

The background of the cover features a close-up, angled view of the pages of an old book, showing the texture of the paper and the binding. Overlaid on the right side is a snippet of musical notation on a staff, including notes, stems, and a treble clef. The overall color palette is warm, dominated by the golden-brown tones of the book's pages.

# Formal Functions in Perspective

*Essays on Musical Form  
from Haydn to Aldorno*

EDITED BY STEVEN VANDE MOORTELE,  
JULIE PEDNEAULT-DESLAURIERS, AND  
NATHAN JOHN MARTIN

---

---

# Formal Functions in Perspective

---

---



## Eastman Studies in Music

Ralph P. Locke, Senior Editor  
Eastman School of Music

### Additional Titles of Interest

*Analyzing Atonal Music: Pitch-Class Set Theory and Its Contexts*  
Michiel Schuijjer

*Analyzing Wagner's Operas: Alfred Lorenz and German Nationalist Ideology*  
Stephen McClatchie

*Aspects of Unity in J. S. Bach's Partitas and Suites: An Analytical Study*  
David W. Beach

*Bach to Brahms: Essays on Musical Design and Structure*  
Edited by David Beach and Yosef Goldenberg

*Concert Music, Rock, and Jazz since 1945: Essays and Analytical Studies*  
Edited by Elizabeth West Marvin and Richard Hermann

*A Dance of Polar Opposites:  
The Continuing Transformation of Our Musical Language*  
George Rochberg  
Edited by Jeremy Gill

*The French Symphony at the Fin de Siècle:  
Style, Culture, and the Symphonic Tradition*  
Andrew Deruchie

*Music Theory in Concept and Practice*  
Edited by James M. Baker, David W. Beach, and Jonathan W. Bernard

*Reviving Haydn: New Appreciations in the Twentieth Century*  
Bryan Proksch

*A Theory of Music Analysis: On Segmentation and Associative Organization*  
Dora A. Hanninen

A complete list of titles in the Eastman Studies in Music series  
may be found on our website, [www.urpress.com](http://www.urpress.com).

---

---

# Formal Functions in Perspective

---

---

Essays on Musical Form  
from Haydn to Adorno

Edited by Steven Vande Moortele,  
Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers,  
and Nathan John Martin

Copyright © 2015 by the Editors and Contributors

*All rights reserved.* Except as permitted under current legislation, no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded, or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2015

University of Rochester Press  
668 Mt. Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA  
www.urpress.com  
and Boydell & Brewer Limited  
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK  
www.boydellandbrewer.com

ISBN-13: 978-1-58046-518-2  
ISSN: 1071-9989

#### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Formal functions in perspective : essays on musical form from Haydn to Adorno / edited by Steven Vande Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin.

pages cm — (Eastman studies in music, ISSN 1071-9989 ; v. 127)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-58046-518-2 (hardcover : alkaline paper) I. Vande Moortele, Steven, editor. II. Pedneault-Deslauriers, Julie, editor. III. Martin, Nathan John, editor. IV. Series: Eastman studies in music ; v. 127.

MT58.F68 2015

781.8—dc23

2015021591

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

This publication is printed on acid-free paper.  
Printed in the United States of America.

# Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Introduction 1  
*Steven Vande Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers,  
and Nathan John Martin*

## **Part One: Theoretical Studies in Haydn and Mozart**

1 “Functial Formanality”: Twisted Formal Functions in  
Joseph Haydn’s Symphonies 11  
*L. Poundie Burstein*

2 Mozart’s Sonata-Form Arias 37  
*Nathan John Martin*

## **Part Two: Nineteenth-Century Taxonomies**

3 Formal Type and Formal Function in the Postclassical  
Piano Concerto 77  
*Julian Horton*

4 Saint-Saëns’s Cyclic Forms 123  
*Andrew Deruchie*

## **Part Three: Schubert**

5 Schubert’s “Deflected-Cadence” Transitions and the  
Classical Style 165  
*Brian Black*

6 “Heavenly Length” in Schubert’s Instrumental Music 198  
*François de Médicis*

**Part Four: Text, Texture, and Form**

- 7 Sentences in the Lieder of Robert Schumann:  
The Relation to the Text 225  
*Harald Krebs*
- 8 *Parlante* Talk: Texture and Formal Function in the  
Operas of Verdi 252  
*Steven Huebner*

**Part Five: Analysis and Hermeneutics**

- 9 Discipline and Punish among the Winds in the First Movement  
of Beethoven's First Symphony 295  
*Henry Klumpenhower*
- 10 Laborious Homecomings: The "Ongoing Reprise" from  
Clementi to Brahms 317  
*Giorgio Sanguinetti*

**Part Six: Schoenberg and Beyond**

- 11 Dominant Tunnels, Form, and Program in Schoenberg's  
*Verklärte Nacht* 345  
*Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers*
- 12 Form and Serial Function in Leibowitz's  
*Trois poèmes de Pierre Reverdy* 373  
*Christoph Neidhöfer and Peter Schubert*
- 13 The Philosopher as Theorist: Adorno's *materiale Formenlehre* 411  
*Steven Vande Moortele*
- Afterword 434  
*Janet Schmalfeldt*
- Notes on Contributors 441
- Index 445

# Acknowledgments

The editors are grateful to the Society for Music Theory for helping to make this project possible through a publication subvention, and to the Connaught Fund of the University of Toronto for its financial support. We also thank Ralph Locke, Sonia Kane, Julia Cook, Ryan Peterson, and Tracey Engel at the University of Rochester Press for having shepherded the book to completion; Massimo Guida and Dan Deutsch for preparing the final versions of the musical examples; the anonymous readers whose numerous suggestions we endeavored to incorporate; and our respective families for having put up with us during our crabbiest moments. The book is dedicated to William E. Caplin in humble recompense for the many things we learned under his tutelage.

Toronto; Ottawa; New Haven  
January 2015



# Introduction

Steven Vande Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin

Few writers have contributed as much to the revival of *Formenlehre* in current English-language music theory as William E. Caplin. From his early articles on the eight-measure sentence (1986) and the expanded cadential progression (1987) through to his current work on cadence typologies, Caplin has consistently challenged the field to reengage with the conceptual resources of German *Formenlehre*.<sup>1</sup> The vocabularies introduced, reintroduced, reconfigured, and refined in his writings—above all in his 1998 treatise *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*—have become an indispensable part of every working music theorist's conceptual armature.<sup>2</sup> The essays in this volume engage with Caplin's theorizing in multiple ways and from diverse perspectives, testifying both to its centrality and to its fecundity: it is difficult to imagine contemporary music theorists writing seriously about musical form without orienting themselves, in one way or another, toward the framework that Caplin has elaborated.

The central preoccupation of Caplin's scholarship has unquestionably been the formal processes on display in the musical monuments of high Viennese classicism, that is, in the later instrumental music of Haydn and Mozart and in the earlier works of Beethoven. Despite the eventual centrality of this repertoire to Caplin's career, his path to it was indirect: a dissertation project on theories of musical rhythm, undertaken at the University of Chicago under the direction of Philip Gossett, led him to Carl Dahlhaus at the Technische Universität Berlin from the fall of 1976 through the summer of 1978. Though in Berlin ostensibly to study the history of music theory, Caplin discovered something else: for his defining encounter with the Schoenberg–Ratz line—an encounter whose influence on Caplin's work is measured not least in the central category of “formal function”—was mediated by Dahlhaus. Having decamped to Montreal in the fall of 1978, Caplin began giving regular courses on classical form, first to undergraduates and later to graduate students. What began as an external imposition developed first into a research project and

then into a scholarly career. By the later 1980s, various drafts of what eventually became *Classical Form* were in circulation as teaching texts, and certain characteristic features of these pedagogical origins were carried over into the published treatise: the gradual, systematic exposition of theoretical concepts, the modesty of the authorial voice, the pellucid prose. An abiding concern with pedagogy, indeed, has been a distinctive feature of Caplin's scholarship, and it was in that context that the present editors (two as graduate students, one as a postdoctoral fellow) first began to engage intensely with his work.

## Formal Functions

The key term in Caplin's theorizing is *formal function*. In one sense, Caplin's notion of formal function is very general: as defined in the glossary to *Classical Form*, it is "the specific role played by a particular musical passage in the formal organization of a work."<sup>3</sup> At the same time, the term has acquired a far more concrete meaning in the gradual unfolding of Caplin's thinking. In this latter sense, formal functions stand conceptually opposed to *formal types*. Types, which are the traditional objects of theories of form, are the easier category to grasp. They are conventionalized concatenations of musical units arranged into standard conglomerations—constructs like compound periods, small binaries, or recapitulations. Functions, in contrast, are the musical building blocks out of which types are formed: basic ideas, presentations, cadential ideas, and continuations or—up one level of magnification—main themes, transitions, and developmental cores.

To describe them only thus, however, is to give formal functions far too neutral a cast. For the interpretive richness of Caplin's perspective lies in the additional characterizations that such building blocks receive. One way to get at this added value is to ask what formal functions *do*. And what they do is this: formal functions impart a highly developed sense of temporal orientation within a work's unfolding to those who know how to hear them. Listeners attuned to formal function, simply put, know where (or rather "when") they are. Quite obviously, and even trivially, such orientation is in part contextual: the piece has just begun, or has already been going on for some time now. Such background contextual orientation, however, is complemented in Caplin's theorizing by a meticulous account of the musical devices that are habitually associated with particular locations in musical time.

Behind these associations—and indeed enabling their elaboration—is the crucial distinction between *intrinsic* and *contextual* function. In its purest form, contextual function is in effect *positional* function. It is extrinsic in the sense that it depends upon the functions of surrounding passages, as when one argues "*this* is the main theme, and *that* is the subordinate theme, so this passage in the middle must be the transition." Intrinsic function,

in contrast, depends on markers internal to the unit in question: “This is a presentation because it is four measures long, features a basic idea and its immediate repetition, and prolongs root-position tonic harmony.” The outstanding achievement of Caplin’s thinking is, in the first place, to have clearly articulated the idea of intrinsic formal function, and then to have fleshed out that notion through a careful delineation of the musical features that define such functions.

The stark binaries that the preceding paragraphs have heuristically proposed must, of course, be probed: neither the sharp distinction between intrinsic and contextual function nor indeed that between function and type is entirely satisfactory if left as a simple opposition. Continuation function, for instance, is intrinsically defined through four markers: acceleration of the surface rhythm, acceleration of the harmonic rhythm, fragmentation of the grouping structure, and sequential harmony. Of these, the first three are clearly not exclusively internal: acceleration, for instance, can only be acceleration in relation to some previously established norm. Similarly, at the interthematic level, subordinate-theme function is intrinsically defined by form-functional loosening; yet it is the main-theme function that establishes, in intraopus terms, what will be tight-knit. As for function versus type, one sees upon reflection that the distinction is hardly absolute but rather is relative and aspectual. If a “type,” to recall, is a concatenation of formal functions, then the smallest, most atomic units—on both the inter- and intrathematic levels—are only functions; the highest, most macroscopic ones only types. Thus, basic ideas (or main themes) are formal functions only; sentences (or sonata forms) are only types.<sup>4</sup> But the intermediate structures at each level are functions in relation to their supervening types, types in relation to their constituent functions. A presentation, for instance, is a type if viewed as a concatenation of basic ideas, but as the first half of a sentence, it is a function. The same holds, *mutatis mutandis*, on the interthematic level. Consider, for example, an exposition: it is a type consisting of a main theme, transition, and subordinate theme, but is the first formal function in a sonata form as a whole. Thus the identity of these intermediate units—the question of whether they are functions or types—shifts in accordance with the aspect under which they are considered.

Because of this interpenetration of function and type, functions themselves come to be colored with implicit content. They are by no means the empty vessels of Heinrich Schenker’s anti-*Formenlehre* polemicizing. Rather, Caplin’s formal functions—and therefore also his types—bundle together distinct material characteristics: a cadential idea, for instance, might present an imperfect authentic cadence, or a perfect one, or any of the various half-cadential templates that appear in classical works. The same goes for the other smallest functional units that the theory posits: basic ideas, contrasting ideas, and continuation functions proper. All these functions are, in essence, families

comprising interrelated schemata (in something like Robert Gjerdingen's sense), from which the supervening functions and types are assembled combinatorially.<sup>5</sup>

## In Perspective

One consequence of its material determination is that Caplin's theory of formal functions is highly idiom-specific. The theory's very richness—its fine-grained delimitation of the classical style—entails a corresponding loss of generality. The subtitle of Caplin's treatise restricts its purview to "the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven." The range might have been further delimited, as indeed Caplin acknowledges in the preface, to Haydn and Mozart after 1780 and Beethoven up to about 1810.<sup>6</sup> Of course, Caplin makes occasional incursions into later Beethoven or earlier Haydn. Yet he tends to do so in a selective and ad hoc manner. While the general notion of formal function is obviously relevant to a much wider range of music, the theoretical apparatus that Caplin himself develops from his more specific understanding of the term resists immediate application beyond the repertoire that stands at the front and center of *Classical Form*.

One way in which the essays in the present collection put Caplin's work "in perspective," then, is that they engage with aspects of formal functionality in repertoires reaching beyond the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. They run the chronological gamut from Haydn and Clementi to Schoenberg and Leibowitz; they discuss lieder and arias, symphonies and concerti, opera and chamber music; they range from Vienna and Paris to Milan and beyond. As such, they inevitably "loosen" some of Caplin's strictures; they aim to adapt and expand, to open up new analytical and theoretical vistas while continuing to engage with the basic themes and commitments of Caplin's work.

By no means, however, does our book offer a sustained, systematic—let alone textbook-like—extension of Caplin's theoretical apparatus. To be sure, such extension is one aspect of the volume; it is even a central preoccupation of some chapters. But the perspective we offer is both broader and more multifarious. Over and above the chronological, geographical, and generic openings that they seek, the contributions in this volume are in no way confined by the methodological and conceptual boundaries of Caplinian theory. This becomes most obvious in the concern of many chapters—implicit or explicit—to bring Caplin's theorizing into dialogue with other music theories. Some authors contextualize Caplin's theory by focusing on the theoretical tradition on which Caplin himself draws: the Schoenberg–Ratz–Dahlhaus line of Germanic *Formenlehre*; others enrich the Caplinian perspective by drawing upon the ideas of recent writers who have made considerable contributions

to the development of the theory of formal functions, first and foremost Janet Schmalfeldt; others still confront Caplin's approach with competing theoretical models, most notably that of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's "Sonata Theory." Nor are the perspectives limited to music-theoretical and analytical ones: several essays add a prominent historical, philosophical, or hermeneutic aspect—modes of intellectual inquiry that complement the theory of formal functions as practiced by Caplin himself.

In no aspect of this book does its diversity and eclecticism become more apparent than in the authors' use of terminology. Rather than impose the usage of an orthodox Caplinian vocabulary, we have allowed individual authors to adapt and modify Caplin's terms and concepts freely—at times to the point where a specifically Caplinian lexicon recedes into the background. Far from seeing this diversity as a threat to the integrity of our collection, we embrace it as a mark of its richness. Indeed, one measure of the success of a theory, in our view, is the number of heresies it can inspire.



The thirteen chapters in this volume are grouped thematically into five pairs and one trio. Focusing on Haydn and Mozart, the first set of chapters (part 1) deals with two of the composers who are central to Caplin's own project. L. Poundie Burstein discusses what he wittily calls "functial formality" in the symphonies of Joseph Haydn: instances where the composer skillfully twists conventional formal functionality by expressing it in an unusual fashion. Deliberately toying with the contextual and intrinsic qualities of a given formal unit, Haydn may alter the standard sense of formal beginnings, middles, and ends at any hierarchical level of a formal structure. Examining these passages in light of their unusual formal functions, Burstein argues, helps highlight their expressive and narrative effect. In "Mozart's Sonata-Form Arias," Nathan John Martin surveys the sonata-form schemes that appear in Mozart's operas from 1780 on. By applying and adapting Caplin's formal functions to this operatic repertoire, Martin is able to show how, from the comparatively ample sonata templates of *Idomeneo* to the much more idiosyncratic ones of *Die Zauberflöte*, Mozart progressively abridged his sonata-form arias and varied their formal structure.

The next section (part 2) turns to large-scale nineteenth-century form. Julian Horton offers an overview of the formal functions and types on display in the first movements of postclassical piano concerti from Dussek's opus 14 (1791) to Schumann's opus 54 (1845). Rethinking form-functional theory in view of this corpus, his chapter considers the formal types that underpin first and second themes, the balance of tight-knit and loose organization that obtains between them, and relationships between intrathematic levels and large-scale forms. Throughout, Horton emphasizes the delayed reception

of Mozart's piano concerti and highlights the implications of romantic concerto forms for nineteenth-century form in general. Andrew Deruchie surveys the phenomenon of cyclic form in the music of Camille Saint-Saëns within a broadly Caplinian framework. Combining analysis of the large-scale formal organization of many of Saint-Saëns's instrumental works with an interpretation of their form in the musicopolitical context of France in the first decades of the Third Republic, Deruchie's essay contributes to what may be called a history—rather than a theory—of musical form.

Applying Caplinian analytical categories to the music of Franz Schubert, the next two chapters (part 3)—by Brian Black and François de Médicis—take a more traditional approach: rather than in expanding Caplin's analytical toolbox, their interest lies in demonstrating something essential about Schubert's music. Black examines a particular strategy that underlies a number of sonata-form transitions across Schubert's output, transitions he identifies as the "deflected-cadence" type. These transitions exhibit a cadential redirection in which a cadence is initiated in the home key, evaded, then reestablished only to be diverted suddenly into a perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key, the actual modulation being accomplished exclusively by that final cadential progression. De Médicis, for his part, brings out Schubert's distinctiveness by articulating one of its aspects in form-functional terms: in Schubert's symphonic sonata forms, the contrast between the largest-scale formal functions of beginning (i.e., exposition) and end (recapitulation) on the one hand, and of middle (development) on the other, is mitigated in that compositional techniques that are used in the classical style to articulate one function, may in Schubert occur in a unit that, as a whole, expresses another.

The two chapters filed under "Text, Texture, and Form" (part 4) investigate aspects of formal functionality in two very different kinds of nineteenth-century vocal music. Harald Krebs explores the use of sentences—the theme type most commonly associated with Caplin's theory—in songs by Robert Schumann. Discussing both well-known and less familiar songs, Krebs not only recalibrates Caplin's sentence model in order to make it applicable to mid-nineteenth-century syntax but also investigates the ways in which Schumann's sentences relate to the structure of the poems he is setting and how his sentences reflect the meaning of those poems. Steven Huebner draws on earlier work on "lyric form" to provide a detailed account of *parlante* texture in Verdi's operas. Drawing his examples from across Verdi's oeuvre, he provides a careful description of both the formal organization and the dramaturgical function of such textures, showing how form-functional thinking can help define them more accurately.

The next section (part 5) turns to the hermeneutics of musical form. Offering a close analytical and interpretive treatment of interactions between form, instrumentation, and meaning, Henry Klumpenhouwer's essay explores an engaging feature of the subordinate theme in the first movement of Beethoven's First Symphony. The feature is dramatic in character, staging

the commission of an error and its subsequent correction in the woodwind section of the orchestra—a drama that involves the subordinate theme and the closing section in the exposition and extends to the images of those formal elements in the recapitulation. In addition to taking a hermeneutic turn, Klumpenhouwer’s analysis interacts suggestively with earlier writings about the First Symphony’s subordinate theme, not only by Caplin but also by Hepokoski and Darcy. Giorgio Sanguinetti turns his attention to the moment of recapitulation, considering cases in which its onset is elided, disguised, or attenuated. Through close analyses of examples from Clementi, Schubert, and Brahms, he encourages us to regard “ongoing recapitulations” as gradual processes comparable to Odysseus’s arrival, at night and asleep, delivered unknowingly by his Phaeacian hosts, on the shores of Ithaca.

The last three essays (part 6) in our collection concern themselves with the Second Viennese School, broadly construed—with the music and thought of those composers who established the theoretical tradition on which Caplin’s work draws. Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers reads Schoenberg’s *Verklärte Nacht* in conjunction with the Richard Dehmel poem it programmatically depicts. The skeleton key unlocking her interpretation is the idea of a “dominant tunnel”: a characteristic harmonic device that returns at key formal articulations throughout the sextet, and which she likens to Caplin’s category of the expanded cadential progression. The two remaining chapters in this section deepen our understanding of the prehistory of Caplin’s theory by illuminating two little-known strands of the mid-twentieth-century Schoenbergian *Formenlehre* tradition. Christoph Neidhöfer and Peter Schubert write about René Leibowitz’s *Traité de la composition avec douze sons*, teasing out commonalities between Leibowitz’s and Caplin’s understandings of musical form, and demonstrating Leibowitz’s conceptual apparatus by means of an analytical study of the composer’s own *Trois poèmes de Pierre Reverdy* for four voices and piano. In the volume’s final essay, Steven Vande Moortele identifies unexpected parallels between current form-functional theory—in both its Caplinian and Schmalfeldtian guises—and the “material *Formenlehre*” of Theodor W. Adorno. Bringing together the various relevant fragments scattered across Adorno’s writings of the 1960s, Vande Moortele reconstructs and contextualizes Adorno’s theory of form, and illustrates it by means of Adorno’s own analytical notes on the first movement of the *Eroica* symphony.

## Notes

1. William E. Caplin, “Funktionale Komponenten im achttaktigen Satz,” *Musiktheorie* 1 (1986): 239–60; and “The ‘Expanded Cadential Progression’: A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form,” *Journal of Musicological Research* 7 (1987): 215–57.
2. William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

3. Ibid., 254.
4. This relationship is somewhat differently treated in Steven Vande Moortele, “Sentences, Sentence Chains, and Sentence Replication: Intra- and Interthematic Formal Functions in Liszt’s Weimar Symphonic Poems,” *Intégral* 25 (2011), 129–30.
5. See Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 10–16.
5. Caplin, *Classical Form*, 3.

---

---

*Part One*

Theoretical Studies in  
Haydn and Mozart

---

---



## Chapter One

# “Functial Formanality”

## Twisted Formal Functions in Joseph Haydn’s Symphonies

L. Poundie Burstein

### Introduction

Central to William E. Caplin’s concept of formal functionality is the notion that “musical form directly engages our temporal experience of a work inasmuch as its constituent time-spans have the capacity to express their own location within musical time.” As Caplin explains, “a composer’s ability to realize in a convincing manner these kinds of temporal multiplicities accounts for experienced listeners (that is, those who are familiar with the host of compositional conventions informing this style) being able to discern quickly just where a particular passage lies within the overall temporal extent of a work.”<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, whether a passage functions as a beginning, middle, or end depends not merely on where it occurs within a composition but also on its harmonic, melodic, rhythmic, textural, and rhetorical profile. For instance, in most cases a subordinate theme functions as such not simply because it appears after a main theme but also because it possesses qualities that are typical of a subordinate theme. This can readily be tested by considering a normal sonata-form exposition and imagining how it would sound if the main theme and subordinate theme were swapped (making the appropriate transpositions). In most instances the results would be strikingly unusual, to say the least, and the same would be true if one were to imagine swapping segments on higher or lower levels of structure.

But what can be established may also be disestablished, and crafty composers at times seem to seek out the strikingly unusual by twisting conventional formal functions. In some cases the formal function of a passage is clear, but nevertheless realized in a deformational manner.<sup>2</sup> Put differently, in some situations the formal function is strongly supported by certain features, but

undermined by others—for instance, when a sense of beginning that is firmly suggested by repetition structure and gesture nonetheless is counteracted by harmonic and rhythmic elements. Other times the departure from the norm is so drastic that the formal function itself becomes hazy, to the extent that it may be difficult to discern whether a given passage acts as a beginning, middle, or end.

Instances in which a conventional formal function is undermined do not simply represent alternate formal possibilities. Rather, they are best understood in relation to the standard functions from which they deviate. Caplin notes that “if a given function is actually placed differently from its expressed temporal position—if a medial function appears as a beginning, for example—a kind of formal ‘dissonance’ will result.”<sup>3</sup> As we shall see, at times such a formal dissonance is “resolved” as the work proceeds, and at other times it is left hanging, as it were. In all, the formal functions that Caplin has elucidated are not intended to “represent standards of aesthetic judgment, such that passages deviating from the norm are devalued in any respect.”<sup>4</sup> On the contrary, such deviations often contribute vitally to a composition’s expressive effect.

Appreciating the influence of such formal divergences is particularly important when coming to grips with the works of Joseph Haydn. Many of his pieces employ fascinating instances of form-functional conflict and may be regarded as exemplars of this strategy. In this essay I shall discuss selected symphonic movements by Haydn that exhibit some of the ways in which formal functions may seem to be turned on their head, or at least called into question. In such instances, features strongly associated with one type of location are found at another—for example, when something more normally associated with a middle instead sounds at a beginning, or vice versa. In some cases this involves aspects that appear on the phrase or subphrase level, and in others the form-functional conflicts reach to the deepest levels of the structure. Through an examination of some specific instances of such form-functional conflicts, along with their bearing on the structural and expressive layouts of the compositions, I hope to shed light not only on Haydn’s own works but also on the strategy of playing with formal functions in general.

## Deviating Middles and Ends

Let us begin by considering the main theme of Haydn’s Symphony no. 59 in A Major (“Feuersymphonie”), which presents a rather straightforward example of a form-functional conflict. This theme consists of a sentence whose presentation begins in a boisterous manner (ex. 1.1). One would expect increased momentum in the ensuing continuation⇒cadence, especially considering that a main theme such as this usually has a tight-knit structure. As Caplin

Example 1.1. Haydn, Symphony no. 59 in A Major (“Feuersymphony,” 1768), mvt. I, mm. 1–9. NB: In this and other examples, the registers have been slightly simplified.

presentation

*Presto* basic idea ( ) ;

[f]  
strings only

4 basic idea repeated continuation ==> cadence

NB: surface and harmonic rhythm decelerate!

has described at length, the continuation⇒cadence of a typical sentence conventionally involves a shortening of melodic units into smaller segments, an acceleration of harmonic rhythm, and an increase in rhythmic activity on the surface of the music.<sup>5</sup> Each of these features contributes to a building of energy as the phrase approaches its conclusion.

But no such energy gain is found at the opening of this symphony, for the continuation⇒cadence that follows the presentation (entering a half measure early in m. 5) radically deviates from the norm. Instead of accelerating and fragmenting, it involves a lengthening of the melodic units into bigger segments, a slowing down of the harmonic rhythm, and a decrease of rhythmic activity on the surface of the music, along with softer dynamics and a thinning of the orchestration.<sup>6</sup>

The oddness of this passage results not simply from its slackened energy but also because this slackening takes place precisely at the moment where one most expects an upsurge in energy. As such, the effect is greater than in the main-theme group of the first movement of Haydn’s Symphony no. 26 in D Minor (“Lamentatione”), for instance, where the sudden slowing down (in mm. 9–12, at the start of the second phrase of the main-theme group) occurs within the presentation of a sentence. The formal manipulation at the outset of Symphony no. 59 seems to encourage hermeneutic interpretation,

as the dynamic thrust of the opening measures is suddenly countered by a continuation that suggests uncertainty and wavering. This wavering is quickly shunted aside in the next passage (mm. 10–15), however, where the continuation⇒cadence is particularly brusque. The remainder of the exposition likewise proceeds in an unhesitating manner, as though determined to push aside the initial doubts.

Unconventional energy-decreasing passages may be found in many other works by Haydn, not only within a continuation⇒cadence, but on larger levels of the form as well. A prime example occurs in the developmental core of the first movement of Haydn's Symphony no. 80 in D Minor. Typically, the core of a sonata-form development section expresses a large-scale medial function, and accordingly it usually possesses a characteristic profile similar to that of a sentential continuation (which likewise serves a medial function, albeit on a local level). As Caplin explains, "the core of the development typically projects an emotional quality of instability, restlessness, and dramatic conflict. The dynamic level is usually forte, and the general character is often one of Sturm und Drang. The core normally brings a marked increase in rhythmic activity projected by conventionalized accompaniment patterns."<sup>7</sup>

But this typical layout is not to be found in the first movement of Symphony no. 80. The main theme of this movement opens in as fiery a manner as the one from the "Feuersymphonie" cited above. Also as in the "Feuersymphonie," the continuation of the main theme in Symphony no. 80 slows down (although here only momentarily) before plunging forward with an aggressive force that continues for most of the exposition. The intensity abates only at the arrival of the exposition's codetta, which introduces a new theme that is entirely out of character with what was heard in the movement thus far. This theme, in the manner of a *Ländler*, is strangely lighthearted and comical, in great contrast to the tempestuous themes that precede it.<sup>8</sup>

Of all the themes in the movement, the *Ländler* theme is the only one that would be out of place in a development section. Ironically, it is precisely this theme that dominates the precore and core of the ensuing development (ex. 1.2). Although within this section there are some instances of fragmentation, sequential motion, and Sturm und Drang, in each case these more typically developmental passages are interrupted by the reappearance of the *Ländler* theme at a *piano* dynamic level. For the most part the *Ländler* returns unchanged, except for its transposition to a series of different keys, and before each entrance the momentum is further arrested by a grand pause. To be sure, the extreme modulations here would be out of place in any other section but a development. Still, the rhythmic pace and textures here strongly seem to contradict their developmental setting, creating a humorous effect.



## Deviating Beginnings

The examples discussed above involve deformations that entail middles and ends. In other instances, formal “dissonances” arise at sectional beginnings, as in the category that Caplin describes as themes lacking an initiating function.<sup>11</sup> This category usually involves subordinate themes. However, since they have a large-scale medial function and typically are loosely knit anyway, subordinate themes that lack an initiating function are quite common and usually not so disruptive. Far less normal is a main theme that lacks an initiating function, since a main theme conventionally is tight-knit and has a large-scale beginning function.

Main themes that lack an initiating function, or in which the initiating function is somehow problematic, nonetheless may be found in many of Haydn’s works.<sup>12</sup> For instance, consider the first movement of his Symphony no. 65 in A Major, where the odd main theme opening seems to have repercussions that extend deep into the movement. This symphony commences with a “noise-killer” series of three chords that serve as a thematic introduction to the main theme (ex. 1.3a). As Caplin explains, a thematic introduction “is generally short, two to four measures at most. . . . The melodic-motivic component of such an introduction is either weakly defined or entirely absent, so that the expression of a genuine basic idea can be saved for the structural beginning of the theme.”<sup>13</sup> This description certainly could apply to what is found in measures 1–2 here, except that the “genuine basic idea” that one expects to follow is missing. Instead, the main theme proper starts immediately with a continuation⇒cadence, as unstable harmonies and active rhythms suggest that these measures begin as though in the middle of a larger gesture. Since it lacks a clear presentation, this theme gives a somewhat nebulous impression, which is abetted by the odd harmonic regressions in measures 4–5 and 8–9.

One might even wonder whether the gesture of measures 1–2 could instead be retrospectively regarded as the presentation of a phrase that extends from measures 1 to 6 (see the parenthetical annotation above the first measure in example 1.3a). Yet if measures 1–2 were a presentation, they would be a most unusual one, for their rhetoric strongly suggests a sense of “before-the-beginning.” Furthermore, the gesture of measures 1–2 is texturally, dynamically, and melodically so starkly separated from what follows in measures 3–6 that if measures 1–6 are to be regarded as a unit, the resulting phrase would be an extraordinarily disjointed one.

The odd main theme of this movement is counterbalanced by the subsequent themes, in which the formal functions are presented in a straightforward and unambiguous fashion. These subsequent themes may be regarded as variants of the main theme, and as such they may be said to resolve the form-functional dissonance of the movement’s opening. For instance, the theme of measures 19 and following (ex. 1.3b) is a clear-cut sentence with an extended,

Example 1.3a. Symphony no. 65 in A Major (1769), mvt. 1, mm. 1–11  
 (EC = evaded cadence; PAC = perfect authentic cadence)

Example 1.3b. Symphony no. 65, mvt. 1, mm. 19–23: variant of main theme that forms a clear-cut beginning of a sentence presentation

sequential continuation. A variant of measures 3–4 serves as the presentation of this phrase, but now with its harmony and rhythm normalized. An allusion to the opening three-note noise-killer gesture of measures 1–2 appears here as well, now demoted to serving as part of the bass within the continuation⇒cadence in measures 23 and following. The passage that leads to the conclusion of the exposition (mm. 37ff., ex. 1.3c) provides further ironing out of the

Example 1.3c. Symphony no. 65, mvt. 1, mm. 37–40: further variant of main theme forms part of extremely tight-knit phrase



main theme, as it presents yet another variant of this theme in the form of an exceedingly tight-knit phrase. In all, the evolution of materials derived from the main theme unfolds a type of narrative through the course of the exposition, in which seemingly unbridled thematic material is ultimately converted into a theme whose formal functions are extremely orderly.

In other works by Haydn as well a form-functional dissonance presented toward the outset of the movement is resolved as the movement proceeds. A particularly celebrated example may be found in the first movement of Haydn's Quartet for Strings in G Major, op. 33, no. 5. The opening gesture of this movement in measures 1–2 appears as a preamble to the main theme, and it displays what Caplin describes as the *content*—but not the *function*—of a V–I cadence.<sup>14</sup> In subsequent passages, this gesture is placed in its more “proper” position at the end of a phrase, where it has both cadential content and cadential function (see, for instance, mm. 9–10 and 31–32).<sup>15</sup>

A somewhat similar but more extended example of this strategy arises in the first movement of Haydn's Symphony no. 90 in C Major. The exposition of this movement opens literally with a passage that has a medial function, for the main theme starts in the midst of the continuation of an oddly proportioned sentence that had already begun within the Adagio introduction (ex. 1.4a).<sup>16</sup> Such functional conflicts appear continually throughout the movement: that is, almost every time the main theme returns, it commences in the middle of a formal unit, harmonic progression, or both. The only exception arises toward the end of the movement, where the theme finally appears within its own phrase, although still containing a harmonically unstable opening (mm. 218ff., ex. 1.4b). Not until the very end of the movement is the gesture from the opening two measures put in its “proper” formal place (see brackets in ex. 1.4b), as though to finally resolve the tensions created by the form-functional disparities found throughout.<sup>17</sup>

Sometimes form-functional conflicts involve *both* beginning and endings, as may be witnessed in the Trio from the third movement of Haydn's Symphony no. 64 in A Major (“Tempora mutantur”). This section begins with what sounds reminiscent of a cadence, but which then turns out to function as the basic idea at the start of a sentence (ex. 1.5). In other words, in the manner discussed above, this opening has cadential content, not cadential function. Matters become confusing when this theme returns in the last phrase of this



Example 1.5. Symphony no. 64 in A major (“Tempora mutantur,” 1774), mvt. 3, Trio, mm. 25–48

**A** basic idea , basic idea , continuation ==> cadence

25

hns. ob.

strings *p*

*faux “cadence”*

**B** basic idea , basic idea , continuation ==> cadence (!?)

33

cadence (!?)  
end, or middle?  
(V<sup>(8)</sup>-)

**A'** basic idea , basic idea ob. , continuation ==> cadence (IAC)

41

hns. ob. ob. + hns. PAC

beginning, middle, or  
end?  
- 7 I)

the middle of a larger harmonic and contrapuntal gesture. Likewise, although the thematic return in measure 41 implies that this measure functions as a formal beginning, there is a sense that it, too, appears in the middle of an overriding harmonic-contrapuntal motion. There is even a momentary hint that measures 41–44, with their allusion to cadential content, provide an authentic cadential end for the phrase that began in measure 33.<sup>18</sup> The actual conclusion of the Trio is itself somewhat muddled as well, for when the Menuetto is repeated following the Trio section, its opening measures initially sound as though they might serve as a codetta to the Trio.<sup>19</sup> The various temporally discombobulated moments in the Trio might well relate to the seeming preoccupation with the disjointedness of time found throughout this symphony.<sup>20</sup>

## The First Movement of Symphony no. 81 and the Quiescenza

The first movement of Haydn’s Symphony no. 81 in G Major provides an example of form-functional conflict on a yet grander scale. The main theme of this movement unfolds in a fragmentary, almost impressionistic manner. The sense of dislocation is heightened by the theme’s harmonic framework, which is based on what at the time was a standard “after-the-ending” schema involving a I-V<sup>7</sup>/IV-IV-V-I progression—typically placed over a static tonic pedal point in the bass—that supports the implied melodic figure 8-b7-6- $\sharp$ 7-8 (ex. 1.6a). Robert Gjerdingen has dubbed this standard pattern a “Quiescenza.” As Gjerdingen points out, the Quiescenza was commonly used as an opening gesture in earlier eras, but by the middle of the eighteenth century it had been established as a “stock schema employed for closing rather than opening passages. . . . Just as a cadenza exploits a pause within an important cadence . . . , so a Quiescenza exploits a moment of quiescence *following* an important cadence.”<sup>21</sup> To demonstrate its ubiquity, Gjerdingen cites numerous examples where the Quiescenza appears at the ends of movements or large sections of movements in works by C. P. E. Bach, François-Joseph Gossec, Johann Baptist Wanhal, and other composers who flourished in the mid-eighteenth century and later.

Example 1.6a. Quiescenza figure: abstract example

I V<sup>7</sup>/IV IV V<sup>7</sup> I V<sup>7</sup>/IV IV V<sup>7</sup> I  
 I \_\_\_\_\_

Haydn likewise often took advantage of the *Quiescenza* as an ending formula, especially in his symphonies. Over a quarter of them contain at least one movement in which a *Quiescenza* figure appears close to the end, including the first movements of his Symphonies no. 8, 58, and 98, the second movements of his Symphonies no. 36 and 39, the Menuetto of his Symphony no. 94, and the Finales of his Symphonies no. 43, 73, and 101 (example 1.6b excerpts one such ending).<sup>22</sup>

There are only three symphonic movements by Haydn that clearly employ the *Quiescenza* within the stylistically less normative position at the very opening of the main theme.<sup>23</sup> One of these is Symphony no. 59, first movement (cited in ex. 1.1 above), in which the typical sense of a *Quiescenza* figure is powerfully undercut by a frenetic bass line that counteracts any sense of coming to a close. Another is the second movement of Symphony no. 62 in D Major, where the bass line is relatively pacific and in which the *Quiescenza* opening sets the stage for an exceptionally serene movement, one that features unusually long stretches of harmonic stability.<sup>24</sup> The final one is Symphony no. 81, first movement, where a classic *Quiescenza*—appearing over a tonic pedal point—opens not merely an internal movement, but indeed the entire composition (ex. 1.7a).<sup>25</sup>

To be sure, a *Quiescenza* figure does not necessarily always evoke a sense of an ending, even when it appears in works from the later 1700s. This is especially so when the use of the *Quiescenza* is strongly counterbalanced by rhythmic, textural, and topical devices that strongly suggest a beginning, as is the case, for instance, in the first movements of Haydn's aforementioned Symphony no. 59 or the Piano Sonata no. 52 in E-flat Major.<sup>26</sup> But no such counterbalancing takes place in the opening of the first movement of Symphony no. 81; on the contrary, as noted above, the rhythmic and textural features at the outset of this symphony tend to work against a clear sense of beginning. As a result, not

Example 1.6b. Symphony no. 43 in E-flat Major (c. 1771), mvt. 4, mm. 196–202, “after-the-end” passage based on *Quiescenza* schema

8    $\hat{b}7$     $\hat{6}$     $\hat{b}7$    8    $\hat{b}7$     $\hat{6}$     $\hat{b}7$    8

I    $V^7/IV$    IV   V   I    $V^7/IV$    IV   V   I

until its last few measures does it become apparent that this movement’s first phrase serves as an antecedent, as a part of what turns out to be a period that embraces the main theme. That the opening measures of this symphony could serve as a stylistically suitable ending is supported by the return of the opening material—only slightly modified—as the *actual* ending of the entire movement (cf. exx. 1.7a and 1.7b). In these final measures, the *Quiescenza* serves effectively in its standard role as an “after-the-end.”<sup>27</sup>

It is instructive to compare the beginning of this symphony with that of Haydn’s Symphony no. 61 in D Major (ex. 1.8). The gestures used at the start of Symphony no. 61 are practically clichéd signals of an opening, as the noise-killer downbeat chord is followed by the arpeggiation of the tonic harmony and then by the standard melodic figure that Gjerdingen labels as a “Prinner.” The conventional schema found within this main theme—along with its more self-assured melodic and textural profile—helps place the more unusual main theme of Symphony no. 81 in relief: whereas Symphony no. 61 begins with what is unmistakably well suited for an opening, the beginning of Symphony no. 81 seems to send mixed signals.

The relative instability of the opening of Symphony no. 81 in turn poses challenges for the recapitulation. Naturally, it is most typical for a main theme to reenter at the start of a movement’s final large section that both begins and

Example 1.7a. Symphony no. 81 in G Major (1784), mvt. 1, mm. 1–12: beginning of movement

Example 1.7b. Symphony no. 81, mm. 167–79: end of movement

Musical score for Example 1.7b, showing measures 167–179 of Symphony no. 81. The score is in G major and common time. It consists of three systems of staves. The first system (measures 167–170) features a treble clef staff with a melody of eighth notes and a bass clef staff with a bass line of eighth notes and a dynamic marking of *fp*. The second system (measures 171–174) continues the melodic and bass lines. The third system (measures 175–179) concludes the passage with a final chord in the treble clef staff and a bass line of quarter notes.

Example 1.8. Symphony no. 61 in D Major (c. 1776), mvt. 1, mm. 1–8; cf. ex. 1.7a

Musical score for Example 1.8, showing measures 1–8 of Symphony no. 61 in D Major. The score is in D major and common time. It consists of two systems of staves. The first system (measures 1–4) features a treble clef staff with a melody of eighth notes and a bass clef staff with a bass line of eighth notes. The first measure of the treble staff is marked *f* and the second measure is marked *p*. The first measure of the treble staff is labeled "tonic arpeggio" and the second measure is labeled "Prinner". The second system (measures 5–8) continues the melodic and bass lines, ending with a final chord in the treble clef staff and a bass line of quarter notes.

ends in the tonic key.<sup>28</sup> The return of the main theme at this juncture usually marks the onset of the final rotation through the *Anlage*, that is, the basic thematic plan first presented within the exposition (see table 1.1).<sup>29</sup> The simultaneous initiation of both the final large tonal section and the final presentation of the *Anlage* usually is a dramatic highpoint of a movement, one that aptly may be described with the term “point of recapitulation.”

Not all movements that otherwise conform to the sonata-form model are constructed in this manner, however. In some cases, the final presentation of the *Anlage* begins prior to the definitive return to the tonic key, so that the onset of the final tonal section appears in the middle of the unfolding of the *Anlage* (see table 1.2).<sup>30</sup> This strategy is particularly amenable to those movements in which a sense of beginning is undermined within the main theme: after all, it is not easy to have a grand restart of a theme that even in its first iteration started in a somewhat tentative manner.

Table 1.1. A standard major-key sonata-form framework

<i>Exposition</i>	<i>Development</i>	<i>Recapitulation</i>
<i>Ist Periode</i> Begins in tonic key, ends in key of V	<i>2nd Periode, 1st half</i> Begins in key of V, often ends with half cadence, either in the tonic key or in another key (such as vi, iii, or ii) followed by a recapitulation	<i>2nd half</i> Begins and ends in tonic key
First presentation of <i>Anlage</i> (movement’s basic thematic plan)	Possible second presentation of <i>Anlage</i> , starting with main theme, loose-knit and often incomplete	Final, slightly condensed presentation of the <i>Anlage</i> , starting with the main theme in the tonic key

Table 1.2. An alternate sonata-form framework

<i>First part</i>	<i>Second part</i> (no clear point of recapitulation)	
<i>Ist Periode</i>	<i>2nd Periode, 1st half</i> ⋮	(retransition)   <i>2nd half</i>
First presentation of <i>Anlage</i>	-----	Second and final presentation of <i>Anlage</i> , beginning with main theme (often starting in tonic key) and continuing through the end of the movement. This often embraces “developmental” passages.

Among the works with tentative-sounding main themes whose layouts conform to the pattern depicted in table 1.2 are Haydn's Symphony no. 65 (whose unusual main theme was discussed above) and his Symphony no. 81. Table 1.3 parses the first movement of Symphony 81 according to its cadential and thematic structure. As is depicted here, the return of the main theme that initiates the final statement of the *Anlage* (m. 73) as well as the start of the final tonal section (m. 124) appears within the midst of larger structures.<sup>31</sup> Accordingly, the beginning of the final rotation through the *Anlage* (in m. 73) is recognized only in retrospect, as it sneaks in within the middle of a tonally unstable developmental passage (much as do those moments that resume the *Anlage* within the retransition in mm. 94, 101, and 111). Likewise, the final tonal section begins relatively unheralded, as its entrance coincides with the return of the transition theme (in m. 124; cf. mm. 24ff.), which clearly has a medial function and lies within the larger unfolding of the *Anlage*.<sup>32</sup>

When confronting a situation such as this, any attempt to isolate one moment as the official "point of recapitulation" arguably proves more of a hindrance than an aid. Although one could certainly put forth reasonable justifications for designating one moment or the other as the "official" onset of the recapitulation, it is unclear what would be gained as a result.<sup>33</sup> No matter where the recapitulation is located, it remains that any moment labeled as the beginning of a recapitulation here lies in the middle of something and thus would give rise to form-functional conflicts.

A double return of the opening of the main theme and main key is delayed until the coda, where the main theme in the exposition now *follows* the transition and subordinate theme. To label the situation here as a "reversed recapitulation" would be an incomplete description at best, however.<sup>34</sup> Although the *content* of the main theme returns at the end of the movement, its *function* does not. At the beginning of the movement, the opening passage functions (however uncomfortably) as a main theme; at the end of the movement, the analogous passage functions as a coda. As a result, the formal function of this material has changed from behaving as a beginning to serving in what would seem to be its more proper role as an "after-the-ending."<sup>35</sup>

In all, the appearances of the main theme throughout this movement may be regarded to follow a type of narrative progression. At the start of the movement, the main theme is forced to play the role of an opening gesture, as it were. In the second half of the movement, the theme comes back in the guise of a medial gesture, and thus still in conflict with its "natural" role. Only at the end of the movement does the theme appear in its "proper" place as a concluding gesture, as though to resolve the formal conflicts that had persisted throughout.

Table 1.3. Parsing of Symphony no. 81 in G-Major, first movement

m. 1	m. 68	m. 73	m. 94	m. 124	m. 167
<i>1st Periode</i> Starts in G, cadences in D	<i>2nd Periode, 1st half</i> Eventually cadences on V of ii followed by standing on the dominant		<i>(retransition)</i> Leads from V of ii back to G major	<i>2nd half</i> Starts and end in G	<i>appendix (coda)</i> to <i>3rd Periode</i>
First presentation of <i>Anlage</i>	Second and final presentation of <i>Anlage</i> begins at nearly original pitch level, but now within motion to G; unfolding of <i>Anlage</i> interrupted by developmental passages in mm. 79ff.		Hint of main theme starting in m. 94 and m. 101; latter part of main theme (cf. mm. 7ff.) hinted at in mm. 111ff.	Unfolding of <i>Anlage</i> continues with the transition theme (cf. mm. 24ff.)	“Content” of main theme (but without main theme function)

## The Second Movement of Symphony no. 65: The Unrepentant Formal Function

Many of the movements discussed above have been described according to a similar narrative trajectory in which a problematic formal element presented toward the beginning returns later in a normalized fashion, as if to resolve the functional conflict presented earlier. But this narrative paradigm does not fit in every case: in some works, a formal dissonance presented in the opening measures of a piece remains unresolved at the movement's end. Such is the case in the final work to be examined in this essay, the *Andante* second movement of Haydn's Symphony no. 65 in A Major. Unlike in the first movement of this symphony (discussed above; see ex. 1.3), the form-functional conflicts in this *Andante* are never fully mollified; if anything, they intensify as the piece progresses.

The main theme of this movement seems framed by a variant of a sentence (ex. 1.9a), except that the presentation is missing (much as it was in the main theme of the first movement; see ex. 1.3a above). As a result, the theme begins with the strings playing a continuation⇒cadence in measures 1–3 (see top line of annotations in ex. 1.9a). The oboes and horns answer this in measures 4–5 with a postcadential extension, which—as Caplin notes in describing this formal function—“prolong[s] the final harmony of [the] preceding cadence [while] the energy accumulated in the motion towards the cadential goal is dissipated.”<sup>36</sup>

When the theme repeats in measures 6–8, however, a new interpretative possibility arises: might the gesture in the oboe and horns retrospectively be understood as a presentation for a phrase that extends from measures 4 to 8 (see italicized line of annotations in ex. 1.9a)? It would be an oddly proportioned phrase to be sure, and the contrast between the presentation and the continuation⇒cadence would be far greater than typical, yielding a rather fragmented structure. The passage in measures 13–16 presents a similar possibility for reinterpretation: is the *tutti* outburst of these measures to be regarded as the contrasting middle of a small ternary form, with the opening section of the main-theme group returning in measure 17? Or are measures 13–16 retrospectively to be understood as the presentation of a sentence that extends from measures 13 to 19? Here, too, if these measures are indeed to be considered a sentence, the resulting phrase would be extraordinarily disjointed. But then again, so much else of this movement is so extraordinarily disjointed that the possible presence of such an oddly balanced and fragmented phrase cannot automatically be ruled out.

The main-theme group of the exposition concludes in measures 20–33 with what likewise may be regarded as a sentence (see annotations above the staff in ex. 1.9b). But what a bizarre sentence it is! Its proportions are peculiar, and the segments that compose the phrase involve even greater contrasts than in

Example 1.9a. Symphony no. 65 in A Major (1769), mvt. 2, mm. 1–19: first parts of main theme group

continuation ==> cadence ; post-cadential extension  
 or: presentation continuation

ob. + hns.

strings *p*

7 ==> cadence or: presentation  
*f*

15 continuation ==> cadence  
 continuation ==> cadence  
*ff* *p*

the preceding sections. Furthermore, the formal functions of the elements heard at the outset of the movement are now switched around in their new contexts: the flippant opening gesture from measure 1, played pianissimo, is now wedded to a somber, *forte* unison passage to form the basic idea of this phrase’s presentation. Consequently, the oboe and horn gesture that reappears in measures 32–33 is changed from its previous role as a postcadential

Example 1.9b. Symphony no. 65, mm. 20–33: end of main theme group

basic idea ( ) varied repeat of basic idea  
or continuation

=>> cadence  
continuation => cadence  
, post cadential extension

ob. + hns.

extension (or, as noted above, was it a presentation?) to now function as a continuation⇒cadence.

Or perhaps there is another way to understand measures 20–33. As suggested in the italicized line of notations within the staff of example 1.9b, might measures 20–31 be regarded as a weirdly expanded variant of measures 1–3? If this is so, then these measures might be regarded in their previous manner as a continuation⇒cadence, with what follows in measures 32–33 acting as a postcadential extension.

Such ambiguities are not clarified as the movement proceeds. On the contrary, in the second half of the movement the functions are even more confusing, as the seemingly erratic interruptions increase both in number and in brazenness. The larger formal functions are caught up in the confusion as well, for it is not completely clear where the recapitulation (or, for that matter, the final run-through of the *Anlage* or the movement's final tonal section) begins. This is not to deny that one could make a good case for one large-scale formal parsing or the other. Nevertheless, however this movement is parsed, the formal divisions on all levels of structure surely are far murkier than is typical.

The movement's eccentric nature might well suggest a programmatic underpinning. It calls to mind Haydn's oft-cited remark that in one of his early symphonic movements he attempted to portray an exchange between God and a "foolish sinner," in which "the dominant idea [is] how God speaks to an unrepentant sinner, and pleads with him to reform, but the sinner in

his foolishness pays no heed to the exhortations.”<sup>37</sup> Although Haydn did not reveal which symphonic movement was based on this program, a number of scholars have ventured reasonable guesses regarding the identity of the work, including movements from his Symphonies no. 7, 22, 26, and 28.<sup>38</sup> Haydn was quite emphatic in stating that he used this specific program only once; nevertheless, that there are so many viable candidates suggests that the general narrative paradigm that underlies this program was not an uncommon one for him.<sup>39</sup>

Its late dating argues against the second movement of Symphony no. 65 as possibly being the unnamed early symphonic movement that Haydn specifically related to the God/sinner program. Still, this work does seem to loosely follow the basic outline in which an authoritative and a flippant idea are in dialogue with one another, and in which the flippant one remains steadfastly “unreformed.” Throughout this movement the wayward opening alternates with passages imbued with gravitas. At times these conflicting ideas seem to combine to form phrases of sorts, although they never quite meld successfully. Unlike in many of the movements discussed above, the formal problems that result are not “solved” by the end of the movement: the unruly opening gesture is never placed within its “proper” formal setting so as to resolve the form-functional dissonances that it inspires. Rather, it seems to spread further confusion as it continues, helping to muddy up the sense of the large-scale formal design. At the end of both halves of the movement (mm. 46–56 and 132–45), the initial part of the opening gesture appears to celebrate its independence with a merry little dance. This dance concludes by appropriating the unison texture and loud dynamics of the movement’s more serious gestures (see mm. 54–56 and 143–45), as though to wrap things up by thumbing its nose at authority.

Haydn himself may be regarded as a figure of authority, one who helped establish the artistic standards of his era. As his early biographer Albert Christoph Dies put it, “lucid arrangement, *lucidus ordo*, is not the least of Haydn’s excellences.”<sup>40</sup> Few equaled his skill at handling musical forms or his ability—when he so desired—to compose convincing beginnings, middles, and ends. But as the examples cited here suggest, Haydn did not always wish to do so: sometimes, in the service of musical expressivity, he, too, seemed to enjoy thumbing his nose at authority.

Naturally, the devices examined here may be found in works of other composers as well, though rarely with the skill and powerful effect as witnessed in the output of Haydn. As is suggested by this and the other examples discussed above, form-functional conflicts can take on various guises and involve various parameters. For instance, sometimes it is a rhythmic feature that seems at odds with its location within the formal design, and sometimes it is a textural element, melodic figure, or harmonic element that appears to be out of place.

In certain instances, the effect of the dislocation is rather subtle; this is particularly true when a single feature more characteristic of an ending seems to have been placed as a beginning, or vice versa. At other times, the playing with formal functions seems to create outright confusion, as in cases where several elements more suited for a middle section appear at the outer edges of the form. In such cases especially, an appreciation of the ways in which the music departs from conventional formal functions can contribute vitally to a deep understanding of the composition's structural and hermeneutic implications.

## Notes

1. William E. Caplin, "What Are Formal Functions?" in William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski, and James Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 23, 25; see also Michel Vallières, Daphne Tan, William E. Caplin, and Stephen McAdams, "Perception of Intrinsic Formal Functionality: An Empirical Investigation of Mozart's Materials," *Journal of Interdisciplinary Music Studies* 3, no. 1–2 (2009): 17–43.
2. The concept of deformation as an agent of musical meaning and significance is most closely associated with the works of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, as exemplified in their book *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). As I shall argue here, this concept is compatible with the theory of formal functions as espoused by Caplin as well.
3. William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 111. Caplin describes a number of form-functional deviations and reinterpretations throughout his writings.
4. *Ibid.*, 4.
5. *Ibid.*, 40–42. Regarding the relationship of the opening measures of this passage to the Quiescenza schema, see the discussion of Haydn's Symphony no. 81 below.
6. The deceleration is further attenuated when the main theme returns in the recapitulation (mm. 79–89), where the continuation⇒cadence is drawn out to an even greater extent. See also comments regarding the unusual nature of this main theme in Elaine Sisman, "Haydn's Theater Symphonies," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 43, no. 2 (1990): 342–43; and A. Peter Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, vol. 2, *The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 113.
7. Caplin, *Classical Form*, 142.
8. The striking use of the *Ländler* theme in this symphony has been insightfully discussed by various commentators, including James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in his Instrumental Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 167; and Elaine Sisman, "Haydn, Shakespeare, and the Rules of Originality," in *Haydn and His World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997), 30–32.
9. As Sisman puts it, "the ostensible beginning of the recapitulation in fact turns that material (m. 128) into a retransition with lengthy dominant pedal, and turns the

- original F-major theme into the ‘real’ return [in m. 147], in D major”; see Sisman, “Haydn, Shakespeare, and the Rules of Originality,” 31–32. See also comments about this recapitulation in Webster, *Haydn’s “Farewell” Symphony*, 167; W. Dean Sutcliffe, “Haydn Seek,” *Musical Times* 134, no. 1806 (1993): 447; and Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, 2:204. In *Mozart, Haydn and Early Beethoven, 1781–1802* (New York: Norton, 2009), 354, Daniel Hertz suggests that the recapitulation actually begins in measure 147; depending on how one defines the term “recapitulation” (a relatively modern term, unknown to eighteenth-century musicians), Hertz’s labeling might indeed be an appropriate one.
10. Caplin himself claims that his theoretical method is compatible with a dialogic approach to form; see William E. Caplin, “Comments on James Hepokoski’s Essay ‘Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form,’” in Caplin, Hepokoski, and Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre*, 90.
  11. Caplin, *Classical Form*, 111–15.
  12. Caplin discusses the category of main themes that lack an initiating function in *ibid.*, 199–201.
  13. *Ibid.*, 15.
  14. William E. Caplin, “The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no. 1 (2004): 81–85.
  15. As a number of commentators have noted, the syntactic twisting of cadential closing gestures in Haydn’s works frequently has a witty or humorous effect; see, for instance, Gretchen A. Wheelock, *Haydn’s Ingenious Jesting with Art: Contexts of Musical Wit and Humor* (New York: Schirmer, 1992), 98–115; and Scott Burnham, “Haydn and Humor,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn*, ed. Caryl Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 71–72. For the use of closing gestures at openings in general, see Norma Sherman-Ishayek, “Closing Gestures in Opening Ideas: Strategies for Beginning and Ending in Classical Instrumental Music” (masters thesis, McGill University, 1991).
  16. This sentence is itself a varied repetition of what appears in measures 1–8 of the introduction. This main theme, along with its unusual formal function, is discussed in Caplin, *Classical Form*, 199–200. I also discuss this movement and its formal conflicts in L. Poundie Burstein, “Comedy and Structure in Haydn’s Symphonies,” in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 2:78–81.
  17. Caplin himself addresses the notion that a formal dissonance of an unusual opening can be resolved by subsequent passages; see William E. Caplin, “Mozart, Symphony No. 40 in G Minor, K. 550, II,” in *A Composition as a Problem II*, ed. Mart Humal (Tallinn: Eesti Muusikaakadeemia, 1999), 155–62, where he notes (on p. 162) that in this work “Mozart sets up a conflict between an implied formal function and an actual formal placement—an ‘ending’ gesture occurring at a beginning. . . . The conflict between function and placement is eventually resolved, not surprisingly, in the recapitulation.”
  18. Compare the formal twists in this symphony to those found in the Trio from the third movement of Mozart’s Symphony in C (“Jupiter”), K. 551; regarding the formal manipulations in the Mozart movement, see Jonathan Kramer, *The Time of Music: New Meanings, New Temporalities, New Listening Strategies* (New York: Schirmer, 1988), 143–44; and Caplin, “The Classical Cadence,” 83–85.
  19. This notion is bolstered by the return of the material from the first four measures of the Menuetto as a codetta in the final measures of this section, following a perfect

- authentic cadence in the tonic key (cf. mm. 1–4 and 21–24). Such form-functional conflicts that span the divide between a Menuetto and Trio may be found in other works by Haydn as well, as is noted in James Webster, “Haydn’s op. 9: A Critique of the Ideology of the ‘Classical’ String Quartet,” in *Essays in Honor of László Somfai on his 70th Birthday: Studies in the Sources and the Interpretation of Music*, ed. László Vikárius and Vera Lampert (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005), 139–57 (esp. 144).
20. Regarding the possible programmatic implications of Symphony no. 64, see Sisman, “Haydn’s Theater Symphonies,” 326–31; and Jonathan Foster, “The *Tempora Mutantur* Symphony of Joseph Haydn,” *Haydn Yearbook* 9 (1975): 328–29.
  21. Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 183.
  22. Naturally, locating passages based on the Quiescenza schema relies on interpretation, and it is quite possible that others could reasonably come up with a slightly different list of those symphonies by Haydn that conclude with this figure (which is why I resist providing a complete list). Nonetheless, surely any fair accounting would agree with the essential point put forth here: namely, that the Quiescenza is a relatively common concluding figure in Haydn’s symphonic movements, but that it is rarely found as an opening gesture in these works.
  23. In a few cases, a Quiescenza is found in the second phrase of a main theme: see, for instance, the first movements of Symphony “B” or Symphony no. 46, or the Finale of Symphony no. 22.
  24. Passages that are directly built either upon the Quiescenza figure or over a pedal point in the bass take up over a third of the movement, including the entire core of the development section.
  25. The presence of the Quiescenza figure in Symphony no. 81 is discussed in Markus Neuwirth, “‘Verschleierte’ Reprisen bei Joseph Haydn: Über einige Fragwürdigkeiten eines anachronistischen Sonatenform-Paradigmas,” in *Joseph Haydn (1732–1809) [= Memoria*, vol. 11], ed. Sebastian Urmoneit (Berlin: Weidler, 2009), 60–62. As H. C. Robbins Landon observes, one of the remarkable things about this symphony is its “marvelous beginning, unique in the whole of Haydn’s symphonic art”; see H. C. Robbins Landon, *The Symphonies of Joseph Haydn* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), 393.
  26. As Caplin claims regarding topoi, “if we can identify that a given topic is displaced from its conventional formal position, yet the topic also displays musical characteristics that are suitable for the formal position it actually occupies, there is little reason to believe that the composer is toying with our expectations on the relation of topic to form, even if that relation is not as typical as some other one”; see William E. Caplin, “On the Relation of Musical Topoi to Formal Function,” *Eighteenth-Century Music* 2, no. 1 (2005): 121. The same surely would hold true for the use of schemata: no single device can by itself establish a sense of beginning or ending. I would add only that the sense of formal displacement or lack thereof depends on the force of the formal associations of the topoi or the schemata as well as on the distinctiveness of the “musical characteristics that are suitable for the formal position [a passage] actually occupies.” Thus, for instance, the textures and gestures in the openings of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, Mozart’s K. 332, or Beethoven’s opus 1, no. 1, prevent them from sounding like endings, their use of the Quiescenza figure notwithstanding. For a discussion of other works from the later 1700s and afterward that begin with this figure, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 91–92.

27. As Brown aptly puts it, the main theme “returns at the end of the movement, because the brand of instability that it provided at the beginning underlines closure”; see *The Symphonic Repertoire*, 2:207.
28. This large final section in the tonic key corresponds to what Heinrich Christoph Koch refers to either as a third *Periode* (if it follows a grand perfect authentic cadence in a nontonic key) or as the second half of the second *Periode* (if there is no preceding perfect cadence in a nontonic key, as is the case with Symphony no. 81); see Koch, *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, 3 vols. (Rudolstadt and Leipzig: Böhme, 1782–93), 3:304–11, 396–425; trans. by Nancy Kovaleff Baker as *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 199–201, 223–44. For reasons that should become clear below, I deliberately avoid the term “recapitulation” to describe this final, large tonal section.
29. Modern readers might note the similarity of this to the concept of “rotational form” discussed at length in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*.
30. Problems with applying the relatively modern concept of the “point of recapitulation” to a number of works of the eighteenth century, including those that follow the layout depicted in table 1.2, have been discussed at great length by Peter Hoyt; see Peter Hoyt, “The Concept of *développement* in the Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, ed. Ian Bent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 141–62; and Hoyt, “The ‘False Recapitulation’ and the Conventions of Sonata Form” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1998). I discuss this layout in greater length in L. Poundie Burstein, “Echt oder Falsch? Zur Rolle der ‘falschen Reprise’ in Haydn’s Sinfonie Nr. 41,” trans. Felix Diergarten, in *Joseph Haydn (1732–1809)*, 97–129, as well as in L. Poundie Burstein, “True or False? Reassessing the Voice-Leading Role of Haydn’s So-called ‘False Recapitulations,’” *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* 5 (2011): 1–37.
31. Here, too, it is instructive to compare this movement with the first movement of Symphony no. 61. Although the key structures of the second halves of these movements share striking similarities, in Symphony no. 61 the last large tonal section does begin with a clear return of its main theme, which—as noted above—in this work is quite well suited for establishing a convincing sense of a beginning.
32. As Neuwirth notes, the solid manner in which the exposition’s transition begins—which contrasts with the hazier nature of this movement’s main theme—helps allow the material of the transition to serve as the start of a section within the movement’s second half; see Neuwirth, “‘Verschleierte’ Reprise,” 54–63. That the transition begins in the firm manner appropriate for an opening, however, does not detract from that overall impression that it has a medial function, as becomes ever clearer as the section continues.
33. Attempts to pinpoint the start of the recapitulation in the first movement of Symphony no. 81 usually have been appropriately accompanied by an acknowledgment of the problems involved; see, for instance, Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: Norton, 1998), 157–59; George Edwards, “Papa Doc’s Recap Caper: Haydn and Temporal Dyslexia,” in *Haydn Studies*, ed. W. Dean Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 296; Ethan Haimo, *Haydn’s Symphonic Forms: Essays in Compositional Logic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 145–60; and Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, 2:207. The advantages and disadvantages of the various proposed points of recapitulation for this movement are discussed at length in Neuwirth, “‘Verschleierte’ Reprise,” 54–63. Neuwirth

- contains that the formal processes in this movement—with its multiple, ritornello-like returns—are better understood as relating to those found in a typical concerto movement rather than in terms of standard sonata-form paradigms.
34. A reading of this movement in terms of a “reversed recapitulation” is proposed in Haimo, *Haydn’s Symphonic Forms*, 155; see also Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire*, 2:207. Neuwirth discusses the various problems with reading a “reversed recapitulation” in this movement in “‘Verschleierte’ Reprisen,” 58–59.
  35. Another swapping of function involves measures 42ff. and 161ff. Although the thematic contents of these passages are similar, they have differing roles: the function of measures 42 and following is that of a second part in a two-part transition (using Koch’s terminology, a *Grundabsatz in der Tonart der Quinte*); the function of measures 161 and following, on the other hand, is that of a final part of the subordinate theme (in Koch’s terminology, the *Schlußsatz*).
  36. Caplin, *Classical Form*, 16.
  37. Haydn reported this to his friend and biographer Georg Griesinger, and he related something similar to another of his biographers, Albert Christoph Dies; see Vernon Gotwals, ed. and trans., *Haydn: Two Contemporary Portraits* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), 62, 155; the translation used here is from Webster, *Haydn’s Farewell Symphony*, 234.
  38. See Webster, *Haydn’s Farewell Symphony*, 235; and Richard Will, “When God Met the Sinner, and Other Dramatic Confrontations in Eighteenth-Century Instrumental Music,” *Music and Letters* 78 (1997): 175–209.
  39. Regarding Haydn’s remarks on the programmatic implications of his symphonies with his biographers, see the illuminating discussion in Webster, *Haydn’s Farewell Symphony*, 234–35; see also David Schroeder, “Orchestral Music: Symphonies and Concertos,” in Clark (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn*, 96. Will proposes that this basic paradigm may be found in a number of works by other composers from the eighteenth century as well; see Will, “When God Met the Sinner,” 194–209.
  40. Gotwals, *Haydn*, 199.

## Chapter Two

# Mozart's Sonata-Form Arias

Nathan John Martin

In his influential 1972 study *The Classical Style*, Charles Rosen maintains that Mozart's mature operas make comprehensive use of sonata principles: "No description of sonata form can be given," he writes, "that will fit the Haydn quartets but not the majority of forms in a Mozart opera."<sup>1</sup> At the opposite extreme, James Webster contends in his 1991 article on Mozart's arias that "a catalogue of formal types in Mozart's Da Ponte operas would include precisely one aria in sonata form," namely, Susanna's "Venite, inginocchiatevi" (*Figaro*, no. 12).<sup>2</sup> Between these two poles—and accounting in part for the disparity in their verdicts—lies a rich, and richly contested, scholarly terrain: some two hundred years of competing agendas—political, historiographical, and ideological—whose tectonic shiftings erupted into the analysis of Mozart's operas in the early 1990s.<sup>3</sup> In what follows, I adopt a calculated naiveté in undertaking to bracket off these complexities so as to cast a fresh eye on those of Mozart's operatic arias that are, in some sense, "in" sonata form. My aim, in so doing, is to reach a *juste milieu* between Webster and Rosen.<sup>4</sup> For if Rosen's commitment to "sonata principles"—with all that phrase's manifold accretions—leads him to subsume even such prima facie unpromising candidates as Figaro's "Se vuol ballare" (*Figaro*, no. 3), Zerlina's "Batti, batti" (*Don Giovanni*, no. 12), and Donna Anna's "Non mi dir" (*Don Giovanni*, no. 23) under the rubric of sonata form,<sup>5</sup> Webster's polemicizing sins in the opposite direction: taken at face value, his injunction would deny the obvious analogies that obtain between the formal shapes of many Mozart arias and the more familiar templates operative in his instrumental music, resemblances that Webster is elsewhere quite ready to acknowledge.<sup>6</sup>

As a starting point, I tabulate some straightforward statistics, counting in particular the proportion of arias in sonata form (in a sense to be clarified momentarily) in generically matched works from the opposite ends of Mozart's later operatic career: first *Idomeneo* (Munich, 1780) versus *La clemenza di Tito* (Prague, 1791), and then *Die Entführung aus dem Serail* (Vienna, 1782) versus *Die Zauberflöte* (Vienna, 1791). What these comparisons suggest is that sonata-form arias became significantly less prevalent in Mozart's operas over

the second half of his career.<sup>7</sup> I then move to three more detailed analytical case studies: of “Traurigkeit” (*Die Entführung*, no. 10), “Un’ aura amorosa” (*Così fan tutte*, no. 17), and “Ach, ich fühl’s” (*Die Zauberflöte*, no. 17). A subtext throughout is my attempt to prize apart any reflexive associations in the reader’s mind between sonata form, “tonal drama,” and onstage action. My principal concern, however, is to illustrate how, in his later arias, Mozart progressively abridged the complete sonata structures that predominate in *Idomeneo*.



In *Idomeneo*, the basic template for an aria can be schematically described as follows: a standard number begins with a sonata exposition (preceded, optionally, by an orchestral ritornello) and ends with a complete recapitulation (sometimes with a concluding ritornello). Whatever text was sung to the exposition’s music is repeated verbatim in the recapitulation, even when, in minor-mode arias, the transposition of the subordinate theme(s) to the tonic imparts a contrasting affective valence. 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 whose typical formal properties I am as yet hesitant to generalize.<sup>8</sup>

Illia’s lovely third-act aria “Zeffiretti lusinghieri” (no. 19) can stand as an example (ex. 2.1). The aria begins with an orchestral introduction (ritornello) that synopsizes the exposition’s subsequent gestures. Measures 1–8 form an eight-measure compound-basic-idea+continuation hybrid that leads to a tonic half cadence (HC) at measure 8. (This same music will subsequently reappear, in varied form, as the aria’s main theme.) To this initial tight-knit unit, Mozart then appends a new four-measure continuation (beginning in m. 9) that is supported exclusively by an expanded cadential progression. The projected cadence is evaded at measure 13, however, and the entire continuation is repeated, this time completing its arc and coming to rest with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) at measure 17. The entire introduction thus resembles a kind of sixteen-measure hybrid in which a complete eight-measure theme type is followed by a more expansive continuation phrase.<sup>9</sup> (The second continuation, incidentally, will reappear to close the exposition’s subordinate theme, so that the entire ritornello is composed of materials subsequently heard in more expanded form.)<sup>10</sup>

The entrance of the singer in measure 18 marks the beginning of the exposition proper. The main theme (mm. 18–29) appears much as it was prefigured in the introduction, except that its continuation phrase is now significantly expanded (m. 5 becomes mm. 22–23, m. 6 becomes mm. 24–25, and the original cadential function of mm. 7–8 is expanded to four full measures in mm. 26–29).<sup>11</sup> After the main theme ends (I:HC arriving at m. 29), a subordinate theme follows immediately in the dominant, beginning in measure 30. This