

**REVIEW OF
FORMAL FUNCTIONS IN PERSPECTIVE,
EDITED BY STEVEN VANDE MOORTELE,
JULIE PEDNEAULT-DESLAURIERS, AND
NATHAN JOHN MARTIN**

BY GRAHAM G. HUNT

ONE OF SEVERAL MAJOR COLLECTIONS of analytical essays released over the past year or so,¹ *Formal Functions in Perspective* represents a first of its kind in two ways. On the one hand, it is the inaugural collection of articles employing William Caplin’s resuscitated and refined *Formenlehre* approach, “Formal Functions”; but on the other, it is the first *Festschrift*-style tribute to William Caplin, one of the pre-eminent scholars in our midst, who is well-deserving of such a collection of essays in his style and in his honor. The volume boasts such an impressive array of scholars, repertoires, and diversity of approaches that it proves not only the “usefulness” of Formal-Function theory² but provides a taste of its untapped utility in repertoires outside of the Classical canon (for example, Schumann and Schoenberg), and in tandem with other analytical methods such as hermeneutic analysis and dramaturgical/textual interpretation. Indeed, what impresses the most about this collection is the diversity of analytical environments and the different “payoffs” the reader can take from each of these essays; each of the studies in *Formal Functions in Perspective* could (and hopefully will!) lead to its own lineage of successive studies, just as Caplin’s own groundbreaking work has contributed to a boom in *Formenlehre*-based studies over the past decade or two.

This essay is divided into two main sections, the first summarizing and reflecting on the essays, and the second taking the analytical baton from one essay and extending it into new case studies. In doing so, I hope to not only provide a general critical commentary on the book standard to a review of this kind, but also to demonstrate the potential “lineage” of future work that can spring from these well-written and thought-provoking essays.

1. THE ARTICLES

1.1 THEORETICAL STUDIES IN HAYDN AND MOZART

Poundie Burstein opens the proceedings with “Functial Formanality” in Haydn—a play on words reminiscent of the opening to his 2005 article on the auxiliary cadence, whose first sentence seemingly begins mid-sentence to illustrate a prosaic spin on beginning music *in medias res*.³ His tongue-in-cheek term Functial Formanality intentionally applies Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of deformation to Formal Functions; it refers to situations where a formal function of a given passage is clearly expressed but somehow “realized in a deformational manner.” This occurs, for example, when the main theme of a sonata exposition, which carries the task of large-scale beginning func-

¹ See Beach and Goldenberg (2015) and Neuwirth and Bergé (2015).

² As evidenced by recent scholarship that uses Formal-Function theory as its central methodology, such as Bakulina (2012), Neuwirth (2015), and Suurpää (2014).

³ The article begins thusly: “After all, according to Heinrich Schenker, a non-tonic opening is a prime means by which Art can confront Nature.” (Burstein 2005, 159).

thematic introduction (or presentation?) MT proper continuation ==> cadential

f *p* *p*

ii_6^6 V_6^6/V (aband. cadence) ii_6^6 V I

PAC

Example 1. Haydn, Symphony No. 65, I, mm. 1–6 (from Burstein, Example 1.3a).

tion, has a weakened, or non-existent, initiating function. Burstein then explores the effects of these deformations on the remainder of the movement. In the opening movement of Haydn’s Symphony No. 65, for example, the clarity of the main theme’s initiating function is undermined; it opens with three “noise-killer” chords (I–V–I) that could be interpreted as either 1) framing (before-the-beginning) or 2) presentation (prolonging the tonic). Since what follows is a continuation ⇒ cadential phrase, we are faced with one of two non-conventional theme types: 1) thematic intro (before-the-beginning) + continuation ⇒ cadential (middle and ending in one phrase), or 2) basic idea (presentation) + continuation ⇒ cadential (middle and ending in one phrase).⁴ As a result of the “formal dissonance” caused at this crucial moment in the piece, Burstein notes that the remainder of the themes in the movement (most of which are variants of the main theme) are much more straightforward, or tight-knit; this suggests that over the course of the movement, the “seemingly unbridled thematic material [of the opening theme] is ultimately converted into a theme whose formal functions are extremely orderly” (18). Haydn turns formal functions upside down in the opening movement of his Symphony No. 81, whose main theme begins with Gjerdingen’s so-called *Quiescenza* schema, a cyclic progression over a tonic pedal in the bass that was typically employed as a post-cadential gesture in the Classical style. Slyly, Haydn brings back the opening theme at the end of the symphony, finally placing it in its proper location—after a cadence, and thus “after the end.”

Of course, by Burstein’s own admission, Caplin has discussed both the idea of formal dissonance at the opening of a piece having an effect on later passages (33n17), and

the idea that “dialogic” approaches are very much compatible with his own methodology, so Burstein by no means is passively pointing out a lacuna in Caplin’s writings. Rather, he has brought his own multivalent approach to a specific quirk in Haydn’s symphonic compositions. The result is refreshingly original hermeneutic readings using formal-function theory norms as a generic baseline. For example, the “unrepentant formal function” produced by the ambiguous, disjointed opening theme of Haydn’s Symphony No. 65, second movement, creates the sense that the opening theme is “flippant” and “thumbing its nose at authority” by refusing to fix its formal functionality in any of its returns throughout the movement (31). Burstein mentions Haydn’s own quote about an early attempt in a symphonic slow movement to “portray an exchange between God and a ‘foolish...unrepentant sinner’...[who] pays no heed to the exhortations” (30–31), which is certainly applicable to the “eccentric” opening theme of the 65th symphony’s slow movement. One quibble with the voice-leading sketch in Example 1.2 should be mentioned: the passage from m. 147 to the end is exclusively in D major, yet the sketch implicitly says it is in minor (the F within the 5-Zug is not marked as F♯). However, this hardly takes anything away from Burstein’s insightful essay on formal-function dissonance in Haydn.

Nathan John Martin, too, masterfully weaves interpretative analysis with formal/harmonic analysis in his essay “Mozart’s Sonata-Form Arias.” While dramaturgical/musical reading is naturally different in operas than in symphonies, Burstein and Martin’s approaches mesh perfectly in this opening pair of essays. Using arias from four late Mozart operas (*Idomeneo*, *Die Entführung aus dem Serail*, *Die Zauberflöte*, and *La clemenza di Tito*),⁵ Martin assesses Mozart’s strategies for modifying sonata forms, with an end goal of showing that “in his later arias [he] progres-

⁴ I see the cadential events differently from Burstein, who reads V/V–ii₆⁶ in mm. 4–5 as a harmonic regression; I see a cadential progression beginning in m. 3 with the ii₆⁶, which moves to the V/V, which fails to resolve to V, thus creating an abandoned cadence. This alternate reading is shown in Example 1; Burstein’s original reading can be found in his Example 1.3a.

⁵ Excluded from these are numbers that are duets, trios, choruses, or finales.

sively abridged the complete sonata structures that predominate *Idomeneo*" (38). This is primarily due to Mozart's proclivity for truncating the recapitulations of sonata expositions. Moreover, comparing the proportion of arias in sonata form in "generically matched" opera pairs—*Idomeneo* (1780) and *Tito* (1791) as *opera seria* and *Entführung* (1782) and *Zauberflöte* (1791) as *Singspiele*—suggests that sonata forms became less frequent over the second half of his career in general.

Martin's fascinating study (as well as similar studies he previously published on arias in other operas by Mozart and Haydn⁶) argues that the norms or defaults of sonata form as gleaned from instrumental music by Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven are not necessarily the same standards one should apply to sonata-based vocal forms. On the contrary, there are several "deformations" or "hybrid-form" peculiarities seen throughout Mozart's late-career aria forms (and, as I hope to show below, in numbers from other Classical-era operas) that are common enough to be defined as standard forms themselves. For example, Martin's so-called "sonata-ternary" form, which consists of a "concise" sonata exposition followed directly by a compressed recapitulation, becomes so prevalent in *Tito* that it should be considered a standard—or "first-level default"—formal option. By contrast, this form is rare in instrumental works, usually found only in slow movements; indeed, Caplin files it as one of his "slow-movement" forms in Chapter 14 of *Classical Form*. In my view, other "quirks" that are in fact quite common in "aria forms" include expositions with no transition (or transitions that move to the subordinate key almost right away), middle sections that range from simple "contrasting middle" sections to development-like sections with sequences, internal tonicizations and/or sequences,⁷ and recapitulations that do not literally bring back the exposition's subordinate theme but do have a passage carrying subordinate-theme *function*. In the more detailed discussion at the end of this essay, I explore how accounting for these and other common

"anomalies" can help categorize aria forms that seem to elude clear classifications.

Martin's discussion beautifully interweaves formal-function and dramatic analysis; the first full analytical vignette, "Traurigkeit" from *Entführung* (No. 10), is especially effective. The opening dotted-rhythm gesture, first sounded in the woodwinds, then repeated by Constanza, seems initially like an introductory or "framing" phrase preceding the true initiating phrase. However, Martin contextualizes these opening four measures, opening our eyes to a most moving musical-dramatic construction:

"Having welled up in the previous recitative, her *Traurigkeit* presses down on her with nauseating force. Indeed, it leaves her momentarily unable to speak: the winds' opening motto...is an onomatopoetic gasp for breath...The abrupt pause that follows serves to register the shock...she stumbles, then catches herself. The brief pause is enough, and she repeats the woodwinds' gesture (mm. 3–4), now naming it ["*Traurigkeit*"], and so beginning to master herself once more...Constanza's first sung gesture...stand[s] apart like a motto...yet what follows in measure 5, where, propelled by the circling figures in the second violins, the aria seems first to get underway, is not an **initiation** but a **continuation**; melodically, though not harmonically, these measures are sequential, with corresponding accelerations in the surface and in harmonic rhythm." (47–48; my emphasis)

Readers less familiar with Caplin's theme types will doubtlessly appreciate Martin's attempt to pre-empt confusion regarding, for example, the fourteen-measure "sixteen-measure sentence" subordinate theme in "Traurigkeit," as Martin notes that the compressed continuation phrase accounts for the numerical disparity: "The qualification 'sixteen-measure' [sentence]...refers to the ideal-typical model form being instantiated and not to its instantiation" (70–71n24). However, Martin does go against his mentor's axiom that transitions cannot start in the subordinate key when, in Example 2.4, he identifies m. 20 as the beginning of the transition, despite the fact that it is in the subordinate key, B \flat major.⁸ Still, this hardly detracts from Martin's insightful study of Mozart's sonata forms in a carefully chosen set of representative pieces from Mozart's later career.

1.2 NINETEENTH-CENTURY TAXONOMIES

In the next two essays, and really throughout the rest of the book, we begin to see how extending Caplin's methodology past the Classical-era repertoire can yield a variety of beneficial insights. Julian Horton's entry posits that Caplin's theory "compels speculation about the ubiquity of his Viennese syntax: would the theory look the same

⁶ Martin (2010b) and (2016b).

⁷ As Charles Rosen outlines in more detail, the *da capo* form with ritornello elements that predominated early- and mid-century opera numbers gradually evolved into sonata-based forms. Rosen specifies three variants of the form that prevailed by the 1750s. In the "full" *da capo* form, the A section would contain a modulation from the tonic to dominant (the "exposition"), then a stretch modulating back to (or starting in) tonic that "gradually" took on the "full character of a recapitulation," usually in a different tempo and tonal center (but not a development). This was then followed by a full return of A1 and A2. As composers began to "mercifully" abbreviate this massive structure, they used a *dal segno* indication to return to only the A2 (recapitulation) after the B section (A1 A2 B A2), or did away with the first A2, resulting in what Rosen calls "sonata form without development but with a central trio section": A1 B A2, or exposition–middle section–recapitulation (Rosen 1988, 57–58).

⁸ Although Caplin does not explicitly state this, it is implicit throughout his definitions of transition and subordinate themes, and he has noted it to me in private correspondence.

if it were grounded evidentially in, for example, the music of Boyce, Clementi and Dussek rather than Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven?” (77). He proposes a revised set of norms for first-movement nineteenth-century concerti based not upon the traditional lineage from Mozart to Beethoven to Mendelssohn, but rather upon an “as yet sparsely investigated body of music” by composers from Dussek, through Moscheles, to Chopin, (77–78). Contrary to assertions by Hepokoski and Darcy, who say the Type 3 sonata became the default first-movement form for nineteenth-century concerti, Horton maintains that the “more widely disseminated” repertoire of the time did maintain the “Type 5” sonata (or, as he calls it, the “sonata-ritornello” variant) seen in Classical concerti (79). He then proceeds to outline the syntax of the main thematic areas of the Type 5 sonata’s two expositions: the first theme of the ritornello (“R1 A”), the solo (“S1 A”), and the second theme (“B”) from both; to do so, he cautions that one must be mindful of applying Caplin’s standards derived from Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven to nineteenth-century themes because of an increased “degree of syntactic looseness” (85). He adds that the increased presence of (or “proliferation” of) continuation function and loosened syntax permeates several different interthematic regions (main theme most notably), not just the subordinate-theme group. This statement, however, is slightly misleading—Caplin does not really say “that ‘loose’ design is generally a subordinate-theme property in Viennese classicism” (85), but rather that subordinate themes are *relatively* looser than their corresponding main themes, but tighter-knit than a transition section. Caplin’s theory allows for an unusually “loosened” exposition in which, say, a non-conventional theme type or multiple cadential deviations within the main theme can set the precedent for an increase in continuation features or loosening throughout all thematic regions.⁹ As he notes in his more recent *Analyzing Classical Form: An Approach for the Classroom*, “the main theme of a sonata defines a standard of tight-knit organization for the movement as a whole, to which all of the other sections can be compared as **more or less loosely organized**. It must be stressed that the expression of tight-knit and loose form is not absolute, but always *relative* to a given movement...what is important is the degree to which a given main theme is tight-knit **in relation to the units that follow** and how these units are rendered looser in relation to that initial main theme” (Caplin 2013, 264; italics in original, bold my emphasis).

Thus, Horton’s assertions that the opening theme from Hummel’s Piano Concerto, Op. 113, I (his Example 3.4)

is “distinctive for its displacement of functional characteristics” (88) or that the Op. 89 concerto, I (his Example 3.5) has “no fewer than five intrathematic layers” (90), perhaps exaggerate how *radically* loosened Caplin’s theme types truly are. The former example can be explained as a hybrid theme with various extensions and expansions within its continuation phrase, whereas the latter seems more like a main-theme complex with two themes: the first a fairly straightforward sixteen-measure hybrid 1 theme (compound antecedent + continuation), and the latter a sixteen-measure sentence with an expanded continuation phrase; see Table 1.¹⁰ Furthermore, they set the relative scale for tight-knit vs. loose form throughout the exposition; in Op. 113, the (first) subordinate theme is also a similarly loosened theme type—a sixteen-measure hybrid 1 theme with an expanded continuation and a repeat of the final phrase with an expansion. This is not to say that these themes are tight-knit, or that Horton’s analysis is incorrect, but they demonstrate that Caplin’s theme types are quite readily *applicable* to nineteenth-century works, though more flexibility is of course needed in light of the increasingly chromatic language in these pieces.

Horton outlines the typical layout (a first-level default of sorts) of the nineteenth-century concerto’s first solo theme group (“S1 A”): it starts with a *bravura* preface, usually in a period form, moves to a more *cantabile* or nocturne-like theme, and finally concludes with a brilliant display-episode (often as the transition section). These three phases reflect the “three topical attitudes of the virtuoso concerto: *bravura* [pianism], *brilliant* display [virtu-

¹⁰ The presentation in Op. 113’s “R1 A” consists of a c.b.i. (mm. 1–4), which leads to a continuation in two phases: 1) mm. 5–7, liquidation and fragmentation of “a3” as Horton notes, but also with a hint of an interpolation; 2) model/sequence (mm. 8–11). A cadential phrase seems to begin in m. 12 with an ECP, but it leads to an evaded cadence (m. 19; Horton does not start the ECP until m. 16, despite the prolongation of a cadential I⁶ beginning in m. 12—and he oddly labels this ECP [mm. 16–19] as “deceptive”), then a one-more-time ECP, which does reach the PAC in m. 23. Overall, its syntax seems more in line with a c.b.i. + continuation (highly expanded and extended) than a sentence; but in any case, while loosening indeed occur in this theme, they occur within one of Caplin’s theme types. Op. 89’s opening theme is probably best interpreted as a main-theme *group*, with main theme 1 a sixteen-measure hybrid 1 theme (compound antecedent: mm. 3–10 a sentential antecedent, mm. 11–15 not a consequent as Horton designates, rather a continuation that builds off the antecedent’s continuation) with a melodic sequence, followed by a cadential progression in mm. 15–17 to the IAC (the tonic “hammer-blows” in the timpani create, at least to my ear, a ‘root-position’ resolution to the tonic triad, though of course the blank first beat does weaken the cadential resolution). Main theme 2 then comprises mm. 19–45, a sixteen-measure sentence whose continuation is expanded: c.b.i. + c.b.i. (mm. 19–26), fragmentation (mm. 27–32), standing on the dominant followed by chromatic bass ascent (mm. 33–40), and a cadential progression (mm. 41–45) reaching the PAC in m. 45.

⁹ Or, as for example in the quirky pieces by Haydn that Poundie Burstein discusses, the sliding scale of relative tight-knit to loose-knit organization can be turned upside down.

Table 1. Hunt and Horton analyses, Hummel Op. 113 and Op. 89 main themes.

(Hummel, Op. 113)

Hunt									
Formal Function	Presentation		Continuation		Cadential			Cadential (repeat)	
Internal events	c.b.i.	[extension]	model/sequence		ECP			ECP	
Cadence					EC			one-more-time PAC	
m.	1	5	9	12	14	16	19	20	23
Horton									
First grouping level	Presentation			Continuation		ECP (Deceptive)		ECP (fulfilled)	
Next grouping level	c.b.i.	continuation	tonic confirm.	model repetition		[DC]		PAC	
Cadence									

(Hummel, Op. 89)

Hunt										
Formal Function	MT1 (Compound hybrid)					MT2 (Compound sentence)				
Internal events	Antecedent		Continuation			Pres.	Continuation		Cadential	
Cadence	b.i. + b.i.	cont ⇒ cad	IAC			c.b.i. + c.b.i.	(expansion)	(expansion)	ECP	
m.	3	7	11	17	19	27	33	41	45	
Horton										
First grouping level	Presentation			Response		Continuation			Cadential	
Second grouping level	Statement			Consequent		Cont. Phr. 1	Cont. Phr. 2	Cont. Phr. 3		
Third grouping level	Antecedent			b.i. + c.i.		Model	Repetition			
Next grouping level	b.i.	c.i.	IAC attempted					PAC		
Cadence	HC (10)									

osity], and song [a nod to *bel canto* opera]” (90). Using this baseline, Horton nicely shows standard examples of this three-phase layout in Dussek and Moscheles. He also points to composers that, say, omitted the *cantabile* episode and went straight to the display episode, as Johann Baptist Cramer did, inspiring similar modifications by Sterndale Bennett.

Horton’s dense article rightfully advocates for a more genre-specific approach to nineteenth-century forms, much as Martin crafts a syntactical system specifically for opera arias in the preceding article. While I feel that Horton exaggerates how “elusive” the theme types in nineteenth-century concerti are relative to Caplin’s definitions, his use of lesser-known composers’ tendencies within the genre to help establish a revised set of terms within the form certainly deserves praise and points toward potential applications to other nineteenth-century genres.

Andrew Deruchie similarly advocates for inclusion of a composer hitherto overlooked as a major proliferator of a formal technique, Camille Saint-Saëns. In this case, the technique is cyclic form, the process of bringing earlier thematic material back in later movements of a multi-movement work. The most noteworthy example is the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. Most literature cites Franck and d’Indy as the major proponents of cyclic form in nineteenth-century French music, but as Deruchie points out, Saint-Saëns employed it long before Franck “standardized” it and before d’Indy career truly got started. Deruchie’s main goal is twofold: on the one hand, he seeks

to clarify how Saint-Saëns’s own deployment of cyclic form evolved over the course of his career, referencing five representative works spanning some twenty-five years. On the other hand, he seeks to continue recent efforts by Puri (on Ravel), Wheeldon (on Debussy), Hart (on d’Indy), and others, to demonstrate that in nineteenth-century French composers’ hands, cyclic form is “an umbrella category that admits an array of compositional procedures” (124).

To bolster his approach to cyclic form, Deruchie draws on Caplin’s formal functions and Steven Vande Moortele’s concept of “two-dimensional” form, in which multiple movements (the cycle) are on the same formal hierarchical level as an over-arching sonata form spanning the entire work. In Vande Moortele’s own words, he wishes to “conceptualize Saint-Saëns’s approach to cyclicism as one that embeds the formal functions of a single-movement sonata form—main theme, exposition, coda, and so on—among the sundry movements of his cycle” (125). Indeed, since his cyclic/two-dimensional pieces resemble those Vande Moortele has outlined in Liszt’s *oeuvre*, and since Saint-Saëns “tirelessly championed his colleague [Liszt]’s music in France” (125), Deruchie posits Liszt as “the most immediate source” for Saint-Saëns’s cyclic strategy.

Deruchie elegantly shows how, in his first *Violin Concerto* (1859), the cyclic form and sonata form shift in and out of phase: the first movement presents the exposition (main themes, subordinate theme) and development, but the recapitulation “fizzles.” At this point, the sonata dimension “goes dormant” and the cyclic form takes over, as the slow movement begins an autonomous ABA form. Following this, the cyclic dimension drops out as what Deruchie

Table 2. Deruchie and Hunt readings of Saint-Saëns's Cello Concerto No. 1, exposition.

Hunt							
Sections	Main Theme			Transition	Sub. Theme (16-m. sent.)	Contin., ECP	Closing Theme
Key/cadences	a:	HC (16)	Repeat Ant.	HC (43)	a:Ab Cad (55)	F:PAC (111)	Closing func. PAC
m.	1		24	43	59	75	111
Deruchie							
Sections	Main Theme		Transition	Sub. Theme	Transition resumes	Closing Theme	
Key/cadences	Antecedent	Consequent?		Presentation (no contin.!)	(continuation)	contin., cad. PAC	
	a	HC (16)	a	HC (43?)	49!	F	6/4

labels the recapitulation begins. The subordinate theme of the opening movement returns (though not in the tonic key);¹¹ the *tempo primo* has returned but the true *finale* of the movement cycle, ostensibly, has not truly begun. Finally, the main themes return in the tonic to launch the *finale* of the cyclic form.

At a more local level, Deruchie, like Horton, somewhat exaggerates the extent to which intra- and interthematic functions are “destabilized” or “confounded” (132). For example, in discussing the exposition of the first Cello Concerto, he notes that the “boundaries between main theme, transition, and subordinate-theme group are fluid and ambiguous” (132); yet, much of this can be explained in terms of the same kinds of deviations or loosening techniques seen in Classical pieces (see Table 2). As Deruchie points out, the main theme does seem to be laid out as a (compound) antecedent followed by a (failed) consequent, which also ends in a tonic-key half cadence (creating what he calls a “duplicate antecedent”), and this second half cadence does seem like a concluding gesture to the main theme. However, Deruchie asserts that throughout the expositions, the boundaries seem “blurred,” and “the hierarchy that would group...intrathematic functions [presentation, continuation, cadential] into discrete interthematic functions [main theme, transition, subordinate theme] dissolves” (132). However, I have a different view—the subordinate theme provides a logical succession of formal functions, albeit with some loosening effects, as we would expect in a piece composed roughly a century later than Classical-era works.

The subordinate theme directly follows, beginning in m. 59 in the submediant key (F major), expressing exclusively presentation function for its first twelve mea-

asures (four-measure c.b.i. + four-measure c.b.i. [sequential] + four-measure melodic fragmentation), although over a C (dominant) pedal. Following what seems like a four-measure attempt at either continuation (chromaticism) or cadential progression (the D-major harmony perhaps to become V of subdominant harmony), the i_4^6 chord from earlier returns in m. 75, suggesting that, as Deruchie reads it, the transition has resumed and we are off to the true subordinate theme. However, the chord takes a different direction, moving into what I view as the continuation of the ongoing subordinate theme; an ECP begins in m. 79, but is abandoned when the i_4^6 harmony in m. 91 fails to resolve to a root-position dominant. Another ECP is then begun in m. 103, leading to the subordinate-key PAC. In sum, this passage (mm. 75–111) renders the brief $a:i_4^6$ return not as a resumption of the transition section, but rather the beginning of continuation function within the subordinate theme that had been lacking in the opening sixteen measures. Because the subordinate theme as a whole does in fact provide a logical succession of formal functions, I don’t agree with Deruchie’s assessment about the blurry borders or “dissolving hierarchy” of intra- and inter-thematic functions. On the contrary, the main thematic areas of the exposition still contain their standard complement of intrathematic functions, and clear borders can be established between each.¹²

While this discussion might seem engaged with a level of Deruchie’s analysis more at the surface than his larger point about cyclic form, it is relevant to his larger-level claim that “by confounding hierarchy at this relatively low formal level, the concerto’s exposition prepares its large-scale design: the dynamic relationship between sonata form and sonata cycle springs forth from fluid relationships between main theme, transition, and subordinate-theme group” (133–134).

¹¹ Deruchie does not address this important deviation—in a Type 2 sonata, for example, the subordinate theme that follows the development returns in the tonic key. Perhaps Deruchie is implying that this is a Type 2 sonata with a subdominant “recapitulation” (analogous to a Type 3 sonata with a subdominant recapitulation, e.g., Mozart’s Piano Sonata K. 545, Beethoven’s *Coriolan* Overture, and several examples in Schubert).

¹² I do maintain that the transition *ends* before the subordinate theme begins, it just does do without reaching a fully realized *cadence* and without modulating from the tonic, a deviation that could be explained by the surreptitious return of the i_4^6 chord within the subordinate theme.

1.3 SCHUBERT

Brian Black initiates the pair of articles on Schubert with a study of his “deflected-cadence” as a strategy to highlight the entrance of the subordinate key and the subordinate theme. This is accomplished by a cadential progression in the home key being immediately followed by a second cadential progression that begins the same way but then diverts to a PAC in the subordinate key.¹³ By nature, this idea of *initiating* the subordinate theme with a *concluding* gesture (the SK:PAC) goes against Caplin’s axiom that the transition cannot end with a SK:PAC, nor can the subordinate theme be initiated by it.¹⁴ If and when this occurs in a Classical exposition, the passage leading up to the SK:PAC is designated a “transition/subordinate theme fusion,” since it begins as a transition but ends as a subordinate theme. After all, the task of the entire subordinate theme is to confirm the subordinate key with this SK:PAC, so how can this occur at its *beginning*? Black, however, argues that the deflected cadence is not a radical deformation of Viennese Classical norms, but rather a “subtle transformation of the classical style indicative of a new approach to sonata form and its aesthetics in the early nineteenth century” (165). He makes it clear that the passage leading up to the SK:PAC is not a TR/ST fusion, but rather *the* transition. Even though it ends with the SK:PAC, it does not truly confirm the second key (since we have hardly been in the key for any length of time)—that task remains to be accomplished by the subordinate theme. Conversely, Black makes it clear that he is *not* endorsing Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition of a SK:PAC as a “third-level default” medial caesura, nor is he invalidating the concept of TR/ST fusion in Schubert’s predecessors. Rather, viewing Schubert’s technique in light of these Classical definitions “allows Schubert’s departure from this norm to stand out quite noticeably.”

Interestingly, most of his examples come from what I designate as three-key expositions;¹⁵ his earliest deflected-cadence example, the opening movement of

the D. 112 String Quartet (B \flat major), does present a problematic stretch from mm. 35–103 that can be read either as a transition leading to the first subordinate theme (my view) or entirely as *the* transition (Black’s view). Two main events complicate both interpretations, and they resonate with larger questions of formal analysis of nineteenth-century sonata expositions. The first is the PAC in G minor (a subordinate key) in m. 45 (his first deflected cadence). Black interprets mm. 45ff as another section of the transition, but without acknowledging this deviation from the Classical norm defined by Caplin that the transition (or internal sections of it) cannot begin in the/a subordinate key. Black could well have noted this deviation as another example of Schubert’s departures from the norm, as he did with the SK:PAC as a gesture to end the transition and launch the subordinate theme.¹⁶

However, acknowledging m. 45 as the beginning of the (first) subordinate theme is problematized by the PAC in m. 73 in the tonic key, B \flat major—which, incidentally, follows the second of three deflected cadences in the exposition. In some ways, this implies that we have not truly left the tonic key. Adopting this logic—as well as the argument that in his three-key (or apparent three-key) expositions, Schubert related the second tonality “directly back to the tonic” (193) *before* proceeding to the final key, a point I wish to return to below¹⁷—Black accordingly reads this as still being part of the transition. Only in m. 103, following the third, and final, deflected cadence—which leads to a V:PAC—does the subordinate theme begin. Table 3 shows two interpretations—one replicating Brian Black’s reading (mm. 35–103 being the transition) and one reading m. 45 as the beginning of the first subordinate theme. In this alternate reading, the return of tonic in m. 73 launches the second subordinate theme (albeit in the tonic), and the third subordinate theme is mm. 103ff in the key of the dominant. In this reading, also, each of the subordinate themes is set up by one of Black’s deflected cadences—suggesting that it

¹³ Later in the article, he shows that the second cadential progression can occur later, after a further transitional passage, thus creating a “large-scale” deflected cadence.

¹⁴ As Caplin first stated in *Classical Form*, interpreting an SK:PAC this way “blurs a theoretical distinction fundamental to this study, namely, that the authentic cadential confirmation of a subordinate key is an essential criterion of the *subordinate theme’s* function” (Caplin 1998, 203; my emphasis).

¹⁵ See, for example, Hunt (2009) and (2014); even though this term had previously been used somewhat tentatively (with quotes around it) or modified (as, for example, by Caplin, who designates them as part of a “modulating subordinate theme,” since in Classical expositions, the second key is “rarely” given cadential confirmation), Schubert frequently deployed three clear tonal centers in his expositions, often giving *both* the second and third keys cadential confirmation—for example his Second Symphony (I and IV: I–IV–V) and the “Death and the Maiden” String Quartet (i–III–v).

¹⁶ It is also possible that he views this as some kind of variant of a transition starting on a remote tonal region, which Caplin defines as a possible beginning strategy for transitions (Caplin 1998, 129–131)—indeed, using the submediant was the most common way this was done, since it acts as a tonic substitute. However, this is likely not Black’s view—he implies that transitions can, and often do, begin in a subordinate key, again without acknowledging his modification to Caplin’s methodology; in three-key expositions “in which the initial subordinate key area is unstable and eventually yields to the second subordinate key...the transitional process continues, despite the projection of a new thematic beginning [and a subordinate key area]” (195n11). In my work with three-key expositions, however, I have found it more useful to maintain Caplin’s definition and identify the first “subordinate key area” that projects a thematic beginning as the second key, not as a continued transition.

¹⁷ This argument was initially proposed by James Webster.

Table 3. *Black and Hunt, outlines of Schubert's String Quartet No. 8 (D. 112), I, exposition.*

		*Deviating Sub. Theme								
measures		1–34	35–45	45	45–73	73	73–95	99	103	103–156
Key area		B \flat	(g)	g	g \rightarrow	B \flat	B \flat \rightarrow	g \rightarrow F	F	
Hunt	Section	MT	TR		ST1		ST2*	<i>deviates</i>		ST3
Black	Section	MT	TR		TR		TR			ST
	Cadence			g:PAC	<i>g:EC (66)</i>	B\flat:PAC		<i>g:EC</i>	F:PAC	
		I			vi	(I)				V

could also be used as a gesture *within* a subordinate theme group to launch another subordinate theme.

This second interpretation, while perhaps clinging too stubbornly to Caplin’s axiom that a transition (or portion therein) cannot begin in the subordinate key, does seem more convincing when considered in light of nineteenth-century three-key exposition strategies by Schubert and other composers. As I am exploring in a separate study, there are several strategies composers used in three-key expositions as a method of modulation from the second key to the third key. I define these strategies by where the modulation occurs in the subordinate theme’s succession of formal functions. The D. 112 String Quartet exemplifies a special tactic in which the second key does not lead directly to the third key, which creates two internal modulations. Note that in this case the ‘internal’ key is the tonic, but in other cases in Schubert and, in particular, Bruckner, it is another key entirely.¹⁸ A familiar example is the first movement of Beethoven’s Op. 10, No. 3 Piano Sonata, whose first subordinate theme begins in the submediant key, but quickly moves to a cadential progression and PAC in the home key’s mediant. An internal, transition-like passage eventually moves to the key of the dominant, articulating a V:PAC and launching another subordinate theme in the normative key of the dominant.¹⁹ Viewed in light of this and other examples with internal keys (tonic or non-tonic), the move to the tonic key within D. 112’s subordinate theme group does not seem so outlandish. The modulation from vi to I, as well as from I to V later in the exposition, is accomplished with the strategy I have called the “deviating subordinate theme,” in which the theme turns towards another harmony during the cadential portion of the theme.²⁰ This

deviation is indicated in the “alternate interpretation” portion of the example.

In spite of our different viewpoints on this exposition, likely due to our different angles on Schubert’s expositions (Black is focused on Schubert’s developing strategies within sonata expositions and developments, whereas I focus exclusively on three-key expositions in works by Schubert and numerous others), Brian Black’s call for a broadening of the concept of transition and subordinate theme junctions should be heeded. Indeed, the use of a subordinate-key PAC to end the transition also holds true throughout nineteenth-century sonata expositions.²¹ Furthermore, he argues persuasively that the deflected-cadence strategy is an important aspect of Schubert’s sonata-form design and exploring it adds a fresh perspective on sonata form at a pivotal time in its history.

François de Médicis approaches Schubert’s formal strategies from the perspective of thematic sequences and phraseology, with the goal of addressing temporality in his music—or, put more informally, Schubert’s tendency toward longer instrumental pieces that has garnered both praise and criticism over the years. Referencing Robert Schumann’s term “heavenly length” used in reference to Schubert’s Ninth Symphony, de Médicis’s essay shows how the interaction of uniform grouping structures and sequence types “weakens the differentiation of the main sections of the form, thus creating the sense of large-scale coherence that is distinct from the classics and helps project a *typically Schubertian experience of temporality*” (199; my emphasis). Central to his argument is the use of se-

¹⁸ When this internal key hosts a subordinate theme and/or cadential confirmation, it can create the extremely rare “four-key exposition.” Notable examples include the second movement of Schubert’s D. 667 Piano Quintet and Piano Sonata D. 575, and the first and last movements of Cesar Franck’s Op. 8 Violin Sonata.

¹⁹ The submediant key is also used in another major-key three-key exposition by Beethoven, Violin Sonata Op. 12, No. 2, which flees the key of vi even more rapidly than the Op. 10, No. 3 Piano Sonata.

²⁰ Other strategies include, for example, the “false subordinate theme,” which modulates in the presentation phrase, the “contin-

uation \Rightarrow internal transition,” which occurs during a continuation phrase, and “internal transitions,” in which the modulation occurs in a passage marked off by a preceding cadence. I explore these strategies more extensively in an ongoing project (Hunt 2016).

²¹ Examples of transitions ending in PACs in the subordinate key, and also initiating the first subordinate theme, include: Schumann’s Piano Trio Op. 63, IV and Symphony No. 4, I; Saint-Saëns’s *Rondo Capriccioso* Op. 28; and Dvořák’s Romance Op. 11. Examples of this in three-key expositions (to initiate the second key) include Schubert’s four-hand Piano Sonata D. 617, III and *Quartettsatz* D. 703; and Brahms’s Second Symphony, I and Cello Sonata Op. 99, IV. Franck’s Violin Sonata Op. 8, I employs it in a four-key exposition.

quences normally associated with expositions in a development section, and vice versa. As Caplin has outlined, the development's core section usually has *Sturm und Drang* type sequences, with a model of at least four measures which is eventually subjected to fragmentation (Caplin 1998, 142ff). De Médicis defines this kind of sequence as “non-thematic”—one in which the model does not form one of Caplin's theme types. By contrast, he points out that Schubert frequently employed sequences in which the model takes on a conventional theme type (for example, a period, as in the core of Schubert's Fourth Symphony). He designates these “thematic sequences” (201).

When thematic sequences occur in the development, particularly combined with sequences in the exposition's subordinate theme, they weaken the contrast that typically exists between exposition and development. It is unclear, however, whether de Médicis is referring to *thematic* sequences or *non-thematic* sequences occurring in the subordinate theme. He refers to “core-like sequences” occurring in the exposition (ostensibly in the subordinate theme), so perhaps it is either, providing they have a *Sturm und Drang* character. In any case, he implies that Schubert was the first composer to use sequences (“core-like”) in the expositions, and that it was rare or non-existent in Classical sonata-form pieces. He does acknowledge a tendency for “intensification” near the end of a concerto-form subordinate theme—usually in what Hepokoski and Darcy refer to as a display episode—but that these intensifications occur in “looser but *still thematic* structures...whereas in Schubert's works it appears in developmental sections characterized by sequential writing and *Sturm und Drang* character, or at least in unthematic digressions” (209).

Conversely, he cites noteworthy Classical developments that contain thematic sequences, such as Beethoven's famous E-minor theme in the *Eroica* Symphony, or, as Charles Rosen had previously noted, Mozart's Piano Sonata K. 332, I and Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 2, No. 1, IV (Caplin 1998, 220n11, and Rosen 1988, 2). However, sequences, both thematic and non-thematic, *can* in fact be found in pre-Schubertian expositions—Caplin himself cites the use of sequences as an example of a loosening technique found in Classical subordinate themes (Caplin 1998, 111–113). In one of his examples, from Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 2, No. 2, I, the first subordinate theme (mm. 58–92) begins with a (non-thematic) sequence in the minor dominant key, a four-measure model that is sequenced twice, followed by further fragmentation (mm. 70ff) and sequences. Combined with the modal mixture and chromaticism, and the rising Alberti-bass sixteenth notes in the left hand, this passage certainly “evokes a developmental core” (204–205) as de Médicis states in reference to a similar passage in Schubert's Fourth Symphony. Schubert's second subordinate theme also features

a (non-thematic) sequence with a four-measure model, although it is certainly more extensive than Beethoven's (ostensibly he is referring to mm. 143–158, although he never specifies this or includes it in the formal table in Table 6.1). However, from a certain perspective, Schubert's use of a sequence *within* a (sixteen-measure) sentence's continuation phrase is less unusual than Beethoven's use of the sequence at the *beginning* of the subordinate theme group. Schubert's sequence is syntactically appropriate within the form-functional layout of the sentence, whereas in Beethoven's example, beginning *a/the* subordinate theme with a continuation function essentially means the group begins with a medial function.²²

De Médicis's implicit claim that Schubert's uses of sequences are less normative than those of Classical composers also seems tenuous when one considers another loosening technique in sonata expositions: the three-key technique. In the ongoing study mentioned earlier, I outline various strategies composers used to modulate out of the second key (established by the first subordinate theme).²³ In one of them, which I call the “false subordinate theme,” the sequence is used during a (seeming) presentation phrase to quickly catalyze the modulation out of the second key, and thus represents an example of de Médicis's expositional use of sequences. Granted, these sequences might not be core-like or of *Sturm und Drang* character, but, just like the “intensification” technique discussed above, they represent a possible Classical precedent for Schubert's weakening of the contrast between exposition and development. Furthermore, the use of the initial idea or theme as the model for a sequence creates a kind of “retrospective” continuation function (e.g., c.b.i. ⇒ model for non-thematic sequences, or sentence ⇒ model in a thematic sequence). Although time prevents a detailed exploration of these sequential false subordinate themes, I have found examples as early as Scarlatti's Piano Sonatas (K. 203, mm. 37–49; K. 239, mm. 15–20) and Haydn's Piano Trio Hob. XVI: 24, I (mm. 30ff),²⁴ as well as in Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 31, No. 3, II (mm. 29ff) and Symphony

²² It should also be noted that a sequence also occurs in the *first* subordinate theme in Schubert's symphony, also within the continuation phrase of a sentence (a 32-measure sentence in this case); cf. mm. 101–112. Although this is briefer and perhaps less “core-like” than the one occurring later, it would have strengthened de Médicis's argument about exposition/development boundary obfuscation.

²³ Hunt (2016).

²⁴ This example is debatable, since the second key, the chromatic mediant, could be interpreted as a substitute tonic of sorts, and this passage as the second part of a two-part transition; this is the reading of Caplin (via private correspondence). Samantha Inman (2016) views mm. 30ff as neither part of TR nor the “true” S theme, but the first block of a Trimodular Block.

No. 7, I (mm. 113ff), and finally in post-Schubertian works by Schumann, Bruckner, and Tchaikovsky. Familiar examples employing thematic sequences can be found in Beethoven's *Coriolan* Overture (mm. 46ff) and Dvorak's Violin Concerto, III. These examples found at the *beginning* of a subordinate theme show that de Médicis's idea of sequential ("core-like") techniques in the subordinate theme group does indeed blur the boundary between exposition and development, but he perhaps exaggerates how unique or exclusive this technique was to Schubert.

1.4 TEXT, TEXTURE, AND FORM

Part 4 of *Formal Functions in Perspective* could be seen as a "contrasting middle" of sorts, as the focus is exclusively on vocal music and the integration of formal functions and text. Like Nathan John Martin's earlier piece, Harald Krebs's "Sentences in the *Lieder* of Schumann" extends Caplin's theory to vocal music, specifically the art song in the nineteenth century, and also centers on a specific theme type: the sentence. In presenting several examples of Schumann's sentences, and pointing out "obfuscations" and loosening devices seen therein, Krebs establishes a theoretical baseline for Schumann's *Lieder* sentence.²⁵ Following Stephen Rodgers's lead in his previous work on Schubert's *Die schöne Müllerin*, Krebs probes an important correlation between the sentence's form and the poetic text: the setting of the opening two rhyming lines as the basic ideas that open a sentence theme. However, as Krebs points out, "the shape of a typical continuation is not as obvious a fit to common rhyme schemes of German lyric poetry" (234), and as a result, Schumann adopts one of two strategies in his continuation phrases. In some cases, he manipulates the poem by concealing rhyming words in the succeeding couplets. Alternatively, he adds unusual features to the continuation to *highlight* the rhyming scheme

by, for example, adding an "uncharacteristic" (236) caesura within the middle of a continuation through a *ritardando*, fermata, or longer note value.

Krebs's essay truly hits its stride in its final section, where he uses his poetry/sentence mapping to explore "text-expressive sentences" in Schumann's *Lieder*.²⁶ In his non-normative "manic sentence," exemplified in "Warte, warte, wilder Schiffsmann," the presentation, normally associated with tonic prolongation and stability, creates an increase in *tension* through a "parade" of no less than five presentation phrases before a continuation ⇒ cadential phrase is finally achieved in a piano postlude. Non-normative sentences are also used by Schumann against a backdrop of *normative* sentences for dramatic effect: in "Ich wandelte unter den Bäumen," the "human sentence" is a normative sentence, articulated twice as the protagonist seeks answers within the trees. Against this backdrop, the "avian sentence," in which the birds give their response, is in fact simply a presentation phrase, with a twice-repeated basic idea and no continuation. The "clarity" of the final human sentence, again a normative sentence, "renders the avian nonsentence all the more striking" (245). In "Stille Liebe," in which a poet struggles to express his love for his beloved through song, the non-normative sentence appears in the piano introduction and interludes, alternating with normative sentences during the singer's verses. The vocal strophes thus "actualize the discursive background against which we can interpret the introduction and interludes as failed, unsuccessful utterances" of the poet's love. When the final postlude "corrects" the non-normative sentence theme by expanding the continuation and the cadential progression, there is a strong suggestion that perhaps "there is some hope that the desired message of love might in the end be [successfully] composed" (248).

Steven Huebner applies Caplin's methodology to the operas of Verdi, using phrase structure and formal-functional units to help clarify the difference between *parlante* texture and "voice-dominated" textures. Advancing previous studies on the subject by Harold Powers and nineteenth-century Italian scholar Abramo Basevi, he uses Verdi's early and middle works to establish his definition of *parlante* textures: "the formal functions articulating the larger structure are projected mainly by the orchestra rather than by the vocal line" (254). In these textures, the symmetrical phrases (sometimes with compressions and extensions) must exhibit "phrase-structural sufficiency" and the orchestral motives must be at least two measures long. By contrast, passages with brief, one-measure motives in

²⁵ I differ with Krebs on one analytical point, his reading of *Widmung's* middle section as a sentence (mm. 14–29); he states that the first two four-measure segments are "virtually identical in terms of melody" for their first three measures (231)—yet, as Caplin emphasizes throughout his writings, harmony is the primary musical factor to be used when judging whether a second idea is another basic idea or a contrasting idea. While the melodic content is certainly similar, the harmonic profiles are quite different; the first four measures prolong tonic by using a *Quiescenza* schema over a tonic pedal, whereas the second four measures feature significant harmonic acceleration, and after a tonicization of ii, a cadential progression featuring the chromatically ascending bassline culminates with the dominant harmony in m. 21, bringing the initial eight-measure phrase to a close. Assuming a four-measure unit size (Caplin's "R = 2N" proportions, certainly reasonable here given the rapid tempo), this creates a basic idea + contrasting idea layout to the first eight measures; seeing the remainder of the theme as a continuation, as Krebs does, creates an overall hybrid theme: c.b.i. + continuation.

²⁶ Like the previous studies by Rodgers (2014) with Schubert, BaileyShea (2002–2003) with Wagner, and Martin (2010a) with Schumann, he emphasizes non-normative sentences (238).

the orchestra are examples of “voice-dominated” textures (other examples include *recitativo obbligato* or more lyrical textures in “aria” or “cabaletta” sections). By establishing this definition in Verdi’s early- and middle-period works such as *Nabucco* and *La traviata*, in which *parlante* textures generally alternated with voice-dominated passages fairly discretely, he shows how the relationship between these two textures grew closer in later works such as *Otello* and *Falstaff*. This is due to Verdi’s shift away from quadratic phrase structures and aria/cabaletta stand-alone numbers. While Huebner’s study is, by his own admission, a “brief survey” (277), the potential application of form-functional analysis to works of Verdi and other nineteenth-century Italian opera composers is intriguing. For example, stretches in *Macbeth* (the “Cauldron” scene in Act 3, or the Banquet in Act 2), or *Il trovatore* (the Count and Ferrando’s interrogation of Azucena in Act 3) could be outlined in terms of the alternation of *parlante* and voice-dominated textures, and its interaction with the ongoing dramatic action.²⁷

1.5 ANALYSIS AND HERMENEUTICS

Henry Klumpenhouwer revisits a passage that Caplin, as well as Hepokoski and Darcy, had previously discussed on several different occasions: the subordinate theme group of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 1, I, spanning mm. 53–88. In the 2009 collection *Musical Form, Forms, and Formenlehre*, edited by Pieter Bergé, Caplin’s and Hepokoski/Darcy’s different analytical readings came into sharp relief; in particular, how the G-minor passage following the G:PAC in m. 77 fits into the theme’s formal division—is it a fourth *Satz* in a larger sentence-like secondary-theme zone (as Hepokoski and Darcy had previously posited; Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 125–129) or is it the second subordinate theme within a three-part subordinate theme group, as Caplin reads it (Caplin 2009a, 25)? Klumpenhouwer does not simply rehash this point of contention in order to “parse the formal divisions” or answer the question of “where the second theme ends” (303). Rather, he adopts the idea of narrative denial (shared by Caplin and Hepokoski and Darcy) and explores m. 77 in relation not only to the seeming “restoration of order” to G major in m. 88, but also to the preceding music. Inspired by the idea from Hugo Riemann’s *Catechism of Orchestration* (1897)—that while the string instruments speak as an “orchestral mass” (305), the solo woodwind

instruments represent more individual personalities—Klumpenhouwer weaves an intriguing dramatic narrative of this secondary/subordinate-theme area.

During the opening of the theme, a seeming sixteen-measure period, the flute and oboe dovetail in the tight-knit sentential eight-measure antecedent; see Example 2a. In the consequent, the flute and oboe join up, now dovetailing with the violins. But in m. 64, the flute surprisingly leaps to F \sharp , rather than the expected D, and the oboe suddenly goes silent—an act that Klumpenhouwer reads as a “refusal.” “The oboe will simply not join the flute in disrupting the logic established in the antecedent” (308). Later, during the “sinister” G-minor passage in mm. 77ff, the oboe returns to scoldingly “reeducate” the flute, by holding its erroneous F \sharp for almost twice its initial note value (reminding the flute of its initial error); it then models the “correct” version, starting on D, with the bassoon joining in at the lower octave to drive the message home to the erring (and now sheepishly silent) flute. Since this leads to the restoration of harmonic and grouping “order” with the PAC in m. 88, the stretch from mm. 77–88 can be read as a passage of “correction and restoration” at several levels. Klumpenhouwer further unpacks the titular “discipline and punish among the winds” when the *dramatis personae* are re-cast in the corresponding minor-key spot in the recapitulation. Here, it is the oboe who commits the error, now a B \flat . In its “final humiliation” (311) the oboe, perhaps scolding itself, replays the erroneous version with the doubled note value, but the clarinet and bassoon (the oboe’s “former teaching assistants” in the exposition) play the scolding, corrected version of the motive (starting on G) as the sheepish oboe goes silent.

Klumpenhouwer’s delightful dramatic analysis adds another layer to his assimilation and reappraisal of Caplin’s and Hepokoski/Darcy’s previous analyses of this passage—but perhaps the biggest payoff is his suggestion that the problematic F \sharp originated in the very opening of the entire movement. As he points out, the second and third chord-pairs in the slow introduction (G–a; D–G) are identical to the first four harmonies in the subordinate theme’s consequent, but an F \sharp is added to the G chord in m. 5 after the half cadence, much as the flute erroneously pops up to the F \sharp over the G chord in the consequent; see Example 2b. As it turns out, “the flute has been *set up* to make its mistake in measure 64” (313).

The sense of denial and unexpected detours central to Klumpenhouwer’s hermeneutic analysis dovetails nicely with the essay that follows, Giorgio Sanguinetti’s “Laborious Homecomings,” which equates an obscured sonata-form recapitulation—or “ongoing reprise”—with an unstable or anticlimactic return home after a long absence. His parallel with literary homecomings, such as Ulysses’s return to Ithaca and Primo Levi’s autobiographical return

²⁷ *Macbeth* receiving his prophecies, Banquo’s ghost appearing to Macbeth at the banquet, and Ferrando’s growing realization that Azucena is the long-lost gypsy that stole the Count’s brother (Manrico), respectively.

Antecedent

Flute 53
Oboe

G: T I D V D V T I D V

Consequent

Flute 61
Oboe
Vln1
Vln2

G: T I Sp D D/S S
ii V 7/IV IV

Roots G a D G^{b7}

ERROR!
no oboe!

Example 2a. Beethoven, *Symphony No. 1, I*, mm. 52–57 and 60–65 (from Klumpenhouwer, *Examples 9.2 and 9.3*).

f p f p

G a D G (b7)

etc

Example 2b. Beethoven, *Symphony No. 1, I*, mm. 1–5.

home from Auschwitz, poignantly sets the stage. Caplin defines the section that signals the return home (the retransition) as a phrase or theme-like unit that begins in the development key (or tonicized tonal area), sometimes articulating the main theme in a non-tonic key (a “false recapitulation”), modulates back to the home key, and culminates in a half cadence. In a normative sonata form, the recapitulation then begins with the “double return” of the home key and the first theme. Sanguinetti defines his “ongoing reprise” as somewhat resembling Caplin’s retransition—except that it references the main theme “in an unstable tonal context and is *not* followed by a recapitulation” (329; emphasis original). It does not occur at any specific point, but is instead an ongoing process that drives through the missing double return, eventually leading to the return of the tonic key at some point within the transition, subor-

ordinate theme, or even later. Finally, a central feature of the ongoing reprise is the “harbinger”—a (false) signal that the true recapitulation is forthcoming, such as the appearance of the main theme (or portions of it) in the “unstable tonal context.”²⁸

²⁸ It is difficult to specify exactly what harbinger are, since Sanguinetti does not provide a clear definition, but the locations he labels as such are main-theme fragments in non-tonic keys. One wonders how they differ from the previously used term “false recapitulation;” this, too, is difficult to discern, since he simply gives the blanket statement that “the ongoing reprise differs from the false recapitulation, or from any other kind of non-DR [double reprise] recapitulation” (319–320). Another harbinger could very well have been off-tonic half cadences or dominant arrivals, as well as standing on the dominant that might follow it, such as in his Example 10.5, the ongoing reprise of Schubert’s “Reliquie” Piano Sonata: the (wrong-key) standing on the dominant that precedes the B-

At this point, one might wonder how Sanguinetti's ongoing reprise differs from Hepokoski and Darcy's "Type 2 sonata," in which a development leads not to a double-return recapitulation, but a return of the secondary (and closing) theme(s) in the tonic key. Sanguinetti distinguishes his ongoing reprise from the Type 2 sonata by pointing out that in a Type 2 sonata "the tonal return arrives, as a rule, together with the subordinate theme, whereas in the ongoing reprise it tends to come much earlier—within the transition, or even the main theme itself" (339n14). Yet, Hepokoski and Darcy, to my knowledge, do not unequivocally state that the tonic key must return *at* the subordinate theme. Instead, they note that at some point during the development, "the music will (sometimes imperceptibly) lock onto some middle portion of the expositional pattern on a bar-by-bar basis either at the original pitch level or transposed to an appropriate key to lead to or produce the *tonal resolution* (2006, 379)." Following Scarlatti scholar and cataloguer Ralph Kirkpatrick, they designate this moment of correspondence the "crux," and propose that it can correspond with any expositional material after the opening of the first theme. Since the crux is usually *in* the main key and contains post-main theme material, it seems analogous to what Sanguinetti calls the tonal return; thus the ongoing reprise *would* qualify as a Type 2 sonata. Sanguinetti also implies that his "harbingers," which interrupt the flow of the development (339n14), distinguish the ongoing reprise from the Type 2 sonata, but Hepokoski and Darcy do not explicitly rule out false recapitulations appearing in Type 2 Sonatas.

This line of discussion is not intended to discount Sanguinetti's concept of the ongoing reprise, nor his well-thought-out literary analogies of "homecomings." Perhaps the ongoing reprise could be thought of as a specific kind of loosening or deformation of the recapitulatory process of the Type 2 and Type 3 sonatas (depending on whether or not there is a double return later). His three case studies provide a useful range of possible ongoing reprise locations. In Clementi's Piano Sonata Op. 40, No. 1, I and Brahms's Violin Sonata Op. 78, I, the ongoing reprise precedes an undermined return of the main theme in the tonic within an overall Type 3 sonata. Clementi's recapitulation is undermined by a dominant pedal (as in, for example, Beethoven's "Appassionata" Piano Sonata Op. 59, I and Brahms's Symphony No. 3, I), and Brahms's Violin Sonata recapitulation is undermined by the addition of a "destabilizing" flat seventh to the tonic chord (337). In Schubert's "Reliquie" Piano Sonata (D. 840, I), a plethora of harbingers precede the "longest reappearance of the main theme at

major appearance of the main theme seems like a strong signal that the recapitulation is impending, and thus itself a "harbinger."

this point" (330), creating a possible subdominant recapitulation of a Type 3 sonata. Alternatively, Sanguinetti reads this moment as simply another harbinger within an ongoing reprise—or within an overall Type 2 sonata (providing one acknowledges the previously cited resemblance between an ongoing reprise without a main theme/tonic double return and a Type 2 sonata).

1.6 SCHOENBERG AND BEYOND

The final trio of articles focuses on three figures associated with the Second Viennese School, although perhaps not the three primary names one associates with this term: Schoenberg, René Liebowitz (a composer known mostly for his *writings* on Schoenberg, Webern, and Berg), and Theodor Adorno (known primarily as a writer/critic/philosopher). As the three editors state in their introduction, the common thread in these essays is "the music and thought of those composers who established the theoretical tradition on which Caplin's work draws" (7). In the first, which deals with the main progenitor of the *Formenlehre*, Arnold Schoenberg, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers adopts Caplin's "Expanded Cadential Progression" (hereafter "ECP") in order to unearth a striking formal/harmonic technique she calls a "dominant tunnel" that appears throughout Schoenberg's *Verklärte Nacht*. In its first appearance, the dominant tunnel begins with the cadential dominant of D major, which resolves to a fourth-inversion ninth chord built on Ab, derailing the ongoing cadential progression and plunging the music into "ambiguous territory," a passage with a "disorienting, labyrinthine quality" (351). Although the dominant harmony is recaptured twice, the tunnel has disoriented the progression enough that it again fails to resolve, and thus "the painstakingly dug harmonic tunnel...bores a chasm of psychological, tonal, and formal irresolution" (355).

Pedneault-Deslauriers uses this dominant tunnel, and its four other occurrences in *Verklärte Nacht*, to probe the psychological drama of Richard Dehmel's poem that forms the basis for the string sextet. In her masterful interpretation, the tunnel's first two appearances depict the poem's possibly adulterous woman and her emotional turmoil as she reveals her infidelity to the man. Beginning with its third appearance, however, the tunnel "integrates materials related to the program's two other characters: the man and the [unborn] child" (357). The third appearance softens the tunnel's ambiguity—replacing the Ab⁹ chord with a (modal) predominant harmony resolving directly to the expected tonic (D major) and creating a plagal resolution to D. Shortly thereafter, the fourth tunnel resolves in an even clearer fashion, emerging from the ambiguous harmonies to a cadential dominant that finally resolves to D

major, simultaneously closing the piece's second main section and initiating the final coda. This, along with the final dominant tunnel, does what it had previously been incapable of doing: resolving the cadential progression properly to the D-major tonic.

The second essay, co-authored by Christoph Neidhöfer and Peter Schubert, shifts the focus to a prolific composer and theorist closely associated with the Second Viennese School, René Liebowitz. Liebowitz's theoretical writings adopt the Schoenbergian "formal functions" that we have grown familiar with through Caplin's work, but they are applied to serial music rather than tonal music. And yet, as our two authors show in this fascinating study, formal-function theory, as applied by Liebowitz in his writings and compositions to *serial* music, can "classify any segment of a piece...and often allows us, merely by looking at a few measures, to identify which section of a piece a given segment must come from" (378). They do caution, however, that it is not always possible to equate how contents of a serial row can project formal functions to how "triadic harmonic progressions" can—something Liebowitz himself acknowledged in his writings. Neidhöfer and Schubert use the concepts and definitions from Liebowitz's unpublished "Traité de la compositions avec douze sons" from the 1950s and apply them to his work from some two decades later, *Trois poèmes de Pierre Reverdy*. Once one adopts the general concept that a row (or subset) in its prime form is analogous to Caplin's "basic idea," they can readily follow how Liebowitz outlines a "sentence" (*phrase*) and "period" (*période*), which open with a *modèle* and *proposition*, respectively. Caplin's concept of grouping structure is analogous to what Liebowitz defines as "consistent partitioning" of the row, and the concept of "tight-knit" themes aligns with Liebowitz's "closed structures." A detailed discussion of the analogies between Caplin/Schoenbergian concepts and those of Liebowitz (which the authors do most cogently in the opening part of the essay) lies beyond the scope of this essay, but suffice it to say that the payoffs from this carefully researched study by Neidhöfer and Schubert are significant. Of course, bringing this rarely discussed composer/theorist into the spotlight of the *Formenlehre* tradition is a central benefit, but the extrapolation of Liebowitz' theoretical concepts, their contextualization within the more familiar Schoenberg-to-Caplin lineage, and their rigorous application to the theorist's own music is sure to spark similar studies of other serial compositions. Within the volume as a whole, this chapter certainly ventures the furthest from the harmonic tradition of the First Viennese School, but this distance merely demonstrates how far Schoenbergian/Caplinian concepts can be extended in our analytical discourse.

Vande Moortele, the last of the three editors to contribute an essay to *Formal Functions in Perspective*,

also enriches the historical and philosophical traditions of Schoenberg and Caplin by training his spotlight on Theodor Adorno. By revisiting and reconstructing Adorno's *materiale Formenlehre* ("material theory of form"), he reinforces Janet Schmalfeldt's suggestion that Adorno prefigures Caplin's formal-function theory. In order to exemplify Adorno's formal-functional prescience, Vande Moortele collates and constructs a schematic overview of Beethoven's *Eroica* symphony from scattered, fragmentary analytical notes.²⁹ From this overview (Vande Moortele's Table 13.1), Adorno—via Vande Moortele—argues that "the form comes into being through the interplay between the makeup and content of the individual formal units (the parts) and the form of the entire movement (the whole)" (424). Thus, Adorno conceives of this relationship much as Caplin does, from the "bottom" (the internal organization of local ideas) upward through the local grouping of these organizations, then to the "top" (the sonata form). He also implicitly acknowledges the tension that can be projected when certain formal units "are at odds with the position they occupy in the overarching form" (424), which Caplin might describe as a loosened structure or a "formal dissonance."³⁰ For example, the theme in m. 83 (the woodwind "chorale"/stretto theme), the most acceptable subordinate theme thus far to Adorno, "does not sound like a beginning but like a consequent, more specifically like the 'consequent phrase to a *non-existent* antecedent phrase'" (425; emphasis original).³¹ As many analysts have since posited, Adorno notes that the problematic subordinate-theme group in the exposition is compensated for by the E-minor theme in the development, whose status as a subordinate theme is confirmed when it gets "its own recapitulation" in the movement's coda" (425).

As Janet Schmalfeldt states in her poignant afterword, one of the unifying threads among these thirteen studies, beyond the clear agenda to extend formal-function theory beyond the Classical period,³² is the wealth of *other* methodologies they bring into their studies, according to their particular composer, genre, or angle. Pedneault-Deslauriers frames her essay within the social context sur-

²⁹ Adorno rarely presented lengthy analyses in his published writings; Vande Moortele's reconstruction is based on fragmentary analytical notes on Beethoven that Adorno compiled between 1938 and 1956 that "might have eventually led to [a full] analysis" of the first movement of *Eroica*. The notes make up approximately five pages total (423).

³⁰ Caplin (1998, 111).

³¹ Caplin mentions how a piece can begin with a similarly "orphanned" consequent—his example is the opening of Beethoven's Violin Sonata Op. 24, III, a small-ternary minuet form that opens with a four-measure consequent (Caplin 2013, 617).

³² Which has also been done in other recent publications on post-Classical composers: Schumann (Martin 2010a), Wagner (Vande Moortele 2013) and Liszt (Zenkin 2012).

rounding *Verklärte Nacht* at the time of its publication, particularly issues of sexuality and the patriarchal family. The essays employing hermeneutic, narrative and philosophical approaches, such as Burstein’s “unrepentant sinners” or Klumpenhouwer’s woodwind disciplining, represent “topics and...modes of writing about music that are not predominant in [Caplin’s] own work” (436). They also demonstrate the vast range of scholarship that can coexist with formal-function analysis. I join Janet in the assertion that “William Caplin will without a doubt be exceedingly pleased about this *Festschrift* in his honor” (436).

2. FURTHER APPLICATION

I also concur with Schmalfeldt that the book contains several “strong recommendations...about how Caplin’s theory of formal functions might be expanded and newly adapted” into previously unexplored (or rarely explored) environments (438), such as Romantic and post-tonal music, or genres such as opera and *Lieder*. I wish to close this essay with a tip-of-the-iceberg contribution of my own—taking the analytical baton from Nathan John Martin and exploring further *Formenlehre* possibilities in Classical opera numbers. I also join the authors that enlisted Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, not to (re)engage in the lively discussions and debates between formal-function theorists and sonata theorists, but to constructively combine them at the appropriate formal levels.

I wish to both refine and adapt some of Martin’s formal types by placing the forms in dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata types, with two important modifications to the norm (or “first-level default”). To be clear: this is by no means an attempt to pigeonhole operatic forms into instrumental forms, nor to view them as deformations thereof. Rather, I seek to reshape the “norms” within Hepokoski and Darcy’s five sonata types based on a survey of Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven’s operas. Once we establish general formal syntactic characteristics, we can then examine how operatic numbers are in dialogue with them. Adjustments (deformations in Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology, loosening in Caplin’s) seen within these forms can then be probed for further interpretation (as many recent studies have similarly done with instrumental pieces), specifically in connection with the operatic text. In short, I feel that previous terms used to describe Mozart and Haydn’s operatic forms, such as “ternary plus tonal return,” “sonata-ternary” or “rondò” undercut these forms’ undeniable connections with instrumental forms, particularly since there are many clear examples of sonata forms in Mozart and Haydn’s early operas.

From my survey of Haydn and Mozart operas from (approximately) the last quarter of the eighteenth century,

I have found two primary features that differ between sonata-based opera forms and sonata-based instrumental forms. First, transitions are not “standard” in expositions: often, transitions move almost instantaneously to the subordinate key, become *fused* with the subordinate theme, or are omitted altogether. Second, the section between the exposition and recapitulation (if present) can range from what Caplin would call a contrasting middle to more active pseudo-core sections, and finally to full-fledged ‘development’-like sections. I give this section the neutral term “middle section.”³³ I do, however, consider a subordinate theme-like unit that directly follows a main theme (with no transition) as part of an ongoing exposition, even if it does not return in the “recapitulation.”³⁴ With this more flexible concept in hand (i.e., a transition is not required, and the exposition and recapitulation need not be connected by a “development section”), I adopt the prefix “aria-” to the various sonata Types. For the purposes of this discussion, I focus on Aria-Type 1 (sonata without middle section), Aria-Type 2 (sonata with middle section followed by subordinate theme in tonic), and Aria-Type 3 (or Aria-Sonata; exposition, middle section, recapitulation).³⁵

To address a cautionary plea Martin himself issued in an earlier study, this approach strives to define “both the formal types and the criteria invoked in their analytic deployment...as explicitly and as precisely as possible,”³⁶ while adjusting expectations from “instrumental” sonata types to the “operatic” sonata types as I have just proposed. To address one of these adjustments, let us consider the transition section of the forms’ expositions: in my survey, a “normative” transition culminating in a tonic-key HC or subordinate-key HC (shown in the first line of Table 4) occurs about 27% of the time, and the elimination of the transition altogether occurs slightly less frequently (see the last

³³ Martin notes “in between the exposition and recapitulation—where, in the corresponding instrumental form, the development would go—there may or may not be an additional span of music about which whose formal properties I am as yet hesitant to generalize” (38). Hepokoski and Darcy rarely venture into sonata forms in arias, but do make some references to Mozart aria numbers; they cite the Quartet “Andro romingo” from *Idomeneo* as an example of a Type 2 sonata.

³⁴ While a certain “ternary” layout is implied when this occurs without a transition between the main theme and the subordinate theme (A = MT; B/Contrasting Middle = ST; A’ = MT)—a vestige of the *da capo* form prevalent earlier in the century—the subordinate-theme characteristics, unusual in Caplin’s contrasting middles, seem more expositional to me.

³⁵ Beyond the scope of this paper, but certainly related, are: Aria-Type 4 (exposition [MT/ST], MT-middle section, recapitulation [MT/ST]), and Aria-Type 5 (orchestral exposition followed by Aria-Type 3), and hybrid sonata forms such as Aria-Type 5/1 (Type 5 sonata without a development/middle section).

³⁶ Martin (2016b).

Table 4. Options for opera-aria expositions.

Possible layouts for Aria-Sonata expositions

“Standard”	MT (I:PAC)	TR	I:HC or V:HC	ST
Quick modulation	MT (I:PAC)	TR (to V quickly)	V:HC	ST
	MT (I:PAC)	TR (to V quickly)	no cadence	ST
Fusion	MT (I:PAC)	TR / ST fusion	V:PAC	ST2 or Closing
no TR	MT (I:PAC)			ST

11 (end of MT) TR (fuses with ST - V:PAC in 25)

Sisto I:PAC *Vitellia*

te, tut - to, tut - to fa ro - per - te. Pri - ma che'il sol tra

15 *etc.*

mon - ti, e - stin - to io vo' l'in - de - gno;

(C:) V⁷ I

End of MT TR

Example 3. Mozart, *La clemenza di Tito*, Act 1, No. 1 (“Come ti piace”), mm. 11–17.

line in the table).³⁷ Also possible is a transition that almost

³⁷ This is based on a corpus study of sonata-form numbers from the operas of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, as well as Mozart’s standalone or replacement numbers. Occasionally, a brief orchestral link functions as the “transition,” by quickly modulating to the subordinate key (or its dominant [V/V]), before the voice re-enters to initiate the subordinate theme. For example, see two arias from *Don Giovanni*, “M’hi tradi quell’alma ingrata” mm. 51–52 (which uses 5–6 motion over the home-key tonic chord before sliding to V/V) or “Metà di voi” m. 10 (which uses a monophonic *Prinner*, descending from the main-key tonic to the subordinate-key tonic). In private correspondence, Prof. Caplin has told me he views these as

immediately follows the main theme’s concluding cadence with a modulation to the subordinate key (shown in the second and third lines). In some cases, this will eventually lead to a V:HC, but in other cases, this opening phrase of the transition simply ends without a conclusion, and the subordinate theme’s presentation begins. These “instant” or “quick” modulations occur so frequently that they become somewhat of a first-level default option. The modulation is occasionally implemented by moving to V/V im-

a “link” at a level higher than a “lead-in” but lower than an “idea.”

Example 4a. Modulating Prinner, stock example (C major).

mediately after the I:PAC or with a 5–6 motion over the I chord preparing it (shown in Example 3, from the opening duet “Come ti piace” of Mozart’s *La clemenza di Tito*)—but the most common strategy involves the *galant* schemata coined by Robert Gjerdingen as the modulating *Prinner*.³⁸

As shown in Example 4a, the modulating *Prinner* takes the bass of this home-key I chord as the beginning of a step-wise descent to the subordinate-key tonic. The addition of the subordinate key’s leading tone (usually as 3–#4 motion over the first note or as a raised sixth over the penultimate note) effects the modulation, and retrospectively renders the bass-line as 4–3–2–1̂ in the subordinate key (not 1̂–7̂–6̂–5̂, as in a non-modulating *Prinner*). Example 4b shows a variant, the “leaping” modulating *Prinner*, in which the bass leaps to 5̂ before 1̂.³⁹ “Un’ aura amorosa” from *Così fan tutte*

Example 4b. Mozart, *Don Giovanni*, Act 1, No. 8 (“Ah fuggi il traditor”), mm. 7–9.

³⁸ In his chapter “The Child Mozart,” Gjerdingen posits that during the Mozart family’s stay in Paris in 1764, the eight-year-old Mozart was likely exposed to French ornamentation as applied to various *galant* schemata such as the *Romanesca*, *Meyer*, and *Prinner* (Gjerdingen 2007, 333ff). The modulating *Prinner* appears frequently in his early sonatas sketched during the remainder of the family’s trip (such as the K. 10–15 and K. 26–31 sets), as well as in many of his earliest operatic numbers—see, for example, numbers 1, 2, 5, and 7 from *Bastien und Bastienne*, which employ different versions of the modulating *Prinner* as a means of modulating quickly to the dominant. Martin (2016a) has also discussed this technique in Mozart’s operatic sonatas.

³⁹ A number of other variations on this basic prototype can be found throughout the corpus examined: the addition of the leading tone in the bass (4–3–2–7̂–1̂; see *Nozze di Figaro*, “Esci omai,” mm. 13–17), the omission and/or replacement of one or both two interior notes (for example, 4–3–7̂–1̂ or 4–#1̂–2̂–7̂–1̂; for an example of the latter, see the final part of the scene with Pamina and the three boys from Act II of *Zauberflöte*, mm. 106–110), or an incomplete modulating *Prinner*, which leaps to 5̂ but remains there to create a V:HC (shown in the upcoming example), or a combination of these variations. In an additional technique, which I call an “abandoned” modulating *Prinner*, the second note (3) becomes the beginning of a cadential progression when it reverses directions (3–4–5̂, or 3–4–#4–5̂) and articulates a V:HC to end the transition. This is similar to Gjerdingen’s “Passo indietro,” although his schema only

(also examined in Martin’s essay) provides another helpful example of this quick-modulation transition technique, as well as one of the modulating *Prinner* variants.

As shown in Example 5, the bass leaps to #1̂ as part of the tonicization of F# (vi in the tonic key, but ii in the subordinate key), resolving up to F# in the next measure, thus substituting for the second step in the *Prinner*, G#, which is transferred to an upper voice. The leap to B (5̂ in the new key) in m. 26 supports V⁷/V. An incomplete half-cadential progression brings us to the V:HC in m. 29, and concludes the transition. The *Prinner* has thus been modified by replacing the second bass note with a chromatic chord tone,

involves 4 and 3, and not the reversal to a cadential progression. Although examples of these various modulating *Prinners* can be found throughout the Mozart and Haydn operas surveyed, I cite the later examples to highlight the fact that Mozart continued to employ these *galant* schemata that he learned as a child in his late career.

(end of MT) 23 TR *Ferrando*

Al cor che nu - dri - to da
spe - me d'a - mo - re, da spe - me d'a - mo re

$\hat{1}$ =V: $\hat{4}$
I vii⁷/vi vi = E: ii

$\hat{5}$ (inc. *Prinner*)
V⁷ $\frac{6}{4}$ $\frac{V^4}{V}$ V V:HC

Example 5. Mozart, *Così fan tutte*, Act 1, No. 17 (“Un’ aura amorosa”), mm. 23–29.

and it is incomplete, failing to reach the expected E of a complete **modulating** *Prinner*. Interestingly, the Quartet “Colla presente scrittura private” from Haydn’s *Lo speziale*, also in A major, employs a similar technique (mm. 10–14), but the leap down to B is followed by a resolution to the subordinate-key tonic, completing the $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{1}$ – $\hat{2}$ – $\hat{5}$ – $\hat{1}$ bass motion.⁴⁰

3. TRUNCATED AND EXPANDED RECAPITULATIONS

Additional characteristics seen commonly enough to be analogous to “second-level default” adjustments relate to a problematic term often seen in previous operatic sonata-form studies—the “tonic return” or “free re-

capitulation” applied to an operatic form with an exposition, (optional) middle section, and a section in the tonic key that omits the melodic-motivic material from the exposition’s main theme and/or subordinate theme. To some earlier analysts, this lack of melodic return within a clearly tonic-based section either stripped the number’s “sonata-form” label altogether or necessitated the qualifiers “tonic return [but not motivic return]” or “free[ly recomposed] recapitulation.”⁴¹ Indeed, Webster,

⁴⁰ The transition continues after this, however, eventually reaching a V:HC in m. 22.

⁴¹ These terms are seen primarily in Mary Hunter and James Webster’s previous studies on Haydn and Mozart’s operatic forms, respectively. Webster constrains the possible operatic sonata forms by saying that if one accepts traditional instrumental sonata forms and adopts these qualifiers (free recapitulation, tonal return section), that “a catalogue of formal types in Mozart’s Da Ponte operas would include precisely one aria in sonata form” (Webster 1990, 204). Note that Webster is speaking exclusively of single-character numbers, not ensembles—duets, trios, quartets, etc., which, he ac-

following Platoff, asserts that (instrumental) sonata forms are “irrelevant;” concluding sections in the tonic following an “exposition” usually do not qualify as “recapitulations.” They are insufficient either motivically (the music may be varied beyond aural recognition, or totally new) or gesturally (the return to the tonic is often “under-articulated” compared to what is *always* heard in instrumental movements).⁴² However, I feel that given their formal-function syntax, these problematic tonic-key sections can, in fact, invoke main theme or subordinate theme function, and thus serve as a recapitulation in a more flexible sense.

Martin acknowledges this issue in his discussion of “Un’ aura amorosa,” whose final section in the tonic omits the subordinate theme’s melodic-motivic material from the exposition, and indeed seems to be missing subordinate-theme function. In many ways, then, it seems to simply be in ternary (ABA’) form. And yet, “whereas no [melodic-motivic] material from the subordinate theme reappears in the reprise, Mozart nonetheless recomposes the main theme’s ending [m. 62] so as to incorporate...loosening devices that *suggest subordinate-theme function*: namely, the cadential extensions and expansions that make up the typical concluding rhetoric of a subordinate theme” (60, my emphasis). Although he had previously referred to this aria’s form as “small ternary,” admitting a residual affinity for Edward Cone’s “sonata principle,”⁴³ Martin now identifies it as a “sonata-ternary” form, which “hovers somewhere between a sonata (without development) and a ternary form” (60). I would take this a step further, also acknowledging that this form is “not a *deformation* or hybrid, but rather a standard option for opera arias” (60), and identify it as an Aria-Type 1 sonata with a truncated recapitulation, but one that compensates for the lack of a separate subordinate-theme group by injecting subordinate-theme *loosening* features to the very end of the main theme. This form, which I abbreviate as “A1^{t,e}” (the superscripts indicating the truncated recapitulation and the compensatory extensions + expansions) can also be found in *Così fan tutte*’s Act II Duet with chorus “Secondate, aurette amiche” and several numbers from *La clemenza di Tito* (e.g., the arias “Del piu sublime” and “Torno di Tito a lato”). An analogous form that has a middle section, the Aria-Sonata with truncated/expanded recapitulation, can be found in two num-

bers in Mozart’s early *Bastien und Bastienne* (1768),⁴⁴ as well as “Voi che sapete” and “Aprite, presto, aprite” from *Le nozze di Figaro* and “Ah fuggi il traditor” from *Don Giovanni*.⁴⁵ The subordinate-theme loosening features in these recapitulations (during the main theme) include deceptive cadences (e.g., “Voi che sapete,” m. 73 and “Ah fuggi,” m. 32 and m. 38), extensions following deceptive cadences, expanded cadential phrases (“Ah fuggi,” mm. 33–38), and even modal mixture. In “Aprite presto aprite,” the main theme actually moves to, and cadences in, G minor (likely to highlight Cherubino’s melodramatic farewell to Susanna as he leaps out the window). Only the closing section—accompanying Susanna’s frantic attempts to stop the already-airborne Cherubino—returns to the major mode.

4. REPLACEMENT SUBORDINATE THEMES

What if a recapitulation’s main theme reaches a PAC and is followed by a theme or group that carries subordinate-theme function, but does not contain the melodic-motivic material from the exposition’s subordinate theme? This layout was previously diagrammed as “ABAC (C in tonic)” and called “sonata with tonal return section” (Webster 1991, 115), or the cumbersome “reprise-form with double return but no recapitulation of second group” (Hunter 1982, 57). However, given the current discussion, if we accept that a theme group with subordinate-theme *function* appears in the recapitulation after the main theme’s return, we can account for the missing “return of the second theme” thusly: subordinate-theme *function* has returned, but melodically speaking, we have a “replacement” subordinate theme. “Metà di voi” from *Don Giovanni* provides an illustration of this form:

⁴⁴ The arias “Befraget mich ein zartest Kind” and “Meiner liebsten schöne Wangen.”

⁴⁵ These examples also provide a range of “middle sections” that stand in for the more common development sections in instrumental sonata forms. The *Bastien* examples are brief, the contrasting middle of “Befraget” containing a *Fonte* sequence and that of “Meiner liebsten” housing a simple tonic-key hybrid theme (c.b.i. + ECP concluding in an HC). Not surprisingly, the later examples have more extensive “contrasting middle” sections: for example, “Voi che sapete” tonicizes two keys, bVII (with a PAC in m. 45) and vi (PAC in m. 52), followed by a retransition featuring a sequence (mm. 52–61), and “Ah fuggi il traditor” has a vi:PAC (m. 22), also followed by a re-transition. These cadences hint at Caplin’s so-called “development key” cadences; although these middle sections are not true development sections as we are used to in instrumental forms, the concept of development key does seem applicable, and the retransitions that follow the last “DK: PAC” are also part of the analogous procedure in instrumental sonata forms.

knowledges, are often in “unambiguous” sonata forms.

⁴² Webster (1990, 204; my emphasis). As has been discussed in recent scholarship, and indeed in *Formal Functions in Perspective* (in Sanguinetti’s contribution), the return of the tonic at the beginning of a recapitulation can sometimes be understated or obscured, as in an “ongoing reprise”.

⁴³ Martin (2010b, 404).

EXPOSITION

MT	Metà di voi quà vadano, e gli altri vadan là e pian pianin lo cerchino, lontan no sia di quà.	Half of you go this way, the rest go that way, and we'll look for him quietly. He can't be far from here.
ST¹	Se un uom e una ragazza passagiam per la piazza, se sotto a una finestra fare all'amor sentite, ferite pur, ferite, il mio padron sarà!	If you should see a man and a lady walking through the square or if you hear someone making love under a window, then wound him, It will be my master!
ST²	In testa egli ha un cappello con candidi pennachi, addosso unagran mantello, e spada al fianco egli ha.	He wears a hat on his head that has white plumes, there's a large cloak around his shoulders and a sword at his side.

RECAPITULATION

MT	Metà di voi (etc.)	Half of you (etc.)
TR	Andate, fate presto! <i>The villagers exeunt; to Masetto:</i> Tu sol verrai con me.	Go on, go quickly! You alone shall come with me.
ST [new]	Noi far dobbiam il resto e già vedrai cos'è.	We can do the rest ourselves— And you'll soon see what that is. ⁴⁶

The “replacement” subordinate theme in the recapitulation (mm. 60ff) accompanies an important shift in Don Giovanni’s audience and tone. While the entirety of the aria up until now has dealt with him (disguised as Leporello) ordering the villagers to hunt and attack Don Giovanni, he is now alone with Masetto, and menacingly hints at his upcoming attack on him—*e già vedrai cos'è!* From a formal-function perspective, the passage from m. 59 to m. 70 certainly brings subordinate-theme function: following the I:HC in m. 59, the seeming presentation phrase plays out as an extended cadential progression, spanning the basic idea and the contrasting idea and resolving with the PAC in m. 64. A one-measure “false codetta” leads to a repeat of this decidedly non-conventional theme type (mm. 65–70, PAC in m. 70), which can best be described as a “contrast-

ing basic idea” (c.b.i.) supported by an ECP.⁴⁷ Since there is no middle section, this aria is thus in Aria-Type 1 form with a “replacement” subordinate theme in the recapitulation.⁴⁸ The replacement subordinate theme technique is also seen in conjunction with the Aria-Type 3 form.⁴⁹

5. RONDÒ REPLACEMENT SUBORDINATE THEMES

The replacement subordinate theme is also used within the context of a concluding section in a faster tempo, a device sometimes referred to as the *rondò*. The most common layout for this “form,” normally reserved for characters of higher social status, has been outlined by James Webster, as an A (I) B (V) A (I) form followed by a faster-tempo section (C) in the tonic key (Webster 1991, 116, 171). Charles Rosen distances the first ABA construction from the previous *da capo* tradition, while acknowledging its sonata-exposition features: the “first part [ABA] has nothing to do with the *da capo* aria or with normal ternary form: the B goes always to the dominant, and has the character of a ‘second group’ of a sonata (sometimes followed by a development)” (Rosen 1971, 306, my emphasis). He also aligns with the flexible approach to “recapitulation” I am advocating in this study, noting that “the faster concluding section that follows the return of the opening

⁴⁷ By contrast, the two subordinate themes in the exposition, each accompanying a clue Don Giovanni provides the villagers as to their target’s activity (seducing a woman) and appearance (hat with plumes, cloak, etc.), are a relatively tight-knit sentence (mm. 11–19) and a slightly loosened sentence (mm. 19–33), respectively.

⁴⁸ Other examples of this replacement-ST in an Aria-Type 1 sonata include “Ho Capito” (mm. 47ff, written-out repeat in mm. 69ff) from the same opera, “Non più andrai” (mm. 61ff, written-out repeat in mm. 89ff) from *Figaro* and the quartet “Solte dies dein Jüngling sehen” (mm. 147ff) from *Zauberflöte*. In all of these examples, as in “Metà di voi,” the replacement subordinate theme coincides with new text and a new thought, mood, or perspective: Masetto cynically pointing out that the *cavaliere* Don Giovanni will make a *cavaliere* out of Zerlina, the topical portrayal of the march music that is to be in Cherubino’s future, and Pamino and the three boys uniting in a Greek chorus/narrator-style delivery about the power of love.

⁴⁹ For example, the recapitulation of the *Zauberflöte* trio “Seid uns zum zweiten Mal willkommen” contains a “new” subordinate theme that, by comparison with the extremely square four-measure units that preceded it (main theme, subordinate theme [V], contrasting middle [dominant prolongation], main theme’s return), is highly loosened (mm. 21ff). At this point, the boys’ words change from descriptions of the supplies they return (Tamino’s flute and Papageno’s bells) and provide (food, drink) to specific adjurations to the two men: “Courage, Tamino!” and “Keep silent, Papageno!” The extensions to the end of the subordinate theme (mm. 29ff) allow the boys to reiterate their parental “Keep silent! Keep silent!” commands to the chatter-prone Papageno.

⁴⁶ Fisher (2007, 208).

[New] Subordinate
Theme
Presentation

b.i. b.i. (exact)

Pa-ce, pa - ce, o vi - ta mi - a! pa - ce, pa - ce, o vi - ta

Zerlina
60

Continuation

frag. 65 frag. (extension)

mi - a! in - con - ten - to ed al - le - gri - a not - te e di - vo - gliam pass

68 expansion cadential

sar, model seq. not - te e

IV

Example 6. Mozart, Don Giovanni, Act 1, No. 12 ("Batti, Batti o bel Masetto") mm. 60–78.

71 one more time

di vo- gliam pas - sar, not - te e

V_4^6 $\frac{5}{3}$ //
evaded cadence

74 one more time

di vo gliam pas - sar, not - te e di vo gliam pas - sar.

I V^7 //
evaded cadence

I ii^6 V_4^6 $\frac{5}{3}$ I
PAC

Example 6. (Continued).

theme substitutes harmonically for the recapitulation of B, or the ‘second group’ (306).⁵⁰ To take this a step further, if the faster-tempo concluding section brings subordinate-theme function (which it frequently does, since vocal gymnastics are a primary feature here, and expansions and extensions prove ideal for these showpieces), it can also be viewed as a “replacement” subordinate theme within a sonata form. Consider “Batti, batti, o bel Masetto” from *Don Giovanni*: its main theme (a sixteen-measure period) is directly followed by the subordinate theme,⁵¹ a sixteen-measure sentence with an evaded cadence

⁵⁰ He includes “Batti, batti” from *Don Giovanni*, to which I will turn momentarily, as an example of this form.

⁵¹ Mozart uses “3–#4” motion over the bass in m. 16 to efficiently modulate to the dominant key in a brief, one-measure orchestral link.

(m. 30) and an expanded one-more-time cadential unit (mm. 30–34). A brief retransition leads to a return of the main theme, followed by a closing section. At m. 61, while the tempo does not *change*, a faster pace is created by the switch from $\frac{2}{4}$ to $\frac{6}{8}$ meter, hinting at the *rondò* form (see Example 6). This section carries subordinate-theme function, though it is not a return of the subordinate theme’s melody from the exposition: it is a sentence with several loosening features, such as an extended (mm. 66–67) and expanded (mm. 68–69) continuation and two evaded cadences with one-more-time extensions (m. 72 and m. 74). The closing section consists of four codettas, which, as is common in closing sections, grow shorter and shorter (mm. 78–99). Thus, the overall form can be laid out as:

Exposition (MT, ST)
Recapitulation (MT || ‘new’ ST in faster tempo)

It is thus an example of an Aria-Type 1 sonata (with *rondò* replacement subordinate theme).

As discussed earlier, using a replacement subordinate theme typically accompanies not only a change in text but also a dramaturgical change, and increasing the tempo at this juncture reinforces this, suggesting increased intensity or a changed emotional state. Here, while the exposition and the return of the main theme accompany Zerlina's playful (?) apology and submission to possible punishment, the *rondò* section coincides with her realization that Masetto can't bring himself to punish her ("Ah, lo vedo! Non hai core"); the replacement subordinate theme then announces her change of perspective toward their reconciliation and future happiness ("In contenti ed allegria || notte e di vogliam passar"). Zerlina's other aria, "Vedrai, carino," has a similar layout, although also without a specific tempo change for the recapitulation's subordinate theme.⁵² However, other examples contain clearer tempo changes: "Non mi dir" from *Don Giovanni* (mm. 64ff), "Dove sono" (mm. 53ff) and Marcellina's "Il capro e la capretta" (mm. 54ff) from *Figaro*,⁵³ "Come scoglio" (mm. 79ff) and "Per pietà" (mm. 35ff) from *Così fan tutte*, and "Per pietà, non ricercate" K. 420 (mm. 76ff).⁵⁴

The "*rondò* replacement subordinate theme" technique is also used from time to time in the context of other sonata forms. In an Aria-Type 3 form, the *rondò* replacement subordinate theme occurs in the recapitulation following the return of the main theme. To date, I have only located a handful of examples, one being Armida's aria "Se pietade" from *Armida*, in which the tempo change precedes the contrasting middle (mm. 72ff). As a result, the contrasting middle and main theme's return in the tonic (mm. 111ff) are in a faster tempo along with the replacement subordinate theme.⁵⁵ Although the *rondò* layout was associated with *opera seria* characters in Mozart's later operas, it was

also employed in *buffo*-style ensemble pieces. In the Act II Finale Quartet from Haydn's *Lo speziale* (1768), discussed above in regards to its use of the modulating *Prinner* in the exposition, the tempo change coincides with Grilletta and Sempronio's fury upon discovering the ruse of the two "notaries" (mm. 110ff).

In an Aria-Type 2 sonata, one encounters the layout of:

Exposition (MT [TR] ST)
Contrasting middle/development
ST (in tonic).⁵⁶

However, in a handful of numbers Haydn and Mozart composed in the 1760s and 1770s, this layout featured a "new" subordinate theme after the middle section (creating a "sonata-binary" layout analogous to Nathan Martin's "sonata-ternary" concept). An example is the frantic, comic finale to Act I of from *Entführung* ("Marsch fort!") a rare example of a minor-key operatic number, and an even rarer instance of Mozart concluding a minor-key sonata form in the major mode.⁵⁷ The contrasting middle contains a "pseudo-core" sequence (mm. 61–72) as well as a concluding tonic-key half cadence (m. 81), a layout commonly seen in instrumental development forms. A return of the transition from the exposition follows, but instead of beginning on the submediant harmony, as in the exposition, here it stands on the dominant, prolonging the half cadence in m. 81; it concludes on a fermata, which precedes the tempo change for the *Allegro assai* "new" subordinate theme. The key changes to C major, remaining there for the rest of the number as Osmin bullishly orders Pedrillo and Belmonte onwards to conclude the opening act. Often, the border between the contrasting middle and the replacement subordinate theme is unclear, as in "Non c'è al mondo" from Mozart's *La finta semplice* and "Mirate che contrasto" from *La finta giardiniera*.⁵⁸ Examples of an Aria-Type 2 with a *rondò* replacement subordinate theme can also be found

⁵² The steady sixteenth-note rhythmic pulse, however, does create the sense of an increased tempo; also, unlike "Batti, batti," the instrumental closing section brings back the main theme from the exposition, as well as part of what I consider the transition (compare mm. 17–18 with 93–94), and an expanded cadential progression (mm. 95ff) that is abandoned. This unusual loosening of the instrumental closing section could well have been done to allow for Zerlina to carefully help the crippled Masetto off the stage, or for various stagings of Zerlina's flirtatious caretaking.

⁵³ The first part of the exposition's subordinate theme does return before the tempo change and the replacement subordinate themes (ST1: mm. 45ff, "new" ST2: mm. 54ff); here, Marcellina turns from her polemic about the "war of the sexes" in animal species to how (human) women are repaid for their love with men's treachery.

⁵⁴ This, as well as two other recitative and arias, was written as an insertion aria for the 1783 performance of Pasquale Anfossi's *Il curioso indiscreto* (1777) in Vienna.

⁵⁵ Mary Hunter calls this aria's form the "reprise form with double return [return of main theme in tonic] but no recapitulation of [the exposition's] second group" (1982, 56, 307–308, 539).

⁵⁶ Examples of this form include "Che imbroglione" from Haydn's *L'infidelta delusa*, "D'Oreste, d'aiace" from *Idomeneo*, and "Ach, ich fühl's" and "Der Hölle Rache" from *Die Zauberflöte*.

⁵⁷ This might have been done by Mozart to avoid having the curtain fall on Act I in a minor key.

⁵⁸ To some extent, Susanna's "Deh vieni non tardar" from *Figaro* could be construed as an Aria-Type 2 with replacement subordinate theme, with an exposition (main theme, mm. 7–12; mm. 13–18 a dissolving-consequent transition/subordinate theme fusion; mm. 18–20 closing section), and a contrasting middle prolonging the dominant (mm. 21–26). But mm. 27–32, a sentence ending in a home-key PAC (m. 32), presents a challenge, as it could be read as a retransition culminating in a I:PAC (highly unusual) or a transition/subordinate-theme fusion within a "recapitulation." The passage from mm. 32–48, a sentence with numerous loosening techniques (extended presentation, abandoned cadence, deceptive cadence, and an odd abandoned cadence in m. 44, when the I⁶ harmony shifts to root position), strikes me as a subordinate theme, thus suggesting the overall Aria-Type 2 layout (with replacement subordinate theme) despite the ambiguous passage in mm. 27–32.

in a handful of numbers: four are from Haydn operas, including two from 1780s *La fedeltà premiata*;⁵⁹ one is from Beethoven's *Fidelio*, discussed shortly; and four were written by Mozart—"Ich gehe jetzt" from *Bastien und Bastienne* (1768), "Fuggi crudele fuggi" from *Don Giovanni*, the just-mentioned "Marsch fort" from *Entführung*, and the sprawling "Io non chiedi" K. 316, an insertion aria written for his soon-to-be aunt-in-law Aloysia Lange (née Weber).⁶⁰ The tempo change occurs either before the contrasting middle section (exposition [MT-ST] || CM-[new] ST) or before the replacement subordinate theme (exposition [MT-ST] CM- || [new] ST).

6. BEETHOVEN'S STROPHIC ARIA-TYPE 2 SONATA?

I wish to conclude by offering a reading of a number from Beethoven's *Fidelio*, whose numbers have not, to my knowledge, been explored using either Caplin's formal functions or Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory. Marzelline's aria "O wär ich schon mit dir vereint" offers an extremely compact example of the Aria-Type 2 sonata with a *rondò* replacement subordinate theme; see Example 7 and Table 5. As in "Marsch fort," it is in C minor at its opening but the concluding section is entirely in C major, a clear parallel with Marzelline's self-uplifting words of hope that her love for "Fidelio" (Leonore in disguise) will be realized ("Die Hoffnung schon erfüllt die Brust"). The form is treated strophically, repeated with ornamental changes (such as more rapid rhythms in the violins, and new text during the exposition and "contrasting middle")—but it retains the *Hoffnung*-based final three lines in the final section. A concluding coda follows the second "strophe", spanning mm. 66 to 84.

Assuming a "R = 1/2N" proportion throughout the aria, in which one "real" measure is notated as a half-measure,⁶¹ the orchestra's opening two-measure c.b.i. is repeated with the voice to create the presentation. However, the continuation (mm. 5–6) briskly modulates to the

relative major (Eb), ending the c.b.i. + continuation hybrid theme with the III:HC in m. 6. Given the subordinate theme that follows, the opening six measures (four measures when accounting for the written-out repeat of the c.b.i.) represent a fusion of main-theme and transition functions, a device common in instrumental sonata-form main themes but almost always reserved for recapitulations.⁶² The subordinate theme is a relatively tight-knit sentence, with the chromatic motive ("x") in the bass from the first b.i. echoed in the response b.i. (mm. 7–8), followed by a continuation ⇒ cadential phrase ending with the III:PAC in m. 10; a brief "echo" codetta closes out the exposition. The sentential contrasting middle spans the next eight measures, prolonging the dominant of the home key, with a half cadence in m. 16 followed by the woodwind's cascading triplets (possibly an onomatopoeic depiction of Marzelline's sigh and clutching of her breast: *Sie seufzt und liegt die Hand auf die Brust*). The tempo then changes (*Poco più allegro*), with further acceleration created by the thirty-second-note pulse, and the "new" subordinate theme, a sixteen-measure sentence (c.b.i. + c.b.i. + continuation) begins in the home-key's parallel major key, C major. It features a call-and-response between the voice and the oboe and bassoon, reminiscent of the subordinate theme of Beethoven's First Symphony discussed so insightfully by Henry Klumpenhouwer in his contribution to *Formal Functions in Perspective*. Relative to the tight-knit subordinate theme in the exposition, it is loosened with an extension following the IAC in m. 25. In this extension, Beethoven modifies the texture of the voices (both human and instrumental), transferring Marzelline's earlier melody to the flute and oboe, moving the oboe's response to the violins, and adding a new motivic response in the voice. The PAC in m. 32, delayed slightly by an extra beat of the dominant-seventh harmony, suggests Marzelline's envisioned but as-yet unfulfilled yearning; the orchestral closing section ends the first strophe and the Aria-Type 2 sonata form.

To be sure, this interpretation might seem far-fetched to some, given the unusual strophic treatment of the entire "sonata form," the compactness of the "exposition," and the binary-form layout that also seems prevalent (indeed, the Type 2 sonata is closely tied to binary form; as Hepokoski and Darcy point out, Domenico Scarlatti's "binary sonata" layouts are themselves precursors for the Classical sonata types they put forth⁶³). Marzelline's aria hovers between a binary form and the Type 2 model in many ways,

This aria deserves more discussion than is feasible here, particularly the dramatic shift that accompanies the new subordinate theme in mm. 32ff (Susanna's subtle change from the "ruse Deh vieni" addressed to the Count, to a more direct "Deh vieni" addressed to Figaro as she begins to doubt whether she should continue the ruse). Rosen acknowledges this aria's sonata characteristics, calling it "sonata-minuet" form (Rosen 1971, 308), and Paul Sherrill (2015) explores the musical-dramatic subtleties throughout the aria.

⁵⁹ Nerina's aria "È amore de Natura" (No. 13) and Celia's aria "Om-bra del Caro" (No. 39c).

⁶⁰ This aria is noteworthy for twice requiring the singer to sing G₆.

⁶¹ Caplin (1998, 35).

⁶² Caplin notes the extreme rarity of this in an exposition, citing Mozart's Piano Sonata K. 545, I (mm. 1–12) as a "highly exceptional" example (Caplin 1998, 277n16).

⁶³ Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 355ff).

EXPOSITION

R=I/2N

Main Theme / Transition

1 (intro.) c.b.i. b.i. c.i.

Marzeline

O wär ich schon mit dir vereint, und

Subordinate Theme

5 continuation b.i. b.i. (response)

dürf - te Mann dichnen - nen! EinMäd - chen darf ja, was es meint, zur

$\text{iv}^6 = \text{Eb}; \text{ii}^6$ V^6 $\frac{5}{3}$

III:HC

9 continuation=> cadential *codetta?* cadential repetition? **CONTRASTING MIDDLE**

Hälf - te nur be - ken - nen. Doch wenn ich nicht er -

ii^6 V I (c:) V

III:PAC

Example 7. Beethoven, Fidelio, Act 1, No. 2 ("O wär ich schon mit dir vereint"), mm. 1-34.

13

-rö-ten muss ob ei - nem war menHerzenskuss, wenn nichts uns stört auf Erden

Itô V
HC

(sie seufzt und legt
die Hand auf die Brust.)

17

die

[RECAP / "TONAL
RESOLUTION"]
Subordinate theme
("new") 19 c.b.i.

Hoff - nung schon er füllt die Brust mit un - aus - sprech-lich

Poco piu allegro Ob., Bsn. c.b.i. (exact)

Example 7. (Continued).

Continuation

22
 süs - ser - Lust, wie glück-lich will ich wer - den, wie

*Extension
(repeat ST)*
c.b.i.

24
 glück lichwill ich wer - den! Die Hoff - nungschoner füllt die

Ob. Fl., Ob. Vln

I⁶ ii⁶ V₄⁶ $\frac{5}{3}$ I
IAC

28
 c.b.i. (exact) continuation
 Brust mit un - aus-sprech-lich süs-ser Lust, wie glück-lich, glück-lich, ja wie

Vln Fl., Ob.

Example 7. (Continued).

Table 5. Outline of Example 7.

c	EXPOSITION			ST Sentence E>	Closing (Codetta)	C. MIDDLE		"RECAPITULATION" (Tonal resolution)					
	MT/TR Fusion Intro c.b.i. + contin.		III:HC			CM/IT/dev? Sentential (c: V)	i:HC	ST (new) 16-m. sent.	(Extension) 16-m. sent.	Closing (Codettas)			
	1	3	7	8	10	10	12	16	19	25	26	32	32

but when considered in light of the legion “Aria-Type 2” forms I have found—with the modifications such as missing or quick-modulating transitions, or “replacement” subordinate themes in the recapitulation—my reading seems entirely in line with the operatic forms that had been established by the time Beethoven set to work on his rescue opera.⁶⁴

My hope is that more work can be done on “taking *Formenlehre* to the opera,” applying Caplin’s formal-function concepts to opera numbers (and perhaps sacred-music numbers) and deploying them in context of a baseline set of forms such as my aria-type sonata forms, while also *not* (over-)privileging sonata form at the expense of other factors.⁶⁵ In my opinion, this is a much more fruitful enterprise than disengaging vocal and instrumental “sonata” forms altogether, as James Webster would have us do; nearly a quarter of a century ago, he protested that identifying an exposition in late Classical opera numbers “needs critical review,” and that in general, “to invoke instrumental formal types as the primary basis for understanding arias may be *irrelevant, if not positively misleading*” (1990, 204; my emphasis). As I hope is apparent from my discussion, I find quite the opposite to be true. Furthermore, the more “idiosyncratic” numbers, particularly those from Mozart’s late operas that have eluded easy classification, can be re-approached in dialogue with this adjusted, but not brand new, set of aria-sonata forms.

APPENDIX. SELECTED EXAMPLES OF ARIA-SONATA FORMS

Aria-Type 1 Sonatas

- Mozart, “Voi che fausti” from *Il re pastore* (No. 13)
- Haydn, “Ah che invan” from *L’isola disabitata* (No. 6)
- Mozart, “Il padre adorato” from *Idomeneo* (No. 7)

⁶⁴ Indeed, *Fidelio* has a variety of what I consider sonata-based forms, as do Mozart’s final works; four out of the fourteen numbers are normative examples of the forms (three Aria-Type 1’s and one Aria-Type 2), and the remainder are in sonata-based forms with one or more of the “deformational” features outlined in this paper (e.g., replacement subordinate themes, eliminated subordinate themes but subordinate-theme *function* within the recapitulation’s main theme).

⁶⁵ A list of selected examples of each of the 5 “Aria-Sonata” types can be found in the Appendix.

Mozart, “Ach ich liebte” from *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (No. 6)

Haydn, “Tu mi sprezzì” from *Armida* (No. 14)

Mozart, “Il mio Tesoro” from *Don Giovanni* (No. 21)

Mozart, “Dove son!” from *Così fan tutte* (No. 18, part 5)

Beethoven, “Ha! Welch ein Augenblick” from *Fidelio* (No. 7)

Aria-Type 2 Sonatas

Haydn, “Ha gl’occhi brillanti” from *La pesciatrici* (No. 23)

Mozart, “Di che si l’arbitra” from *Il sogno di Scipione* (No. 10)

Mozart, “Una damina” from *La finta giardinera* (No. 17)

Mozart, “Andro romingo” from *Idomeneo* (No. 21)

Mozart, “Ah pieta” from *Don Giovanni* (No. 20)

Mozart, “Der Hölle Rache” from *Die Zauberflöte* (No. 14)

Beethoven, “Jetzt, Ständchen” from *Fidelio* (No. 1)

Aria-Type 3 Sonatas

Mozart, “Va l’error” from *Mitridate* (No. 11)

Haydn, “Oh che gusto” from *L’infidelta delusa* (No. 22)

Mozart, “Si mostro” (K. 209)

Mozart, “Geme la Tortorella” from *La finta giardinera* (No. 11)

Haydn, “Se la mia stella” from *Il mondo della luna* (No. 46)

Mozart, “Rase, Schicksal” from *Zaide* (No. 4)

Mozart, “Cosa sento!” from *Le nozze di Figaro* (No. 7)

Haydn, “Al tuo seno” from *L’anima del filosofo* (No. 3b)

Aria-Type 4 Sonatas

Haydn, “Noi pariamo” from *L’incontro improvviso* (No. 8)

Mozart, “Se tu di” from *Il re pastore* (No. 11)

Haydn, “Mi fanno ridere” from *Il mondo della luna* (No. 14)

Mozart, “O! wie will ich triumphieren” from *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (No. 19)

Mozart, “Ah ah—o che ridete” from *Il sposo deluso* (No. 1)

Aria-Type 5 Sonatas

Mozart, “L’ombra de’ remi” from *Ascanio in Alba* (No. 3)

Mozart, “Si permette” from *La finta giardinera* (No. 7)

Mozart, “Ich bin so böse” from *Zaide* (No. 11)

Haydn, “Se dal tuo braccio” from *Armida* (No. 5)

REFERENCES

- BaileyShea, Matthew. 2002–2003. “Wagner’s Loosely Knit Sentences and the Drama of Musical Form.” *Integral* 16/17:1–34.
- Bakulina, Olga. 2012. “The Loosening Role of Polyphony: Texture and Formal Functions in Mozart’s ‘Haydn’ Quartets.” *Intersections: Canadian Journal of Music* 32 (1–2): 7–42.
- Beach, David, and Yosef Goldenberg. 2015. *Bach to Brahms: Essays on Musical Design and Structure*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Burstein, Poundie. 2005. “Unraveling Schenker’s Concept of the Auxiliary Cadence.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 27 (2):159–186.
- Caplin, William. 1998. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009a. “What are Formal Functions?” In *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, edited by Pieter Berge, 21–40. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2009b. “Comments on James Hepokoski’s Essay ‘Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form.’” In *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, edited by Pieter Berge, 90–95. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2013. *Analyzing Classical Form: An Approach for the Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, Burton D. 2007. *Mozart’s Da Ponte Operas*. Miami: Opera Journeys Publishing.
- Gjerdingen, Robert. 2007. *Music in the Galant Style*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hepokoski, James. 2009. “Comments on William E. Caplin’s Essay ‘What Are Formal Functions.’” In *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, edited by Pieter Berge, 41–45. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hunt, Graham. 2009. “The Three-Key Trimodular Block and its Classical Precedents: Sonata Expositions of Schubert and Brahms.” *Integral* 23:65–119.
- . 2014. “When Structure and Design Collide: The Three-Key Exposition Revisited.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 36 (2): 247–268.
- . 2016. “Diverging Subordinate Themes and Internal Transitions: Assessing Internal Modulations in Three-Key Expositions.” Paper presented at the Society for Music Theory Annual Meeting, Vancouver, BC.
- . 2017. “Aria-Sonata Forms? Taking Formenlehre to the Opera once more.” Paper presented at the 9th European Music Analysis Conference (EuroMAC), Strasbourg, France.
- Hunter, Mary. 1982. “Haydn’s Aria Forms: A Study of the Italian Operas Written at Esterháza, 1766–1783.” Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.
- Inman, Samantha. 2016. “TMB Strategies in Haydn’s Sonata Movements.” Paper presented at the Texas Society for Music Theory Annual Meeting, Belton, TX.
- Martin, Nathan John. 2010a. “Schumann’s Fragment.” *Indiana Theory Review* 28 (1/2): 85–109.
- . 2010b. “Formenlehre Goes to the Opera: Examples from *Armida* and Elsewhere.” *Studia Musicologica* 51 (3/4): 387–404.
- . 2016a. “The Prinner Transition in Mozart.” Paper presented at the Music Theory Midwest Annual Meeting, Fayetteville, AR.
- . 2016b. “Formenlehre Goes to the Opera: Examples from *Don Giovanni*.” In *Mozart in Prague: Essays on Performance, Patronage, Sources, and Reception*, edited by Kathryn Libin, 371–402. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.
- Neuwirth, Markus. 2015. “Is There a ‘Musical Task’ in the First Movement of Haydn’s ‘Oxford’ Symphony? Voice-Leading Schemata and Intrinsic Formal Functions.” *Music Theory & Analysis* 2 (2): 194–203.
- Neuwirth, Markus, and Pieter Bergé. 2015. *What is a Cadence? Theoretical and Analytical Perspectives on Cadences in the Classical Repertoire*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Riley, Matthew. 2015. “The Sonata Principle Reformulated for Haydn Post-1770 and a Typology of his Recapitulatory Strategies.” *Journal of the Royal Music Association* 140 (1): 1–49.
- Rodgers, Stephen. 2014. “Sentences with Words: Text and Theme-Type in *Die schöne Müllerin*.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 36 (1): 58–85.
- Rosen, Charles. 1971. *The Classical Style*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- . 1988. *Sonata Forms*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Sherrill, Paul. 2015. “Susanna’s ‘Deh Vieni’.” Paper presented at the Society of Music Theory Annual Meeting, St. Louis, MO.
- Suurpää, Lauri. 2014. “Deferral of a Cadentially Confirmed Tonic and Play with Changing Conventions in the First Movement of Haydn’s F# Minor Piano Trio (Hob. XV:26).” *Music Theory Spectrum* 36 (2): 228–246.
- Vande Moortele, Steven. 2013. “Form, Narrative and Intertextuality in Wagner’s Overture to *Der fliegende Holländer*.” *Music Analysis* 32 (1): 46–79.
- Vande Moortele, Steven, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin, eds. 2015. *Formal Functions in Perspective*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press.
- Webster, James. 1990. “Mozart’s Operas and the Myth of Musical Unity.” *Cambridge Opera Journal* 2:197–218.

———. 1991. "The Analysis of Mozart's Arias." In *Mozart Studies*, edited by Cliff Eisen, 101–199. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zenkin, Konstantin. 2012. "Fluidity of structures in the music of Franz Liszt: From Romantic 'form as process' to 'open form'." *Quaderno dell'Instituto Liszt*.