

## Towards a Reconciliation of Schenkerian Concepts with Traditional and Recent Theories of Form

Author(s): Janet Schmalfeldt

Source: *Music Analysis*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Oct., 1991), pp. 233-287

Published by: [Wiley](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/853969>

Accessed: 23-11-2015 12:38 UTC

### REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[http://www.jstor.org/stable/853969?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/853969?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

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.



Wiley is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Music Analysis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

---

JANET SCHMALFELDT

## TOWARDS A RECONCILIATION OF SCHENKERIAN CONCEPTS WITH TRADITIONAL AND RECENT THEORIES OF FORM

---

At this revisionist stage in the reception and critique of Schenkerian theory, it is time to examine an important consequence of Heinrich Schenker's influence – the deprecation of 'conventional' theories of form. Among these, the ideas about form in tonal music developed by Arnold Schoenberg, one of Schenker's opponents on certain fundamental matters, can be posited as representative of concepts that Schenker presumed his 'new theory of form' would invalidate.<sup>1</sup> Schoenberg's formal views, like those of more recent writers about form, find their basis within the mid-to-late nineteenth-century formal tradition most especially inaugurated by A. B. Marx and rejected by Schenker.

One cannot help but wonder whether the conflict between Schenkerian concepts and traditional formal theories would have arisen if Schenker and Schoenberg, two of the most influential theorists of this century, had acknowledged certain shared first principles. As what we today call organicists, both understood 'form' to be not just the interrelation of parts within the whole, but also one that manifests structural, organic coherence. As classicists, both endowed form with the capacity for balance through the continual interaction between parts and whole within a hierarchic design. As the heirs of nineteenth-century formal theory, both tended to conflate 'forms' with genres,<sup>2</sup> to regard these as fixed formal categories and to be essentially concerned with the form-types established as conventions by mid-to-late eighteenth-century composers. Finally, both passionately believed that to compose in the truest sense of the word is to 'envision the form as a totality'.<sup>3</sup> In brief, Schenker and Schoenberg fundamentally concurred on the nature and role of form as the concrete result of a coherent compositional process. But Schenker's radically new view of the origin of form has had the effect of minimizing his common bonds with Schoenberg to such a degree that these would appear to be trivial.

For Schoenberg, whether as atonal composer or as theorist of tonal form, each vision of the totality must necessarily be a new vision, a unique idea whose individuality would be the worthy product of a truly creative

act. In Schenker's theory at the final stage of its development, all great composers share one and the same vision – the totality of the fundamental structure (*Ursatz*). For Schenker, form originates in the background and derives from this through the technique of *Auskomponierung*; thus both the uniqueness of a work and its form emerge as strictly middleground-to-foreground phenomena.<sup>4</sup>

If the origin of form resides in the background, then Schenker must vehemently reject all notions of form that take foreground elements as their 'starting point' – that is, all concepts that do not invoke the principle of structural levels.<sup>5</sup> It follows that he would have rejected three formal concepts distinctly associated with Schoenberg and his school: 1) the *Grundgestalt* ('basic shape', 'basic motive', 'basic idea') as the concrete musical representation of the composer's vision; 2) the realization of a *Grundgestalt* through the technique of 'developing variation'; and 3) the concept of *formal function* of parts within the whole. To a large extent disciples of Schenker have taken his cue, dismissing not only Schoenberg's ideas but also many aspects of traditional formal theory in general. Particularly untenable for the Schenkerian is Schoenberg's notion of the 'motive' as a generative element of form. The term 'motive' in Schoenberg's sense is what Schenker calls "motive" in the usual sense' (see note 5) – a 'surface' or foreground phenomenon; until recently, Schenkerians have tended to devalue the individual role of the 'surface' motive in favour of Schenker's 'hidden [motivic] repetition' ('motivic parallelism') – a phenomenon that involves more than one structural level.<sup>6</sup> The Schenkerian analyst also tends, like Schenker, to address primarily the large-scale, or middleground, units of forms (e.g. A-B-A; first theme, second theme; exposition/development/recapitulation). Notions of foreground *process* such as 'fragmentation' (see below) and 'cadential evasion' are rarely explored; and terms that describe the functions of ideas and phrases within the thematic process are notably eschewed.<sup>7</sup>

I should like to believe that Schenker's scathing critique of traditional formal concepts as expressed in his final, and consummate, work – *Der freie Satz* – is a deliberate overstatement – a polemic that has been partially misinterpreted. If the tonal composition indeed expresses 'form', albeit through the composing-out of the fundamental structure, then surely the elements of form, the roles, or functions, that formal units play on multiple *formal levels*, and the very process of formal articulation have validity as subjects for analysis. Moreover, the analyst who endorses the notion of formal process – whether as a mode of musical perception or an aspect of composition, or both – should surely want to ask: In what ways does that process interact with harmonic-contrapuntal structure, or perhaps sometimes conflict with the same?

In order to demonstrate the interaction between formal and voice-leading processes, this study proposes that certain well-established types of formal procedure tend to become associated with specific harmonic-

contrapuntal plans. In particular, the core of the study will focus upon Schoenberg's concept of the 'sentence' (*Satz*) – a type of theme also identified by Leonard B. Meyer as the 'bar form', and one that already begins to emerge as a formal convention in the treatises of the eighteenth-century theorists Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Joseph Riepel and Heinrich Christoph Koch.<sup>8</sup> From the Schenkerian viewpoint, forms are determined by the composing-out of archetypal *linear progressions* (*Züge*). It can be argued, however, that once the sentence-type had become established in the mid-eighteenth century as a conventional formal model, the composer's choice of this phrase structure may very well have contributed towards determining how the linear progression would be elaborated. A similar case will be made for the classical theme-type known today as the 'period'; and, finally, Schoenberg-orientated concepts concerning the formal dynamic of the complete sonata exposition will be investigated towards the goal of assessing their compatibility with Schenkerian principles.

Put most generally, the basis for reconciliation to be explored here is the premise that categories, or 'ideal [in the sense of abstract] types', of musical organization play as central a role in Schenkerian theory as they do in both traditional and recent theories of form; whereas the formalist creates formal categories, the Schenkerian deals with contrapuntal archetypes, as these derive from or replicate the *Ursatz*. In this respect, then, Schenker's 'new theory of form' is no less vulnerable than conventional formal theories to avant-garde criticisms of the kind that Carl Dahlhaus has disparaged: 'as soon as clearly defined forms, rather than form in general, are discussed, formalism is suspected of wanting to incarcerate music in schematic patterns.'<sup>9</sup> Ironically, however, a concern for schematic patterns, variously identified as 'musical archetypes', 'schemata', 'formal conventions' and 'narrative paradigms', has recently resurged not only in studies about the perception of classical stylistic traits<sup>10</sup> but also in essays on such diverse topics as narrativity in music, the role of feminism, gender, sexuality and politics in music-historical criticism,<sup>11</sup> and the origins of musical irony.<sup>12</sup> In these latter essays, formal conventions and conventional forms tend to serve as backdrops against which musical innovation can be interpreted as social commentary. In the present study I can only touch upon the possible relevance to some of these areas of inquiry that an integration of Schenkerian and formal concepts might have; but I do this with the conviction that the attempt towards such an integration is both timely and productive.

It has, of course, long been recognized that, like past and even recent theories of form in tonal music, Schenker's theory evolved as a product of his intensive involvement with compositions from the canon of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century repertoires; moreover, and despite this concentration within a circumscribed historical period, Schenker's writings adopt a noticeably ahistorical tone. Both my choice of musical examples

below – from well-known works by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin and Schubert – and their non-chronological ordering risk the charge that I perpetuate Schenker's biases. My intention has been quite otherwise: since I deal comparatively here with two distinct modes of theoretic thought, the ordering of my materials must necessarily follow a theoretic, rather than historical, argument; and, by addressing music of the kind that both Schenkerians and formalists have traditionally but independently explored, I endeavour to make my claim for the advantages of a reconciliation more persuasive.

## I

As a point of departure, let us consider certain extremely pertinent statements from a recent article by Anthony Newcomb entitled 'Schumann and Late Eighteenth-Century Narrative Strategies'. Newcomb proposes an analogy between 'paradigmatic or conventional narrative successions in literature and history on the one hand, and formal types in music on the other'; for Newcomb 'both can be thought of as a series of functional events in a prescribed order ... what one might call a paradigmatic plot'.<sup>13</sup> Newcomb holds that 'much Classical and Romantic music ... depends in some way on the musical analogue to paradigmatic plots',<sup>14</sup> but he stresses that the task of establishing a 'typology of musical plots' 'remains to be done'.<sup>15</sup> His critique of 'formal diagrams in music appreciation text books' is entirely apt, and readers might agree that it applies as well to the unexplicated Schenkerian voice-leading graph:

... these formal diagrams never question how we identify a particular stretch of music as having a particular function in a particular series. For them the series is given. They do not ask which beginning, or transitional, or closing strategies are appropriate to, and hence signal, certain places in certain kinds of structures. A careful formulation of narrative paradigms in music would have to do this.<sup>16</sup>

Specifically, Newcomb asks: 'is there, in isolation (but within a given style) a difference between a first theme, a transitional passage, a second theme, a closing theme, which enables us to propose a place for the musical event we are hearing ... and hence to interpret the context around that event accordingly?'<sup>17</sup> Whereas Newcomb leaves this question open, Schoenberg might have answered the question as follows: Yes, within the late eighteenth-century style we *can* propose a place, or function, for events, since the structure of, for example, a first theme *will* be different from that of a transition or a second theme. A beneficial step in the 'formulation of narrative paradigms' may well be to reinvestigate Schoenberg's typology of themes, as expressed most succinctly in his

*Fundamentals of Musical Composition*. That Schoenberg's theory of theme-types in particular and of form in general rests upon the concept of 'formal function' is clarified and developed by his student Erwin Ratz.<sup>18</sup> And the American scholar William E. Caplin is currently undertaking a further expansion of Schoenberg's and Ratz's concepts, in a large-scale study whose working title is *A Theory of Formal Function*.

Here, then, are three formal theorists – Schoenberg, Ratz and Caplin – who give one kind of basis for addressing Newcomb's question, especially as this concerns not only inter- and intra-thematic formal functions but also *formal syntax*. It must be stressed, however, that none of these theorists explicitly applies the concept of formal function to a theory of 'narrative strategies' or 'paradigmatic plots'; moreover, none of these theorists directly endorses Schenker's concept of voice-leading levels. Recent criticisms notwithstanding,<sup>19</sup> a new and valuable emphasis on the dimension of linearity in music has been gained by the numerous recent studies that seek analogies between narrative literature and music. But to analysts for whom form and voice-leading are correlative concepts, the narrative metaphor will remain superficial as long as it depends primarily upon formal paradigms: surely if so-called absolute instrumental music metaphorically 'tells a story', it accomplishes this not just through its treatment of formal conventions, but rather by the interaction of both formal and harmonic-contrapuntal processes as these in turn articulate motive, idea and rhythm. Thus to find a basis for mediation between voice-leading and formal concepts assumes a special importance relative to current narrative theories about music.

This study proposes that one such mediatory basis concerns the concept of 'theme' – a central issue in theories of form from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. Inextricably associated with 'theme' is the concept of 'cadence' – a topic I address more fully in a separate article.<sup>20</sup> For the Schenkerian a complete middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure – that is, a middleground replica of an *Ursatz*-form (such as the one shown in Ex. 2b) – prolongs its initial tonic by means of a descending linear progression that closes in that same tonic with a perfect authentic cadence; for most formal theorists the closure of a theme will be articulated by a cadential progression. Thus there emerges a correspondence between 'theme' and 'complete middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure', but the correspondence will have validity *only* if we are careful to use the term 'theme' in the sense that Schoenberg and Ratz, among others, understand it: for Schoenberg, a theme is not just a melody or a series of motivic shapes; Caplin defines Schoenberg's 'theme' as 'a complete musical complex that includes a soprano and bass counterpoint, a definite harmonic plan, a phrase-structural design, and cadential closure'.<sup>21</sup> It is possible to elaborate on Caplin's statement as follows: when the 'complete musical complex' he defines is a harmonically stable, non-modulating theme, then, in Schenkerian terms, a theme frequently projects a complete



middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure.

Schoenberg implies and Ratz proposes that four types of themes become fundamental as conventions within the mid-to-late eighteenth-century European repertoire – the ‘sentence’, the ‘period’, the ‘small ternary’ and the ‘small binary’. In their paradigmatic forms, these four theme-types exhibit what Ratz calls a ‘tightly-knit construction’ (*fest Gefügetes*);<sup>22</sup> Caplin clarifies that the ‘tightly-knit’ theme will be non-modulating (that is, harmonically stable within a single tonal region), that its internal grouping structures will be more or less symmetrical and regular in length, that each formal component within the whole will clearly express a specific formal function, and that the theme will close with a cadence.<sup>23</sup> As such, the paradigmatic forms of the sentence, the period and the small ternary tend to serve as *main themes* (first themes) within larger, complete-movement classical forms such as the sonata movement and the 2- or 3-part Adagio; the small binary frequently serves as the form of the rondo refrain and the theme for variations.

In contrast to the tightly-knit theme, Schoenberg and Ratz propose the metaphor of ‘loose [thematic] construction’ (*locker Gefügetes*) – characteristic of ‘secondary themes’, ‘transitions’, ‘retransitions’, ‘developments’ and ‘contrasting middle sections’ of the small ternary.<sup>24</sup> Caplin has further posited the notion of a ‘continuum between tightknit organization at one extreme and loose organization at the other extreme’.<sup>25</sup> For example, within the ‘paradigmatic plot’ of the late eighteenth-century sonata exposition, the construction of the main theme tends to be more tightly knit than that of the transition and the secondary theme; the transition – the unit whose formal function is to destabilize the home key – exhibits the loosest organization, and the secondary theme is typically looser than the main theme but more tightly knit than the transition. More specifically, a secondary theme is often based upon the paradigm of the sentence or the period; but departures from the archetypical plan will yield expanded forms of these paradigms or altogether unique thematic processes.

Ratz’s and Caplin’s Schoenberg-orientated views about sonata expositions find a precedent in the work of Heinrich Christoph Koch, who recognized that in first movements of the symphony, the sonata and the concerto, the section within the first part devoted to the key of the dominant – that is, the secondary-key area – tends to be *longer* than the first section (main theme plus transition).<sup>26</sup> Here is the area that typically displays numerous extension techniques, often involving multiple thematic processes, evaded cadences and expanded cadential progressions. And here is the area to which the following statement from Schenker about tonal music in general most particularly applies from the viewpoint of late-eighteenth-century formal processes: ‘In the art of music, as in life, motion toward the goal encounters obstacles, reverses, disappointments, and involves great distances, detours, expansions, interpolations, and, in short, retardations of all kinds. Therein lies the source of all artistic delaying,

from which the creative mind can derive content that is ever new.<sup>27</sup>

## II

As shown in Ex. 1, the first part of the Menuetto from Haydn's D major Symphony No. 104 (1795) introduces (bs 1-8), and then repeats (bs 9-16), a model form of the tightly-knit theme-type called the sentence. Those who recall Edward T. Cone's discussion of the opening 'sentence-pattern' of Beethoven's Op. 2, No. 1 (first movement, bs 1-8), or Meyer's 'bar-form' analysis of the initial antecedent and consequent phrases of Mozart's K.331 (first movement, bs 1-4, 5-8), will be inclined to identify Haydn's sentence primarily on the basis of its characteristic proportional design: an initial two-bar idea, immediately repeated, then followed by a four-bar unit that expresses 'something new' (as Ratz puts it), yields the plan 2:2:4 (= 1:1:2), articulated by a motivic structure that can be loosely represented as *m-m'-n* (after Meyer).<sup>28</sup> Caplin would further clarify that Haydn's eight-bar sentence expresses three successive formal functions: 'presentation', 'continuation' and 'cadential'.<sup>29</sup> The opening four-bar unit (2 + 2) provides the 'presentation' – the unit whose definitive feature, the immediate, characteristically embellished, but nevertheless fully recognizable, repetition at bs 3-4 of the idea at bs 1-2, creates a secure structural beginning for the theme within the context of a stable, tonic-prolongational progression. Indeed, since by definition a presentation serves as a beginning rather than as an ending, it will not conclude with a cadence; rather, its twofold projection of the *basic idea* (BI) serves to establish and extend the tonic, in Haydn's case by the simplest possible means – the tonic pedal. Moreover, thus twice presented, Haydn's initial idea will become *basic* not only to the structure of the theme but also to the movement as a whole.

In reaction to the stability of the tonic-prolonging presentation, the second unit of the model sentence – the 'continuation' – typically activates, or mobilizes, the theme through one or more of the following techniques: 1) an acceleration in the rate of harmonic change on the immediate foreground; 2) an increase in surface rhythmic activity; 3) sequential harmonic progression; and 4) the breaking down of the basic idea's two-bar unit size into smaller segments – a process variously identified as *Zergliederung* (Koch), *Verengerung* (Wilhelm Fischer), 'reduction' (Schoenberg), 'foreshortening' (Brendel) and 'phrase-structural fragmentation' (Caplin).<sup>30</sup> Haydn's continuation (bs 5-8) overtly exhibits only one of these four characteristics: at b.5 his bass line begins to move for the first time within this theme; thus at bs 5-8 the acceleration in surface harmonic rhythm contrasts sharply with the static tonic pedal at bs 1-4. No increase in rhythmic activity occurs within Haydn's continuation; moreover, neither true 'fragmentation' nor true sequential harmonic progression can be demonstrated here. But Haydn hints at both of the latter: relative to his



Ex. 1 Haydn – Symphony in D Major, Hob. I: 104, iii: Menuetto  
(reduced score, bs 1-35)

LARGE-SCALE FORM: ROUNDED BINARY ( $\approx$  SMALL TERNARY)  
4: presentation + 2: BI' + 4: continuation

theme-type of mm. 1-8: a sentence

Allegro

(2: BI + 2: BI')

4: presentation 4: continuation

repetition of the sentence

PAC

B

(frag.)

PAC

A'

cresc.

ff

sf

initial two-bar idea, the first and second segments of his continuation create the effect of a fragmentation, thanks to the increased surface harmonic activity; and the parallel sixth-motion between bass and soprano at bs 5-6 intimates a linear sequential pattern.

A definitive characteristic of the model sentence is that it features *only one* operative cadence: it will close with either a half cadence (HC) or an authentic cadence. Within Haydn's sentence, the 'cadential function' is

expressed simply as the final component of the continuation, and the cadence Haydn achieves is the type called the 'perfect authentic cadence' (PAC). We shall see that in expanded forms of the sentence, a separate and distinct third formal unit can assume the task of providing an 'expanded cadential progression' (see note 21).

My identification and clarification of the theme-type represented at the beginning of Ex. 1 has thus far drawn upon what I regard to be the most substantial work among recent typological formal studies, namely, Caplin's article 'Funktionale Komponenten im achttaktigen Satz' (see note 29). With reference to my voice-leading graphs in Ex. 2a, let us now consider Haydn's theme from the Schenkerian perspective. Here I show that the sentence from Haydn's Menuetto creates a complete harmonic-contrapuntal structure; specifically, Haydn's structure replicates one of Schenker's first-level middleground paradigms, the one reproduced in Ex. 2b. We are now in a position to invoke formal terminology in determining precisely how Haydn's contrapuntal form emerges. Note that Haydn's brisk upbeat leads directly by arpeggiation to the primary melodic note –  $\hat{5}$ ; the presentation then assumes the role of prolonging that note. This melodic prolongation is both an integral and an inevitable feature of Haydn's presentation, since by definition a typical presentation prolongs tonic harmony. Only at the beginning of the continuation, where the bass begins to move towards the cadential dominant, will a fundamental melodic motion away from  $\hat{5}$  find its requisite harmonic support; note that the contrapuntal motion via sixths guides the soprano downwards through  $\hat{4}$  and  $\hat{3}$  to  $\hat{2}$ , at which point the cadential progression supports full melodic closure to  $\hat{1}$ .

Within the initial basic idea of the presentation, Haydn establishes both the fundamental motive of this movement and the specific means by which he will prolong  $\hat{5}$ : the metric neighbour motion  $\hat{5}$ - $\hat{6}$ - $\hat{5}$  at bs 1-2 motivates two complete, interlocking turns around  $\hat{5}$ . Lest we forget the *sforzando*-emphasized neighbour  $\hat{6}$ , Haydn breaks his stepwise descent at b.6 expressly to reaccentuate that crucial note. This simple and delightful gesture prepares the entire course of the contrasting middle section to follow: for his first motion away from the home key, Haydn chooses the submediant as his goal, which he achieves at b.20; as shown in the graphs in Ex. 2a, the motion to the submediant supports a splendid expansion, or *enlargement* (Schenker's *Vergrößerung*), of the neighbour motive  $\hat{5}$ -to- $\hat{6}$ . On this very clear middleground level  $\hat{6}$  returns to  $\hat{5}$  at b.26 – the point where Haydn arrives at his cadence in the dominant key. Thus the melodic content of the initial basic idea of this movement has, indeed, become basic: in Schoenberg's terms, one might say that the idea of bs 1-2 serves as the *Grundgestalt* of the movement, in the sense that its content provides the source for, or generates, the very path that the movement will take. Schenker would by all means reject this *Grundgestalt* view, although he did occasionally use the organic metaphors 'Aussaat' and 'Ernte' ('seed' and

'harvest') in describing such motivic relationships; for Schenker these 'concealed repetitions' ('motivic parallelisms') are the 'prime carriers of synthesis'<sup>31</sup> – the ultimate manifestation of organic interrelationships among structural levels.

Ex. 2a Voice-leading graphs for Haydn's Menuetto

The image displays two systems of musical notation with voice-leading graphs for Haydn's Menuetto. The first system covers measures 1-8, and the second system covers measures 9-16. The graphs use numbers 1-8 to represent scale degrees and letters A, S, V, I, VI to represent functional harmony. Arrows and lines connect notes across staves to show voice leading. Measure numbers 5, 17, and 26 are indicated above the staves.

Ex. 2b Fig. 16,5 from *Free Composition*, Supplement: *Musical Examples* by Heinrich Schenker, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster. Copyright © 1979.

Reprinted by permission of Schirmer Books, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.

The image shows a short musical phrase on a single staff. Below the staff is the functional harmony notation: = I IV — V I.

I have dwelt upon the motivic role of Haydn's initial idea in anticipation of the question, How does a composer achieve a unique musical statement within the confines of a well-established formal convention? It would seem that, in Haydn's case, the achievement rests in the felicitous union of original idea and specific theme-type. The sentence's presentation function provides an especially accessible, immediately audible means for Haydn to project the  $\hat{5}\text{-}\hat{6}\text{-}\hat{5}$  motion as a surface phenomenon that provides

the key to the Menuetto's middleground structure. Schoenberg held that 'form in the arts, and especially in music, aims primarily at comprehensibility'.<sup>32</sup> Haydn's choice of formal design illustrates Schoenberg's point, with the result that his motivic content, his harmonic-contrapuntal design and his form cannot effectively be discussed in separation one from another.

We turn now to a survey of additional excerpts in which the sentence plays a formal role. As we proceed, I hope to substantiate the following: 1) in its stable, non-modulating form, the sentence often (though certainly not always) projects a complete harmonic-contrapuntal structure; 2) the presentation unit of a sentence provides a particularly effective means by which *either* directly to prolong the primary melodic note *or* to express an initial ascent (*Anstieg*) towards that note; and 3) the sentence that ends with a half cadence or with an authentic cadence in the dominant usually effects what Schenker calls an 'interruption' (*Unterbrechung*). With these examples, it should, moreover, become apparent that the paradigm of the sentence thrives within a wide range of musical styles; thus to compare the unique ways in which the sentence is treated by composers as diverse as, for instance, Haydn and Chopin is to gain a point of reference for characterizing changes in stylistic and aesthetic goals.

### III

With Haydn's sentence in Ex. 1, the simplest, most direct manner of establishing a presentation has been demonstrated: Haydn presents two harmonically equivalent 'tonic forms' of his basic idea. The sentence paradigm accommodates several additional harmonic strategies for creating a presentation, and the opening of Mozart's G major Keyboard Sonata, K.283 (1775) illustrates one of the most prevalent of these, as shown in Ex. 3a. The presentation unit of this well-known main theme features what Ratz calls 'the statement-response' repetition: Mozart's basic idea moves from the tonic to the neighbour-chord  $V_3^4$ , and its varied repetition 'responds' by returning from the dominant ( $V_5^6$ ) to the root tonic.<sup>33</sup> Like Haydn, Mozart immediately establishes his primary note –  $\hat{5}$ ; but here the double-neighbour motion of the bass provides the counterpoint for a prolongation of that note by means of the preliminary descending third-progression  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ , shown in the graph at Ex. 3b. The declamatory transfer of the alto note a to the high register more than somewhat conceals the voice-leading connection d-c-b, but Mozart will bring that same connection into dazzling relief by manipulating the formal paradigm within his cadence at bs 8-10.

The beginning of Mozart's continuation at b.5 exemplifies the fragmentation technique: the twofold upbeat-downbeat gesture of the original two-bar basic idea now becomes a single one-bar gesture, itself

immediately repeated. The primary note having thus been further prolonged by its upper neighbour, we have reached the point within the continuation (b.7) where the cadential progression would normally follow; and, indeed, listeners and performers who know the sentential paradigm will be especially receptive to the rhetoric of what happens instead. Mozart refuses to relinquish his primary note on schedule: by means of the turn configuration within the lower voices, he creates the effect of even further fragmentation by insisting four more times upon  $\hat{5}$ , and thus *extends* his continuation by one complete, emphatic bar. Scale degree  $\hat{5}$  has by now gained such force that its release calls for a burst of rhythmic activity, but Mozart's concern for proportion will also be met: a hemiola controls the flurry of semiquavers, throwing stress upon each note of the fundamental melodic descent, and thus the expanded three-bar cadential unit balances the three-bar continuation.

Ex. 3a Mozart – Keyboard Sonata in G Major, K.283, i (bs 1-16)

Allegro

4: presentation (2: B1)

+2: B1'

p

1 (V<sub>3</sub>) (hemiola: V<sub>3</sub>) 1

5 6: continuation (1: frag.) +1 var' + (3: cadential)

fp fp f

(IV) 6 (V<sub>3</sub>) 1 IV<sup>6</sup> V<sup>6</sup> (6 7 3)

10 6: continuation repeated

p fp fp f

1 PAC

15 PAC

## Ex. 3b Voice-leading graph for K.283, i (bs 1-10)

## Ex. 3c The 'î-7-4-3-schema' (after Robert O. Gjerdingen)

To summarize, since the closure of Mozart's middleground contrapuntal structure might easily have been achieved in a conventional manner at bs 7-8, the special effect of the conclusion of his sentence cannot be explained on the sole basis of his voice-leading plan. Rather, it would seem that the irregularities of Mozart's phrase structure – that is, his formal scheme – have as one goal an explicit revelation of his contrapuntal design: his expanded six-bar (3 + 3) unit at bs 5-10 arises from the 'extra' bar 7, in which the composer highlights his primary note in the clearest possible way.

Aligned beneath Ex. 3b and labelled Ex. 3c is the contrapuntally supported melodic pattern  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  – a 'schema' identified in this movement by Robert O. Gjerdingen and shown by him to occur in hundreds of compositions from the period 1720 to 1900.<sup>34</sup> Inspired most especially by Meyer's ideas about 'archetypal' musical forms and processes, Gjerdingen's study applies the psychological concept of 'cognitive schemata' to the task of tracing the transformations of this single, predominantly 'Classic' schema from its complex, stylized manifestations in late Baroque music to its 'less predictable profiles' in the nineteenth-century repertoire. Given that Gjerdingen's 'schema prototype' incorporates two 'events' ( $\hat{1}-\hat{7} \dots \hat{4}-\hat{3}$ ) as separated by 'metric boundaries',<sup>35</sup> and that it involves the prolongation of tonic harmony by means of auxiliary dominants, as with the 'statement-response' presentation of Mozart's K.283, it should come as no surprise that both the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$



schema itself and the vast repertoire investigated by Gjerdingen have relevance to the present topic. Among the approximately 330 excerpts he considers, a great many, drawn from the beginnings of main themes, secondary themes and other relatively tightly-knit thematic processes, can in fact be said to function as presentation units within a comparably specific, but higher-level, formal schema – the sentence. In each of these cases, the contrapuntally supported  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$  event presents itself within the context of a basic idea, whose varied repetition (not explicitly identified as such by Gjerdingen) provides the responsive  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ ; the passage that follows (not shown in Gjerdingen's examples) exhibits the requisite characteristics of a continuation and closes with a cadence. Thus Gjerdingen's survey of the historical development of the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern might just as well have served as the point of departure for an investigation into the development of the sentence as a formal convention, although this would of course have required the inclusion and examination of the continuations for all excerpts in question.

From the Schenkerian perspective, not espoused by Gjerdingen, the presence of the tritone  $\hat{7}-\hat{4}$  within the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern inevitably suggests a polyphonic, this is, compound, melodic structure; thus, for instance, my voice-leading graph in Ex. 3b, like those of others who have examined the main theme of Mozart's K.283, assigns the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$  motion of bs 1-2 to an inner voice, as distinct from the descant, the voice-leading strand that introduces  $\hat{5}$  and then prolongs that note by presenting the  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  motion within the preliminary  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  descent.<sup>36</sup> The initial prominence of  $\hat{5}$  within numerous additional excerpts presented by Gjerdingen would result in similar readings on the part of Schenkerians; adopting Gjerdingen's own term, one might say that, in these cases, as with K.283, a potential ' $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema' – one that prolongs  $\hat{5}$  – subsumes and supersedes the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern.<sup>37</sup> Integrating Schenkerian with formal terminology, I can certainly stress that such cases, as these arise within the larger context of the sentence, reinforce one of the generalizations proposed above: sentential presentations often provide the formal means of articulating the initial prolongation of a primary note. Moreover, Gjerdingen's statistically generated 'population curve', which posits that the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema skyrockets in the 1750s and 60s towards a peak in the early 1770s,<sup>38</sup> would seem implicitly to suggest a corresponding upward curve in the conventionalization of a specific sentence-type associated with the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern – the type whose presentation features the I-(V...V)-I statement-response design.

## IV

The I-(V...V)-I progression can of course also accommodate the prolongation of  $\hat{3}$ , rather than  $\hat{5}$ , as a primary note. Within a presentational

statement-response design, a typical contrapuntal plan might be represented as follows:  $\begin{smallmatrix} \hat{3} & \hat{2} & \hat{4} & \hat{3} \\ I-(V\dots V7)-I \end{smallmatrix}$ . And that the plan fundamentally serves to prolong the tonic might be further emphasized by means of a tonic pedal, as shown in Ex. 4 at bs 7-12, the presentation unit that initiates the sentence at the beginning of the *Andante amabile e con moto* from Beethoven's Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 6 (1824). Beneath the elaborate surface of this unusual six-bar (3 + 3) presentation rests the  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern, which some might identify as a 'changing-note' configuration, or a 'double-neighbour' motion. Schenker tends to interpret the pattern as an instance of 'reaching-over'; thus my voice-leading graphs in Exs 5a and 5b treat the descending motion from  $\hat{3}$  to  $\hat{2} - g^2$  to  $f^2$  at b.9 – as one that continues via registral transfer to the inner-voice note  $e_b^1$  at b.12, giving way to the higher-pitched neighbour  $\hat{4}$ , the  $a_b^2$  achieved at b.10 when the voice carrying  $b_b^1$  at b.7 'reaches above' the primary note. In this view, the  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  pattern embellishes the more fundamental upper-neighbour motion  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  over the span of the complete presentation.<sup>39</sup>

As shown within the voice-leading graph at Ex. 5a, Beethoven's continuation unit (bs 13-18) will regain the tonic-supported  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  motion in its original register at bs 17-18 and then lead to a tonicized half cadence on V at the point where the cadential idea (bs 19-21) undertakes its closure of the first part of the Bagatelle in the dominant key. Note that: 1) the resultant middleground descant – the broad  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  motion as shown in Ex. 5b – can be understood as an enlargement of the foreground  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  gesture at b.9; and that 2) already in the initial, contrasting Presto, whose return qua epilogue at the end of the movement frames the Andante and perhaps protects within these boundaries the tenderness of its character, Beethoven anticipates not only the head motive of the Andante – the  $\hat{5}-\hat{1}-\hat{3}$  arpeggiation to the primary note (cf. b.1 and bs 7-9) – but also the fundamental plan of the Andante's presentation,  $I-(V7\dots)-I$  over tonic pedal. Within the second part of the Andante's quasi rounded-binary form (=||: A:|| BA':||; not shown here), the *subdominant reprise* of the presentation unit (at bs 33-8) takes a varied repetition (at bs 39-44) whose scalar ascent and descent bring the latter into even closer rapport with the Presto; and, finally, the subdominant harmony provides the means by which the neighbour  $\hat{4}$  can again be achieved as well as prolonged until, at the very last minute, the cadential idea (bs 51-3) reconfirms the home key.

Among the many extraordinary features of this Bagatelle, some that arise within its initial sentence warrant further comment here. In particular, let us consider the formal process whereby an expanded, fifteen-bar theme results from the choice of a generative three-bar, rather than two-bar, basic idea and its repetition. Rather than effecting a fragmentation of the presentation's 3 + 3 design, the continuation preserves the *Dreitakter*, gaining its momentum instead through a faster rate of harmonic change, increased rhythmic activity, motivic intensification and a sequential plan. The new three-bar model at bs 13-15 quite clearly finds its source in the

## Ex. 4 Beethoven – Bagatelle Op. 126, No. 6 (bs 1-21)

**Presto**

6(2) *f*

(V<sup>7</sup>)

**Andante amabile e con moto**

6: presentation *te - - - nute*

3: BI *p*

6: continuation (3: model)

3: seq.

3: cadential idea

*p*

V=I

V<sup>8</sup>-7

PAC

basic idea, whose head  $\hat{5}-\hat{1}-\hat{3}$  motive, arpeggiating the interval of a sixth from  $b^1$  to  $g^2$  at bs 7-9, now becomes compressed into the span of just two bars and transposed into the submediant; with the subdominant at b.15 as the mediator that prevents the unorthodox direct succession from vi to I, the three-bar sequential repetition at bs 16-18 then clarifies the source of the motive, iterating this transformed version of the basic idea in its original tonic environment. Together the model and the sequence produce a six-bar continuation, at which point the proportional design ( $3:3:6 = 1:1:2$ ) of the model sentence has been fulfilled. Moreover, to the analyst for whom a 'theme' means any distinct musical idea, the seamless shift into the dominant key at bs 18-19 and the downright quirky change of texture and character at bs 19-21 – the abrupt introduction of a new dance-like

## Ex. 5 Voice-leading graphs for Op. 126, No. 6 (bs 1-21)

The image displays three voice-leading graphs (5a, 5b, 5c) for the first 21 measures of the bass line of Beethoven's Op. 126, No. 6. The graphs are written in Schenkerian notation, showing the underlying structure of the music. Graph 5a covers measures 1-8 and 13-18, showing a progression from a first-level structure (1) to a second-level structure (2) and finally to a third-level structure (3). Graph 5b covers measures 9-12 and 19-21, showing a progression from a first-level structure (1) to a second-level structure (2) and finally to a third-level structure (3). Graph 5c covers measures 13-18, showing a progression from a first-level structure (1) to a second-level structure (2) and finally to a third-level structure (3). The graphs use various annotations, including stems, beams, and various annotations like '1', '2', '3', '4', '5', '6', '7', '8', '9', '10', '11', '12', '13', '14', '15', '16', '17', '18', '19', '20', '21' to indicate voice-leading paths and structural levels. Some measures are circled or boxed to highlight specific features.

accompaniment against semiquaver triplets – might suggest that a new thematic process is under way. But the absence of a cadence at the end of the continuation would rule against that view from both the Schenkerian and the Schoenbergian standpoints: not until the apparently new idea provides its perfect authentic cadence in the dominant at b.21 can it be said that the first part of a middleground contrapuntal structure – the large-scale progression from  $\bar{1}$  to  $\bar{v}$  – has emerged and that the sentence has been completed.<sup>40</sup>

The formal perspective can now shed some light on why the conclusion of Beethoven's theme might sound both inconclusive and eccentric. That the arrival on V occurs only at the very end of the theme is not at all uncommon for the Schenkerian. Nor, from the formal viewpoint, should the procedure of creating a distinct unit for the cadential function within

the overall scheme of presentation-continuation-cadence be regarded as exceptional; in this respect, Beethoven's three-bar cadential idea can be compared with the distinct three-bar cadence that closes the sentence from Mozart's K.283. But, whereas Mozart's cadence serves to balance his three-bar continuation, Beethoven's cadential idea has the effect of throwing his proportional design off balance; coming as it does after an apparently discrete six-bar continuation that has already met the proportional expectation raised by the six-bar presentation, this cadential idea seems too short. Moreover, the cadential function it presumes to fill is palpably undermined by an idiosyncratic rhythmic detail: the cadential tonic at b.21 falls on the very last, and thus weakest, beat of the measure.

By contrast, the Schenkerian perspective can reveal that, for all its textural and rhythmic newness, the cadential idea arises as the cohesive but much concealed final stage of a continuous motivic process: above the foreground graph in Ex. 5a, the motivic synopsis displays the pattern set into play when the basic foreground melodic shape of the continuation idea (itself derived from the basic idea at bs 7-9) is repeated sequentially at bs 13-18, and it further proposes that the cadential idea completes the pattern by reiterating as well as expanding upon that very same shape.<sup>41</sup> In short, while the formal analysis investigates the discernible idiosyncrasies of Beethoven's theme, the Schenkerian outlook addresses the issue of its underlying continuity. But each of the two perspectives gains strength in the light of the other; in particular, the claim for an underlying, as opposed to an entirely obvious, continuity will surely become more compelling when the factors that contribute towards an apparent discontinuity are also detailed.

Both the brevity of the cadential idea and the aspect of cadential resolution on the weak third beat propose compositional issues that the Bagatelle as a whole would seem to address. As if to compensate for its brevity, the cadential idea takes an immediate, but now varied and non-cadential, repetition at the beginning of the second part of the Bagatelle, and then two-bar, followed by one-bar, fragments of the idea provide the content for the complete middle section (bs 22-32) of the rounded binary. In fact the Andante's initial, basic idea already sets the stage for the rhythmically weak cadence at b.21: marked *tenute*, the basic idea withholds the entrances of its soprano melody until the third beats of bs 7 and 8, and then, over tonic pedal, delays the implied resolution of an embellishing  $\frac{4}{4}$  to the dominant  $\frac{3}{4}$  until the last quaver of b.9. Similar third-beat resolutions will be heard at bs 12, 15, 24 and 32, and of course again within the subdominant-to-tonic reprise at bs 33-53. Their effect throughout the piece will be to impart an unusual kind of continuity, whereby, without necessarily serving as an upbeat, the third beat nevertheless leans towards the downbeat. Finally, on a much broader scale, the unusual features of the cadential idea might be said to motivate the substantial coda at bs 54-68. Within the last-minute return to the home key at the end of the

rounded binary, it becomes clear the the three-bar cadential idea, with its split-second cadential resolution, will not suffice as a closure for the complete movement. Consequentially, the coda, like those of the second and fifth Bagatelles within Op. 126, gains the status of an exquisite formal necessity.<sup>42</sup>

In contrast to the unconventional dimensions of Beethoven's sentence, Chopin's sentential structures, which abound throughout his oeuvre, tend to observe the sentence's paradigmatic proportions while exploring unique harmonic plans and novel methods for gaining melodic continuity. Such is the case with Chopin's A flat major *Nouvelle Etude* (1839), whose first part within an overall ternary form is shown in rhythmic reduction at Ex. 6a. As with many sentences from the Viennese repertoire, this theme's presentation features the repetition of a four-bar (2 + 2) *compound basic idea* (CBI) rather than the model two-bar unit; the resultant eight-bar presentation calls for an eight-bar continuation, and a sixteen-bar sentence thus arises. As indicated in Ex. 6a, the model-sequence plan (4: 2 + 2) initiating Chopin's continuation at bs 9-12 assumes a shape that differs from that of the repeated cadential idea (4: 2 + 2) at bs 13-16; but the homogeneous texture and the *moto perpetuo* rhythmic structure of the theme counteract the perception of a division into two separate units here. Since this continuous eight-bar unit does not exceed the length of the eight-bar presentation, the regular theme-type represented by Chopin's sixteen-bar sentence must not be confused with Beethoven's fifteen-bar theme, expanded by three bars beyond the expected length of twelve bars promised by his six-bar presentation.

Within the presentation, Chopin introduces a potent variant of the statement-response design: rather than employing the I-(V...V)-I plan, he juxtaposes his initial, tonic-prolonging idea with a response in the subdominant. As a dominant-preparation harmony, the subdominant in turn invites the unusual feature of a continuation that begins on the dominant; when, within the fragment of bs 9-10, the dominant swiftly returns to the tonic, the broad progression I-IV-V-I completes its prolongation of  $\hat{3}$ . But here, for the first time in this study, we find a large-scale prolongation whose boundaries do not precisely coincide with the phrase rhythm expressed by the sentential design: Chopin's harmonic-contrapuntal process subtly conflicts with, rather than clarifies, his formal plan. The conflict, arising as it does from Chopin's subdominant response, has much to do with his essential poetic strategy in this étude: although my voice-leading graphs in Exs 6b and 6c show  $\hat{3}$  to serve as the initial and ultimately fundamental primary note of the work, the effect of Chopin's subdominant statement is to highlight  $\hat{5}$  through its own neighbour  $\hat{6}$  and thus to place this *rival note* in dialogue with  $\hat{3}$ . The effect of a dialogue becomes overt within the model-sequence design at the beginning of the continuation. In fact, it is the need for  $\hat{6}$ , prolonged at bs 5-8, to resolve to the rival  $\hat{5}$  that delays the return to  $\hat{3}$ ; the model at bs 9-10 not only



Ex. 6 Graphs for Chopin's *Nouvelle Etude* in A flat Major (bs 1-18)

**A** : 16-BAR SENTENCE

(8) presentation  
4: CBI  
(b. i. + c. i.)

(8) continuation  
4 (2: frag  
as model

6a

6b

6c

resolves  $\hat{6}$  to  $\hat{5}$  but also summarizes that relationship with the gesture  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ ; the sequence at bs 11-12 then responds with the motion  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ . Although expansions of the all-pervasive head motive  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  twice close the harmonic-contrapuntal structure of the sentence, the contrasting middle section of this étude will develop and intensify the dialogue between  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{3}$ .

Ex. 6 cont.

B

2: seq)

4 (2: cad.

2:1 of  
cad.)

4: model

[illegible]

Let us now examine three sentences whose presentations effect an *Anstieg*. The first of these, shown in Ex. 7a, provides the initial part (= A) of the rounded-binary theme for variations from the Presto finale of Haydn's Keyboard Sonata in G major, Hob. XVI/27 (?1776). Chosen from among the many excerpts discussed by Gjerdingen, Haydn's presentation at

bs 1-4 embeds the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema, displayed in Gjerdingen's manner in Ex. 7a, within what Schenkerians would undoubtedly take to be the somewhat more prominent, more fundamental stepwise ascent from  $\hat{1}$  to the primary note  $\hat{3}$ , as graphed at Ex. 7b.<sup>43</sup> Schenkerian and formal terminology might together permit the following clarification of Haydn's presentation. Its I-(V...V)-I statement-response plan supplies the contrapuntal basis for a parallel motivic construction in which the basic idea (bs 1-2) gives downbeat stress to  $\hat{1}$  and its repetition (bs 3-4) begins with downbeat stress on  $\hat{2}$ . Although a similar parallelism associates the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$  motion of b.2 with the  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  motion at b.4, Schenkerians would favour the parallelism that yields the eminently noticeable stepwise continuity from  $\hat{1}$  through  $\hat{2}$  to  $\hat{3}$ ; and, as it happens, a formal feature – the parallel repetition of the basic idea, now giving stress to  $\hat{2}$  – justifies the Schenkerian perception. Within the *Anstieg* from  $\hat{1}$  to  $\hat{3}$ , both  $\hat{2}$  and  $\hat{3}$  are achieved through reaching-over: by means of the voice exchange between bass and soprano at bs 2-3, the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$  motion at b.2 gives way to  $\hat{2}$  when the bass  $a_4$  at b.2 is transferred to the soprano at b.3; likewise, the motion from  $\hat{2}$  to  $\hat{3}$  is embellished by the reaching-over of  $\hat{4}$  to  $\hat{3}$  at b.4. In fact, the source, or motivation, for these reaching-over gestures may already be found in the bass at bs 1-2: here the progression from b to a –  $\hat{3}$ -to- $\hat{2}$  – dictates the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$  motion in the soprano and perhaps takes priority over the latter as the more basic progenitor of the  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  motion at b.4.

Ex. 7 Haydn – Keyboard Sonata in G Major, Hob. XVI:27 (bs 1-8)

Ex. 7a: Presentation of the basic idea (BI) and its continuation (BI'). The BI is marked with a circled 1 and 7, and the BI' is marked with a circled 4 and 3. The continuation is marked with a circled 1 and 2. The cadence is marked with a circled 1 and 2.

Ex. 7b: Continuation of the basic idea. The diagram shows the progression of the basic idea (BI) and its continuation (BI') with Schenkerian annotations. The BI is marked with a circled 1 and 7, and the BI' is marked with a circled 4 and 3. The continuation is marked with a circled 1 and 2. The cadence is marked with a circled 1 and 2.

The foregoing interpretation of Haydn's presentation at Ex. 7 would apply as well to other examples of the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema discussed by Gjerdingen; and, where  $\hat{1}$  (rather than  $\hat{5}$ ) serves as a clear point of departure but  $\hat{2}$  is given less prominence or omitted altogether, the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema would tend to be interpreted by Schenkerians as an embellished, but arpeggiated rather than stepwise, *Anstieg* from  $\hat{1}$  to  $\hat{3}$ , with  $\hat{5}$  as a potential later primary-note goal. Moreover, had Gjerdingen provided continuations for his examples – a task that understandably falls outside the scope of his study – it would have been easy to demonstrate that, as in the case of Haydn's theme, these tend to exhibit the characteristics of a sentential continuation. For instance, fragmentation, sequential progression and increased rhythmic activity all help to mobilize Haydn's continuation at bs 5-8: an inverted version of the basic idea's head motive at b.5 serves as the one-bar fragment sequenced at b.6, and an acceleration of the harmonic rhythm at b.7 directs Haydn's theme towards the interruption accomplished by the cadence in the dominant at b.8.

Example 8a provides a rhythmic reduction for the main theme from the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 10, No. 1 (?1795-7); the complete exposition of this movement, to be discussed towards the end of this study, will be found in Ex. 12. Beethoven scores this movement in  $\frac{3}{4}$  metre, but his *Allegro molto* tempo in coordination with the actual content of each notated bar strongly suggests that he is employing 'hypermeasures', in the specific sense that we perceive each notated bar as presenting only one half the content of a stylistically comparable 'real' bar within a moderato tempo. Although my voice-leading graphs at Exs 8b and 8c fundamentally concur with Schenker's own graphs of this theme,<sup>44</sup> my rhythmic reduction in Ex. 8a departs from Schenker in order to explore Beethoven's hypermetric organization: I notate my reduction in the hypothetical  $\frac{6}{4}$  meter, changing to  $\frac{9}{4}$  at the notated b.13 in an effort to locate the one 'odd bar' – discussed by Donald Francis Tovey – within Beethoven's otherwise completely even-numbered groupings.<sup>45</sup>

As shown in Ex. 8a, Beethoven's presentation displays yet another variant of the statement-response design. Here the repetition of the basic idea projects the intensified dominant substitute  $\text{vii}^{\hat{5}}$  as a passing chord with the *Anstieg* motion from  $\hat{3}$  to  $\hat{5}$ . Note that the arrival upon  $\hat{5}$  coincides precisely with the beginning of the continuation, and that the irregular ' $\frac{9}{4}$ ' bar further emphasizes this primary note via registral transfer; note as well that Beethoven's continuation leads only to the non-cadential  $\text{V}^6$  at b.16, such that, as in his Bagatelle, a completely distinct unit will fulfil the cadential function. It must be conceded that Beethoven's quaver triplets somewhat disguise his fundamental melodic descent at bs 17-22, but the composer can afford to be brusque here: his continuation has already presented the  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  descent in miniature three times (see bs 9-16).

In Ex. 9a, the presentational *Anstieg* of the Countess's aria 'Dove sono', from *Le Nozze di Figaro*, may serve as the initial clue to Mozart's

Ex. 8 Graphs for Beethoven's Piano Sonata in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 1, i  
(bs 1-23)

## EXPANDED SENTENCE

4: presentation  
(2: Bl.)

+ 2: Bl. )

4½: continuation  
(new motive  
as frag.)

8a

8b

8c

extraordinary psychological interpretation of this character. Here is an *Anstieg* that promises a complete arpeggiation to  $\hat{5}$  but settles instead for  $\hat{3}$ . A broad turn around  $\hat{1}$  informs the melody of the Countess's tonic-prolonging 2-bar basic idea. With the first oboe providing the passing  $\hat{2}$  as the link upwards at b.2, a harmonically exact repetition at bs 3-4 permits

## Ex. 8 cont.

(further as frag.)      3 (⇒ 2): cadential

⑬      ⑮      ⑳

9/4 rinf.      6/4      *pp*      *ff*      PAC

(Vii<sup>4</sup><sub>3</sub> — V<sup>6</sup> — V<sup>7</sup><sub>5</sub>)      i      ii<sup>6</sup>      V<sup>6</sup><sub>4</sub> (6 7 5 3)      i

^5      ^4      ^3      ^2      ^1

(Vii<sup>7</sup> — )      i      ii<sup>6</sup>      V<sup>6</sup><sub>4</sub> (6 7 5 3)      i

^5      ^4      ^3      ^2      ^1

6 — 5      10      6 — 5

(Vii<sup>7</sup> )      i      ii<sup>6</sup>      V<sup>6</sup>      i

the Countess to present the turn around  $\hat{3}$ . Again the oboe moves upwards, now to the high  $g^2$  ( $\hat{5}$ ), and we are fully prepared to hear the Countess do the same. But, deeply troubled over her husband's infidelity, and uncertain how to handle her situation, the Countess is not ready to achieve what might have become the primary note of the aria. The oboe



Ex. 9a Mozart – *Le Nozze di Figaro*, Act III, No. 19: (the Countess) ‘Dove sono’ (reduced score, bs 1-18)

16-BAR PERIOD

Aria (8) antecedent as sentence

Andante

Ob.

Fag.

La C.

Vc.e B.

Do - ve so - no i bei mo - men - ti di dol - cez - za, e di - pia - cer — , do - ve an -

(2: B1 + 2: B1)

HC

(10) consequent as sentence

Ob.

Fag.

Cor.

La C.

Vc.e B.

da - ro i giu - ra - men - ti di quel lab - bro men - zo - gner, di quel lab - bro men - zo - gner?

PAC

having prompted her to try, she reaches only the  $f^2$  within the continuation at b.6, and then the sentence ends with a half cadence, effecting an interruption within the descent and bringing the continuation to a close on the unstable  $\hat{2}$ .

In this excerpt the initial eight-bar sentence will be repeated, and the repetition, expanded from eight to ten bars, will compensate for the half cadence at b.8 by closing with a perfect cadence at b.18. We can say, then, that, on the large-scale formal level, the sentence and its repetition together create the theme-type known as the *period* – namely, a theme consisting of precisely two phrase-structural processes, the first of which functions as an antecedent relative to the second, or consequent. Unlike numerous

theorists, Schoenberg and his disciples have attempted to salvage the term 'period' from a historical morass of different meanings by restricting the notion of 'consequent' to mean a 'modified repetition of the antecedent', in which the final cadence will be stronger than that of the antecedent; in other words, for Schoenberg the term 'period' applies exclusively to what Douglass M. Green, among others, calls the 'parallel period'.<sup>46</sup> The archetypal period – perhaps the most common type of theme within the classical repertoire – is the eight-bar type, divided into two four-bar phrases; Caplin would regard the Countess's eighteen-bar theme as an expanded form of the sixteen-bar period – a *compound theme-type*, since both the antecedent and the consequent feature the type of theme called the sentence.<sup>47</sup>

Da Ponte's text for the Countess offers the most immediate explanation for Mozart's choice of the sixteen-bar period in this case: the sentential antecedent-consequent construction reinforces Da Ponte's grouping of his four verses into pairs, each of which begins with 'Dove' and features the rhyme scheme *a – b* (*momenti, piacer; giuramenti, menzogner*). But a subtler benefit of the antecedent-consequent plan is that it gives the Countess not one, but two, chances to achieve *g*<sup>2</sup>; that, within the consequent at bs 9–18, the Countess again fails to reach the goal prompted by the oboist is thus made all the more poignant by Mozart's choice of form. My voice-leading graph in Ex. 9b attempts to highlight the phrase expansion within the consequent's continuation at b.14 – the point where the Countess brings a vital new dotted rhythm to the task of striving upwards. Although she touches lightly upon *g*<sup>2</sup> within the subsequent contrasting middle section of here aria, *only* within her closing Allegro, when she reaches the determination 'to change' her husband's 'ungrateful heart' ('*di cangiar l'ingrato cor*') does Mozart reward the Countess with truly full-bodied

Ex. 9b Graph for 'Dove sono' (bs 1-18)

The image shows a musical score for the aria 'Dove sono' from Mozart's opera 'Le Nozze di Figaro'. The score is divided into two main sections: the antecedent (bars 1-8) and the consequent (bars 9-18). The instruments are 1st Oboe, Countess (soprano), and Bass. The Countess's part is the focus of the voice-leading graph, which shows a sequence of notes: 6-5, 4-3, 6-5, 4-3, 6-5, 4-3. The Bass part also has a voice-leading graph with notes ii, 6, and V. The score is written in 2/4 time and features various musical notations including slurs, ties, and dynamic markings.

reiterations of  $g^2$  (see bs 86, 111-12, 115-16, 122 and 127) and then celebrate her accomplishment with joyful instrumental tutti.<sup>48</sup>

## VI

The complete middleground contrapuntal structure shown in Ex. 9b replicates Schenker's *division of the fundamental line by interruption*. Indeed, by adopting Schoenberg's restricted definition of 'period', one can generalize as follows: the Schoenbergian, that is, parallel, period whose antecedent ends with a half cadence and whose consequent closes with a perfect authentic cadence in the same key will usually correspond with the two-part formal design arising from interruption, as demonstrated here;<sup>49</sup> moreover, evidence points to the probability that Schenker's concept of interruption initially emerged in association with this particular theme-type, rather than in connection with larger formal units or complete movements.<sup>50</sup> Since the type of theme to which I refer – let us call it the 'interruption period' – is one with which readers will be familiar, I shall proceed, not by providing an example of the eight-bar paradigm, but rather by exploring one remarkable nineteenth-century song in which a distortion of the eight-bar model serves to reinforce the text. The ensuing discussion should help to demonstrate that, when there arise exceptions to the rule of a clear association between the parallel period and the interruption process, a consideration of the manner in which an interruption at the end of the antecedent is obscured, or avoided altogether, can often serve as a point of departure for grasping what is unique, rather than conventional, about a periodic theme. We turn to Schubert's 'Der Wegweiser' from the cycle *Winterreise*; the introduction and first strophe of this song will be found in Ex. 10.

In this song a verbal reference to the title and fundamental image – the signpost ('Wegweiser') – is withheld by the poet until the penultimate of four strophes. Schubert's initial basic idea must, however, surely have been inspired by that central image: like the signpost, the fivefold repetition of the single note  $b_b$  at bs 1-2 seems to 'point' forward towards a goal, and within the complete song the all-pervasiveness of this static melodic *idea* captures the psychological effect of an *idée fixe*. The imitative response of bass to soprano within the introduction serves to 'fix' the idea, to establish the walking pace of the traveller, and to anticipate the imitative scheme of the first strophe.

Carl Schachter has proposed that bs 5 and 10 of this song exemplify Schenker's concept of the 'added downbeat bar':

Bars 1-4 could easily constitute a perfectly balanced four-bar unit, one that could very well close on the dominant chord of bar 4. That the four bars make a complete rhythmic unit is underscored by the way

Schubert composes the beginning of the vocal line: . . . [as] essentially a repetition of bars 1-4. In both the piano introduction and the song proper, a tonic resolution uncharacteristically appears at the end of the phrase, extending it to five bars.<sup>51</sup>

I would say that at b.6 the song proper begins with an absolutely regular four-bar antecedent phrase: typical of the paradigm antecedent here is the succession of basic idea followed by *contrasting idea*, a plan that strongly distinguishes the antecedent type from the presentation type; also typical is the closure via HC at b.9. As the phrase begins, the singer (doubled by the pianist's top voice) leads, with the pianist's bass following imitatively; this feature of the phrase makes its contrapuntal design especially rich, but in no way does the imitation destroy the antecedent properties of the phrase. Note that I impose the conventional symbols for interruption at the HC; and, in doing so, I suggest that an interruption period has thus far been promised.<sup>52</sup>

Whereas Schubert leaves no question that b.5 serves as the goal of the introduction, and thus as an added downbeat bar, the function of the comparable b.10 is less clear. Here we have every right to expect the beginning of a four-bar consequent phrase; and here the pianist's resumption of the 'pointing' motive sounds, at least to me, less like Schachter's 'tonic resolution' – that is, less like the final bar of a five-bar phrase – than like the expected new beginning. That the pianist begins *alone* at b.10 makes Schachter's view compelling. But, more specifically, the singer and pianist reverse roles: and, with this detail, Schubert might just possibly invite us to perceive that the pianist now *initiates* the phrase, with the singer entering imitatively and thus creating an added downbeat bar at b.11 (rather than at b.10).<sup>53</sup> The singer's entry – a tone above the pianist's – has the effect, however, of shifting the would-be consequent plan off its harmonic track; and we soon ascertain that we are *not* hearing a true consequent phrase in the sense of 'modified repetition of the antecedent'. Instead, the progression iv<sup>6</sup>-V<sup>7</sup> of bs 11-12 will be treated sequentially at bs 13-14, with the result that the phrase wanders into the highly remote tonal region of unraised vii (F minor relative to G minor). The pivotal home subdominant at b.16 brings the phrase back on the home track, but now two, or possibly three, efforts to close the phrase are thwarted by the technique of *evaded cadences*, the first of which forces the singer to 'back up' and repeat the cadential idea 'one more time'. Although the singer reaches a conclusion at b.19, the pianist's apparent cadential tonic in that bar might in fact be better understood as the final imitation, whose cadential goal arrives only at b.20.<sup>54</sup>

In short, like the poet's arduous journey through the 'snow-covered rocky heights' ('verschneite Felsenhöhn'), Schubert's 'consequent' has taken on the characteristics of a tortuously expanded continuation-like structure. To be sure, an interruption period can be said to emerge on the

Ex. 10 Schubert – *Winterreise*, Song 20: ‘Der Wegweiser’ (bs 1-21)

Maßig

INTRODUCTION

5 (2: BI +3: CI) Was ver-

pp

4: antecedent (2: BI) 6 +2: CI = contrasting idea consequent 5 (1)

1st STROPHE (=A)

meid ich denn die We - ge, wo die an - dern Wand - rer gehn, su - che

(link)

5 6

i VI<sup>5</sup> iv<sup>6</sup> HC V i

11 +2: model +2: seq.)

mir ver - steck - te Ste - ge durch ver - schnei - te Fel - sen - höhn ? su - che

6 7 6 7

iv<sup>6</sup> V<sup>7</sup> iv<sup>6</sup> vii V<sup>7</sup>

15 (2) 1 1

mir ver - steck - te Ste - ge durch ver - schnei - te Fel - sen - höhn, durch Fel - sen - höhn ?

cresc. p

i v i V iv V(6 5 4 4-3) EC EC

Ex. 10 cont.

20

Ha-be ja

PP.

i! PAC

middleground, as proposed by the voice-leading graph in Ex. 11. Here I attempt to demonstrate that Schubert expands his consequent by enlarging the contrasting idea of his antecedent (the corresponding events of antecedent and consequent have been aligned to show this relationship). More precisely, the 'pointing' motive of the original, basic idea now infiltrates the consequent, providing the material means by which the first two quaver steps within the contrasting idea's descending fourth-span from  $c^2$  to  $g^1$  at b.8 now inform the content of bs 11-14.<sup>55</sup> But completely missing on Schubert's foreground is the effect of proportional balance conventionally provided by a consequent relative to its antecedent: the greatly expanded twelve-bar unit at bs 10-21 dwarfs the four-bar antecedent, throwing into question our perception that the interruptive periodic design rests at the basis of Schubert's theme.<sup>56</sup>

Meanwhile, the text tells us that, without comprehending why (note the question marks at bs 14 and 19), the vocal persona feels driven to 'avoid the roads that other travellers take' and to 'seek concealed paths' ('suche mir versteckte Stege'). As the essential musical analogue for this textual confession, Schubert's phrase-structural path becomes obscured and completely unconventional; as if in utter identification with the alienated poet/singer, Schubert the composer avoids the road that other composers have taken, concealing his antecedent-consequent plan to such a degree that it may no longer be recognizable as such. I cannot imagine a more appropriate transformation of the 'paradigmatic plot' at the service of this text.

To appreciate the transformation, one must know the paradigms, both contrapuntal and formal. The Schenkerian who simply rules for or against the expanded interruption form here discounts what may be a deliberate, and text-motivated, ambiguity on the part of Schubert. The formalist who sees a periodic design but does not explore the concealed contrapuntal means by which the consequent has evolved from the antecedent will be otherwise hard pressed to substantiate the antecedent-consequent relationship. And, finally, social music-historians as well as narrative theorists



## Ex. 11 Graph for 'Der Wegweiser' (bs 1-21)

INTRODUCTION

FIRST STROPHE  
antecedent  
(BI)

consequent

CI)

might be tempted to observe an association between Schubert's own experience as a homosexual pariah<sup>57</sup> and his involvement with the themes of alienation and grief that run so strongly throughout *Winterreise*; but unless one examines *how* Schubert treats these themes in the language of his own *métier*, that is, in musical terms, such an observation would go no further than to comment upon Schubert's choice of text for his cycle. Together these kinds of theorists and historians have much to say to each other; and the dialogue is long overdue.

## VII

Thus far this study has focused upon paradigmatic or expanded forms of what Ratz calls 'tightly-knit' themes – harmonic-contrapuntal structures

that function as first parts of rounded-binary or ternary forms (Exs 1, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10) or as main themes of sonata-form movements (Exs 3 and 8). For a concluding discussion, it will be well to turn now to a complete sonata exposition. A primary concern within what follows will be to illustrate the distinction between tightly-knit thematic construction and relatively looser organization as these formal notions can in turn be substantiated from the perspective of Schenkerian theory. An additional goal will be, by way of summary, to demonstrate certain advantages that an integration of Schenkerian and recent formal concepts might have over earlier outlooks on form and motive.

Having already considered the main theme from the first movement of Beethoven's Op. 10, No. 1 (Ex. 8), I choose to examine the remainder of the exposition of that movement for the following reasons: 1) Schenker's middleground voice-leading graph of this exposition (Ex. 13a), as discussed within his chapter entitled 'Form' in *Free Composition*, can help to clarify the distinct formal functions of main theme, transition and secondary theme that, as formal concepts, Schenker himself rejected; and 2) by contrast, Josef Rufer's Schoenbergian formal analysis of the secondary theme can serve to exemplify the drawbacks of a methodology that treats form with little reference to harmony and voice leading.

On first glance, my formal reading of Beethoven's exposition, as given in the annotated score at Ex. 12, might strike the reader as the antithesis of Schenker's graphic interpretation at Ex. 13a. Whereas Schenker displays a continuous, unbroken harmonic-contrapuntal process, the formal view would seem to divide the exposition into a series of discrete segments. Indeed, the absence of formal labels in Schenker's graph underscores his outspoken disdain for nearly every aspect of traditional sonata-form terminology; but the annotations at Ex. 12 in turn give no indication whatsoever that matters of voice-leading or contrapuntal design have been considered. If a reconciliation of Schenkerian and formal concepts is at all possible, it most surely cannot be accomplished through the mere juxtaposition of two such apparently divergent notational displays.

The reconciliation begins when points of commonality are acknowledged. It should be clear, first, that both types of analysis give a privileged status to the dimension of *harmony*, second, that they express hierarchic views, and, third, that they seek in part to establish or confirm paradigms. Schenker offers his graph of the Op. 10, No. 1 exposition for the sole explicit purpose of demonstrating the following general harmonic-contrapuntal case, representative of a wide range of sonata movements:

A linear progression can also depart from  $\hat{5}$ , as does the fifth-progression in this instance; but only a continuation to III or V fulfills the basic requirement of a first section of a sonata form. Specifically, if in *minor* the motion takes place... as in our example,  $\hat{5}-4-3$  then constitutes that third-progression which leads to the key of III. This

Ex. 12 Beethoven – Piano Sonata in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 1, i: exposition  
(bs 1-105)

**Allegro molto e con brio**  
MAIN THEME (see Ex. 8)

9

18 *codetta*

27 *TRANSITION model*

38 *frag.* *seq.* (2) (+2) (VI) 8: standing (4 on V)

49 *in III: ii* *+4: var. rep.)* *SECONDARY THEME presentation* 8: *BI* *V7* *1*

Ex. 12 cont.

[illegible]

provides for the path that the development will take until it reaches  
 $V^{*3}$ .<sup>58</sup>

Likewise, one objective of the formal analysis at Ex. 12 is to substantiate certain general claims about late eighteenth-century sonata forms set forth by, among many others, Charles Rosen as well as Schoenberg, Ratz and Caplin. For example, this analysis explores the ways in which, like most other expositions by Beethoven, that of Op. 10, No. 1 exemplifies the culmination of a general stylistic trend from the mid to the late eighteenth century – the tendency to dramatize through greater thematic and textural differentiation the harmonic-formal functions of establishing the home key (main theme plus codetta), destabilizing the home key while leading to the new dominant (transition) and confirming the new key (secondary theme plus codetta). The formal analysis also purports to corroborate Caplin's notion of a continuum between tightly-knit and loose organization: the discussion below will highlight the means by which Beethoven characteristically projects a secondary theme that is more loosely organized than his main theme, but more tightly knit than his transition.

A closer examination of Schenker's graph in Ex. 13a reveals that it in no way conflicts with the general formal observations made thus far. Let us consider the outline in Ex. 13b, aligned beneath Schenker's graph to show where within the voice-leading structure the formal events of main theme (plus codetta), transition and secondary theme (plus codetta) arise. The outline should help to confirm that a central purpose of the graph is to elucidate Beethoven's path from i to III: the largest segment of the graph involves the transition (bs 32-55), for which Schenker provides a complete foreground reading. By contrast, both the main theme (bs 1-22) and the secondary theme (bs 56-94) take strictly middleground summaries, and the codettas are not at all represented. But it so happens that these discrepancies make the effort towards reconciliation all the easier. Schenker's notational shorthand at the beginning and the end of the graph immediately clarifies that he regards what I call the main theme and the secondary theme each to be a complete middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure – an *Ursatz* replica: his  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  prolongation of the background primary note  $\hat{5}$  at the beginning of the graph corresponds with the same in my more detailed graph of the main theme at Ex. 8; and his summary of the secondary-theme passage at bs 56ff. shows that the background melodic descent from  $\hat{5}$  through  $\hat{4}$  to  $\hat{3}$  takes full harmonic support within the mediant, such that, within that key, the descent can be locally reinterpreted as participating within the *Ursatz*-replica  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$ . In short, Schenker's graph strengthens the correspondence between 'theme' and 'complete middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure' proposed earlier in this study. Moreover, although the graph abjures formal divisions in favour of showing voice-leading continuity, three distinct processes – those corresponding with the formalist's main theme, transition and

Ex. 13a Fig. 154,3 from *Free Composition*, supplement: *Musical Examples* by Heinrich Schenker, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster. Copyright © 1979.

Reprinted by permission of Schirmer Books, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.

Beethoven, Sonata op. 10 no. 1, 1st mvt. (see Fig. 154.7)

Ex. 13b main theme transition secondary theme

secondary theme – become evident once the closed structures of the main theme and the secondary theme are recognized as distinct from the looser design of the transition.<sup>59</sup>

It is time now to consider the structures of both the transition and the secondary theme in greater detail. Whereas Schenker's abbreviated representation of the secondary theme sheds no light on how that theme might be regarded as more loosely organized than the main theme, the portion of his graph devoted to the transition can certainly enhance the formal view expressed at bs 32-55 within Ex. 12.

There the transition is shown as accomplished in two stages, the first of which adopts a conventional loosening technique – the model-sequence-fragmentation plan. As the model for sequence, Beethoven's new four-bar idea at bs 32-5 (= 2 'real' bars within the hypermetric scheme) breaks the silence of b.31 with what might want to sound like the heraldic solo entry of a horn. As the descent in the bass through the fifth-span from  $e_b^1$  to  $a_b$  gets underway, the soprano achieves  $e_b^2$  through a gesture soon to emerge as motivically pervasive – the ascending leap  $g$ -to- $e_b$ , already highlighted within the basic idea of the main theme at bs 1-3. The soprano then undertakes an embellished, pseudo-canonic imitation of the bass at the octave, with the result that bass and soprano descend together in parallel tenths. Like the cadential elision (indicated with  $\leftrightarrow$ ) that marks the end of the main theme and the simultaneous beginning of the codetta at b.22, the simultaneous endings-beginnings at bs 36 and 40 preserve the hypermetre while allowing the two four-bar sequential repetitions to merge within one continuous descent only somewhat disguised by the registral transfer at b.37. The sequential pattern breaks at b.44, where two-bar fragments now effect an acceleration in the drive towards the goal harmony at b.48 – V of III. What Ratz calls a 'standing on the dominant' (*das Stehen auf der Dominante*)<sup>60</sup> – a straightforward dominant prolongation – then serves as



the second stage: above the dominant pedal, a different four-bar idea (bs 48-51), but one that maintains the counterpoint in tenths, gives way to a varied repetition (bs 52-5) whose quaver turn configurations anticipate the continuous quaver motion of the forthcoming secondary theme and foreshadow the eventual role of the turn within its repeated cadential phrase.

The formal analysis, taken strictly on its own terms, depends for its harmonic basis on the view that a descending-thirds sequence controls the model-sequence-fragmentation design within the modulatory first stage of the transition. With the home-key C-minor cadential tonic at b.30 as the point of departure, the transition's initial idea leads to  $A_b$  (= VI), its first sequence to F, its second to  $D_b$  and its fragmentation to  $B_b$  – the new dominant. Schenker's graph 'normalizes' this plan, effectively cancelling the role of the remote  $D_b$ , which, after all, presses swiftly into the fragmentation. Although each of the other steps within the descending-thirds sequence finds representation at Ex. 13a, the second of these, the  $A_b$ , is interpreted as an arpeggiative subdivider within the broader fifth-span C-to-F, perhaps already predicted by the striking foreground bass motion  $E_b$ -to- $A_b$  with which the transition begins. A larger-scale sequential progression – the descending-fifths sequence C-( $A_b$ )-F ...  $B_b$ - $E_b$  – now emerges, and this middleground plan spans the complete exposition, providing a traditional, diatonic basis for the modulation from i to III.

For the formal theorist who is uncomfortable with Schenker's view that even the unstable, relatively 'loose', improvisatory-like paths of transitions arise as elaborations of simpler, paradigmatic harmonic-contrapuntal processes, doubts might be increased here: Schenker's graph hierarchically favours the goal of the first sequence – the F minor chord at b.40 – over both the  $E_b$  at the beginning of the transition and the goal of its initial idea,  $A_b$ . Not only does Schenker highlight an event that occurs midway within the formal process; in order to do so he must also infer the lower f, since the registral transfer at b.37 allows only for the sounding of the higher  $f^1$  (see the parentheses around the bass f and the upward-pointing arrow in the graph). To meet such objections, we must consider the complete scope of Schenker's middleground counterpoint. As the first intermediate goal harmony within the transition that can be called a true diatonic pivot chord (iv in C minor = ii in  $E_b$  major), the F minor harmony supports the neighbour note  $a_b^2$  – the note that embellishes and thus prolongs the background  $\hat{5}$ ,  $g^2$ , until its descent to  $\hat{3}$  within the secondary theme. Schenker would undoubtedly propose that the registral transfer at b.37 has the express purpose of allowing that neighbour note to appear at bs 40-2 within the 'obligatory register' – the register in which the primary note is first achieved at b.9 and then reinforced within the codetta at bs 23ff. Indeed, the very gesture within which the  $a_b^2$  is achieved – from the third above, as c-b $_b$ - $a_b$  – becomes the topic of the 'standing on the dominant' at bs 48-55, with the result that the resolution of  $a_b^1$  to  $g_b^1$  serves as the immediate link into the beginning of the secondary theme, completing a



middleground plan that can now be summarized as follows:  $\overset{5}{i}\overset{6}{iv}-\overset{6}{[V7]}\overset{5}{III}$ . In its role of pivotal upper note, the neighbour  $a_b$  has already been fleetingly heard as such at the beginning of the cadential unit within the main theme at b.17; and, again within its obligatory register, it will resume prominence shortly after the secondary theme begins.

In the absence of a foreground interpretation of the secondary theme in Ex. 13a, I provide my own graphs in Ex. 14 – the first of which includes formal annotations corresponding with those given at Ex. 12. From either example, it will be seen that, as the last thematic structure to be discussed in this study, this theme manifests both the greatest freedom and the greatest expansion in its treatment of the sentential paradigm. And, in the light of late eighteenth-century stylistic norms as well as aesthetic goals, that such is the case would seem to arise as a compositional necessity within the context of an exposition whose main theme has already expressed the form of an expanded sentence, itself reinforced by a substantial codetta.

By now readers will be quick to notice that Beethoven's notated eight-bar presentation unit at bs 56–63 hypermetrically expresses a characteristic four-bar statement-response design within which the  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema plays a role (Gjerdingen does not report this example). It should also be noted that the secondary theme's initial, basic idea (bs 56–9) begins by outlining but also harmonically reinterpreting the opening melodic gesture of the transition – the ascending leap  $g^1$ -to- $e_b^2$ . Although the contour of the presentation – an upward curve towards the primary note  $g^2$  at b.63 – recalls the paradigm of the *Anstieg*, in this case that same note in its lower register serves as the melodic point of departure at b.56. Hence the foreground graph at Ex. 14a interprets the ascent as one that returns the primary note to its obligatory register, while also reinterpreting the neighbour motion  $a_b^2$ -to- $g^2$  –  $\hat{6}$ -to- $\hat{5}$  – as a reaching-over of  $\hat{4}$  to  $\hat{3}$  within the mediant; in other words, as shown more simply at Ex. 14b, Beethoven's presentation exemplifies the type that prolongs the primary note. Given, however, that an interplay of registral extremes is an outstanding feature of Beethoven's secondary theme, and one that also characterizes the movement as a whole, my choice of the lower register in which to portray basic middle-ground connections at Ex. 14b should be regarded as somewhat arbitrary, even though it conforms with Schenker's graph at Ex. 13a.

Having prepared the listener to expect an eight-bar continuation subsequent to his presentation, Beethoven now gives the first signal that his sentence will not follow the conventional plan. Rather than proceeding directly to a continuation, he first introduces a varied repetition of the presentation (bs 64–70), one that expands the basic idea's intervallic ascent from  $g^1$  to  $e_b^2$  by a complete octave, made possible by an embellishment of the original arpeggiation with staccato quaver steps. Whereas the idea thus achieves the  $e_b^3$  not heard since the very beginning of the movement (bs 2–3), the dominant-to-tonic response, adopting the same embellishment at

## Ex. 14 Graphs for the secondary theme, Op. 10, No. 1, i (bs 56-94)

presentation                      var. rep. of presentation                      expanded cadential phrase

14a

(56) = 3

14b

(10)      8 — 7

bs 68-9, begins an octave lower than its counterpart at bs 60-3, so that the obligatory  $g^2$  again becomes the goal at b.70. It should be clear, however, that that goal arrives one bar 'too soon'. Our immediate impression might be that the  $4-3$  motion of bs 62-3, there occupying the full last two bars within the four-bar idea, has this time been altogether suppressed. In fact the idea itself has been compressed: as shown at Ex. 14a, the ascending scale can lead as if driven into the  $g^2$  one bar earlier, since, by giving downbeat stress to the  $a_b^1$  at b.69, it already completes the motion from  $4$  to  $3$ .

What perhaps becomes clear only in retrospect is that the goal at b.70 –  $\frac{3}{1}$  – simultaneously serves as a new beginning. Several initial clues will ultimately support this perception: in the bass, the quaver rest on the downbeat of b.70 introduces a momentary change of patterning; and, in the treble, the very gesture elaborated at the beginning of both the presentation and its repetition – the ascending leap  $g$ -to- $e_b$  – again proposes itself as an initiator, now reappearing in its simplest possible form, compressing but also clarifying what has preceded, and regaining the  $e_b^3$  of

## Ex. 14 cont.

expanded rep.

b.66. But the notion of a phrase-structural elision at b.70 finds confirmation only when the overall plan of the secondary theme has been ascertained. The formal analysis at Ex. 12 asserts that, having transformed his original eight-bar presentation to create a compressed six-bar repetition, Beethoven then resumes a regular eight-bar grouping pattern all the way to the elided end of the theme at b.94. With b.70 as its beginning, the first of these eight-bar units (bs 70-7) stands for, that is, takes the place of, the continuation unit that normally completes a sentential theme. Rather than leading towards a cadence through the kinds of continuational techniques we have observed earlier, this phrase immediately undertakes an expanded cadential progression: the prototypical cadential progression  $I^{6-5}_{4-3} - IV - V - I$  serves as the harmonic basis of the complete phrase, with each component of the progression given a regular two-bar hypermeasure. The foreground graph at Ex. 14a further interprets the new unison texture at bs 71-4 as one in which, with the bass leading and the upper voice following (doubling), both parts combine to throw a spotlight upon the crucial  $a_b$  – the dominant preparation in the bass and, when the soprano

resumes its role as such, the boundary note to which  $a\sharp$  and  $b\flat$  are juxtaposed. With the middleground graph at Ex. 14b, the motivic role of the passage and its unity as a discrete eight-bar phrase become all the more evident: Beethoven's expanded cadential phrase provides the opportunity for yet another large-scale projection of the neighbour-note motion  $g-a\flat-g$ . Indeed, from the purely formal viewpoint, this phrase is the unit that might directly have completed the hybrid form – 'presentation + cadential phrase' (rather than continuation) – of the hypermetric 'eight-bar' ('2:2:4' = 4:4:8) sentence promised by the presentation at bs 56-64. To verify that observation, one might 'reconstruct' the theme by simply omitting the varied repetition of its presentation, such that b.63 would lead immediately to b.70, with the sentence concluding at the imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) on  $\dot{1}$  at bs 76-7.

For Josef Rufer, who, as an early student of Schoenberg, was apparently exposed to his concept of formal function as well as his distinction between loose and tightly-knit formal organization, Beethoven's secondary theme ends at b.76, after which there follows a 'liquidation of this and codetta, bars 77-105'.<sup>61</sup> Good reasons account for why neither present-day formal theorists nor Schenkerian theorists would be likely to support Rufer's formal point of view. In fact, in his posthumously published *Fundamentals*, Schoenberg himself disagrees with Rufer: far from regarding the passage at bs 78-94 as a 'liquidation', which 'consists in gradually eliminating characteristic features, until only uncharacteristic ones remain',<sup>62</sup> Schoenberg recognized that the 'cadential extension' – the expanded cadential phrase discussed above – 'is repeated with variation'.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, since Schoenberg hears 'two more four-measure phrases' at bs 64-71, his 'cadential extension' begins at b.72, rather than at b.70, and his varied repetition would presumably begin at b.80. The above argument in favour of a new phrase beginning at b.70 takes a more updated outlook on Beethoven's grouping structure as articulated by the interaction of harmonic rhythm and motive with contrapuntal design; a similar approach to the passage at bs 78-94 will, I hope, reveal the inadequacies of both Rufer's and Schoenberg's analyses.

For those who concur with the viewpoint that a hypermetrically regular eight-bar cadential phrase begins at b.70, it will follow that the varied repetition of that phrase begins at b.78 (rather than at b.80). By noting the direct correspondence between bs 79-82 and bs 71-4, we can easily confirm that a varied repetition is under way; but, in respect to its starting point, what apparently misled Schoenberg here is that the content of b.78 does not precisely correspond with that of b.70. As shown at Ex. 14a, a wonderful motivic detail can account for the discrepancy. Having concluded his eight-bar cadential phrase on  $\dot{1}$ , with  $g$  as the soprano note, Beethoven links the end of his cadential phrase to the beginning of its varied repetition by means of an ascending arpeggiation whose overall span

is the motivically essential interval  $g$ -to- $e_b$ ; in short, the varied repetition of the cadential phrase begins with the soprano already on the  $e_b^3$  of b.71, rather than on the  $g^2$  of b.70, because the gesture  $g$ -to- $e_b$  of bs 70-1 has already been accomplished within the phrase-structural link at bs 76-8.

On the very surface of the music, elements of motive and design strongly articulate two eight-bar groupings within the expanded repetition at bs 78-94; as recalled most easily by reviewing the annotated score at Ex. 12, the second of these eight-bar units sharply distinguishes itself from the first by invoking and developing the jagged dotted figure from the opening of the main theme. Schoenberg sees this unit, beginning at b.86, as an 'added segment' that 'again reaches the 6/4 in b.90';<sup>64</sup> his language suggests that he regards the varied repetition already to have reached its completion at b.85. As an exponent but also a revisionist of Schoenberg's *Formenlehre*, William Caplin would probably hold that the entire passage at bs 78-94 represents the repetition of the eight-bar expanded cadential phrase, since again the cadential progression  $I^6$ -IV-V( $\frac{6}{4}$  $\frac{5}{4}$ )-I informs the complete harmonic content of the passage; in other words, he would regard the passage not just as a varied repetition, but also as an even more greatly expanded cadential phrase, now stretched to the point where it becomes twice as long as its prototype. And, by pointing to the logic of Beethoven's large-scale formal plan, he would surely argue against Rufer's notion that the secondary theme has ended at b.76. Whereas the formal basis of this secondary theme remains the hybrid sentence-type identified above as 'presentation + cadential phrase', Beethoven freely departs from that model by repeating *both* the presentation *and* the cadential phrase; moreover, by shortening the varied repetition of his presentation, he sets the stage for the enormous expansion that will follow within the repeated cadential phrase. Thus to regard the latter as separate in any way from the formal process of the secondary theme makes little sense; not until the much postponed perfect cadence of b.94 closes the theme can that process be said to have been completed.

Although Schenker's theory would have no place for the kind of formal argument I have independently ascribed to Caplin, the Schenkerian graphs in Ex. 14 provide abundant evidence in support of precisely the same conclusions about both the scope of the secondary theme and the nature of its much expanded cadential repetition. In Ex. 14a the first eight-bar unit within that repetition – the passage at bs 78-85 – is shown to initiate the cadential progression, moving quickly from the tonic at b.78 to the dominant-preparation IV-chord at b.80; whereas a conventional harmonic reading might conclude that the cadential dominant in the form of V( $\frac{4}{2}$ ) then directly arises at b.82, Ex. 14a proposes that this first eight-bar unit withholds that dominant until b.86, by instead expanding, that is, prolonging, the IV-chord. The second eight-bar unit then extends the cadential  $\frac{4}{2}$  by means of a broad turn in the bass (cf. b.54), effecting a voice exchange with the alto and recalling the diminished-seventh-chord

sonorities of the main theme; within the turn configuration, the interchange (10-10; 6-6) of the note pairs  $a\flat-b\flat$  and  $f\sharp-g$  further re-establishes the primary note  $g^2$  ( $\hat{5}$  = local  $\hat{3}$ ) in its original obligatory register, only then for that note to plunge downwards through three octaves but also finally to complete its *Urfinie*-like descent through the implied  $f^1$  ( $\hat{2}$ ) to  $e\flat^1$  ( $\hat{1}$ ) when the cadential dominant at last resolves to the tonic at bs 93-4. In Ex. 14b, the middleground overview lays bare not just the harmonic but also the contrapuntal means by which bs 78-94 project one, continuous, unified process; and, with this complete graph, we are now in a position to propose why Rufer's limited view of the secondary theme would be just as meaningless to the Schenkerian analyst as to Caplin.

Summarizing much that has been discussed above in detail, the graph at Ex. 14b reminds us that one and the same middleground contrapuntal structure informs each of the first three formal components of Beethoven's secondary theme: the presentation, its abbreviated repetition and the first expanded cadential phrase each, in its own unique way, fundamentally project the large-scale neighbour motion  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  ( $g-a\flat-g$ ) within a tonic-prolonging context in the key of the mediant. Moreover, Schenker's graph (Ex. 13a) displays that same neighbour motion, interpreted as  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  with reference to the home key, as the first-level middleground descant from the very beginning of the movement through the transition to the beginning of the secondary theme. Up to the point, then, where, at the close of the secondary theme's first cadential phrase, Rufer's secondary theme ends, the middleground descant has remained fundamentally static around the primary note; the composer's imperfect, rather than perfect, cadence at b.76 prevents the fundamental line from descending and thus motivates the cadential repetition. When, after a much greater and intensely heightened delay, the repetition concludes with the perfect cadence of b.94, the descant finally descends to the tonic note in the mediant; at that point, and only then, a complete middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure emerges, and this, once again, corresponds with a thematic process that has been brought to its completion.

## VIII

Many of us may be loath to accept what the history of music analysis so clearly teaches us – that no single analytical method remains fixed for ever, that, like any language, discourse about music will always be susceptible to the changes in perception we ourselves must make within an ever-changing social and aesthetic environment. It seems both predictable and appropriate, however, that future generations will continue to probe Heinrich Schenker's theory as one whose resources for insight into the structures of tonal music may be limitless. At the same time, one can



hardly imagine that listeners of the future, as aficionados, analysts, theorists, music historians, performers and composers, will ever arrive at modes of music perception that do not depend at least in part on matters of form. Whether Schenker's 'new theory of form' might serve to invigorate, rather than invalidate, traditional formal concepts is a question that studies such as this are just now beginning to raise; conversely, the possibility that recent formal outlooks can complement as well as enhance the Schenkerian vision will only be entertained when ideological biases on both sides give way to a meeting on common ground.

## NOTES

1. The development of Arnold Schoenberg's theory of form can be traced throughout his published writings. His concepts of form in tonal music achieve their clearest expression to date in his *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, ed. Gerald Strang and Leonard Stein (New York: St Martin's Press, 1967); but new explanations will surely be gained with the forthcoming publication of his manuscript entitled *Der musikalische Gedanke und die Logik, Technik und Kunst seiner Darstellung* (The Musical Idea and the Logic, Technique and Art of Its Presentation), as translated with commentary by Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff. Concerning basic points of disagreement between Schoenberg and Schenker, see Carl Dahlhaus, 'Schoenberg and Schenker', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, Vol. 100 (1973-4), pp. 209-15; Jonathan M. Dunsby, 'Schoenberg and the Writings of Schenker', *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg Institute*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1977), pp.26-33; Bryan R. Simms, 'New Documents in the Schoenberg-Schenker Polemic', *Perspectives of New Music*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1977), pp.110-24; and Helmut Federhofer, *Heinrich Schenkers Verhältnis zu Arnold Schoenberg* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1982). Concerning Heinrich Schenker's 'new theory of form', see his *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979), p. 106, and Part 3, Chapter 5 ('Form').
2. See Carl Dahlhaus, 'Form', in *Darmstädter Beiträge zur Neuen Musik*, Vol. 10 (Mainz, 1966), as translated by Stephen Hinton in Dahlhaus, *Schoenberg and the New Music*, trans. Derrick Puffett and Alfred Clayton (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), p.259; see also Joel Galand, 'Heinrich Schenker's Theory of Form and Its Application to Historical Criticism, With Special Reference to Rondo-Form Problems in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Instrumental Music' (Diss., Yale University, 1990), pp.57, 78-80.
3. Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.128. Cf. Schoenberg, 'Constructed Music' (c. 1931), in *Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg*, ed. Leonard Stein, trans. Leo Black (New York: St Martin's Press, 1975), p.107: '[Musical logic] comes about because in my case the productive process has its own



way; what I sense is not a melody, a motive, a bar, but merely a whole work.'

4. See Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.130. It should be emphasized here that Schenker's stance on form changed over time; for example, in his 'Eroica' analysis, published just five years before the completion of *Free Composition*, Schenker still uses traditional sonata-form terms, qualifying that these are 'according to the general, conventional teaching of sonata form' ('nach der allgemein üblichen Lehre der Sonatenform'). See Schenker, 'Beethovens III. Sinfonie zum erstenmal in ihrem wahren Inhalt dargestellt', in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, Vol. 3 (1930).

In view of their brevity, Schenker's chapters on rhythm and form at the very end of *Free Composition* have been regarded as incomplete: 'In part because of the circumstances which complicated the completion and publication of *Free Composition*, we should not take these discussions as full expositions of Schenker's thought, even though they did turn out to be his final published words on these subjects' (Larry Laskowski, 'J. S. Bach's "Binary" Dance Movements: Form and Voice Leading', in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel [Cambridge: CUP, 1990], p.84). Although the idea that Schenker's 'new theory of form' needs elaboration has just begun to take hold among Schenkerians, several preliminary efforts to develop a Schenkerian-based *Formenlehre* can be cited: along with 1) Laskowski's article, see 2) Allen Cadwallader's 'Form and Tonal Process: The Design of Different Structural Levels', in *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, ed. Cadwallader (New York: Schirmer, 1990), pp. 1-21, and 3) Galand's 'Heinrich Schenker's Theory of Form ... With Special Reference to Rondo-Form Problems', Chapter 1 (pp. 1-77). In particular, Galand's first chapter treats such diverse issues as the past and present status of formal theory in general, ways in which Schenker's concept of 'artistic delay', or 'content-expansion' (*Inhaltsmehrung*), recalls Heinrich Christoph Koch's theory of extended form, and sources of the present conflict between Schenkerian and Schoenbergian approaches to motivic-thematic analysis.

5. '... music finds no coherence in a "motive" in the usual sense. Thus, I reject those definitions of song form which take the motive as their starting point and emphasize manipulation of the motive by means of repetition, variation, extension, fragmentation, or dissolution. I also reject those explanations which are based upon phrases, phrase-groups, periods, double periods, themes, antecedents, and consequents. My theory replaces all of these with specific concepts of form which, from the outset, are based upon the content of the whole and of the individual parts; that is, the differences in prolongations lead to differences in form' (Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.131).
6. Charles Burkhart's critique of motivic studies by such Schoenberg disciples as Rudolph Réti and Josef Rufer rests on the following:

In particular, they make no attempt to relate melodic phenomena to the domains of harmony and tonal structure. Schenker's starting point is a theory of tonal structure that accounts for both melody and harmony and

the interaction of the two. . . . By 'surface' I mean the 'note-to-note' aspect of music, without thought of hierarchy. A condition of motivic parallelism is that either pattern or copy or both must lie at least partly beneath the surface – that is, be embellished by additional notes.

Burkhart, 'Schenker's "Motivic Parallelisms"', *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (1978), pp.146, 147f. As the first clarification of Schenker's 'motivic parallelisms', Burkhart's study establishes the primary goal of 'motivic analysis' for the Schenkerian – to demonstrate how the motive qua 'pattern' is validated on the basis of its sub-surface *enlargement* or surface *contraction* qua 'copy'. But Burkhart's work has also notified Schenkerians that it is not unimportant to consider the role of the 'surface' motive on its own terms. Publications by, among others, Allen Forte and Carl Schachter have also been highly influential in this respect. See, for example, Forte, 'Motive and Rhythmic Contour in the Alto Rhapsody [of Brahms]', *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (1983), pp.255-71; and Schachter, 'Motive and Text in Four Schubert Songs', in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David Beach (New Haven: Yale, 1983), pp.61-76. Much to the potential annoyance of present-day Schoenbergian analysts, Joel Galand has asserted that: 'Certainly, *Grundgestalt* analysis can be subsumed fairly easily by Schenkerian analysis, which has the advantage of demonstrating the voice-leading context as well' (Galand, 'Heinrich Schenker's Theory of Form . . . With Special Reference to Rondo-Form Problems', p.20). In support of this observation, Galand observes a striking 'convergence' between the Schoenbergian and Schenkerian analytical approaches juxtaposed in the 'Analysis Symposium: Patricia Carpenter and Allen Cadwallader on Brahms's Op. 76, No. 6', *Theory and Practice*, Vol. 13 (1988), pp.31-78.

7. These generalizations on my part hold even for the essays published in the two most recent Schenkerian collections – *Schenker Studies* and *Trends in Schenkerian Research* – as well for the above-cited studies of form by Laskowski and Cadwallader. Galand's work decidedly represents a break from the tradition I describe, but he, too, announces from the outset that his project will concern 'large-scale formal processes' ('Heinrich Schenker's Theory of Form . . . With Special Reference to Rondo-Form Problems', p.iii); adopting Jan RaRue's symbols in his presentation of formal diagrams (see LaRue, *Guidelines for Style Analysis* [New York: Norton, 1970]), Galand rarely goes further than to identify phrases and thematic functions (e.g. principal, transitional, secondary, closing, ritornello, episodic) by letter names. A notable exception to the Schenkerian rule, is, however, the text by William Rothstein entitled *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music* (New York: Schirmer, 1989). As its title suggests, this Schenkerian study focuses upon a 'foreground' formal concept – the *phrase*; from an examination of the relation of hypermetre to phrases, 'subphrases', 'periods', phrase expansions, 'phrase overlaps' and 'lead-ins', Rothstein leads to an investigation of 'some of the consequences that the study of phrase rhythm may have for the study of form'

(p.102). Although the author stresses that 'an extensive discussion of the ways in which individual phrases are formed is beyond the scope of this book' (p.25), he gives some attention to the internal structure of the *sentence* (see, for example, pp.26-7, 151-5) – the type of theme I intend to treat at length below.

8. For his description of the 'bar form', see Leonard B. Meyer, *Explaining Music: Essays and Explorations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), pp.39-40; for a summary of discussions and examples of this theme-type in the works of Kirnberger, Riepel, and Koch, see Janet Schmalfeldt, 'The Evaded Cadence and the "One More Time" Technique', *Journal of Musicological Research*, Vol. 12, Nos 1-2 (1992), note 19.
9. Dahlhaus, 'Form', p.248.
10. I refer specifically here to Robert O. Gjerdingen's *A Classic Turn of Phrase: Music and the Psychology of Convention* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), in which Meyer's work on 'musical archetypes' (see especially his section on 'Archetypal Schemata' in *Explaining Music*) serves as a basis for the formulation of Gjerdingen's '1-7-4-3 schema', to be discussed in some detail below.
11. As a mere sampling of recent studies on these topics, the following have exerted considerable influence in American musicological quarters: Anthony Newcomb, 'Once More "Between Absolute and Programme Music": Schumann's Second Symphony', *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 7 (1984), pp.233-50; Carolyn Abbate, *Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender and Sexuality* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991); McClary, 'The Blasphemy of Talking Politics During Bach Year', in *Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*, ed. Richard Leppert and Susan McClary (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), pp.13-62.
12. See Mark Evan Bonds, 'Haydn, Laurence Sterne, and the Origins of Musical Irony', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (1991), pp. 57-91.
13. Anthony Newcomb, 'Schumann and Late Eighteenth-Century Narrative Strategies', *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (1987), p.165.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, p.167.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.* Newcomb's question echoes those of Edward T. Cone in 1984:

A thorough analysis of consequentiality would depend on ... a classification of the compositional functions themselves. It would entail an investigation of those characteristics that make a passage appropriate for one role in a composition rather than another. A few examples will show what I mean. Why are some themes suitable for 'first subjects' in a sonata-form, and others for 'second subjects'? Why are yet others more suitable

for contrasting sections, such as trios or rondo episodes? ... Answers to such questions would require a typology not only of thematic character but also of thematic treatment – e.g., expository, developmental, episodic, recapitulatory, and the like.

Cone, 'Twelfth Night', *Journal of Musicological Research*, Vol. 7 (1987), p.149; Cone's article is an expanded version of an address delivered at the 1984 Conference of the Society for Music Theory in Philadelphia, PA. In this study, Cone stresses the need for 'a new macro-analysis, a new *Formenlehre* – a *Lehre* not of forms but of form itself, or of form and content together. Perhaps the new field should be described in terms of musical rhetoric ... rhetoric as a study of the principles governing the relationships of ideas to one another, and of the most convincing ways of ordering and connecting them – "modes of continuation", to use Monroe Beardsley's apt term' (p.135).

As mentioned by Cone, T. W. Adorno's call for a 'material theory of form in music' (*materiale Formenlehre der Musik*) likewise addresses the need for a new typology – 'that is, the concrete definition of categories like statement (*Setzung*), continuation (*Fortsetzung*), contrast (*Kontrast*), dissolution (*Auflösung*), succession (*Reihung*), development (*Entwicklung*), recurrence (*Wiederkehr*), modified recurrence (*modifizierter Wiederkehr*)...' Adorno further claims that 'so far not even the beginnings of an approach have been made regarding such a "material theory of form"'. 'On the Problem of Musical Analysis' (1969), introduced and trans. Max Paddison, *Music Analysis*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1982), p.185.

18. Erwin Ratz, *Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre*, 3rd edn, rev. and enl. (Vienna: Universal, 1973).
19. See Jean-Jacques Nattiez, 'Can One Speak of Narrativity in Music?', *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, Vol. 115, Part 2 (1990), pp.240-57.
20. Schmalfeldt, 'Cadential Processes', pp.1-52.
21. William E. Caplin, 'The "Expanded Cadential Progression": A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form', *Journal of Musicological Research*, Vol. 7 (1987), p.216. To clarify further, the term 'theme' for Caplin does not in any way refer to what, for example, Cadwallader as Schenkerian calls 'theme' or 'surface theme'. Cadwallader identifies the initial 'surface theme' of Mendelssohn's Op. 85, No. 1 by pointing out '♯ and the prominence of its upper neighbour ♮ (bar 2), which is decorated at the surface by the skip to ♯'; in other words, he describes a foreground melodic pattern or motive (Cadwallader, 'Form and Tonal Process', p.10). For Caplin the initial 'theme' of Mendelssohn's *Song without Words* would be the complete period (antecedent plus consequent) at bs 1-17.
22. Ratz regards the small ternary (*dreiteiliges Lied*) as a compound (*zusammengesetzte*) form, since its first part itself often takes the structure of a sentence or a period. See Ratz, *Einführung*, p.25.
23. Caplin, *A Theory of Formal Function* (unpublished typescript; publication

- forthcoming), Chapter 1, p.36; Chapter 6, pp.29-30.
24. See Schoenberg, *Fundamentals*, p.204; Ratz, *Einführung*, pp.21, 30-3.
  25. Caplin, *A Theory of Formal Function*, Chapter 1, p.36.
  26. About the 'single main period' that constitutes the first part (= exposition) of the 'first allegro of the symphony', whose form he regards as the basis for first movements of the sonata and the concerto, Koch says: '... after the theme has been heard with another main phrase, the third such phrase usually modulates to the key of the fifth – in the minor mode also towards the third – in which the remaining sections are presented, because the *second and larger half* of this first period is devoted particularly to this key' (Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, Vol. 3 [1793; facsimile repr., Hildesheim, 1969], par. 101, p.306, as translated by Nancy Kovaleff Baker in Koch, *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4* [New Haven: Yale, 1983], p.199; emphasis mine).
  27. Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.5.
  28. Cone, *Musical Form and Musical Performance* (New York: Norton, 1968), pp. 75-6; Meyer, *Explaining Music*, pp.39-40; Ratz, *Einführung*, p.175.
  29. Caplin, 'Funktionale Komponenten im achttaktigen Satz', *Musiktheorie*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (1986), pp.241-3; see also Caplin, 'The "Expanded Cadential Progression"', pp.218-19.
  30. See, for example, Koch's discussion of *Zergliederungssätze* in his *Versuch*, Vol. 2, par. 79, p.348, as translated in his *Introductory Essay on Composition*, p.3; Wilhelm Fischer, 'Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils', in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, Vol. 3 (1915), pp.43-4; Schoenberg, *Fundamentals*, pp.8-9; Alfred Brendel, *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), pp.42-3, 50-3; Caplin, *A Theory of Formal Function*, Chapter 1, p.4; see also Caplin, 'The "Expanded Cadential Progression"', p.219.
  31. Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.100.
  32. Schoenberg, 'Composition with Twelve Tones (1)' (1941), in *Style and Idea*, p.215.
  33. Ratz, *Einführung*, p.27. In describing this 'complementary relationship' between the presentation's basic idea and its repetition, Schoenberg uses the terms 'tonic form' and 'dominant form'; see Schoenberg, *Fundamentals*, pp. 21-2.
  34. See Gjerdingen, *A Classic Turn of Phrase*, p.65, Ex. 2-11; see also pp.23-7 and Ex. 2-14 on p.31. Esther Cavett-Dunsby reproduces Gjerdingen's complete Ex. 2-11 in her critical review of his work (*Music Analysis*, Vol. 9, No. 1 [1990], p.82).
  35. *Ibid.*, pp.63-4.
  36. To clarify the differences between schema theory and Schenkerian theory, Gjerdingen himself reproduces voice-leading graphs of the K.283 theme by Felix Salzer (from his *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*, Vol. 2 [New York: Dover, 1962], p.79) and Joel Lester (from his *Harmony in Tonal Music, Vol. 1: Diatonic Practices* [New York: Knopf, 1982], p.176). Lester's

graph in turn reproduces one he discusses in his earlier 'Articulation of Tonal Structures as a Criterion for Analytic Choices', *Music Theory Spectrum*, Vol. 1 (1979), pp.67-79. In part as a critical response to Lester, David Beach has recently provided yet another graph of the opening of K.283 – one that, like Salzer's and my own graph, argues against Lester's rejection of the notion of a fundamental  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  descent at bs 8-10 (see Beach, 'The Cadential Six-Four as Support for Scale-Degree Three of the Fundamental Line', *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 34, No. 1 [1990], pp.81-99). Although the central point of this note is to clarify that Salzer's, Lester's, Beach's and my own graph all interpret Gjerdingen's  $\hat{1}-\hat{7}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema at bs 1-4 as part of a compound-melodic structure that prolongs  $\hat{5}$  through the preliminary descent  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ , it must be added that, like Gjerdingen, none of these other three analysts recognizes the late-eighteenth-century convention of the sentence-type as the formal basis for Mozart's theme. Thus, for Lester, Mozart opens with 'a continuous ten-measure phrase group which forms the bulk of the first theme group' (Lester, 'Articulation of Tonal Structures', p.69; as indicated in my Ex. 3a, what follows Lester's 'bulk' is a repetition of the continuation). For Beach, Mozart's opening theme is a 'ten-bar idea, divided into phrases of four and six measures, followed by the varied repetition of the second one' (Beach, 'The Cadential Six-Four', p.83); Beach asserts that bs 5-6 might be 'heard as parenthetical' – a notion that, by negating the continuation function of those bars, eliminates the motivation for Mozart's intensified, hemiola-controlled cadential unit at bs 8-10.

37. For instance, within his Part I alone, the following examples from Gjerdingen's study invite the argument for a ' $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  schema': Exs 2-23, 2-24, 4-13, 5-12, 5-14, 5-15a, 5-15c, 5-30, 5-31 and 5-33.
38. *A Classic Turn of Phrase*, pp.102, 159ff., 264.
39. On the subject of reaching-over, see Schenker, *Free Composition*, pp.47-9 and p.83; my foreground interpretation of Beethoven's presentation unit conforms with the type of reaching-over shown schematically in the supplement to *Free Composition*, Fig. 41b/1. As presented to me in private correspondence, John Rothgeb's view of this passage is quite different from mine. Specifically, his graph highlights the motion by arpeggiated sixths from  $b\flat^1-g^2$  (bs 7-9) through  $a\flat^1-f^2$  (bs 10-11) to  $g^1-e\flat^2$  (bs 13-14); in this reading, the  $a\flat^1$  of b.12 becomes a passing note, rather than a neighbour note, within the inner-voice motion from  $b\flat^1$  (b.7) to  $g^1$  (b.12), and the descant prolongs the primary note  $\hat{3}$  by means of an initial  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  descent that reaches its registral completion only at b.14 (within the continuation). In other words, whereas my reading tries to capture the foreground melodic-rhythmic parallelism between the  $\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  motion at b.9 and the responsive  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  at b.12, Rothgeb favours the slightly more concealed motivic progression of the interval of the sixth, a progression whose completion cuts across the formalist's boundary between the end of the presentation and the beginning of the continuation, thus counteracting the obvious change of design at bs 13ff.
40. Readers may wish to compare my discussion thus far with Ratz's analysis of



the Bagatelle in his *Einführung*, pp.175-8. Ratz proposes that the absence of fragmentation within the continuation has to do with the lyrical character of the movement: 'In place of the dramatic build-up, development and unfolding through variation are coupled with the propulsion of the harmonic design' (p.176 – translation mine).

41. Rothgeb would take exception to one aspect of the motivic synopsis I present above Ex. 5a (see note 39). Whereas I interpret the sequential repetition at bs 16-18 as a transposed, tonic-orientated copy of the model at bs 13-15, Rothgeb hears that repetition as harmonically reinterpreted by the ii<sup>6</sup> at b.18, which he regards as a crucial dominant preparation already in effect upon the arrival of the IV-chord at b.15. More specifically, for Rothgeb the tonic of bs 16-18 plays a strictly parenthetical role within a more fundamental progression from IV to V; in this view, the governing harmonic plan of Beethoven's complete theme becomes I-(vi)-IV-(I)-V rather than I-(vi-IV)-I-V. That, from a purely theoretic viewpoint, both of these harmonic plans 'rest on a foundation of logical and coherent voice leading' has been demonstrated by Carl Schachter, who then proceeds to show that only the individual composition 'can give us reasons for our choice' (Schachter, 'Either/or', in *Schenker Studies*, p.167). As I hope to have clarified in Ex. 5, my choice finds its 'reasons' in the notion of a straightforward, rather than misleading, sequentially-repeated pattern at bs 16-18 – one that overtly reinstates as well as compresses the broad neighbour motion  $\hat{3}\text{-}\hat{4}\text{-}\hat{3}$  of the presentation. I also hope that Rothgeb will clarify the reasons for his choice in a forthcoming paper.

My deepest gratitude goes to John Rothgeb for his advice on numerous matters of voice leading and for his permission to discuss his unpublished graphs of Beethoven's Bagatelle.

42. See Schmalfeldt, 'On the Relation of Analysis to Performance: Beethoven's Bagatelles Op. 126, Nos. 2 and 5', *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (1985), pp.16-17, 21-8.
43. In his chapter on 'Schematic Norms and Variations' Gjerdingen aligns the first four bars of Haydn's theme with the openings of the five variations in order to show that 'each instantiation (including the theme) alters one or more norms of the schema' (*A Classic Turn of Phrase*, pp.68-9).
44. Schenker, *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, Vol. 1 (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925), pp.189-90; in his 'Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels' (Diss., Yale University, 1981), pp.99-100, William Rothstein explicates the 'rhythmic normalization' procedures illustrated in Schenker's graph.
45. Donald Francis Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas* (London: Associated Board, 1931), p.44.
46. Schoenberg, *Fundamentals*, p.29; Douglass M. Green, *Form in Tonal Music*, 2nd edn (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979), p.65.
47. Caplin, *A Theory of Formal Function*, Chapter 5, pp.8-10.
48. For those who hold that the vocal line must take priority over all other (instrumental) soprano parts in determining the fundamental tonal structure



of 'Dove sono', a voice-leading study of the complete aria would most probably conclude that  $\hat{3}$ , rather than  $\hat{5}$ , remains the definitive primary note throughout. Thus a Schenkerian background graph would not, strictly speaking, help to substantiate Siegmund Levarie's inspired account of the Countess's ultimate success in her struggle to attain  $g^2$  (Levarie, *Mozart's 'Le Nozze di Figaro': A Critical Study* [New York: Da Capo Press, 1977], pp.155-61). But Levarie's argument needs no such substantiation; and the foreground-middleground graph that neglects the instrumental as well as vocal role of  $\hat{5}$  in this aria would, indeed, fail to capture what may be the most outstanding dramatic and compositional strategy of the work.

49. In his discussion of 'the derivation of odd-number measure orderings from duple orderings at higher levels' ('Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels', p.138), William Rothstein has made a similar observation: '... the two parts of an interrupted linear progression normally occupy equal spans of time; this norm is in fact the basis of the typical 8- or 16-bar "parallel period"' (p.142). Douglass Green does not, however, restrict the term 'parallel period' to the type that features an interruption; for example, the consequent of a 'parallel period' might end with a perfect authentic cadence in the dominant (see Exs 5-8 on p.60 of Green's *Form in Tonal Music*), or the antecedent might close on the tonic, rather than with a half cadence (see Green's Exs 5-9, on p.61). The expression 'interruption period', rather than 'parallel period', might thus be appropriate for clarifying the type of theme to which Rothstein and I refer.
50. See Galand, "Heinrich Schenker's Theory of Form...With Special Reference to Rondo-Form Problems," pp.105-6; in particular, Galand cites Schenker's 'Fortsetzung der Urlinie-Betrachtungen', in his *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, Vol. 2 (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1926), pp.15-16.
51. Schachter, 'Rhythm and Linear Analysis: Aspects of Meter', in *Music Forum*, Vol. 6, Part 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), p.39.
52. With its view of an interruption at b.9, and in several other respects (see note 56), my graph takes exception to the ones presented by Walter Everett in his 'Grief in *Winterreise*: A Schenkerian Perspective', *Music Analysis*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1990), pp.157-75; Everett's graphs (see his Exs 11 and 12) endorse Schachter's claim for the 'tonic resolution' at b.10.
53. Here is a case where our perception of phrase structure can, I think, be strikingly influenced by the performance. If the pianist observes Schubert's crescendo at b.9 into the accent on the downbeat of b.10, the chance of our hearing b.10 as a new beginning will be increased; if, like Gerald Moore (on the 1990 compact disc reissued by EMI as CMS 7-63559-2), the pianist minimizes the crescendo, gives little stress to the accent and then interprets the latter as one that calls for a subsequent diminuendo throughout b.10, the singer's entry at b.11 will, like Fischer-Dieskau's, inevitably sound like the main event – the new phrase beginning – rather than like the urgent imitative response to the pianist that I believe it might be.
54. For a study of the 'one more time' convention, that is, the technique of

- motivating a repetition by means of an evaded cadence, see Schmalfeldt, 'Cadential Processes'.
55. I gratefully acknowledge Charles Burkhart's help in arriving at a graphic representation of the enlargement process within the consequent as shown Ex. 11. I am, however, solely responsible for the interpretation I present of bs 8-9 within the antecedent, one that conflicts with Everett's reading. Everett denies the role of a 'IV harmony' here, since he hears the motion  $c^2$ -to- $b^1$  in the descant at b.8 as the immediate resolution of the neighbour note  $c^2$ . I propose that the  $c^2$  of b.8, like the same at b.11, functions as a broader incomplete neighbour prolonged by the descending span  $c^2$ -to- $g^1$  that defines the interval of the fourth within  $iv^6$ ; that the syllabically-declaimed text at bs 8-9 – 'an-der-n Wand-rer gehn' – does not invite the resolution of a neighbour note on the weak syllable '-dern' has influenced my reading. In short, whereas Everett's graph obliges him to say that 'the  $c^2$ - $b^1$ - $a^1$ - $g^1$  line of b.8 has a slightly different function from  $c^2$ - $b^1$ - $a^1$ - $g^1$  in bs 11-16', my reading lends support to his claim that 'at a deeper level, however, they are the same' 'Grief in *Winterreise*', p.169).
  56. To quote Eric Wen, although 'symmetry has long been acknowledged as an important element in the period construction of an antecedent and a consequent phrase', 'a durational imbalance can sometimes occur between [these two phrases]': 'Illusory Cadences and Apparent Tonics: The Effect of Motivic Enlargement upon Phrase Structure', in *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, p.133. Given that all of Wen's examples of 'imbalance' result from expanded consequents (and are all from works by Mozart), rather than from expanded antecedents, it would have been well for Wen to stress that, in the periodic design, the notion of an expansion draws heavily upon the perception of an 'unexpanded' prototype: as in the case of Schubert's 'Der Wegweiser', a regular four-bar antecedent typically serves as the prototype against which expansion within its repetition as a consequent can be perceived as such. In other words, Schubert's formal strategy in the first part of 'Der Wegweiser' is not at all uncommon; but, by the extent to which Schubert expands his consequent, he risks stretching that strategy beyond its perceptual boundaries.
  57. See Maynard Solomon, 'Franz Schubert and the Peacocks of Benvenuto Cellini', *19th-Century Music*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1989), pp.193-206.
  58. Schenker, *Free Composition*, p.135. As conventional terms for the passages that accomplish 'the composing-out of  $\frac{2}{v}$  or  $\frac{5-3}{I-III}$ ' (the case of Beethoven's Op. 10, No. 1), Schenker disparages such labels as 'second theme' and 'subordinate theme' as 'inadequate terms and concepts which afford no insight into sonata form' (p.135); 'the quality of improvisation evident in the works of the great masters makes it impossible to conceive of an intellectual and chronological separation between a so-called first and second theme' (p.138).
  59. It should, of course, be stressed that in this exposition the main theme and the secondary theme are shown graphically to occur on different structural levels: whereas, within the large-scale interrupted form of the complete movement, the secondary theme participates in the first-level middleground descent of

the *Urlinie* to the dominant divider, the main theme arises simply as an initial prolongation of the primary note at a later middleground level. According to Schenker, such will be the case in general for expositions that move from a minor home tonic to III. In major-mode expositions, the main theme again usually prolongs the primary note, but the transition then tends to accomplish the descent to  $\frac{2}{b}$ , after which this single goal will be composed-out by the secondary-theme materials; thus, in these cases, the main theme and the secondary theme occur on comparable structural levels (see, for example, Schenker's graphs of major-mode sonata expositions in the Supplement to *Free Composition* at Figs 154/1 and 2).

60. Ratz, *Einführung*, p.25.
61. Josef Rufer, *Composition With Twelve Notes*, rev. edn, trans. Humphrey Searle (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1969), p.39. (The original text, under the title *Die Komposition mit zwölf Tönen*, was published by Max Hesses Verlag, Berlin, 1952.) Rufer's introductory overview of Schoenberg's formal concepts (see pp.24-38) anticipates Ratz's treatment of the same and elucidates Schoenberg's own presentation in his *Fundamentals*. But in his 'analysis and synthesis' of Beethoven's Op. 10, No. 1, Rufer gives short shrift to formal issues for the sake of a more ambitious enterprise – the effort to demonstrate that the initial, basic idea of Beethoven's sonata (bs 1-4) serves as the basis (*Grundgestalt*) 'not only of the main theme, but of the whole thematic material of the movement, and further of the whole work...' (p.39; see Rufer's motivic 'flow chart' in Tables I and II, pp.214-15). Although this is not the place for a critical evaluation of Rufer's *Grundgestalt* analysis, my own Schenkerian discussion of Beethoven's exposition implicitly rejects many of Rufer's motivic observations (especially those loosely associated with his 'motive (b)' – the 'falling second' at b.4) while also drawing attention to the transformed recurrences of at least one motivic component of Beethoven's initial idea that Rufer and I regard as seminal, the ascending leap from  $g^1$  to  $e_b^2$ .
62. Schoenberg, *Fundamentals*, p.58.
63. *Ibid.*, p.205.
64. *Ibid.*