



Yale University Department of Music

---

On the Relation of Analysis to Performance: Beethoven's "Bagatelles" Op. 126, Nos. 2 and 5

Author(s): Janet Schmalfeldt and Beethoven

Source: *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring, 1985), pp. 1-31

Published by: [Duke University Press](#) on behalf of the [Yale University Department of Music](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/843369>

Accessed: 31-07-2015 23:31 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Duke University Press and Yale University Department of Music are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Music Theory*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ON THE RELATION OF ANALYSIS TO  
PERFORMANCE: BEETHOVEN'S  
BAGATELLES OP. 126, NOS. 2 AND 5

Janet Schmalfeldt

Performance students at colleges and universities today depend especially upon the theorist-analyst for general knowledge about musical structure and compositional technique. If the theorist believes that performers will profit from analytic studies, then he faces a major responsibility with a wide range of challenges.

Performers and analysts will generally agree that a fine performance of a work expresses a unique understanding of its essence. Most performers describe their effort toward that goal as a primarily intuitive process, a matter of becoming intimate with the work through physical as well as mental activity. To the performer, then, the analyst's concern about the craft of composition, his interest in relationships between events widely separated in musical time, his need to develop a terminology for comparing compositional techniques, these can seem foreign if not irrelevant. After all, whereas the analyst can speak and write about a work without having to perform it, the performer's presentation will, for better or worse, reflect his "analysis"; the performer commits himself to a compositional re-creation, in which his physical skills as well as his intellectual and spiritual rapport with the work are on the line.

The theorist who wishes to convince performers of the benefits of

analysis will carefully consider those objectives that distinguish the act of performing from that of analyzing. He will further ask himself which modes of analysis most specifically address the problem of how to shape a performance. A search for answers to this question has served as the point of departure for the present study.

My aim will be modest: I intend simply to make my own first formal effort to confront the relationship between performer and analyst—a relationship I regard as elusive and problematic. In doing so, I hope to contribute toward a more far-reaching endeavor that I am convinced analysts today must make: I refer here to a comprehensive critique of the value and the limitations of analysis for performance.

The format of this study reflects my special determination to examine my topic from the separate viewpoints of performer and analyst. In the ensuing discussion, I will alternately assume the roles of two musicians—a Performer whose forthcoming concert includes Beethoven's Six Bagatelles op. 126, and an Analyst who is preparing a study of the same. Many months ago these two musicians agreed that each would choose one of the six Bagatelles as a focus for the comparison of their respective goals. The reader is asked to regard this essay as a joint presentation that represents the results of their collaboration.

In that the two musicians for whom I will speak share very similar backgrounds and know each other well, it should be clear from the outset that a most idealistic exchange is about to take place. In the process of preparing their presentation, the Performer and the Analyst have already learned that each can strongly influence the other. What follows, then, will not be a debate. Instead, the Analyst will begin by presenting an overview of the Second Bagatelle; to appeal to the Performer will be the Analyst's chief purpose, and her approach to analytic method will deliberately be eclectic. When the Analyst has concluded, the Performer will offer a response; here she will cooperate with the Analyst by addressing fundamental aspects of structure discussed in the analysis, as these relate to her performance. For the Fifth Bagatelle, the Performer and the Analyst will reverse their mode of presentation. The Performer will first introduce the work and then invite the Analyst to draw this essay to its conclusion by responding to certain specific performance questions.

As the Analyst now begins with her discussion of Beethoven's Second Bagatelle op. 126, the reader is referred to the annotated reproduction of the score at Example 1. References by measure numbers will be to Example 1 unless otherwise indicated.<sup>1</sup>

Allegro

antecedent  
8 (4: basic idea)

+4: contrasting idea)

2.  
head motive

consequent  
8 (4)  
HC

+4) 10 (2) +8)  
closing statement  
PAC  
in III

1. 2.  
PAC  
in III

3  
8 *Cantabile*  
in III: I 11<sup>6</sup> V ——— I 11<sup>6</sup>

7  
33 35 *cresc.*  
V  
HC in III

Example 1. Beethoven - Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 2

Development  
1st stage

8 (4)

39

42

1 11 6

iv

2d stage

+4)

4 (2)

45

sempre *f*

3d stage

+2)

4 (1 1 2)

+1

51

54

+1

56

5

4:

model

60

4: sequence

5

64

dim. - - -

66

cresc. - - -

(IV)

The image displays four systems of musical notation for a piano piece, continuing from a previous page. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef.

- System 1 (Measures 69-73):** Features a melodic line in the treble clef with a *dim.* (diminuendo) instruction. The bass clef provides harmonic support. Fingerings are indicated with numbers 1-5. A *PAC* (Pedal Accented Chord) marking is present at the end of the system.
- System 2 (Measures 74-78):** Continues the melodic and harmonic development. It includes the instruction *sempre più dim.* (always more diminuendo) and a *codetta* section at the end.
- System 3 (Measures 79-83):** Shows further melodic and harmonic progression. A *\** marking is placed below the first measure.
- System 4 (Measures 84-88):** Concludes the section with a *cresc.* (crescendo) instruction. It includes first and second endings, marked with *1.* and *2.*

Example 1 (continued)

## Presentation of the Analyst

I propose that with the material of the initial eight measures of this Bagatelle, Beethoven firmly commits himself to the compositional issues that will be fundamental to the movement. I will interpret the most outstanding of these issues in dramatic as well as musical terms. Let us, first of all, consider certain prominent features of the initial phrase structure.

The opening of this work presents a very special challenge to the Performer: despite the striking change of design at m. 5, she must convey that the first formal punctuation occurs not at m. 4 but rather at the half cadence in m. 8. That cadence marks the end of an eight-measure phrase, and the experienced listener will recognize this as the antecedent of a potential period: namely, like the model classical antecedent phrase, this unit presents a *basic idea* (mm. 1-4) followed by a *contrasting idea* of equal length (mm. 5-8) leading to a relatively weak cadence. The potential for a period is realized within mm. 9-16; in this consequent phrase, the basic idea returns unchanged, but the contrasting idea adapts to the role of providing a stronger, authentic cadence in the mediant. So far, then, this sixteen-measure modulatory period follows a conventional plan. But one very unconventional feature of its content warrants consideration.

Within the typical antecedent phrase, the degree of contrast between the basic idea and the contrasting idea will be explicit but not always strong.<sup>2</sup> Now, in the case of this eight-measure antecedent, the overt contrast between our two ideas is, to say the least, extreme. These ideas differ very sharply, in respect to register, texture, contour, articulation, dynamic, and rhythmic values; in short, here are ideas of strongly opposing character, and together they create a most unusual period.<sup>3</sup> This salient feature inspires a metaphor to be developed throughout the analysis: I suggest that the basic idea and the contrasting idea have been juxtaposed as rivals and that they will now begin to compete for pre-eminence. I further suggest that the duality of opposing characters will affect the dramatic process of the entire movement. A unique formal design will result from that process; and thus the special content of the first eight measures itself represents a major issue of the work.<sup>4</sup>

Thus far I have used the term "basic idea" simply in reference to the material that initiates a period. It must now be clarified that the idea presented in mm. 1-4 will be basic to this Bagatelle in a much broader sense. As with many initial ideas in the classical repertory, the special motivic content of this idea will have both an immediate and a long-range influence on the structure of the work. The potential for such influence depends upon an essential characteristic of a basic idea—its capacity to be developed. More specifically, the content of a basic

idea will be amenable to certain fundamental motivic processes; among these, the procedures described by Arnold Schoenberg as reduction, condensation, and liquidation will result in the breaking down of a basic idea.<sup>5</sup> In brief, the idea contains the seeds of its own destruction. I can demonstrate this point simply by drawing attention to the straightforward surface motivic features of the basic idea in this Bagatelle.

Consider Beethoven's right-hand, left-hand notational scheme at mm. 1-4. Clearly the composer's notated groupings have been chosen to clarify the surface motivic content: a head motive is presented and immediately repeated (m. 1); the motive is repeated again, but now extended downward (m. 2); then the extension itself is expanded sequentially (mm. 3-4). The potential for a breaking down of the basic idea is already in evidence; its head motive has already begun to be developed. The three iterations of the head motive give this figure such clarity that it will be entirely possible for the motive to stand alone later. And, indeed, this is what happens in mm. 17-18.

We have seen that our initial periodic theme permits two highly contrasting ideas to alternate as if on an equal footing. At the upbeat to m. 17 the rivalry begins. Within the alternation scheme, it is the basic idea's turn to be heard. But now only its head motive appears. And whereas we originally heard three immediately successive statements of that motive, this time only two statements occur; moreover, these have been separated, or "stretched," in time, to use Edward T. Cone's expression.<sup>6</sup> Needless to say, the "stretching" technique weakens the impact of the idea; worse yet, what was once a complex four-measure statement has been *reduced* to a simple two-bar fanfare gesture. I suggest that here we have a courageous effort to maintain a position of strength. But the effort fails. For now, as if undaunted, the quiet eighth-note contrasting legato idea simply "reaches over" and completes an expansive ten-measure phrase;<sup>7</sup> thus the contrasting idea gives the strong impression of having gained the upper hand.<sup>8</sup>

This interpretation can be supported by reference to the formal function of mm. 17-26. Edward T. Cone suggests that here we have a subordinate theme in the sense of a sonata exposition.<sup>9</sup> I assert that, by achieving complete closure in the mediant at m. 16, the contrasting idea has usurped the function of a subordinate theme. What follows at mm. 17-26, then, is a *closing statement*, wherein the legato idea confirms its new key. In fact, the closing statement could be eliminated altogether without destroying the formal relationship between first and second parts of this piece. In performance one would simply eliminate the upbeat to m. 17 and proceed directly to mm. 27-30. It should be clear that what we lose by the omission of the closing statement is a striking dramatic dimension—the breaking down of the basic idea and the ascendancy of its rival. To summarize: the contrast, or conflict, between

main theme and subordinate theme that one normally associates with the sonata form has been represented here within a single, modulatory period and a closing statement. The extreme opposition of ideas within that period serves as a novel means of achieving expositional contrast within a highly compressed two-part non-sonata movement. This broad formal view will be substantiated in due course.

I now wish to address a second compositional issue that will be established as fundamental to this Bagatelle within its first eight measures—the influence of the basic idea upon the contrasting material of the work. Up to this point we have witnessed several unconcealed developmental procedures applied to the basic idea—procedures that have overtly undermined its status as a rival. Beneath the musical surface, the distinctive motivic content of this idea will be treated to additional modes of development. For the purpose of displaying these, two voice-leading graphs for the first part of the Bagatelle have been provided at Example 2.

At the beginning of graph A, I show the basic idea's compound melodic structure, and I draw attention to its two predominant initial features. First, the head motive presents a rapid ascending arpeggiation from  $\hat{1}$  to the active melodic tone  $\hat{5}$ , the  $D\sharp$ . Second, when the head motive is repeated, it yields one of the most favored intervallic patterns of the tonal era, the linear motion 5-6-5; this motion prolongs  $\hat{5}$  by introducing and resolving its upper neighbor. As we proceed through the Bagatelle, I will show that *enlargements* of the neighbor motion around  $\hat{5}$  will serve as the outstanding means of prolonging this primary melodic tone until it is ready to make its final, fundamental descent back to  $\hat{1}$ . Within the first two measures, then, the basic idea foreshadows the primary prolongational process of the movement.

As displayed at mm. 5–6 of graph A, the contrasting idea begins by mimicking, in slower motion, the basic idea's initial ascent from  $\hat{1}$  to  $\hat{5}$ . At m. 7 the ascent proceeds onward to  $E\flat$ , the neighbor  $\hat{6}$ , itself now embellished by the  $F\sharp$  and fully supported by the subdominant. Finally, at mm. 7–8, the contrasting idea enlarges the resolution of  $\hat{6}$  by allowing it to participate in a complete *turn figure* ( $E\flat$ - $D\sharp$ - $C\sharp$ - $D\sharp$ ). In short, for all its unequivocal contrast, the contrasting idea has already managed to exploit the basic idea by expanding and thus developing its initial motivic content.

Within the closing statement we have an even more enlarged variant of the melodic pattern established by the basic idea—ascent to  $\hat{5}$  followed by its prolongation through the neighbor  $\hat{6}$ . Graph A shows that at the upbeat to m. 17 the fanfare gesture, now in the mediant, initiates a middleground stepwise melodic ascent from  $B\flat^1$  through the registrally displaced  $C\sharp^3$  at m. 19 (supported by the dominant) to the further displaced  $D\sharp^1$  at m. 23 (supported by the tonic). Graph B draws attention

**A** antecedent (basic idea) ————— contrasting idea —————)

**B**

**A** consequent ————— closing statement —————

**B**

Example 2. Voice-leading graphs for  
Beethoven's Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 2 (mm. 1-26)

to the special means by which this stepwise ascent is highlighted: when the contrasting eighth-note legato idea enters at the upbeat to m. 19, it approaches the  $C\sharp^3$  by first “reaching over” one step higher, to the prefix  $D\sharp^3$  (see note 7). Once the fundamental  $B\flat-C\sharp-D\sharp$  has been recognized as the basis of the complex foreground descent in mm. 19–23, the  $E\flat^2$  at the upbeat to m. 23 will be understood to result from a second instance of reaching-over. The primary tone  $D\sharp$  thus having been achieved once again via its upper neighbor, something quite wonderful now happens. The reaching-over pattern will not yet be halted: a sudden acceleration of the harmonic rhythm at mm. 23–24 helps to propel the reaching-over process beyond its  $D\sharp^1$  goal to the neighbor  $E\flat^1$ , once again, as at m. 7, approached from  $F\sharp$  and now metrically stressed. The newly achieved middleground  $E\flat$  (supported by  $IV^6$ ) returns to the primary tone  $D\sharp$  when the cadential dominant arrives at m. 25. After my analysis of this Bagatelle has been completed, the Performer will suggest certain ramifications of these observations for performance.

Let us now consider the second part of the Bagatelle. At the beginning of this section a new *cantabile* statement will be generated by means of a very subtle variant upon a favorite classical procedure. The classical composer is fond of beginning the second part of a binary structure with the very idea that marks the end of the first part—the final cadential (or codetta) gesture. An illustration is provided at Example 3, which shows the end of the exposition and then the beginning of the development from the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata op. 10, no. 2. Now, in the Bagatelle, the variant of this procedure exemplifies what Heinrich Schenker has called the “linkage technique” (*Knüpftechnik*), discussed by Oswald Jonas<sup>10</sup> and John Rothgeb.<sup>11</sup> In this piece, as displayed in Example 1, the final melodic gesture of the closing statement will be given two “concealed repetitions” (Schenker’s *verborgene Wiederholungen*) in the first eight measures of the *cantabile*.

At Example 1, consider the last two measures of the first part (mm. 25–26). Here the syncopated rhythm gives special interest to the cadential melodic pattern  $D\sharp-C\sharp-A\sharp-B\flat$ . This is the pattern that will be concealed twice within the beginning of the second part. As a result, the slower-moving contrasting idea, having gained control within the closing statement, will maintain its control by virtue of content as well as character within the *cantabile*.

My analytic overlay at mm. 27–31 (Ex. 1) shows that the repetition of the melodic pattern  $D\sharp-C\sharp-A\sharp-B\flat$  has been enlarged: still in the region of the mediant, each tone of the pattern is now given full harmonic support within the progression  $I-ii^6-V-I$ . The same progression simply begins again at m. 31, this time stopping on the dominant at m. 34. Within the repeated progression we have the second, partial melodic

The image displays two systems of musical notation. The first system, labeled with a circled '63', shows a piano passage with a 'cresc.' (crescendo) marking. It features a first ending bracket over the final two measures of the system. The second system, labeled with a circled '67', shows a continuation of the piano passage with a second ending bracket over the final two measures of the system. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, various note values, rests, and dynamic markings.

Example 3. From the first movement of  
Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 10, No. 2

repetition, just slightly less concealed. Note especially the prominent recurrence of the motion D $\sharp$ -to-C $\sharp$  at m. 32, now contracted and harmonically intensified; conversely, the motion from C $\sharp$  down to A $\sharp$  at mm. 32–34 receives an expansion that creates the effect of melodic sequence.

To begin again: as we move from the end of the first part to the beginning of the second, the immediate augmented repetition of the melodic motion D $\sharp$ -to-C $\sharp$  should be very perceptible, and I firmly believe that the Performer will want to project that repetition. But at mm. 29–30, the motion A $\sharp$ -to-B $\flat$  is heavily concealed by an accented passing tone and a register transfer; it can easily be shown that the Performer *must not* give strong emphasis to the A $\sharp$  and the B $\flat$ . This brings us to a general performance issue. It often happens that to project a concealed idea defeats the purpose of concealment. Here Beethoven uses the linkage technique to establish a subtle continuity over the formal boundary. But by concealing his enlarged repetitions, he permits the *cantabile* structure to emerge as a new theme in its own right.

The analytic overlay at mm. 27–34 shows that a long-range stepwise descent from the primary tone D $\sharp$  has been attempted but interrupted at the half cadence in m. 34. A second attempt will be made in mm. 35–41. Here the eight-measure *cantabile* melody begins again; but now, in its new *cantabile* guise, the contrasting legato idea begins to lose control. This time the *cantabile* theme veers completely off its track, arriving at m. 41 upon the dominant of the subdominant—and, indeed, arriving one measure too soon. Example 4 clarifies this observation: there the first and second phrases of the *cantabile* theme have been aligned in order to show where a contraction from eight measures to seven measures can be most easily demonstrated to occur.

At m. 42 (Ex. 1) the silent downbeat confirms that the contrasting legato idea has finally failed to maintain its stability within the mediant. But the silence also serves as an inspiration, a golden opportunity for the initial basic idea; as such, that silence must be potent. The Performer's challenge here is to give the silence its full rhythmic value. The challenge will be met when the Performer understands that she has abruptly reached the end of an irregular seven-measure phrase at m. 41. She will then treat the silent downbeat at m. 42 as the beginning of a new eight-measure phrase.<sup>12</sup> Here the metric pattern will yield a strong bar of silence, followed by a weak bar to which the head motive of the basic idea drives as it begins to test its strength. This eight-measure unit will serve as the first stage of a three-stage development within which the basic idea will gradually reassemble its forces.

The three stages have been indicated in the score at Example 1. Note that with each successive stage, the silences are systematically shortened, until, finally, within the third stage, the basic idea achieves its

The image displays a musical score with two systems of music. The first system, starting at measure 27, is marked *Cantabile*. It features a piano accompaniment with a steady eighth-note pattern in the right hand and a more active bass line in the left hand. A melodic line is written above the staff, with a slur covering measures 27 through 34. The second system, starting at measure 35, is marked *Cresc.* and shows a more dynamic and rhythmic accompaniment. The melodic line continues with a slur from measure 35 to 38. An arrow points from the first system to the second, indicating a transition or comparison.

Example 4

original continuous sixteenth-note rhythm within the time span of its original four measures. In other words, the basic idea regains its strength by reversing the very process that led to its disintegration in the first part of the Bagatelle. There, at mm. 17-18, the head motive was cut off from the basic idea and “stretched” in time. Here the head motive gradually closes the gaps in time in order to reconstruct the fundamental rhythm of the basic idea.

We must now consider the motivic content of the third stage, mm. 54-57. Here, in its magnificent struggle to regain pre-eminence, the basic idea steals from the original contrasting idea its turn figure from mm. 7-8—the special expanded resolution of the neighbor  $\hat{6}$  to  $\hat{5}$ . In m. 54 at Example 1 an upward flag has been imposed upon the  $E\flat^2$ , the neighbor  $\hat{6}$ , in order to signal the beginning of the expanded turn figure. Observe that the  $E\flat$  moves through the  $D\sharp$  at m. 55 and the  $C\sharp$  at m. 56 to the primary melodic tone  $\hat{5}$  at m. 57; and this turn now cooperates with the chromatic descent in the bass from  $G\sharp$  to the  $D\sharp$  that announces the arrival of the home dominant. Thus once again we have an enlarged repetition of a basic motive, within which octave transfers and scrambled voice leading, displayed in graphic notation at Example 5a, conceal the fundamental progression shown at Example 5b.

At this point it is important to note that although the rhythm of the basic idea has been regained, we have not yet heard an overt tonic reprise of the basic idea; nor, for that matter, will there be one in this Bagatelle. If Beethoven had wished, however, to make a sonata-like reprise of his opening theme, the dominant arrival at m. 57 would easily have provided him the opportunity to do so at m. 58. My conventional alternate version of mm. 54-59 at Example 6 invites the gross dissatisfaction we might have experienced had the contest between conflicting ideas simply begun again. I suggest that what happens instead has everything to do with the capacity of a dramatic idea to generate a unique form. By m. 57 the basic idea has completely recovered its strength of character; it is now in a position not only to rival the contrasting idea but also to surpass it. There can be no turning back here. The basic idea must be confronted rather than merely recapitulated. And this dramatic necessity inspires one of Beethoven's great moments.

Having taken over the turn figure, the sixteenth-note idea will now tenaciously possess this motive, first making it rumble in the tenor voice (Ex. 1, mm. 58-61), then allowing it to be radiant in the upper register (mm. 62-65). But for the first time in this Bagatelle, the continuous sixteenth-note idea no longer stands alone. It now appears in counterpoint with a new (contrasting) figure, which enters like a shriek (soprano voice, mm. 58-59). This counter figure must attempt to restrain the torrent of sixteenths by imposing upon these the slowest rhythmic pattern of the *cantabile* (mm. 38-39) and the highest pitch

Example 5 consists of two systems of piano accompaniment. System 'a' shows a treble clef with a circled measure number 54 and a bass clef with a circled measure number 5. The music includes a melodic line in the treble and a bass line in the bass clef, with fingerings 6 and 8 indicated. System 'b' is similar but includes a 'V' marking at the end of the bass line.

Example 5

Example 6 is an alternate version of measures 54-59. It is a single system of piano accompaniment with a treble clef and a circled measure number 54. The music features a melodic line in the treble and a bass line in the bass clef.

Example 6. Alternate version of mm. 54-59

Example 7 shows a single system of piano accompaniment with a treble clef and a circled measure number 63. The music includes a melodic line in the treble and a bass line in the bass clef.

Example 7

of the movement. With mm. 58–65, the moment of direct confrontation arrives. It would be easy for me, the Analyst, to describe the sforzandos, the giant leaps, the unusual voice leading, the bold exchange of parts. What is difficult is to convey the enormous impact this battle of ideas must make upon the listener; thus here I will depend upon the Performer.

As we proceed toward the close of the movement, attention must now be focused upon the eighth-note upbeat to m. 66 and its consequences. At this point the contrasting counter figure of mm. 58–59, having descended through four octaves, regains its highest register and introduces the  $F\hat{b}^3$  that will prepare the entry of the fundamental neighbor  $\hat{6}$ —the  $E\hat{b}^3$ , supported, as at m. 7, by the subdominant. Here the passing tone  $E\hat{b}^3$  intensifies the culminating resolution of  $E\hat{b}^3$  to  $D\hat{b}^3$  (m. 67). As the quarter-note melodic descent begins, a most extraordinary detail emerges: inextricably connected to each tone of the melody, we have a reiteration of the head motive of the basic idea, as clarified in Example 7. At mm. 66–73, then, the Performer might profit by attempting to convey that, once and for all, our two conflicting ideas have become locked within one long definitive drive toward closure.

At mm. 68–69 the chromatic descent continues, such that  $\hat{5}$  is released to make its fundamental descent to  $\hat{3}$  as the bass marches up to the tonic. Though the turn around  $\hat{5}$  has been foresworn, the turn motive has not yet run its course: the analytic overlay at Example 1 shows that the prolonged Neapolitan 6th-chord at mm. 70–71 prepares the way for the turn to bring  $b\hat{2}$  down to  $\hat{1}$ . Now the sixteenth-note motion gives way to triplets, and a much subdued restatement of the cadential unit permits the new triplet motion to predominate.

To summarize, the big sixteen-measure section at mm. 58–77 counterbalances the sixteen-measure development, substitutes for a tonic reprise, and unites the essential elements of contrast. But the unusually weak metric placement of the tonic arrivals at mm. 73 and 77 strongly undermines the effect of finality. The need for a series of codettas is thus created, and here the composer subtly alludes to the original contrasting idea but overtly develops the cadential gesture from the end of the first part.<sup>13</sup> The silence at m. 81 forewarns that the unexpected tenderness of the tonic major will not endure. At mm. 86–89 the cadential gesture becomes a smaller two-bar fragment in the typical codetta manner, and thus the tonic minor is driven home.

What, finally, is the outcome of the conflict within the Second Bagatelle? On the one hand, the character of the contrasting idea predominates at the end; however, the failure of this idea overtly to resume its original form undermines the impression that it has won a victory. On the other hand, although the most outstanding characteristic of the

basic idea—its sixteenth-note rhythm—has been completely liquidated, a reminder of the basic idea disturbs the apparent tranquility of the codettas: I refer here to that insistent repeated-note gesture at the upbeats to mm. 86 and 88; if this gesture belongs within this Bagatelle, then might that not be because it implies a rhythmic augmentation of the basic idea's head motive and further alludes to the predominance of  $\hat{5}$  within the basic idea's initial  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  motion? I am suggesting, in the end, that neither rival has won the battle. Instead, a dialectic has been completed: the codettas represent a synthesis of the basic idea and the contrasting idea, in which only residues of their original forms remain; the interaction of these residues results in a new codetta idea at mm. 78–86. If the dialectic view convinces, then the notion of “synthesis” as represented in the Second Bagatelle should be so much more compelling than the popular idea that the normative recapitulation of a subordinate theme within the home key represents a “synthesis” within the sonata form.

To those for whom the dialectic argument seems forced, I will offer an alternate view that may have stronger implications for performance: perhaps the conflict of the Second Bagatelle becomes resolved *only* when a completely new legato *cantabile* theme is permitted to predominate in the subsequent Bagatelle No. 3. And thus the Second Bagatelle remains just that—a *Kleinigkeit*, a splendid miniature whose totality depends upon its context within the cycle as a whole. I conclude this analysis by submitting it for consideration to the Performer.

### *The Performer's Response*

It is only fair that I begin by taking full responsibility for the Analyst's effort to probe the dramatic implications of purely musical events. I, the Performer, suggested this approach. Needless to say, dramatic metaphors cannot be applied to the music of all styles. It has become widely accepted, however, that certain fundamental attributes of the classical style ideally lend themselves to the expression of dramatic action, within or outside the context of opera. By attempting to explain how formal and motivic processes can convey dramatic relationships, the Analyst has offered this Performer a mode of analysis whose appeal and value relate directly to the nature of performance.

It is generally understood that performing musicians share an essential bond with actors, with dancers, in short, with all types of performers upon whom the time arts (as opposed to the spatial arts) depend. When the musician functions as analyst or listener, he has the opportunity simultaneously to enjoy several modes of perceiving the work of art. When the musician performs, his synoptic comprehension

must be placed completely at the service of projecting the work through time—making moment-by-moment connections, holding the thread of musical logic at every point, living within and through the work until, and even after, its final tones have been achieved. The Analyst's interpretation of formal structure in terms of dramatic action attempts to capture the active, diachronic experience of the performer. And though the metaphor of the rivalry and ultimate confrontation of ideas may seem highly subjective, it speaks directly to the performer's need to find the character of the work within its structure.<sup>14</sup>

To performers who may be skeptical about the usefulness of analysis, I can stress, at the very least, that to have an analytic view of a work is to have a basis for the preparation of a performance. I will give four examples.

First, with the opening of the Second Bagatelle, I have always wanted to project the effect of a great struggle to achieve, the transmission of resounding energy from one tone to the next. An understanding of the basic idea's compound melodic structure has helped me to regulate that energy. The initial upbeat, marked *forte*, must, indeed, be strong, since the first note—the G $\sharp$ —will serve as the essential bass tone; the fundamental  $\hat{5}$ - $\hat{6}$ - $\hat{5}$  neighbor motion in the soprano will be announced not with accents but rather by a slight crescendo to the neighbor E $\flat$ .

Second, if the soft contrasting idea will truly rival the initial idea, then it must never become languid; an unwavering steadiness in tempo will allow this idea to hold its ground within the conflict.

Third, I have gained a new attitude toward the closing statement (mm. 17–26) by playing the Analyst's voice-leading graphs for this passage. Here the concept of a series of "reachings-over" carries a suggestive physical connotation and gives new meaning to the entry of the high D $\sharp$ <sup>3</sup> at the upbeat to m. 19. The absence of harmonic change in mm. 19–22 calls for an unruffled, deceptively calm descent in the soprano here; but at the point where the second and third reachings-over push onward to the neighbor E $\flat$  at m. 24, I have found a purpose for interrupting the placidity as I press toward the cadential dominant at m. 25.

Finally, I had practiced this Bagatelle for many hours without hearing the recurrence at mm. 54–57 of the turn motive. The excitement of these measures led to the problem of "rushing," common to excitable pianists. I was aware of the problem but could not find its solution. Thus hours went to the waste of ineffective practice. Once the presence of the turn motive was driven home to me, I knew *what* to practice. I discovered that the turn motive could be made more prominent by the technique of "finger-pedaling," or *Handpedal*, as Schenker calls it.<sup>15</sup> I hope that the result in my performance will be an appropriate increase in texture and volume as well as reduction of the tendency to rush.

At the very most, I am convinced that the analytic effort can heighten

the performer's confidence. Allow me to explain. When we performers begin to learn a score, performance decisions often seem so very obvious. To the Analyst's observations about the predominance of the initial neighbor motion  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  at the opening of the Second Bagatelle, we are inclined to say, "But of course the contour of the opening naturally suggests that this should be projected! And we need not know all about the long-range influence of the  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  motion in order to know how to play mm. 1-2!" Now, I suggest that it is one thing to consider how we might some day realize a score, and it is quite another thing to perform the work. Surely I am not the only performer who has discovered that, as the moment of the concert approaches, performance decisions once so straightforward have a strange way of becoming obscure. Even if I have not merely treated the score as a kind of road map that guides me from the first to the last measure, even if I have tried to follow all of the composer's markings to the letter, giving each phrase the shape and dynamic it calls for within its performance tradition, what have I done to ensure that I can recreate the complete work as if it were my own? On what basis do I perform the work as I do? If I succeed in finding confidence for the performance of the Second Bagatelle, it will be because I have tried more than ever to find an analytic basis for performance decisions. This does not mean that, for the sake of a controlling analytic view, I will forsake the effort to express improvisatory freedom and spontaneity. On the contrary, I believe that I have gained freedom in the security of knowing that I have attempted to absorb a comprehensive study of the work. [The Performer gives a complete rendition of Bagatelle no. 2, op. 126.]

### *The Performer Continues*

As promised earlier, the Analyst and I will now reverse our mode of presentation. For this I refer to Example 8, the score of Beethoven's Fifth Bagatelle op. 126. The Analyst will not present a detailed discussion of this work; rather, she will simply consider my performance of this movement and then provide a response to specific performance questions I intend to raise. To begin, then, here is my present nonverbal view of the Fifth Bagatelle. [The Performer plays Bagatelle no. 5, op. 126.]

Though I would be happy to raise many questions about the Fifth Bagatelle, I will restrict myself to an issue that concerns just one of several fundamental similarities this work shares with the G-minor Second Bagatelle. I refer here to the composer's highly idiosyncratic treatment of cadence. It will be recalled that in the Second Bagatelle the weak metric placement of the fundamental cadential tonic had the effect of necessitating a series of codettas. In the Fifth Bagatelle, I draw attention

Quasi allegretto

5.

8

15 17

22 25 cresc.

29 rinf. dim. 33 35

35 36

Example 8. Beethoven - Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 5

to mm. 29–32 (Ex. 8). This passage presents a cadential progression in which the home dominant at m. 32 is suspended to prevent the home tonic from arriving until the very last eighth note of the bar. Once again, then, we have a cadential tonic whose effect is enormously weakened by its metric placement.

Observe that the second part of the Bagatelle begins in the key of C major—the subdominant of the home key. A return to the home G major is begun at m. 25, and the cadence that follows (discussed above) confirms that key. But then the second part is immediately repeated; and now that final eighth-note tonic chord at m. 32 gains a new significance, for without it the connection back into C major would fail. To be specific, this chord sounds like the dominant of C major, returning to its tonic; and thus the subsidiary function of the cadential goal seems to justify its weak metric position. But this will simply not be the case when we hear the weak G-major cadence for the second time. As we continue now into the final section of the movement, the music remains in the home key. And the material we then hear sounds every bit like a tonic reprise of the opening theme. The possibility of a reprise at m. 35 that is preceded by an apparent tonic cadence at m. 32 brings me to my performance questions.

If I am to project a point of reprise at m. 35, how am I to make sense of the cadence in the home key at m. 32? Which, if either, of these two events should carry the greater structural weight, and which should thus serve as my directional goal? Should I regard the cadence as a fundamental closure? If so, then might I relax the continuous eighth-note motion at mm. 33–34? Or, should I exaggerate the weakness of the tonic chord at m. 32 by driving onward to m. 35 as the more essential boundary-point? If so, how do I create a sense of true arrival at m. 35 while at the same time observing the composer's soft dynamic and effecting his transfer to the upper register?

My questions are in part provoked by Edward T. Cone's discussion of this Bagatelle and the specific directions he gives to performers. Cone is concerned that too much emphasis upon a tonic cadence at m. 32 will make the reprise "sound anticlimactic." He therefore directs the performer to project a prolonged *dominant* all the way from m. 32 to the downbeat of m. 35: "Bar 32, then, must be played this time [that is, in the repeat] as metrically strong; the Ds of its bass must receive sufficient stress to bear the weight of three bars, underpinning the apparent tonics and converting them into second inversions."<sup>16</sup> Example 9 reproduces Cone's own illustration of his view.

Until recently, Edward T. Cone has been one of the few analysts whose work directly addresses the performer. In light of the value of his far-ranging contributions in this area, I have tried very carefully to follow his directives for the Fifth Bagatelle. But I have not found success

The image displays a musical score for Example 9, consisting of three staves labeled 'a', 'b', and 'c'.  
 Staff 'a' (treble clef) contains measures 32, 17, and 33. Measure 32 features a melodic line with eighth notes. Measure 17 is a whole note chord. Measure 33 continues the melodic line. A 'ritardando' marking is present at the end of the staff.  
 Staff 'b' (bass clef) contains measures 32 and 17. Measure 32 has a melodic line, and measure 17 is a whole note chord.  
 Staff 'c' (bass clef) contains measures 32 and 33. Measure 32 has a melodic line, and measure 33 is a whole note chord.  
 Below the staves, figured bass notation is provided:  
 C: v/v v v/v v I  
 G: v I

Example 9. From Edward T. Cone, "Beethoven's Experiments in Composition: The Late Bagatelles," p. 93

here. It does not seem right to sustain the tension needed to imply an unresolved dominant within mm. 33–34. Moreover, my performance has most probably exposed the fact that I am not yet convinced of an alternative. In the hope that a clarification of formal functions might help me, I now invite the Analyst to answer my questions.

### *The Analyst Responds*

It is generally well known that Beethoven's late works demonstrate his capacity to transform traditional formal models. To reveal Beethoven's innovations in the Fifth Bagatelle, I propose that the model undergoing transformation here is the so-called *small* (or simple) *binary* form—a model Beethoven and others have favored for the construction of variation themes rather than complete movements (for example, consider the slow movements of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas opp. 57, 109, and 111).<sup>17</sup> In the Bagatelle, the double bars mark the boundaries of the two fundamental parts, and the final section (mm. 33–42) stands outside the essential form. If this binary view evokes surprise, then perhaps the notion of transformation succeeds.

Indeed, even though the final section of the movement is not included within the repetition of the second part, I entirely agree with the Performer that Beethoven manages to make this section behave like a reprise within a small ternary (rounded binary) design. And, by stabilizing the subdominant so firmly within the dream-like context of his utterly new material at the beginning of the second part, the composer even captures the character of the self-contained Trio within a large, composite ternary. But in both these areas of the piece, Beethoven deceives us. Once we realize that the first part of the Bagatelle has entirely failed to close in the tonic, we understand that a Trio at m. 17 is simply out of the question. And once we acknowledge that middle sections of ternary forms *rarely* conclude with full closure in the home key, we will recognize Edward T. Cone's dilemma about the cadential progression in the tonic at mm. 29–32.

For the purpose of demonstrating the concealed binary design of this Bagatelle and the formal function of its final section, foreground and middleground graphs of the complete movement have been provided at Example 10. In graph B, mm. 17–24, I show that the prolonged C-major subdominant at the beginning of the second part supports the prolonged  $\hat{6}$ , the  $E\hat{4}^2$ . The special melodic role of  $\hat{6}$  in this passage has been prepared in advance. Within the very initial basic idea of the movement (graph A, mm. 1–2), it is the foreground neighbor  $\hat{6}$  that confirms the primary melodic tone  $\hat{5}$ . I call particular attention to graph A, mm. 9–11. Here the supported foreground chromatic ascent

**A** antecedent (basic idea; seq. rep.; continuation to HC) consequent (modulatory)

**B**

Example 10. Voice-leading graphs for  
Beethoven's Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 5

The image displays two systems of a musical score, labeled A and B. System A is divided into three sections: 'presentation', 'continuation', and 'cadential phrase'. System B continues the 'continuation' section. The score features piano (p) and violin (v) parts. In system A, the piano part has a circled 12 and the violin part has a circled 13. In system B, the piano part has a circled 14 and the violin part has a circled 15. Roman numerals (IV, V, VI) are placed below the piano part in system A. In system B, the piano part is marked 'as neighbor' and has a circled 14. The violin part in system B has a circled 15. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and dynamic markings.

Example 10 (continued)

\*The asterisks draw attention to the outstanding rôle of the neighbor tone 6̂ in this movement.

Example 10 (continued)

from  $\hat{5}$  through  $\# \hat{5}$  to  $\hat{6}$  foreshadows a broader middleground motion, shown in graph B, mm. 19–24—the motion from the tonic at m. 9 through the dominant of VI (E minor) at m. 16 into the unexpected domain of the subdominant at mm. 17–24.<sup>18</sup> As we leave the subdominant for the home key at m. 25, the ascent in the melody transfers the neighbor  $\hat{6}$  to its upper register, where an exchange of voices between bass and essential soprano at mm. 28–29 further throws into relief the fundamental resolution of  $\hat{6}$  to  $\hat{5}$  (graphs A and B). Now, at mm. 29–30, we are given one more chance to absorb the idea of the chromatic ascent from  $\hat{5}$  to  $\hat{6}$ , after which  $\hat{5}$  makes its conclusive, supported stepwise descent to  $\hat{1}$  at mm. 31–32. In my opinion what follows, then, is a two-measure *tonic-prolonging* codetta that extends the cadential idea of m. 32 and introduces a coda.

As with the codettas of the Second Bagatelle, here is a coda that is badly needed, thanks to the pre-eminence of the subdominant in the second part and the amazingly weak arrival of the cadential tonic in m. 32. Here also is a coda that substitutes for a reprise: it will be well to note that the coda presents the consequent unit that might have appeared at mm. 9–16 had the initial periodic structure of the opening theme closed normatively in the tonic; in this respect, the function of reprise is completely fulfilled. It should further be observed that the final cadential gesture of the movement parallels and thus closes the open-ended gesture on the dominant of VI at m. 16, just as the cadential gesture at mm. 31–32 closes the half cadence at mm. 7–8. However, a single outstanding feature of the coda—its tenuous, ethereal upper register—betrays its true function: the coda fails to re-establish the register of the opening theme; instead, the codetta of mm. 33–34 accomplishes this, and then the coda reaffirms the register of the fundamental cadence. Far from providing the climax of the movement, as Edward T. Cone implies, the final section serves as a tender reminiscence, a summary statement, in which the all-important neighbor  $\hat{6}$  receives four wonderful farewell tributes (see the asterisks in graph A, mm. 35–42).

In short, to the Performer's question, "Should I regard the cadence at m. 32 as a fundamental closure?", my answer is yes. In other words, to her question whether to drive onward to m. 35, I say "no."

Beyond this, do I fully believe that the Performer will succeed with the movement *only* if she understands the closing section as a coda rather than a reprise? Here, again, the answer must be no. The analytic observation that the final section is a coda can inform the Performer *what not* to do: namely, do not treat the weak cadence at m. 32 as if it did not exist; and do not fail to change the pedal on the last eighth note of that bar. But does the same analytic observation inform the pianist precisely what to do? I do not believe so. If I heard accurately,

this Performer stole just a bit of time before the coda. Harris Goldsmith's forthcoming recording features tiny pauses on the last eighth notes of mm. 32, 33, and 34.<sup>19</sup> Alfred Brendel takes no time at all in these measures; instead, his generally slow tempo and quiet dynamic effect a seamless connection into the coda, and thus he reinforces Beethoven's deliberate ambiguity.<sup>20</sup> All three of these performers convey tonic closure rather than prolonged dominant, but each achieves this effect by impalpably different means. Of all the benefits I have gained from collaborating with my friend the Performer, the first among these is the confirmation that *there is no single, one-and-only performance decision that can be dictated by an analytic observation.*

### *Conclusions*

This study opened with the assertion that the analyst will profit by considering how his work differs from the special demands of the performance experience. By having assumed the roles of both Performer and Analyst, I have attempted not only to explore but also to display some of the obvious similarities and differences between their activities. If we can agree that the performer and the analyst both labor toward a comprehensive understanding of the musical work, then one fundamental difference arises. Whereas the analyst's verbal medium requires a final commitment to a presently held view, the performer's non-verbal "view" must never be taken as final within a live performance. Just one false move—a finger placed too heavily (or too lightly) on the key, an arm motion that misses its target—can force the performer to adjust the fine points of his strategy; suddenly new decisions must be made, and with these, a new "view" may be born. In such moments of stress, or of inspiration, for that matter, the performer's conscious prior analytic work can be tremendously helpful, but here an additional skill not demanded of the analyst is required of the performer—the creative ability to have moment-by-moment control over relationships in sound.

Many have stressed that the richness and complexity of the masterpiece preclude the so-called "definitive" performance or "best" analysis. But it is that very unlimited wealth of genius that invites us forever to make analyses, to perform works already recorded, and then to perform them again. Idealists through and through, the Analyst and Performer portrayed in this study hold that there are always "different, better" performances and analyses to be achieved. Since they have learned that they can help each other toward that goal, they conclude with a call to other performers and analysts for greater commitment toward a liaison based upon an increased understanding of shared and separate tasks.

## NOTES

NB: The preceding is an adaptation of a paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Music Theory, New Haven, 1983. I am grateful to the editors of this journal for permitting me to retain the untraditional format of the paper and its presentational, rather than strictly academic, tone.

1. In Example 1 circled numbers represent measure numbers; a number placed above a measure signals the beginning of a phrase (or sub-unit of the phrase) and indicates its length. The abbreviation HC stands for "half cadence," PAC for "perfect authentic cadence."
2. For example, within the eight-measure period that introduces the subordinate group of the *Waldstein* Sonata op. 53, the two-bar basic idea (mm. 35-36) descends stepwise to the subdominant harmony, whereas the contrasting idea (mm. 37-38) ascends stepwise with crescendo to the half cadence; these differences in contour, dynamic, and harmonic goal create surface contrast, but the rhythmic pattern, register, texture, and articulation remain the same for the two ideas.
3. That the content of this eight-measure antecedent and its consequent produces an untypical example of the sixteen-measure period can be substantiated by additional reference to classical norms. It is well known that the normative classical period is an eight-measure structure, with four-bar divisions into antecedent and consequent phrases. The sixteen-measure period most typically appears in fast-tempo triple-meter Scherzos, where sixteen notated bars represent eight hypermeasures. Consider the Allegretto movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata op. 14, no. 1; here the basic idea (mm. 1-4) and the contrasting idea (mm. 5-8) differ in respect to rhythmic patterns, harmonic goals, and contour but are similar in respect to other surface features. By comparison, the degree of contrast within the antecedent of the Second Bagatelle appears all the more extreme.

Although the Allegro tempo of the Bagatelle invites the comparison of its initial period with those of Scherzo movements, this Bagatelle does not feature the triple meter of the Scherzo, nor will it take on the traditional rounded binary form of the classical Scherzo genre. Indeed, I have found no prototype for this sixteen-measure period within the classical repertory.

4. My proposal that the unique features of the initial phrase structure have everything to do with the dramatic process of the entire Bagatelle is compatible with the following observations by Carl Dahlhaus about Beethoven's Third Symphony op. 55: "The eight-note theme—or 'motto'—of the first movement of the *Eroica* is determined by the overall design and not vice versa: the form is not built up out of the theme. The motto is not so much stated or expounded and then developed as brought forth by the symphonic process in which it has a function to fulfill, and the musical 'idea' is the symphonic process itself, not the theme. . . . In Beethoven formal ideas and melodic detail come into being simultaneously: the single motive is relative to the whole" (*Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century*, trans. Mary Whittall [Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980], pp. 41-42).

5. Schoenberg defines the terms “reduction,” “condensation,” and “liquidation” within his discussion of developmental techniques typically applied in the continuation phrase of the “sentence” structure (Arnold Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, ed. Gerald Strang and Leonard Stein [New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1967], pp. 58–59). Schoenberg’s notion of reduction—that is, the omission of a part of the basic idea—will be demonstrated shortly.

In this study I follow my colleague William E. Caplin in using the term “basic idea” to denote the two-measure (or two-hypermeasure) formal unit that initiates a theme and presents its essential melodic-motivic material (see Caplin, “The ‘Expanded Cadential Progression’: A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form,” publication forthcoming). In *Fundamentals* Schoenberg refers to this basic unit of formal structure as a “phrase” (pp. 21, 25, 58). Caplin substitutes the term “basic idea” in recognition that, for theorists today, the “phrase” is generally greater in length than two measures or two hypermeasures. Since a basic idea typically consists of motives that will be fundamental to the work as a whole, the term “basic idea” as used here is compatible with Schoenberg’s notion of “*musikalische Gedanke*” (“musical idea”), or “*Grundgestalt*” (“basic shape”), when, according to Josef Rufer, Schoenberg has this term mean a small musical unit “which is the *basis* of a work and is its ‘first creative thought’ (to use Schoenberg’s words)” (Josef Rufer, *Composition with Twelve Notes*, rev. ed., trans. Humphrey Searle [London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1969], pp. vi–vii).

I take this opportunity to thank William Caplin for his excellent advice during the preliminary and final stages of my study.

6. See Edward T. Cone, “Beethoven’s Experiments in Composition: The Late Bagatelles,” in *Beethoven Studies* 2, ed. Alan Tyson (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 103. Cone’s penetrating article has provided inspiration not only for the present study but also for Jonathan Dunsby’s “A Bagatelle on Beethoven’s WoO 60,” *Music Analysis* 3 (1984): 57–68. (See Dunsby’s acknowledgments on p. 57.)
7. I allude here to Schenker’s concept of *Uebergreifen*, translated as “reaching-over” by Ernst Oster in Henrich Schenker, *Free Composition (Der freie Satz)* (New York: Longman, 1979), pp. 47–49, 83. It will be demonstrated shortly that a series of reachings-over informs the passage at mm. 18–24.
8. The definitive harmonic-melodic structure of the contrasting idea is that evidenced at its first appearance in mm. 5–8. Needless to say, this structure does not recur at mm. 19–26. Thus in proposing that the “contrasting idea” predominates in these measures, I am permitting the idea to be represented by its additional definitive attributes—its soft dynamic, its legato articulation, and its generally continuous eighth-note rhythm.
9. Cone, “Beethoven’s Experiments,” p. 103.
10. Oswald Jonas, *Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker*, trans. and ed. John Rothgeb (New York: Longman, 1982), pp. 7–9, 134.
11. John Rothgeb, “Thematic Content: A Schenkerian View,” in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David Beach (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 44–45, 48–58 *passim*.
12. My phrase divisions here and elsewhere concur in general with those Erwin Ratz presents in his analysis of the work; specifically, Ratz identifies a seven-

measure unit at mm. 35–41, followed by an eight-measure unit at mm. 42–49 (though he does not give a German equivalent of the term “phrase” as I use it here). See Erwin Ratz, *Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre*, 3d rev. ed. (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1973), pp. 172–175.

I arrived at my decisions about the formal function of phrase structures in the Second Bagatelle prior to studying Ratz’s discussion of this work. It is no coincidence, however, that my views on these issues are similar to his: within the last five years, the first chapter of Ratz’s *Einführung*—“Typische Formstrukturen bei Beethoven”—has strongly influenced my analysis of classical form.

13. Compare the contour, harmonic plan, and  $\hat{6}$ -to- $\hat{5}$  motion of mm. 5–8 with the events of mm. 78–81.
14. “The performer’s paramount concern is to realize the character of the music; it is the purpose for which the music was written. He should not begin with preconceived ideas about moods or emotions to be expressed, but seek the character in the music’s formal features. It is the structure of the music, resulting from its melodic, harmonic, rhythmical and dynamic components, that determines form and character at the same time. The character is given by the structure. In fully realizing the second he will convey the first, but by pulling the music about he will contort both” (Erwin Stein, *Form and Performance* [New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962], p. 20).
15. Hand pedal is a legato keyboard technique in which keys are held longer than required by the notated rhythm. Here the Performer holds down the  $D\sharp^2$  (m. 55), the  $C\sharp^2$  (m. 56), and the  $D\flat^2$  (m. 57) until the right-hand rest of each measure. For Schenker’s observations about hand pedal, see William Rothstein, “Heinrich Schenker as an Interpreter of Beethoven’s Piano Sonatas,” *19th Century Music* 8 (1984): 19–20.
16. Cone, “Beethoven’s Experiments,” p. 93.
17. See Erwin Ratz’s discussion of the small binary form (“zweiteilige Lied”) in *Einführung*, p. 30.
18. Within this broad middleground progression, and somewhat closer to the surface but highly concealed, we have yet another projection of the supported chromatic ascent  $\hat{5}$ - $\sharp\hat{5}$ -6 at mm. 9–14. In Graph B the chromatic ascent takes the fundamental form of a linear  $5$ –(6-6)–5 motion that prolongs the tonic. I am indebted to John Rothgeb for his help toward the graphic representation of this difficult passage, for his clarification of the connection between foreground and middleground here, and in general for his critical assessment of my complete voice-leading graphs at Examples 2 and 10.
19. Harris Goldsmith, Beethoven–“Tempest” Sonata and Nine Stücke, *Sine Qua Non* recordings, forthcoming.
20. Alfred Brendel, Beethoven–Bagatelles opp. 33, 119, 126, *Turnabout* TV 34077 S [196–].