STEVEN VANDE MOORTELE

IN SEARCH OF ROMANTIC FORM

I am not the first, nor will I likely be the last, to state that one of the most remarkable developments in recent North American music theory is the revival of interest in musical form, triggered by the appearance of William Caplin's *Classical Form* (1998) and continued by the publication of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006); today, well into the second decade of that revival, this is old news.[1] Many readers will also be aware that since its very early stages, the 'new *Formenlehre*' – approaches to musical form based on the theory of formal functions, the system of sonata theory or a combination of both – has spread well beyond its Classical core repertoire.[2] Applications of Hepokoski and Darcy's work to music of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have been especially numerous.[3] Surprisingly, theorists have been slower to apply the tools developed by Caplin and by Hepokoski and Darcy to the music of the direct heirs to the Classical masters: Schubert and the Romantic generation. Only a handful of book chapters and articles, most of them very recent, are devoted specifically to form in music between roughly 1820 and 1850.[4]

The publication of Janet Schmalfeldt's award-winning book *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* might therefore be considered a major breakthrough in the young history of the new *Formenlehre*.[5] This is all the more the case since the book appeared in close chronological proximity to two valuable studies by younger scholars who tackle the topic of what could be called 'Romantic form' head-on: Stephen Rodgers's *Form, Program, and Metaphor in the Music of Berlioz* (2009) and Benedict Taylor's *Mendelssohn, Time and Memory* (2012), even though the latter largely stands apart from the new *Formenlehre*.

The appearance of Schmalfeldt's book is a highly anticipated event indeed. Talk about it has been in the air since the earliest years of the *Formenlehre* revival;[6] in her Preface, the author herself recognises that it has been 'in the process of becoming' for a very long time indeed (p. ix). Moreover, Schmalfeldt's 1995 article on the first movement of Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata, Op. 31 No. 2, the pilot study which has now become the core chapter of *In the Process of Becoming*, has acquired the status of a music-theoretical classic. It is largely because of this article that her work has in recent years received considerable publicity, beginning with Bergé, Caplin and D'hoe (2009), an edited volume of eleven contributions on the *Tempest* Sonata, several of which engage

in a dialogue with Schmalfeldt's analysis. In the same year, the annual meeting of the Society for Music Theory in Montreal featured a special session celebrating Schmalfeldt's work, much of it again centring on her *Tempest* article; the proceedings of this session appeared in *Music Theory Online* in 2010.[7] And in 2012, five of the analyses from the 2009 *Tempest* collection were published in a graphical format (Bergé 2012). When she wrote her article in 1995, Schmalfeldt could hardly have suspected that in the years to come, Beethoven's *Tempest* movement would turn into the most over-analysed sonata form in recent history.

In the Process of Becoming is, however, about so much more than Beethoven and his *Tempest* Sonata. At its core stand seven chapters covering an impressive sample of musical form in the first half of the nineteenth century and spanning two distinct music-historical periods. Schmalfeldt begins with the third and last phase of what James Webster (2002) has called the 'First Viennese-European Modernism' (from Beethoven's heroic period, starting in 1802, to his and Schubert's deaths in 1827 and 1828), and she continues with Charles Rosen's 'Romantic generation' of the late 1820s through to the 1840s (see Rosen 1995).

Thirteen early nineteenth-century compositions are analysed in detail: the first movements of Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata and of his *Bridgetower* Sonata, Op. 47 (the sonata for violin and piano formerly known as the *Kreutzer* Sonata); the first movement of Schubert's Piano Sonata in A minor, D. 845, his *Lebensstürme* Allegro for piano four hands, D. 947 (also in A minor) and his Piano Trio in E♭ major, D. 929; the first movement of Mendelssohn's Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 49 and the finale of his Octet in E♭ major, Op. 20; Chopin's Cello Sonata in G minor, Op. 65; Robert Schumann's songs 'Mondnacht' (from the Eichendorff *Liederkreis*, Op. 39) and 'Widmung' (from *Myrthen*, Op. 25), as well as his Arabeske, Op. 18 and Fantasie in C major, Op. 17; and Clara Schumann's song 'Die stille Lotosblume' (from her *Sechs Lieder*, Op. 13). In addition, Schmalfeldt provides short glances towards many other works, including a host of Chopin piano pieces. Preceding the analyses is an introductory chapter which presents the book's central 'idea of musical form as process', while a broader historical perspective is provided in Ch. 3, 'The Processual Legacy of the Late Eighteenth Century', which traces the origins of this phenomenon back to works by Haydn, Clementi and Mozart. These two chapters, along with Ch. 7 on Mendelssohn, are the only entirely new ones in the book. Most of the remaining material has been published before in some form or other, although much has been revised and expanded for inclusion in this volume. Perhaps the most notable expansion is the inclusion in Ch. 2 of Schmalfeldt's response to Caplin's and Hepokoski's critiques of her *Tempest* analysis.

At the heart of Schmalfeldt's study stands the idea that musical form unfolds as a process: the 'process of becoming' from the book's title. The notion is relevant whenever 'the formal function initially suggested by a musical idea, phrase, or section invites retrospective reinterpretation within the larger formal context' (p. 9). The increased prominence of form's processuality is for Schmalfeldt a defining feature of the repertoire she studies, a manifestation of

'post-Enlightenment philosophical ideas about form' which marks 'the emergence of a distinctive Romantic style' (p. 17). One should not understand 'form as the process of becoming' as a monolithic concept; rather, the idea undergoes multiple transformations over the course of the book. In the chapter on Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata, it appears in the pure (but already very complex) sense of Schmalfeldt's definition; it is here that its German idealist overtones resound most strongly. In the following chapters, the lofty concept is then brought down to earth. The analysis of Beethoven's *Bridgetower* Sonata focuses on form-functional expansion – that is, on form becoming something larger than it initially announces itself to be. In her reading of Schubert's A minor Sonata, Schmalfeldt's emphasis shifts to form 'coming into being' (p. 116) over time, and the role of the performer in that process. The next chapter, 'Music That Turns Inward', 'concentrate[s] upon the tendency within early nineteenth-century instrumental works toward cyclic and processual formal techniques that draw new kinds of attention to deeply felt, song-inspired interior movements and secondary (as opposed to main) themes' (p. 136). In the final chapter, concerning songs and piano music of Robert and Clara Schumann, the 'process of becoming' transforms into one of 'homecoming' during Schmalfeldt's search for 'musical answers for why the closing moments in many of Robert Schumann's compositions would seem ... to evoke the idea of yearning to "come home" ' (p. 227). The ambition that repeatedly inflects the central idea of Schmalfeldt's book is thus to identify and illustrate the essential characteristics which distinguish musical form in the first half of the nineteenth century from that in other historical periods. In addition to form as process, these include increased form-functional ambiguity, formal expansion and a tendency towards introspection.

    Schmalfeldt concedes that the idea of form as becoming at times recedes into the background as a result of this ambition (pp. 15–16). One cannot say, therefore, that she presents a tautly organised monograph: her book is perhaps best described as a somewhat loose collection of more-or-less closely related analyses. For this reason, I will not offer a chapter-by-chapter review.[8] Situating *In the Process of Becoming* in relation to the two central treatises of the new *Formenlehre* – Caplin (1998) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006) – I will instead embark on a partisan meditation on the opportunities it creates for, and the challenges it poses to, those who wish to further pursue the study of Romantic form. In what follows, I will focus first on Schmalfeldt's method and then on her book's central notion of becoming before offering a concluding outlook.

Issues of Methodology

From the outset, Schmalfeldt makes it clear that *In the Process of Becoming* is analytical rather than theoretical in orientation. 'My approach', she writes, 'will be composer- and piece-specific, rather than typological or taxonomic' (p. 15). Instead of devising a new theory of early nineteenth-century form, she analyses works from the first half of the nineteenth century relying largely on theories of

form in music of the late eighteenth century. Foremost among these is Caplin's theory of formal functions. To those familiar with the early history of the new *Formenlehre*, Schmalfeldt's allegiance to Caplin will come as no surprise: as both authors acknowledge, they initially developed the theory of formal functions in tandem as colleagues at McGill University in the 1980s (see Caplin 1998, p. vii, and Schmalfeldt 2011, pp. 8–9). On one level, Schmalfeldt's book amounts to a companion volume to Caplin's *Classical Form*, compensating for the relative dearth of sustained analysis of entire movements in the latter. Through her analyses, Schmalfeldt enlightens, perhaps even enlivens, the complex yet flexible terminological system Caplin laid out in his treatise.

In the Process of Becoming is, however, more than an impressive demonstration of what the theory of formal functions enables a sensitive analyst to do. Caplin's theory is characterised by a self-imposed methodological restriction, considering only a limited number of factors to be form-defining: harmony and grouping structure at the lower levels of musical form, and, at the higher levels, tonal organisation (articulated by cadences) as well as the interplay between tight-knit and loose design – the latter distinction perhaps the most obvious way in which he remains indebted to Schoenberg and especially Erwin Ratz (see Martin 2011, p. 563).[9] Conspicuously absent from this list, of course, is the aspect of melodic-motivic content (see Caplin 2009a, pp. 34–9). What distinguishes Schmalfeldt's analytical apparatus from Caplin's is that it is more inclusive and tends towards a 'multivalent' approach – to use the phrase from Webster that Schmalfeldt borrows as well (p. 15) – in which the form-functional perspective is allowed to interact with a variety of other perspectives.

One of the methods Schmalfeldt invokes to complement her Caplinian toolbox is that of the competing theoretical system within the new *Formenlehre*: Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory. This *does* come as a surprise. As became especially apparent from the confrontation between Caplin and Hepokoski during the 2007 EuroMAC in Freiburg – surely one of the more theatrical events in music theory's recent history – the water between both camps runs deep.[10] Differences between the two theories range from matters of analytical procedure – Caplin's bottom-up versus Hepokoski and Darcy's top-down approach to musical form – to disagreements about the significance of a piece's 'rhetorical' features, which are as marginal in orthodox form-functional analysis as they are central to sonata theory's understanding of musical form. Perhaps the most fundamental difference is that between a theory which works with a relatively small group of types and their deformation on the one hand, and one which operates with a much larger number of types (but a limited number of formal functions) on the other – the difference, in short, between Hepokoski and Darcy's default levels and Caplin's taxonomy. Understandably, Schmalfeldt does not aim at a wholesale reconciliation between the two theories in the manner of her earlier attempt to reconcile Schenkerian concepts with theories of form (see Schmalfeldt 1991) but takes from sonata theory only what she needs. More specifically, she separates sonata theory's 'ideological' superstructure – the

concept of dialogic form and the discourse of norm and deformation (or 'formal transformation', to use the term Schmalfeldt prefers [see p. 16]) – from its 'technological' base – including all of its terminological neologisms – and combines it with an analytical apparatus which remains essentially Caplinian (and Schenkerian).[11]

Although Schmalfeldt's initial characterisation of Hepokoski and Darcy's dialogic form as 'an attractive new expansion of an old idea' (p. 16) has the sound of a backhanded compliment, and even though references to their work grow rare after the chapter on the *Tempest* Sonata, it rapidly becomes clear that the dialogic stance forms an indispensable part of her enterprise. More than that: Schmalfeldt leaves herself no other option. In the absence of a theory of early nineteenth-century form, she *has* to analyse Romantic music in Classical terms, simply because those are the only ones she has available. In many instances those terms apply reasonably well to Romantic music; as Schmalfeldt emphasises, 'Classical formal functions and theme types continue to thrive in music of the Romantic generation' (p. 17). But at the same time, things of course happen in Romantic music which are unheard of in Classical music. And unless one develops a theory of early nineteenth-century music, the only way to account for those is by understanding them as deformations of Classical norms.

What we are dealing with here is the dilemma between a 'positive' and a 'negative' approach to nineteenth-century form: does one strive to establish a series of types and norms based on what happens in this music itself, or does one measure it against something external? While the former option would mean applying Caplin's taxonomic approach to a new repertoire (and thus, to a certain extent, starting from scratch), the latter is already built into Hepokoski and Darcy's theory.[12] Indeed, a biased reader may well get the impression that the whole sonata-theory system is devised in no small measure to enable the analysis of nineteenth-century music as a deformation of late eighteenth-century norms.

Schmalfeldt's decision to opt for the negative approach makes intuitive sense, and it works well for what she wants to do. One wonders, however, whether the possibility of a theory of Romantic form is not given short shrift. Schmalfeldt does not comment on whether she thinks such a theory feasible or even desirable, but the fact that she has been working on this repertoire for several decades and still makes do without one is telling. The tacit assumption underlying her decision to opt for a 'composer- and piece-specific' rather than a 'taxonomic or systematic' approach seems to be that differences between individual composers active in, say, the 1830s would have been more pronounced than those between composers working half a century earlier, so much so that it simply is not a viable option to systematise Romantic form in the same way one can Classical form.

Schmalfeldt would be the last to deny the complexities and contradictions of late eighteenth-century music, as her discussion of Haydn, Clementi and Mozart in Ch. 3 amply documents. The theories of Classical form she uses, however, tend to understate these complexities. Caplin can generalise about Classical

form the way he does only because he relies on a consciously narrow definition of the term which covers only the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven written between about 1780 and 1810. Anyone who has applied Caplin's categories to early Haydn or late Beethoven knows how quickly difficulties crop up. Even within Caplin's limited Classical repertoire, moreover, formal procedures are remarkably diverse. Entire volumes could be written building on Caplin's work by exploring the differences in form between Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven as well as between different genres, by looking into how form functions in Classical vocal music and by tracing chronological evolutions within the three composers' oeuvre – all things Caplin does only in passing, if at all. Most important, neighbouring repertoires are entirely bracketed out from *Classical Form* – even those as close to Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven as the works of their contemporaries in and around Vienna. If Schmalfeldt's one example from a not-so-canonical Classical composer, the first movement of Clementi's Piano Sonata in F minor, Op. 13 (1785), is representative, then Classical phrase structure beyond the Viennese threesome works in ways which are wildly different indeed.

The situation is admittedly different for Hepokoski and Darcy. As the subtitle of their treatise proclaims, their ambition is to be more comprehensive in scope and to cover the 'late eighteenth-century sonata' in its entirety. But even though they refer to a much larger number of composers than Caplin, their actual examples are also for the most part drawn from Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven (see Drabkin 2007 and Wingfield 2008). And while the concept of deformation allows the analyst to move more easily beyond this repertoire, there are limits to its applicability: one can reasonably argue that late Beethoven is working against an established Classical norm, but it is much harder to claim the same about, for instance, early Haydn (see Neuwirth 2011).

None of this is meant as a critique of Caplin's or of Hepokoski and Darcy's projects; all it is to say is that, rather than by grace of an illusory stylistic homogeneity of late eighteenth-century music, theories of Classical form have come into being *in spite of* its stylistic heterogeneity. And if we feel comfortable using theories of Classical form which in reality are about a geographically, chronologically and generically selective slice of the Classical repertoire, and which underplay the diversity within that repertoire, it seems not a priori impossible to conceive of a theory of 'Romantic form' encompassing, for instance, only the instrumental music of Schumann, Mendelssohn and Chopin from around 1825 to 1850.

Such a positively formulated theory of Romantic form would be a way around one of the obvious shortcomings of the negative approach: its highly speculative nature. Simply put, the negative approach takes as its starting point a general norm which functions as the background against which particular phenomena are interpreted. In order to claim that such a norm is in place, one has to reconstruct the repertoire on which that norm is based and then assess how that repertoire impacts what is perceived, at the time, as normative. This is difficult,

at least if one wants to avoid conflating normativity with statistical prominence (see Neuwirth 2011). It is not necessarily because a piece exists or is performed that it helps shape the norm: the impact of some works on the norm is likely to be greater than that of others.

Further complications arise when it comes to reconstructing Romantic composers' ideas about form. How close is what Caplin or Hepokoski and Darcy say Classical form is to what an early nineteenth-century composer would have said it was? Not very, it would seem. Assuming that Romantic composers did indeed engage intentionally in a dialogue with Classical models (and there are good reasons to believe that this is what at least some composers did some of the time),[13] it seems unlikely that their understanding of those models had much in common with the extremely detailed and sophisticated late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century theories of form available to us.[14] If the new *Formenlehre* responds to an obligation to recover 'now-eclipsed horizons of expectation', as Hepokoski has put it (2009, p. 72), then it would seem that both sonata theory and the theory of formal functions are considerably overshooting their goal.

The problem becomes even more pressing as the nineteenth century proceeds. It surely would be too simple to analyse form throughout the nineteenth century with an exclusive reliance on a set of norms derived from the Classical repertoire and to qualify everything which does not correspond to those norms as a 'lower-level default' or deformation. The Classical style ages with the nineteenth century, and the system of norms and conventions changes over time. As Hepokoski and Darcy themselves point out, '[w]hat was a deformation in Beethoven could become a lower-level default in Schumann, Liszt, or Wagner' (2006, p. 11).[15] At the very least, therefore, the norm should be updated according to the specific repertoire one wants to analyse. But one could also question the dialogic model's very premise that a given repertoire should be measured against an external norm. Shouldn't the norm against which a composer's practice is measured include that practice itself as well? If one composer consistently does something different from what everyone else does, then what is normative to whom?[16]

In spite of the problems with the negative approach it would be naive to think that one can simply codify a distinct normative practice of musical form for each new generation of composers in the nineteenth century. Nineteenth-century composers were very much aware of the music of their Classical forebears, and the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven was among the first repertoires to retain a continuous presence in the musical canon beyond their composers' lifetime. From the mid-1820s onwards – that is, as the composers of the Romantic generation were embarking on their careers – a select number of works by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven were increasingly held up as a norm. It is hardly a coincidence that the normative term 'Classical', which until then had been used only in an ahistorical sense, now began to refer to a historically specific repertoire.[17] This repertoire was available to nineteenth-century composers in much the same way as it is to us.

What is ultimately needed is a theoretical model in which the negative and positive approaches to nineteenth-century form can coexist. Seth Monahan has recently distinguished between 'two competing models of historical influence' in relation to musical form in the nineteenth century: a linear and – in reference to Carl Dahlhaus's view of the symphony after Beethoven – a circumpolar one. In the former model, he writes, 'compositional devices follow a natural lifespan through novelty, normalcy, and finally cliché', while in the latter, 'some cultural watershed exerts a direct ... influence across successive generations' (Monahan 2011b, p. 40). It seems to me that the form of any given nineteenth-century work can be adequately interpreted only by combining both perspectives. This multi-dimensional model might be conceptualised as a set of concentric circles, at the centre of which stand the Classical norms and conventions casting, as a kind of *prima prattica*, a long shadow across the nineteenth century. The outer circles stand for a multifarious *seconda prattica*, with every circle representing the normative practice of a different period (including a composer's personal practice). With each new generation of composers, the canon grows, and a new layer is added to the stack of available formal options. For any specific piece, a composer may choose to activate – or, perhaps more accurately, the analyst may choose to emphasise – certain sets of conventions while ignoring others.

I have allowed myself this long digression because I believe that in the long run, one of the most valuable aspects of *In the Process of Becoming* will turn out to be that a multidimensional approach to nineteenth-century form is lurking just beneath its surface. Although Schmalfeldt refuses to construct a positively formulated theory of Romantic form, her analyses do offer some of the building blocks which might eventually allow others to do so. In order to bring this aspect of her book to the fore, I will first show how her analytical language at times bespeaks discomfort with the one-dimensional 'Classical-norm-versus-Romantic-deformation' model. Then I will focus on two of the typically Romantic form-functional situations she discusses.

Of the opening of Schubert's Piano Sonata in A minor, D. 845, Schmalfeldt writes: 'when held to the light of Classical formal principles, [it] conforms neither with a slow introduction nor with any conventional type of Classical theme ... ; the conception is uniquely postclassical' (p. 121). Although the term 'postclassical' still implies a pointed reference to a Classical procedure which is somehow altered, the qualifying adverb 'uniquely' suggests that she really understands Schubert's procedure as something *sui generis*. Describing it with the analytical vocabulary we use for Classical form is possible, but that serves only to highlight how radically this music differs from the Classical norm – to such an extent that the relationship between the two loses much of its explanatory force.

Several chapters later, Schmalfeldt echoes her comment on Schubert's opening when describing bars 5–8 of Chopin's G minor Mazurka, Op. 67 No. 2, as 'a notably *post*classical "continuation" ' (p. 199; emphasis in original). Again, the implication seems to be that the passage in question is unlike anything one would encounter in the Classical repertoire. What distinguishes this description

from the discussion of Schubert is its context. In the pages immediately preceding it, the Classical norm recedes further into the background than anywhere else in the book. This becomes very clear from the preceding analysis of the A minor Mazurka, Op. 17 No. 4, which Schmalfeldt reads against the backdrop of the earlier Mazurka in F♯ minor, Op. 6 No. 1. '[F]amiliarity with the Op. 6 Mazurka', she writes, 'might shed some light on what makes the initial sixteen-bar period of Chopin's A-minor Mazurka ... both novel and already nostalgic" ' (pp. 198–9). She then goes on to perform a similar move, albeit in more general terms, when discussing the aforementioned G minor Mazurka, which she explicitly hears '[i]n the light of other, earlier mazurkas' (p. 200). The tacit methodological shift behind this is quite fundamental: Chopin's own oeuvre, not the Classical repertoire, becomes the primary context within which to interpret one of his works; the dialogue is no longer (or not only) between a nineteenth-century piece and a Classical norm, but (also) between a nineteenth-century work and a nineteenth-century norm.

Schmalfeldt introduces in the Chopin chapter one of only a few specifically nineteenth-century analytical categories she uses: the 'nineteenth-century half cadence' (short form: '19cHC' [p. 202]). By this she means 'a local form-defining arrival on the dominant that, unlike the typical goal of Classical half cadences, includes its seventh' (pp. 202–3). In the Classical style, dominant seventh chords which conclude half-cadential progressions are rare. When they do occur, the progression either is not considered a cadence (Caplin instead uses the term 'dominant arrival' [e.g. 1998, p. 79]) or is likely to be interpreted as a deformation of the more standard 'seventhless' half cadence. Half-cadential progressions leading to a dominant seventh chord occur more frequently in the nineteenth century; although Schmalfeldt introduces the term in relation to Chopin, one is equally likely to find examples in Schubert, Mendelssohn or the Schumanns. A change in status is therefore in order: rather than as deformations of the standard eighteenth-century half cadence, half cadences with dominant sevenths now qualify as fully functional and satisfactory cadential situations in their own right.

The nineteenth-century half cadence is obviously a useful concept, but it also raises questions Schmalfeldt does not address. Although half-cadential dominants with sevenths are no longer rare in nineteenth-century music, they remain significantly less common than standard (seventhless) ones. Are both variants then to be considered functionally equivalent? The very term 'nineteenth-century half cadence' seems to suggest that they are not. But then what is the nature of the distinction? Are half cadences with dominant sevenths less stable than seventhless ones? Are they more commonly used in certain form-functional situations than in others? Would it make sense to think of them as relating to seventhless half cadences the same way that imperfect authentic cadences (IACs) relate to authentic ones, thus giving rise to the term 'imperfect half cadence' or IHC, which seems more elegant than 'nineteenth-century half cadence'?

Another form-functional situation found in several examples in *In the Process of Becoming* is that which I propose to call the 'large-scale sentence with periodic

presentation'. Although instances of this formal type can be found in the eighteenth century, it becomes much more common in early nineteenth-century music and can thus be considered more characteristic of Romantic form. One of the axioms of Caplin's theory of Classical form is that the presentation phrase of a sentence in principle does not contain any cadences. (Because Caplin detaches the concept of cadence from the definition of phrase, he can still claim that a presentation constitutes a phrase.) When cadences do crop up in presentations, they are deemed to have 'limited cadential scope' (Caplin 2004, pp. 86–9). Such cadences occur, for instance, in what Hepokoski and Darcy have felicitously called 'Mozartian loops': a presentation type in which both the basic idea and its repetition end with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) which is elided with the onset of the next unit; examples include the main themes from the Piano Sonata in C major, K. 279/i, and the Piano Concerto in E♭ major, K. 279/i. Like Caplin, Hepokoski and Darcy consider these cadences to be 'incapable of serving as structural goals that conclude the broader musical idea', because both of them are 'undone' by what follows (2006, pp. 84–5).

In early nineteenth-century music, cadences within presentations can be of a very different nature. One example is the main theme of Beethoven's *Bridgetower* Sonata (Ex. 1). This theme begins with a nine-bar unit (bars 19–27) leading to an IAC (in III) which is then repeated and leads to a PAC (again in III). As Schmalfeldt explains, both units together form a presentation which, in conjunction with the continuation that follows (bars 37–45), becomes a large-scale sentence that concludes with a PAC (now in the tonic) which is elided with the onset of the transition (p. 97). The difference with Mozartian loops is clear: in Beethoven's theme, the cadences at the end of the initiating nine-bar unit and its repetition are not elided and therefore cannot be considered to be undone. As the conclusion of nine-bar chunks, moreover, they can hardly be said to be of limited scope. Rather, they appear as a correlate of this music's expanded scale, which gives rise to the presence of an additional formal level. At the lowest level in Beethoven's theme, one can still identify a regular two-bar basic idea (bars 19–20), which is immediately subject to fragmentation. This 'basic idea + fragmentation', however, constitutes a large-scale basic idea which resides at the formal level between the two-bar basic idea and the presentation (much like a compound basic idea in a compound sentence) and has become large enough to require its own cadential articulation. The risk, of course, is that the presence of cadences within the presentation will lead to confusion between different levels: because the large-scale basic idea and its repetition stand in an antecedent-consequent relationship which is articulated by cadences, the cadence at the end of the consequent might be mistaken for the end of the theme. To avoid this, Beethoven qualifies the periodic relationship between the large-scale basic idea and its repetition by letting both phrases modulate to the mediant, thus leaving sufficient openness for the following phrase to be perceived as a continuation rather than as the beginning of a new theme.

Ex. 1 Beethoven, Violin Sonata in A minor, op. 47 (*Bridgetower* [*Kreutzer*]), i: bars 19–45

Schmalfeldt proposes a similar analysis as one of several ways to come to terms with the formally much more ambiguous opening of Schubert's A minor Piano Sonata. '[W]e might be prepared', she writes, 'to regard the two half cadences [bars 4 and 10] as ones of "limited scope", while reinterpreting the two antecedent phrases as the expansive presentation of a large, compound basic idea (CBI, bars 1–4) and its expanded repetition (bars 5–10). If this is what we perceive, we will then be expecting a continuation of comparable length' (p. 120). In her example, Schmalfeldt indeed provides bar 10 with the label 'continuation', albeit with a question mark. That question mark is understandable: entirely standing on the dominant, bars 10–25 make for a very atypical continuation and in fact behave more like a contrasting middle. Indeed, it would have been theoretically possible (although perhaps hard to imagine) for the movement's opening to return at bar 26, rather than the new theme that becomes the transition.[18] An analysis as a large-scale sentence with periodic presentation works better for the movement's second subordinate theme (bars 64–77), and given Schmalfeldt's emphasis on the connection between this theme and the movement's opening, it is surprising that she does not make that analysis herself. In this theme, a four-bar phrase leading to an HC is followed by a repetition of that phrase (its beginning repeated sequentially up a whole tone) leading to an IAC, thus forming a period (Ex. 2). The IAC leaves room for a third phrase, a varied and expanded restatement of the first; leading to an even stronger cadence, it can be heard as a continuation.[19]

An even more expansive theme that falls squarely into the category of the large-scale sentence with periodic presentation is the first subordinate theme from Schubert's *Lebensstürme* Allegro (bars 89–133; Ex. 3). Again, Schmalfeldt's analysis is suggestive. She describes bars 89–103 as 'an eight-bar phrase and its varied repetition'. Because of their 'more active character', bars 104–117 'seem to be responding to [bars 89–103] in the manner of a continuation relative to a presentation' and lead to a PAC, which is followed by the 'codetta-like' bars 117–133 (p. 141). Schmalfeldt does not discuss the cadential organisation of bars 89–103 (the presentation), but in her musical example the annotation IAC appears below bar 103. From this it can be inferred that the parallel place in the original phrase is an IAC as well, albeit one that is off-tonic. The combination of two parallel phrases that both end with a cadence – the first weaker, the second stronger – projects a periodic structure. The IAC at bar 103 prevents that period from achieving full closure, which is attained only with the PAC at the end of the continuation.

Reifying analytical categories in this manner goes against the grain of Schmalfeldt's 'analytic and piece-specific' project. She brings both of the categories I discussed above into play almost in passing and with no interest in their theorisation. As I mentioned before, she does not raise any of the questions I pose about the nineteenth-century half cadence, and she does not even have a name for what I call the large-scale sentence with periodic presentation. But it seems to me that one way future scholarship on early nineteenth-century form can

Ex. 2 Schubert, Allegro in A minor for Piano Four-Hands, Op. 144 (D. 944) (*Lebensstürme*): bars 89–107

Ex. 2 Continued

Ex. 3 Schubert, Piano Sonata in A minor, op. 42 (D. 845), i: bars 64–77

build upon the mass of analytical data that Schmalfeldt has assembled is to undertake exactly the kind of typological and taxonomic work that she eschews – in short, to turn her analytical work into theory.

The Notion of 'Becoming'

Schmalfeldt's central analytical category is the one that she deems most typically Romantic: 'If indeed a "theory of nineteenth-century form" can one day be produced', she writes in her introductory chapter, 'I ... argue here that one of its principal tenets must be the idea of processual approaches to form' (p. 15). She

traces the philosophical origins of this idea back to the German idealism of Hegel and Friedrich Schlegel and finds it fully developed in the first volume of the former's *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse* (1817). There, she explains, 'becoming unites the imagining of a concept and of its opposite – its negation, what it is not – in such a way that they "overturn into one another", thus losing their "one-sidedness"; the mental synthesis that results at once *cancels* but also *preserves* the distinction between the two'. Hegel's term for 'the result of the process of becoming', she continues, is '[t]he verb *aufheben*'. This she clarifies as follows: 'At the moment when one grasps that becoming has united a concept and its opposite, or negative, then all three elements – the one-sided concept, its opposite and becoming itself – vanish. And *what has become* [*das Gewordene*] is a new moment – a stage, a synthesis – in which the original concept and its opposite are no longer fixed and separate, but rather identical, determinations, in the sense that the one cannot be thought, or posited, outside the context of the other' (p. 10).

Hegel himself does not use the concept of becoming in connection to music. In order to legitimise its music-analytical appropriation, Schmalfeldt therefore reconstructs a 'Beethoven-Hegelian tradition' (pp. 23–37) that begins with E.T.A. Hoffmann and A.B. Marx and culminates in Dahlhaus, whose famous analytical musings on the opening of Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata function as the springboard for her own work (Dahlhaus 1980a, pp. 11–13; 1980b; and 1987, pp. 45–6, 122–3, 152–4, 210–12). To express 'becoming' in analytical terms, Schmalfeldt uses the double-lined right arrow (⇒), which she borrows from symbolic logic (p. 9) and which has gained broad currency in analytical literature since her initial use of it (in Schmalfeldt 1995). She is, however, reticent to offer an elaborate definition of what 'becoming' means, analytically speaking. Except for the initial formulation cited above (that 'becoming' refers to 'the special case whereby the formal function initially suggested by a musical idea, phrase, or section invites retrospective reinterpretation within the larger formal context'), Schmalfeldt largely leaves it to the reader to tease out its intended valence from its particular analytical deployments.

One thing that becomes clear from reading *In the Process of Becoming* is that those deployments are extremely varied – much more so, in fact, than in Schmalfeldt (1995). In the book, the symbol ⇒ can signal instances not only of formal, but also of harmonic, cadential and even motivic reinterpretation or transformation. In her Ex. 3.12 (p. 81), for instance, which reproduces a portion of the trio 'Cosa sento' from Act I of Mozart's *Figaro*, the annotation ⇒ from bar 23 to 24 indicates that the F major chord which initially appears as the final dominant in an HC in B♭ major becomes, in the next bar, a major tonic that is obtained through modal mixture in F minor (and then immediately becomes an applied dominant to the iv that appears in the next bar, although this second instance of becoming is not shown in the annotations). In Ex. 6.4 (p. 140), from Schubert's *Lebensstürme* Allegro, the symbol shows how the unison G♯ at the end of the transition (bars 85–86) – the third in an incomplete downwards

arpeggiation of a dominant seventh chord in A major – is renotated in the next bar as A♭, which at bar 89 reveals its new function as the root of a tonic chord in the key that opens the movement's subordinate theme group. Finally, in Ex. 6.7 (pp. 145–46), from the *Arioso dolente* portion of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in A♭ major, Op. 110/iii, ⇒ highlights how a dominant seventh chord in A♭ major becomes a German augmented sixth chord in G minor at bar 113.

Schmalfeldt's parametrically broad usage of 'becoming' is complemented by a chronologically inclusive application. As I have emphasised above, she devotes an entire chapter to how instances of musical processuality can be found not only in music of the early nineteenth century, but as early as in works by Haydn, Clementi and Mozart. This is not new: the notion of retrospective reinterpretation and its symbol ⇒ appear with some regularity in Caplin (1998), and as Caplin acknowledges, his use of the symbol was inspired by Schmalfeldt in the first place. Relevant categories discussed by Caplin include the continuation⇒cadential, the reinterpreted HC, several of the strategies that can be used to initiate a transition (A.B. Marx's period with dissolving consequent, the false closing section that becomes a transition and the small ternary with dissolving reprise) and the false closing section that becomes a subordinate theme (CS⇒ST).[20] Most of these categories are quite common in eighteenth-century music, and all of them survive into the early nineteenth century. Schmalfeldt rarely misses an opportunity to highlight them when they occur in the works she analyses; thus she provides good examples of a continuation⇒cadential in Schubert's *Lebensstürme* Allegro (Ex. 6.2, p. 138), of a CS⇒ST in the first movement of the *Tempest* Sonata (Ex. 2.4, p. 47) and the finale of Mendelssohn's Octet (Ex. 7.9, p. 177) and of a reinterpreted HC in Schumann's C major Fantasie (Ex. 9.10, p. 253).

At times, Schmalfeldt's usage of becoming suggests a purely phenomenological understanding of the category, and therefore an even more generalised applicability. Consider her discussion of the opening of Mendelssohn's Piano Trio in D minor, Op. 49. She begins by explaining how the movement's first sixteen bars can be heard as a sentence (p. 164). When discussing the next group of sixteen bars, she remarks that, from the vantage point of the latter (i.e. retrospectively), the 'opening sentence is "becoming" an antecedent type ... relative to the continuation now at hand' (p. 166). When used in this manner, process becomes virtually tantamount to musical form: form *is* process, always and everywhere. Upon sounding, the main theme of a sonata-form exposition – *any* sonata-form exposition – is not given, but comes into being over time. One first hears a two-bar basic idea. Depending on what follows – a repetition of the same basic idea or a completion by means of a contrasting idea – this becomes either a presentation or a compound basic idea (and, if the contrasting idea leads to a weak cadence, an antecedent). In the case of a presentation, the options for what comes next are limited: almost invariably, a continuation will ensue. An antecedent, however, may be followed by either a consequent or a continuation, and thus become either a period or a hybrid. There are even more possibilities if the first four bars

constitute a compound basic idea, which may be followed either by a consequent or by a continuation (thus becoming a hybrid), but which may also be repeated in its entirety, thus becoming an eight-bar presentation, which will itself become a compound sentence when it is followed by a continuation. If any of these eight or sixteen-bar spans concludes with an HC, it may become the antecedent of a compound period. And so on. In musical form, so it seems, nothing is ever sure until it is over. The function of a given unit becomes fully apparent only in light of its context, and because that context includes what follows that given unit, form-functional interpretation is always necessarily partly retrospective.

All of Schmalfeldt's usages of the symbol ⇒ are accurately described in terms of becoming and retrospective reinterpretation, even though some of them verge on the trivial.[21] Moreover, Schmalfeldt's comprehensive usage of both notions handsomely highlights the ubiquity of processes of reinterpretation in the music she discusses as well as the continuity between the formal vocabularies of the Classical and Romantic styles. Some of it, however, sits uneasily with her claim that processuality is, above all, a hallmark of Romantic form. One wonders how, if at all, becoming in nineteenth-century music differs from becoming in the late eighteenth century. Are processes that invite retrospective reinterpretation more pervasive in nineteenth-century music? Do nineteenth-century composers use new strategies of formal processuality in addition to the existing ones? Does retrospective reinterpretation in nineteenth-century music involve higher levels of form than in earlier music? Or is it simply that the processual approach appeals particularly to early twenty-first-century analytical sensibility, in which case we are talking not so much about something that is in the music, but about an analytical perspective that can be applied to various repertoires?

More important, Schmalfeldt's comprehensive usage of the concept of becoming risks detracting attention from what is unique and original about her approach: the emphasis on aspects of form-functional ambiguity and even conflict that are inherent in certain instances of retrospective reinterpretation. While that emphasis was very prominent in her 1995 *Tempest* article, and still is in the reworked version of that text in *In the Process of Becoming*, it is much less pronounced in the rest of the volume. I will therefore revisit Schmalfeldt (1995) 'one more time', in an attempt to clarify how retrospective reinterpretation and form-functional becoming in Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata differ from many of the other situations that are collapsed into these concepts.

The details of Schmalfeldt's analysis are well-known. In the exposition of the *Tempest* Sonata, she identifies three different instances of becoming: in bars 1–21 introduction ⇒ main theme, in bars 21–41 main theme ⇒ transition and in bars 63–87 codettas ⇒ presentation (or, at a larger level, closing section ⇒ subordinate theme 2). Although these three instances of retrospective reinterpretation are in fact quite dissimilar, ambiguity plays a role in each of them. The most straightforward situation obtains in bars 63–87, Schmalfeldt's analysis of which can be summarised as follows. The two three-bar groups in bars 63–68 initially sound as if 'a postcadential codetta and its repetition have begun' (p. 48). When,

however, the unit beginning at bar 69 is revealed to be a continuation, 'the idea of codettas must ... be abandoned, if not forgotten', and the preceding six bars are retrospectively reinterpreted as the presentation of a second subordinate theme in the form of a sentence (*ibid.*). The ambiguity in this passage thus originates in a conflict between intrinsic and contextual formal functionality: although the intrinsic features of bars 63–68 suggest closing function, their function in the larger context of bars 63–87 is initiating.[22]

The situation in itself is no different from what Caplin describes as a 'false closing section ... that is revealed retrospectively to function as the beginning of a new subordinate theme' (1998, p. 123).[23] Yet Schmalfeldt's understanding of the passage differs from an orthodox Caplinian analysis in one small but significant detail. In its Caplinian variant, retrospective reinterpretation presents formal ambiguity as a momentary and transient phenomenon. Listeners may initially have the impression that they are dealing with a closing section, but by the end of the unit, it is made clear ('revealed') that this initial impression was 'false'. Like an illusion dispelled by the truth, the formal function that seemed to be present at the beginning is entirely superseded by the one that is there at the end and that, retrospectively, turns out to have been there all along: the beginning of the unit may look like a codetta and its repetition, but it really is the presentation of a sentential subordinate theme. For Schmalfeldt, by contrast, the initial impression is not erased – it is 'abandoned' but not 'forgotten'. As she emphasises in a different but related context, 'there is nothing false about the codettas' (p. 283, n. 34).

Form-functional ambiguity works very differently in bars 21–41, Schmalfeldt's MT⇒TR. Taken on their own, these bars in no way seem to necessitate a retrospective reinterpretation: the entire unit, from the beginning, is a perfectly acceptable and even typical transition. Long before the modulation gets under way, a listener familiar with the conventions of the Classical style will have recognised the signs – the elided PAC in the tonic, the *forte* affirmation, the forward-driving energy. There is, in other words, no ambiguity in the unit itself; it comes into being only from the confrontation with the preceding one. Whether a listener will hear bars 21–41 as an MT⇒TR or as a TR right away thus depends entirely on that listener's willingness to accept the preceding unit as an MT. If he or she doesn't, like Schmalfeldt, it is an MT⇒TR; if the listener does, like Caplin and Hepokoski in their responses to Schmalfeldt's analysis, it is just a TR.

In the entire *Tempest* debate, therefore, the crux of the matter remains that bars 1–21 are as unlike a main theme as things can get in early nineteenth-century music, no matter how passionately both Caplin and Hepokoski contest this.[24] As Schmalfeldt triumphantly points out in her rebuttal of both authors' response to her analysis: '*neither Caplin nor Hepokoski offers a single precedent for a compound-tempo main theme*' (p. 54; the gleeful italics are Schmalfeldt's). To infer from this that for Schmalfeldt bars 1–21 are intrinsically an introduction would be to underestimate the sophistication of her analysis: the point is not that bars

1–21 appear to be an introduction that is retrospectively reinterpreted as a main theme when the realisation dawns that bars 21–41 are a transition. That view, in fact, is closer to Dahlhaus's original analysis, which she takes as a point of departure: Dahlhaus sees only introductory elements in the opening bars, so for him the conflict really is between the intrinsic features of bars 1–21 and their position in the whole. Schmalfeldt improves considerably upon Dahlhaus's analysis by presenting the analytical data that allow one to see the conflict within bars 1–21 themselves: they are problematic not so much in relation to the rest of the piece, but mainly because they contain within themselves both introductory and main-theme features that allow them to express both functions simultane-ously. They are neither an introduction nor a main theme, exactly because they are both an introduction and a main theme; they are entirely *sui generis* and thus, as Schmalfeldt puts it, 'eminently worthy of a new formal category' (p. 55).

Schmalfeldt's discussion of the opening of the *Tempest* Sonata culminates in the most profound and overtly Hegelian account of the process of becoming in her book. 'Once the moment of becoming has been grasped', she writes, 'neither the concept nor its opposite can remain one-sided, in the sense of fixed and separate; rather, main theme can no longer be imagined outside the context of introduction. This, then, is how I wish to use the expression "introduction becomes main theme": rather than favouring the notion of a main theme as the final verdict, the expression suggests that what has become preserves our memory of the original conflict' (p. 50). In this formulation, which closely resembles Schmalfeldt's thumbnail Hegel exegesis cited above, form as the process of becoming really becomes a form-functional equivalent to Hegel's *Aufhebung*. Its final sentence, however, seems contradictory: its first half states that no final verdict should be favoured, but the wording in the second half suggests exactly the opposite. The phrase 'what has become' (rather than 'becoming') implies an endpoint – an endpoint, moreover, that preserves only the memory of the original conflict, suggesting that the conflict lies in the past. It is in this nuance that my view on the opening of the *Tempest* Sonata differs from Schmalfeldt's: as I have argued elsewhere, citing Dahlhaus (1987, pp. 153–4), 'both interpretations – as an introduction and as a main theme – come to stand next to each other in such a way that "the decision for one or the other would be inadequate to the formal idea of the work". Instead of a harmonic relationship, this engenders an insoluble tension that has to be endured' (Vande Moortele 2009b, p. 304).

Schmalfeldt does not want to go this far. Her reading of Hegel emphasises the moment of synthesis, of reconciliation. But she would probably agree that a more radical understanding of form-functional becoming resonates well with a passage Hegel added to the 1827 and 1830 versions of his *Enzyklopädie* following the one she draws upon when she first introduces the notion of becoming. Elaborating upon the relation between being and nothing, Hegel writes: '*[B]ecoming* is the true expression of the result of being and nothing. It is not only the *unity* of being and nothing, but the *unrest* in itself – the unity that as relation

to itself is not merely immobile, but is within itself against itself in account of the difference of being and nothing contained in it' ([1830] 2010, p. 143; emphasis in original).[25]

In the Process of Becoming is not your typical North American music-theory book. It does not present a method that one can take and apply to something else. It offers no ready-made solutions and leaves the reader with many more questions than it answers. These, however, are also the book's merits. Offering an analytical Grand Tour of early nineteenth-century music, Schmalfeldt's study sets out the beacons for future research in this domain, which will build upon her work, answer the questions it raises and fill in the gaps she leaves open.

One obvious way in which to build upon *In the Process of Becoming* is to expand the repertoire Schmalfeldt covers, for her tour is selective, both geographically and generically. With the exception of Clara Schumann, she only writes about what could be called 'Schenker Germans' – a category that includes Chopin but excludes, say, Liszt and Wagner. Moreover, her repertoire choice neatly fits into the pianist's backpack (in that sense, it actually is fairly typical of North American music theory): of the 21 nineteenth-century pieces she discusses in sufficient detail to warrant the inclusion of at least one musical example,[26] ten are for piano solo and one for piano four-hands, four are chamber music works with piano and three are piano-accompanied Lieder. Only three of the works Schmalfeldt discusses – all by Mendelssohn – do not involve a piano, and of these, only Mendelssohn's Octet, Op. 20, is the subject of a substantial discussion.

All but entirely absent from Schmalfeldt's sample are early nineteenth-century music's most prestigious public genres – opera and orchestral music (which includes overtures and concertos as well as symphonies); the only exception is a single-paragraph discussion of Mendelssohn's *Midsummer Night's Dream* Overture (p. 188). While Schmalfeldt's lack of attention for orchestral music is at least understandable when it comes to the Romantic symphony (reflecting as it does reservations about that genre already held by the composers themselves), it becomes bizarre when taking into account other orchestral genres. The qualms composers such as Mendelssohn and Schumann had about their symphonic endeavours are entirely outflanked by the vivacity of the 'para-symphonic' genre of the concert overture, and, in its wake, a rejuvenated opera overture: Mendelssohn wrote about fifteen overtures, Schumann seven. And as soon as the overture comes into the picture, one can no longer ignore composers such as Berlioz and especially Wagner, who wrote fifteen (twelve of which have survived) between 1830 and 1845 (see Vande Moortele 2013). Likewise, ongoing work by Julian Horton on the concerto demands attention for a very lively repertoire in the first half of the nineteenth century that we have come to think of as marginal, but without which our understanding of the more famous concertos by Chopin, Schumann and Mendelssohn remains one-sided (see Horton 2011). And as soon as one starts talking about the concerto, one has to include Liszt.

One can hardly blame Schmalfeldt for focusing on the repertoire she knows best. But it would be worth investigating the ways in which the same issues that are so important in the piano works, chamber music and songs she analyses play out in the era's genres for larger forces. Such an investigation could show how Beethoven's *Eroica* constitutes a symphonic counterpart to the *Tempest* and *Bridgetower* sonatas, how Mendelssohn's *Hebrides* Overture arguably features as moving a case of 'turning inward' as any chamber or piano work by Schubert, and how Schumann's Piano Concerto is as complex a large-scale form as his C major Fantasie – to name only orchestral works by composers that Schmalfeldt discusses.

The other challenge for future research will be to construct a theoretical framework for Schmalfeldt's analytical work on early nineteenth-century music, a theory of Romantic form that defines in a positive manner the practice of successive generations of composers without losing track of the ongoing relevance of earlier norms and conventions. If it is to account properly for what is going on in this music, such a theoretical model will have to be open and dynamic rather than closed and stable. Friedrich Schlegel's words on Romantic poetry, which Schmalfeldt cites in her introductory chapter, can easily be transferred to Romantic music: 'The romantic kind of poetry is still in the state of becoming: that, in fact, is its real essence: that it should forever be becoming and never be perfected' (Schlegel 1971, p. 175).[27] Schmalfeldt's analytical and piece-specific search for Romantic form takes this statement to heart. But perhaps it is meaningful that she decides to cut the quotation off before the beginning of Schlegel's next sentence: 'It can be exhausted by no theory' (*ibid.*).[28]

NOTES

1. Ironically, the revival is slower to catch on in German-speaking Europe, despite Holtmeier's recent description of form as 'the most "German" of ... theory topics' (2009, p. 8). It is significant that the tome titled *Musiktheorie* in the multivolume *Handbuch der systematischen Musikwissenschaft* (de la Motte-Haber and Schwab-Felisch, 2005) does not mention form (or *Formenlehre*) at all.

2. I borrow the term 'new *Formenlehre*' from Riley (2010).

3. A recent example that also provides ample citation of other relevant work is Monahan (2011b). For further references, see the bibliography in Vande Moortele (2009a).

4. These include, in chronological order: Haney (2004), Black (2005 and 2009), Hyland (2009), Martin (2010), Horton (2011), Horton and Wingfield (2012) and Vande Moortele (2013).

5. Janet Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). xi + 288 pp. £32.50 (hb.) ISBN 978-0-19-509366-7.

6. The bibliography in Caplin (1998), for example, lists it as forthcoming.

7. The special issue of *Music Theory Online* on 'Form as Process' (2010) includes an introduction by Ravenscroft and articles by Reddick, Lee, Caplin and Hepokoski, as well as responses to each by Schmalfeldt. The issue appeared too late for a reference to be included in Schmalfeldt's book, even though the final pages of Ch. 2 are a reordered but otherwise only slightly revised version of her contribution to that debate.

8. For different accounts of Schmalfeldt's book, see Hansberry (2011), Monahan (2011a), Bergé (2013) and Mak (2013); for a recent application of her analytical approach, see Richards (2012).

9. On *locker* and *fest gefügt* see Schoenberg (1995, pp. 176–9) and Ratz (1973, pp. 21 and 30).

10. At a plenary session organised by Bergé and co-moderated by Burstein, Caplin and Hepokoski, along with Webster, each presented a position paper as well as responses to each other's work. The papers and responses were subsequently printed, with rebuttals, in Caplin, Hepokoski and Webster (2009), which has quickly established itself as a landmark publication.

11. On sonata theory's 'neologising impulse', see Wingfield (2008), pp. 166–9.

12. Hepokoski and Darcy are clear about this. 'In addition to furnishing a new mode of analysis for the late-eighteenth-century instrumental repertory', they write, 'the *Elements* also provides a foundation for considering works from the decades to come – late Beethoven, Schubert, Weber, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Liszt, Brahms, Bruckner, Strauss, Mahler, the "nationalist composers", and so on. As we point out from time to time, most of [the late-eighteenth-century] sonata norms remained in place as regulative ideas throughout the nineteenth century' (2006, p. vii).

13. For a case study (on Mendelssohn), see Rosen (1995, pp. 569–90).

14. Horton and Wingfield (2012, pp. 87–93) make a similar point.

15. As I have argued elsewhere, however, Hepokoski and Darcy do not put this point into analytical practice as much as they could. See Vande Moortele (2009a, p. 4).

16. In their earliest joint publication, Hepokoski and Darcy allow for the possibility that something be no longer regarded as deformational 'in the

hands of any later composers who determined to make it a common option in their own personalised styles' (1997, p. 131). The point does not seem to be explicitly retained in *Elements of Sonata Theory*.

17. The first use of the term in this sense seems to have been by the Göttingen philosopher A.J.G. Wendt (1836). On the conceptual history of 'Classical', see Eggebrecht (1998).

18. An additional objection against an interpretation as a 'periodic presentation' is that both phrases end on an HC.

19. Strictly speaking, the antecedent ends not with an HC but with a premature dominant arrival. Schmalfeldt also qualifies her label PAC under bar 77 with a question mark.

20. See Caplin (1998, pp. 43, 57, 128–9, 129, 131 and 124). Caplin does not use the symbol ⇒ (or the concept of reinterpretation) in his discussions of main theme/transition and transition/subordinate theme fusion. All of Caplin's dissolving transition openings are also discussed by Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, pp. 101–11), who add three further categories: the sentence with dissolving continuation, the dissolving restatement (of a continuation or consequent that has been sounded in its entirety before) and, building on Caplin's terminology, the dissolving hybrid. Their use of the symbol ⇒ (which they erroneously attribute to Caplin instead of Schmalfeldt) in this context is limited to the general formula P⇒TR.

21. Consider, for instance, the cases of harmonic reinterpretation listed above: in the Mozart, ⇒ stands for a pivot-chord modulation, in the Beethoven, for an enharmonic reinterpretation. Even Schubert's admittedly quite spectacular reinterpretation of $\hat{7}$ in A major as $\hat{1}$ in A♭ major is, from another perspective, nothing but an uncommon common-tone modulation.

22. On intrinsic versus contextual formal functionality, see Vallières, Tan, Caplin, Shenker and McAdams (2008).

23. It is important to note that Caplin himself disagrees with the analysis of this particular passage in these terms. See Caplin (2009b, pp. 109–10).

24. This paragraph nuances my earlier and partly misfired critique of Schmalfeldt's analysis. Compare Vande Moortele (2009b, pp. 303–4).

25. 'So ist Werden nicht nur die Einheit des Seyns und Nichts, sonders es ist die Unruhe in sich – die Einheit, die nicht blos als Beziehung-auf-sich bewegungslos, sondern durch die Verschiedenheit des Seyns und Nichts, die in ihm ist, in sich gegen sich selbst ist' ([1830] 1992, 128). The wording in the 1830 version, cited here, differs from that in the 1827 edition.

26. I exclude from this list the four eighteenth-century pieces discussed in Ch. 3 as well as those pieces that, although an example is provided, are mainly used as a foil for the discussion of other ones.

27. 'Die romantische Dichtart ist noch im Werden; ja das ist ihr eigentliches Wesen, daß sie ewig nur werden, nie vollendet sein kann' (Schlegel [1798] 1958, p. 38).

28. 'Sie kann durch keine Theorie erschöpft werden' (*ibid.*)

REFERENCES

Bergé, Pieter (ed.), 2012: *Beethoven's* Tempest *Sonata (First Movement): Five Annotated Analyses for Performers and Scholars* (Leuven: Peeters).

____, 2013: '[Review of] Janet Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music*', *Dutch Journal of Music Theory*, 18/ii, pp. 110–4.

Bergé, Pieter; Caplin, William E. and D'Hoe, Jeroen (eds), 2009: *Beethoven's* Tempest *Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance* (Leuven: Peeters).

Black, Brian, 2005: 'Remembering a Dream: the Tragedy of Romantic Memory in the Modulatory Processes of Schubert's Sonata Forms', *Intersections*, 25/i–ii, pp. 202–28.

____, 2009: 'The Functions of Harmonic Motives in Schubert's Sonata Forms', *Intégral*, 23, pp. 1–63.

Caplin, William E., 1998: *Classical Form: a Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

____, 2004: 'The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 57/i, pp. 51–117.

____, 2009a: '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), pp. 21–40.

____, 2009b: 'Beethoven's *Tempest* Exposition: a Springboard for Form-Functional Considerations', in Pieter Bergé, William E. Caplin and Jeroen D'Hoe (eds), *Beethoven's* Tempest *Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 87–125.

____, 2010: 'Beethoven's "Tempest" Exposition: a Response to Janet Schmalfeldt', *Music Theory Online*, 16/ii, www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.2/toc.16.2.html.

Caplin, William; Hepokoski, James and Webster, James, 2009: *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press).

Dahlhaus, Carl, 1980a: *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Athenaion and Laaber: Laaber).

____, 1980b: 'Zur Formidee in Beethovens d-moll-Sonate Opus 31/2', *Die Musikforschung*, 33/iii, pp. 310–12.

____, 1987: *Ludwig van Beethoven und seine Zeit* (Laaber: Laaber).

de la Motte-Haber, Helga and Schwab-Felisch, Oliver (eds), 2005: *Musiktheorie* (*Handbuch der systematischen Musikwissenschaft*, 2) (Laaber: Laaber).

Drabkin, William, 2007: 'Mostly Mozart', *Musical Times*, 148/1901, pp. 89–100.

Eggebrecht, Hans Heinrich, 1998: 'Klassisch, Klassik', in Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, Albrecht Riethmüller and Markus Bandur (eds), *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie*, 27th installment (Stuttgart: Steiner), pp. 1–11.

Haney, Joel, 2004: 'Navigating Sonata Space in Mendelssohn's *Meeresstille und glückliche Fahrt*,' *19th-Century Music*, 28/ii, pp. 108–32.

Hansberry, Benjamin, 2011: [Review of Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming*], *Current Musicology*, 92, pp. 111–18.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, [1817] 2000: Wolfgang Bonsiepen and Klaus Grotsch (eds), in collaboration with Hans-Christian Lucas and Udo Rameil, *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse (1817)*, Vol. 13 of *Gesammelte Werke* (Hamburg: Meiner).

____, [1827] 1989: Wolfgang Bonsiepen and Hans-Christian Lucas (eds), *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse (1827)*, Vol. 19 of *Gesammelte Werke* (Hamburg: Meiner).

____, [1830] 1992: Wolfgang Bonsiepen and Hans-Christian Lucas (eds), in collaboration with Udo Rameil, *Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften im Grundrisse (1830)*, Vol. 20 of *Gesammelte Werke* (Hamburg: Meiner).

____, [1830] 2010: *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences in Basic Outline – Part I: Science of Logic*, trans. and ed. Klaus Brinkmann and Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hepokoski, James, 2010: 'Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form', in William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski and James Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press), pp. 71–89.

____, 2010: 'Formal Process, Sonata Theory, and the First Movement of Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata', *Music Theory Online*, 16/ii, www.mtosmt .org/issues/mto.10.16.2/toc.16.2.html.

Hepokoski, James and Darcy, Warren, 1997: 'The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 19/ii, pp. 115–54.

____, 2006: *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

Holtmeier, Ludwig, 2009: 'Preface', in William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski and James Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three*

Methodological Reflections, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press), pp. 7–9.

Horton, Julian, 2011: 'John Field and the Alternative History of Concerto First-Movement Form', *Music & Letters*, 92/i, pp. 43–83.

Horton, Julian and Wingfield, Paul, 2012: 'Between Tradition and Innovation: Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn's Sonata Forms', in Nicole Grimes and Angela Mace (eds), *Mendelssohn Perspectives* (Farnham: Ashgate), pp. 83–112.

Hyland, Anne, 2009: 'Rhetorical Closure in the First Movement of Schubert's Quartet in C major, D. 46: a Dialogue with Deformation', *Music Analysis*, 28/i, pp. 111–42.

Lee, Mike Cheng-Yu, 2010: 'A Response to Schmalfeldt's "Form as Process of Becoming": Once More on the Performance and Analysis of Schubert's Sonata in A minor, Op. 42', *Music Theory Online*, 16/ii, www.mtosmt.org/ issues/mto.10.16.2/toc.16.2.html.

Mak, Su Yin, 2013: '[Review of] Janet Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music*', *Journal of Music Theory*, 57/i, pp. 151–58.

Martin, Nathan John, 2010: 'Schumann's Fragment', *Indiana Theory Review*, 28/Spring–Fall, pp. 85–109.

____, 2011: [Review of Caplin, Hepokoski and Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre*], *Notes*, 67/iii, pp. 559–63.

Monahan, Seth, 2011a: 'Review of Janet Schmalfeldt: *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music*' *Music Theory Online*, 17/iii, http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.11. 17.3/mto.11.17.3.monahan.pdf.

____, 2011b: 'Success and Failure in Mahler's Sonata Recapitulations', *Music Theory Spectrum*, 33/i, pp. 37–58.

Neuwirth, Markus, 2011: 'Joseph Haydn's "Witty" Play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*', *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie*, 8/i, http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx.

Ratz, Erwin, 1973: *Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre. Über Formprinzipien in den Inventionen J.S. Bachs und ihre Bedeutung für die Kompositionstechnik Beethovens*, 3rd edn (Vienna: Universal Edition).

Ravenscroft, Brenda, 2010: 'Form as Process: Celebrating the Work of Janet Schmalfeldt (Chair's Introduction)', *Music Theory Online*, 16/ii, www. mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.2/toc.16.2.html.

Reddick, Carissa, 2010: 'Becoming at a Deeper Level: Divisional Overlap in Sonata Forms from the Late Nineteenth Century', *Music Theory Online*, 16/ii, www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.2/toc.16.2.html.

Richards, Mark, 2012: 'Transforming Form: the Process of Becoming in the Scherzo of Beethoven's String Quartet, Op. 59, No. 1', *Indiana Theory Review*, 30/i, pp. 75–102.

Riley, Matthew, 2010: 'Hermeneutics and the New *Formenlehre*: an Interpretation of Haydn's "Oxford" Symphony, First Movement', *Eighteenth-Century Music*, 7/ii, pp. 199–219.

Rodgers, Stephen, 2009: *Form, Program, and Metaphor in the Music of Berlioz* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rosen, Charles, 1995: *The Romantic Generation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Schlegel, Friedrich, [1798] 1958: *Athenäum-Fragmente*, in Wolfdietrich Rasch (ed.), *Kritische Schriften* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag).

____, 1971: *'Lucinde' and the Fragments*, trans. Peter Firchow (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).

Schmalfeldt, Janet, 1991: 'Towards a Reconciliation of Schenkerian Concepts with Traditional and Recent Theories of Musical Form', *Music Analysis* 10/iii, pp. 233–87.

____, 1995: 'Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the *Tempest* Sonata', *Beethoven Forum*, 4, pp. 37–71.

____, 2011: *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

Schoenberg, Arnold, 1995: *The Musical Idea and the Logic, Technique, and Art of its Presentation*, trans. and ed. Patricia Carpenter and Severine Neff (New York: Columbia University Press).

Taylor, Benedict, 2012: *Mendelssohn, Time and Memory: the Romantic Conception of Cyclic Form* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Vallières, Michel; Tan, Daphne; Caplin, William E.; Shenker, Joseph and McAdams, Stephen, 2008: 'Intrinsic Formal Functionality: Perception of Mozart's Materials', in Costas Tsougras and Richard Parncutt (eds), *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Interdisciplinary Musicology*, Thessaloniki, 2–6 July 2008, http://web.auth.gr/cimo8/.

Vande Moortele, Steven, 2009a: *Two-Dimensional Sonata Form: Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Instrumental Works by Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky* (Leuven: Leuven University Press).

____, 2009b: 'The First Movement of Beethoven's Tempest Sonata and the Tradition of Twentieth-Century "*Formenlehre*" ', in Pieter Bergé, William E. Caplin and Jeroen D'Hoe (eds), *Beethoven's* Tempest *Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 293–314.

____, 2013: 'Form, Narrative and Intertextuality in Wagner's Overture to *Der fliegende Holländer*', *Music Analysis*, 32/i, pp. 46–79.

Webster, James, 2002: 'Between Enlightenment and Romanticism in Music History: "First Viennese Modernism" and the Delayed Nineteenth Century,' *19th-Century Music*, 25/ii–iii, pp. 108–26.

Wendt, A.J.G., 1836: *Über den gegenwärtigen Zustand der Musik besonders in Deutschland und wie er geworden* (Göttingen: Dieterich).

Wingfield, Paul, 2008: 'Beyond "Norms and Deformations": Towards a Theory of Sonata Form as Reception History', *Music Analysis*, 27/i, pp. 137–77.

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTOR

STEVEN VANDE MOORTELE is Assistant Professor of Music Theory at the University of Toronto. His research interests include theories of musical form, the analysis of instrumental music from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century and the music of Arnold Schoenberg. He is the author of *Two-Dimensional Sonata Form: Form and Cycle in Single-Movement Instrumental Works by Liszt, Strauss, Schoenberg, and Zemlinsky* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009).

ERRATUM

Bar 35 of Ex. 1 and the text that refers to it should read IAC not PAC.

REFERENCE

Vande Moortele, S (2013): 'In Search of Romantic Form', *Music Analysis*, DOI: 10.1111/musa.12015