded, is in Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), p. 49. The reading above also responds to a criticism of the *Elements*' analysis of it in Neuwirth (2011), p. 204.
9. Apart from such composed-over MCs, I am also open to other strategies and perceptible degrees of 'obscured medial caesuras', such as we find, for instance, in middle- and late-period Beethoven, in whose works the MC principle can sometimes become problematic, as discussed, for example, in Richards (2013).
10. This definition is not complete, since it does not provide an indication of how we define S as ending (that is, with the moment of essential expositional closure, the EEC). But the ending of S is not germane to the present conversation. For the issue of the Haydnesque P-based S-situation (is it 'typically contrasting?'), see n. 18.

11. The rhetorical strategy was also being developed in the A sections of certain da capo arias in the period 1730–60, A sections structured as what we now think of as sonata formats (often what Sonata Theory has dubbed Type 1 sonatas, those without a developmental space). This, among other issues, is being pursued in Sherrill (forthcoming).
12. See Koch (1787), §§ 77–9 (pp. 342–8), and n. 14; and Koch (1802), e.g. col. 16, s.v. ‘Absatz’.
13. See also the argument on behalf of construing classical sonata form as a schema in Byros (2015). He presented a shortened version of this article at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Music Theory (2013b). Two excerpts: ‘Schemata are, in essence, *cognitive hierarchies* built up of numerous, embedded subschemata, that define a broader concept through their interaction’; and ‘as a global script schema, SONATA FORM emerges from but also inversely subsumes all other varieties of syntax as its embedded subschemata’ (italics in original; I am grateful to Byros for sharing a copy of his paper with me).
14. Koch (1787), §129, p. 342: ‘Sie bestehet darinne, dass der Periode vier Hauptruhepunkte des Geistes enthält.’ Koch does make provisions for the occasional omission of an earlier, pre-*Schlussatz* cadential station. I take the term ‘journey’, as applied to the approach to the cadence, from Burstein (2014a). (I am grateful to Burstein for sharing this paper with me.) Burstein notes that in any individual exposition ‘any of the resting-points along the journey towards the new-key cadence [*Schlussatz*] could be either omitted or elided, and any leg could be repeated’. On the *erklärende Periode* (generally analogous to Sonata Theory’s closing zone, C), see Koch (1793), §101, p. 305: ‘Oft ist zwar nach der Cadenz desselben noch ein erklärender Periode angehangt, der aber in ebenderselben Tonart fortmoduliert und schliesst, in welcher der vorher gehende auch geschlossen hatte; daher können wir ihn für nichts anders, also bloß für einen Anhang des ersten Perioden erklären, und können gar füglich beyde vereinigt also einen einzigen Hauptperiodien betrachten.’
15. To consider this issue from a different perspective: metaphorically interpreting temporality (‘journey’) as space (‘container’ or ‘schema’) is one of the standard, almost automatic operations of what some leading metaphor theorists (e.g. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, and Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner) call *cross-domain mapping* or the creation of ‘blended spaces’ of ‘formal integration’. Such mapping is relevant to our generalised apprehension of music. See the discussion in Hepokoski (2014) (an essay complementary to the present one), especially pp. 71–5.
16. One example among many may be found in the first movement of C. P. E. Bach’s Württemberg Sonata No. 6 in B minor, Helm 36, Wq. 49

No. 6 (1744). There is no denying a strong, proto-MC effect in bar 7 (i:HC MC followed by two beats of rest). Moreover, what follows is obviously sentential in rhetorical structure (bars 8–9, 10–11 and 12–18). One might therefore wish to regard bars 8–18 as a ‘Part 2’ and a secondary theme – the impulsive turning towards a new idea. On the other hand, the combination of the harmonic content of those bars, starting on a diminished seventh chord that pivots into the modulation to III (D major). the abrupt *forte* blurt of bar 8 and the perhaps questionable thematic salience of that moment (within a modular succession already displaying an erratic variety of contrasting figures and dynamics) might give one pause before assigning to it any unproblematic S-theme status. One might decide this matter either way – or suggest that the movement, like many others in C. P. E. Bach, illustrates a broader tendency towards binary-format ‘expositional’ division that would soon become clearer and more unequivocal in the hands of other composers. At the centre of such questions is the recognisably characteristic quality of what would become the large family of S-theme types.

17. This statement and its larger context reply to a query in Caplin and Martin’s essay in this volume about the dependence of Sonata Theory’s concept of S on what immediately precedes it, a dependence that within the form-functional system is problematic.
18. The Haydnesque P-based S is not an exception to this principle. In those cases the P-based S is a new, refreshed recasting of the P idea that normally follows a series of thematically, texturally and rhetorically different modules in the immediately preceding TR.
19. For another association of the Ponte schema with the dominant-lock, see Byros (2012), p. 297. For its adaptation into a ‘Fenaroli-Ponte’ subtype, see Byros (2013a). Burstein (2014b), p. 213 n. 26, challenges the distinction between ‘half cadence’ and ‘dominant arrival’, preferring ‘half cadence’ for virtually all such cases.
20. The ‘end/stop’ distinction is also made in the glossary of Caplin (1998): an ‘end’ is ‘an articulation of formal closure’ (p. 254), whereas as a ‘stop’ is only ‘a cessation of musical activity at any point in a formal unit, not necessarily at a moment of cadential arrival’ (p. 257).
21. Cf. Caplin (2013), p. 131: ‘The final dominant of the transition is usually given temporal emphasis in order to arouse the listener’s expectation for a tonic resolution. A number of techniques can be used to stretch out the dominant in time. Most often [this will be] a standing on the dominant.’ It may also be worth repeating that one should not confuse the concept of half-cadence arrival with that of the MC. In *Elements of Sonata Theory* (pp. 24–5) Darcy and I sought to clarify this by writing that the medial caesura is typically ‘built around’ a half cadence – suggesting that the time-

point of the HC proper often precedes that of the MC, even as that MC is the final moment of the half-cadential extension that leads up to it.

22. While the above remarks respond to Caplin and Martin's analysis in their essay, it is worth mentioning that, more broadly, Darcy and I regard this exposition as a touchstone of the second type of continuous exposition ('early PAC in the new key followed by (varied) reiterations of the cadence'), not of the first. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 60–3; K. 458/i is discussed on p. 61.
23. Caplin and Martin (2016) place the temporal world of S '*at least as far back as bar 32*' (italics added), while bars 29–31 might be heard to 'inhabit' both transition and subordinate-theme functions. Another argument along those lines might be attracted to the presentational features of bars 27–28 and 29–31, though the sense of an 'extra bar' in the region of bars 30–31 presents yet another issue for analysis.
24. I have altered the order of phrases in the quotation: in the original 'plays a minimal role' precedes 'thematic content'.
25. At stake is the question of what counts as an immediately recognisable S-theme type. Here one needs to appeal to an acquired sense of positionally apt thematic styles, because experience tells us that not all available styles are generically suitable to begin the post-MC Part 2 of such an exposition. There are of course a number of characteristic S-theme types in topic, rhythm, forward motion and expressive content, even as exceptional instances are also found. (For a consideration of some different varieties of typical S-themes, see Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 131–45.) Still, in most half-cadential MC cases it does not unduly strain the resources of an experienced listener to regard the character of that post-HC-MC theme as typically S-like for that individual composer. Through multiple encounters with those many instances, one obtains a general, flexible sense of how the thematic content of a given composer's S-themes most normally begins.
26. It is possible also to conclude Part 1 with a I:PAC. In most cases this amounts to an exposition that omits TR.
27. A somewhat analogous situation involving EEC deferral – the 'production of an additional MC-effect or nonelided cadence shortly into presumed C-space' – is discussed in Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 159–63.
28. Galand (2013), p. 305, objects to this reading, preferring to locate the onset of S at bar 29. I find his reading unpersuasive.

29. The difference between the K. 458 and K. 589 situations is that the former takes place in the context of the second type of continuous exposition, while the latter's context is that of the two-part exposition.
30. Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 525–9; K. 191 is mentioned on p. 527.
31. Burstein (2010) comes to the same conclusion and cites a number of such cases in Haydn's symphonies from the 1760s (pp. 94–6): 'These examples indicate that Haydn sometimes uses authentic cadences and half cadences at analogous spots in the form.'
32. On such frequently encountered S^0 and $S^{1.0}$ themes, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 142–5.
33. Curiously, the exposition's concluding TR modules (the dominant-lock, bars 28–32) recur, transposed to the tonic and with one additional bar, at the end of the developmental space (bars 85–90). There they lead to a 'recapitulation' that begins (bar 91) with the tonic music of the expositional transition (i.e. bar 91 = bar 11). Two points follow. First, there is an aspect of the Type 2 sonata (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 353–87) in this movement, in which case the term 'recapitulation' would, strictly considered, be inappropriate. And second, since the TR-concluding modules (carrying the dominant-lock) are 'used up' at the end of the development, it may be that Bach did not wish to deploy them again, redundantly, at the end of the 'recapitulatory' TR.
34. More specifically, the movement's TR begins with the *forte*-affirmation anacrusis at bar 34. The music proceeds to a I:HC MC offer in bar 48 (the end of a Kochian *Quintabsatz* in I), which is set up by an emphatic dominant-lock at bar 45 and even reinforced by a fermata at bar 48. Because of what immediately follows – an incipit whose initial rising figure, at least (bar 49 and the downbeat of bar 50), replicates that of the tonic-grounded P (bars 24–25) – I would regard this as a fleeting allusion to a common procedure of a declined MC (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, pp. 45–7), even though the music after bar 50 instantly swerves off tonic. In short, TR continues to plough onwards, driving to the V:HC at bar 63 (the goal of a Kochian *Quintabsatz* in V). There follows a dominant-lock on that V/V – sustaining the V:HC – which before long is converted into a *Schlußsatz* module (thematically profiled drive to cadence), bars 72–80, which is then made to serve as a V:PAC MC. What follows, then – S (bar 81) – initiates what I have described above as 'a renewed, secondary and nontonic "expositional journey" in the dominant, supplied with another, Part-2 trajectory to its own *Schlußsatz* and [...] subsequent *Anhänge* (Sonata Theory's S and C)'.

35. Here we might be reminded that, from the perspective of Sonata Theory's reconstruction of the 'sonata principle', it is never required, as a strong norm, to recapitulate pre-MC material (from P or TR), portions of which are often recast or substantially altered – or omitted altogether – in recapitulatory space. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), pp. 242–5, and Hepokoski (2002).

REFERENCES

- Burstein, L. Poundie, 2010: 'Mid-Section Cadences in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements', *Studia musicologica*, 51/i–ii, pp. 91–107.
- _____, 2014a: 'Expositional Journeys and Resting Points', paper delivered at the Seventh International Conference on Music Theory, Tallinn-Pärnu, Estonia.
- _____, 2014b: 'The Half Cadence and Other Such Slippery Events', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 36/ii, pp. 203–27.
- Byros, Vasili, 2012: 'Meyer's Anvil: Revisiting the Schema Concept', *Music Analysis*, 31/iii, pp. 273–346.
- _____, 2013a: 'Trazom's Wit: Communicative Strategies in a "Popular" Yet "Difficult" Sonata', *Eighteenth-Century Music*, 10/ii, pp. 213–52.
- _____, 2013b: 'Sonata quasi uno schema', paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Music Theory, Charlotte, NC.
- _____, 2015: "'Haupttruhpunkte des Geistes": Punctuation Schemas and the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata', in Pieter Bergé and Markus Neuwirth (eds), *What is a Cadence?*, pp. 215–51 (Leuven: Leuven University Press).
- Caplin, William E., 1998: *Classical Form: a Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- _____, 2001: 'The Classical Sonata Exposition: Cadential Goals and Form-Functional Plans', *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie*, 6/iii, pp. 195–209.
- _____, 2004: 'The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 57/i, pp. 51–118.
- _____, 2013: *Analyzing Classical Form: an Approach for the Classroom* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- Caplin, William E., Hepokoski, James, and Webster, James, 2009: *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press).
- Caplin, William E., and Martin, Nathan John, 2016: 'The Continuous Exposition and the Concept of the Subordinate Theme', *Music Analysis*, 35/i, pp. 00–00.
- Galand, Joel, 2013: Review of Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), *Journal of Music Theory*, 57/ii, pp. 383–417.
- Gjerdingen, Robert O., 2007: *Music in the Galant Style* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

- Hepokoski, James, 2002: 'Beyond the Sonata Principle', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 55/i, pp. 91–154.
- _____, 2014: 'Program Music', in Stephen Downes (ed.), *Aesthetics of Music: Musicological Perspectives* (New York and London: Routledge).
- Hepokoski, James, and Darcy, Warren, 1997: 'The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 19/ii, pp. 115–54.
- _____, 2006: *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph, 1787: *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition, zweiter Theil* (Leipzig: Adam Friedrich Böhme; rpt Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1969).
- _____, 1793: *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition, dritter und letzter Theil* (Leipzig: Adam Friedrich Böhme; rpt, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1969).
- _____, 1802: *Musikalisches Lexikon* (Frankfurt am Main: Jüngern; rpt, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2001).
- Neuwirth, Markus, 2011: 'Joseph Haydn's 'Witty' Play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*', *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie*, 8/i, pp. 199–220.
- Richards, Mark, 2013: 'Beethoven and the Obscured Medial Caesura: a Study in the Transformation of Style', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 35/ii, pp. 166–93.
- Sherrill, Paul, forthcoming: 'The Metastasian Da Capo Aria: Moral Philosophy, Characteristic Actions, and Dialogic Form' (PhD diss., Indiana University).

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTOR

JAMES HEPOKOSKI teaches at Yale University. He has written extensively on the challenges of merging newly configured modes of music analysis with historically sensitive hermeneutics, illustrating some of the issues at hand through selected works of Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, Strauss, Sibelius, Elgar, Verdi, Puccini, Debussy and other composers. Among his recent publications are 'Dahlhaus's Beethoven-Rossini *Stildualismus*: Lingering Legacies of the Text-Event Dichotomy', in Nicholas Mathew and Benjamin Walton (eds), *The Invention of Beethoven and Rossini* (Cambridge University Press, 2013); a reflection on program music in Stephen Downes (ed.), *Issues in Musical Aesthetics: Musicological Perspectives* (Routledge, 2014); and a study of the historically changing (and sometimes censored) lyrics of Cole Porter's 1934 song "Anything Goes," in Don M. Randel, Matthew Shaftel and Susan Forscher Weiss (eds), *A Cole Porter Companion* (Indiana University Press, 2016).

ABSTRACT

With regard to the definition of secondary (or subordinate) themes within Classical-style expositions, Sonata Theory and form-functional theory proceed from different understandings of the style, role and structural purpose of such themes. From the more integrative standpoint of Sonata Theory, the form-functional understanding, while logically tight, is insufficiently attentive to rhetorical, punctuational and thematic factors that also lie at the core of expositional practice in the second half of the eighteenth century. This article updates my thoughts on secondary-theme definition in this era, underscoring once again the need for flexibility and musical sensitivity in the application of the ‘no MC, no S’ guideline. Along the way, I outline a broader historical argument to suggest that, beginning around 1750, the strategic introduction of an emphatic medial caesura (or punctuational ‘hard break’) into the centre of what we now call sonata expositions effectively and immediately divided any such exposition into two separate parts. Each of the two parts is usually subdivisible into two separate action-zones, resulting in a *de facto* {P TR}’ {S/C} pattern, each zone of which soon came to call for its own generically appropriate harmonic and thematic/rhetorical treatment. Under the zonal concept of expositional formatting (precipitated by the presence of an MC), the secondary theme is best construed as that characteristic, new theme that marks the post-MC onset of the second part. Expositions without an interior MC present us with a different situation, one in which it can be counterintuitive – or at least analytically unnecessary – to posit the presence of a subordinate theme in the zonal sense: one need not presume that all mid-expositional V:PACs are preceded by a subordinate theme. The article also considers how most productively to interpret a transition-ending dominant-lock leading to an MC and concludes by discussing how and why it is possible for a transition-ending V:PAC to articulate an MC that then gives way to the onset of a characteristic secondary theme.