

An Account of Emotional Specificity in Classic–Romantic Music

Jeffrey Swinkin

Many, if not most, contemporary philosophers of music contend that the musical expression of an emotion does not depend upon the perceiver feeling that emotion.¹ That is, while these scholars do not necessarily deny that emotional responses to music are valuable, even inevitable, they do not view such responses as properly part of the emotional content of the work itself, or even properly part of an aesthetic experience of the work (as opposed to a more informal one). Some argue this on the basis that musical emotions lack intentional objects: if a piece expresses sadness, for example, this could not consist in the listener feeling sad for the piece gives him nothing to be sad about.² Others invoke the problematic paradox of negative emotion: if music really made us feel sad, why would we want to listen to it? (Davies [1997] and Levinson [1997] explore this issue.) Still others observe that pieces often evoke feelings they do not express and vice versa; as Goodman states, “whatever emotion may be excited [by music] is seldom the one expressed” (1976:47). As a consequence, even when the emotions expressed by the music and those felt by the listener happen to coincide, the latter are nonetheless incidental to musical expression. Equally incidental is what composers feel when they compose. As Peter Kivy avers, “It is unthinkable that I should amend my characterization of the opening bars of Mozart’s G-minor Symphony (K. 550) as somber . . . if I were to discover evidence of Mozart’s happiness . . . during its composition” (1989:14–15).

While none of these arguments is ironclad, collectively they make a compelling case for the fundamental separation of musical expression and arousal. Departing from this axiomatic distinction, I will attempt to demonstrate precisely how music possesses emotional content, how emotional qualities arise from (if not completely inhere in) musical form and structure. In the process, I hope to demonstrate that musical emotions need not be of the most general sort, such as joy and sorrow (what Kivy designates “garden-variety” emotions) but may at times be subtle, specific, and “cognitively complex.”³ This view runs counter to those of Eduard Hanslick, Peter Kivy, and Susanne Langer, to cite three prominent aestheticians. However, rather than dismiss their ideas, which are extremely valuable in their own right, I hope to assimilate them into what I feel is a more satisfying theory of musical emotion—one that accounts for more nuanced shades of emotion than these theorists allow. In what follows, I shall neither comprehensively survey the

published positions on musical emotion nor offer an entirely original theory; rather, I shall attempt to synthesize these well-known stances toward musical emotion, incorporating my own, music-analytic approach (which utilizes formal, motivic, Schenkerian, and implication-realization methods). My two related aims are (a) to account for the multiple musical parameters and structural levels that generate emotional content; (b) to explicate the means by which music in certain instances is able to convey specific emotions.

The following is not a universally applicable theory but rather an account of the mechanisms of expression primarily within Germanic music of the late eighteenth and early- to mid-nineteenth centuries (what I shall henceforth designate “classic-romantic music”). The means by which such music generates emotional content are especially susceptible to theorization because, as I will argue, this music generally boasts clearly delineated themes with distinctive emotional profiles,⁴ and also because thematic development in this style elaborates and modifies themes and their corresponding emotions in relatively transparent ways. Granted, a theory of musical emotion based on such a relatively narrow range of repertoire will inevitably be of somewhat limited application. This predicament, however, cannot be avoided, for the simple reason that music of different styles engenders emotion in different ways (although some techniques, of course, are held in common). Hence, theories of musical emotion must be situated historically, however tempting it may be to attempt a universal theory. That said, my theoretical stance is not entirely limited to the classic-romantic paradigm on which it is based, no more so than such music itself exists in a historical vacuum. The emotional processes of Beethoven’s music, for example, may be more patent and potent than those of some other repertoires, but they are also somewhat continuous with those of other repertoires. That is to say, we might hold up Beethoven’s music as a particularly lucid example of how music might mean, and thus as a window into some aspects of the emotional content and processes in other music, even where these are somewhat different or less salient.

I should also clarify that the listener I envision here is one thoroughly immersed in the conventions of classic-romantic repertoire, receptive to its personified contours (able to empathize with its anthropomorphic elements) and capable of listening “structurally,”⁵ of following a linear musical argument and its attendant emotional niceties. I do not believe that the emotional elements I will adumbrate are “built into” configurations of pitch and rhythm, such that anyone perceiving such configurations will by necessity perceive musical emotion. Rather, musical emotion arises from the intersection of sounding music and the perceptions of a listener equipped with certain cognitive and emotional predispositions. In other words, emotional elements, while in some sense present in (correlated with

and delimited by) musical sound rather than imposed willy–nilly from without, are nonetheless only *potentially* present—to become manifest, they require a stylistically competent, structurally comprehending, and empathic listener.⁶ That said, there are *degrees* of emotional apprehension, such that a listener lacking the ability, for example, to follow a musical argument—to attend to music–structural unfolding—might nonetheless glean emotional content from other parameters, such as foreground gestures and topics, as I will discuss.

With these caveats in mind, I proceed to consider the three crucial components of musically embodied emotion mentioned above: first convention and contour, and then formal process.

Convention and Contour

Kivy (1989) cites convention and contour as two sources of musical emotion. By the former he means expressive codes with widely recognized denotations. The most central among these are the major and minor modes, which have been understood to correlate with the positive and negative sides of the emotional spectrum. Insofar as these modes govern entire pieces, they can be understood to generate broad emotional contexts within which more detailed emotional cues occur. Other conventional idioms are more localized and more dependent on style. For example, the topics (*topoi*) of the classical period possess relatively standardized emotional connotations: horn calls (horn fifths) commonly express aggressiveness; *Sturm und Drang* angst; the lament bass (held over from the Baroque) ceremonious grief; the Mannheim rocket intense expectancy; the sigh (*Seufzer*) motif plaintive longing, and so forth.⁷

The “contour” theory, conversely, “explains the expressiveness of music by the congruence of musical ‘contour’ with the structure of [human] expressive features and behavior” (Kivy 1989:77). Here Kivy draws a distinction between expressing emotion and being expressive *of* emotion (1989:12–13). To cite his paradigmatic example, a Saint Bernard is not necessarily sad, but to a human observer his countenance is nonetheless expressive of sadness because it resembles the countenance of a person when he or she is sad. By contrast, the dour countenance of a person who is in fact sad expresses sadness—his countenance directly reflects how he is feeling. Music, Kivy submits, is more like the Saint Bernard than the sad person: a piece is expressive of sadness not because it is sad in any literal sense—nor because it expresses the sad feelings of the composer or evokes them in the listener—but because its contour closely resembles the physical forms we associate with sadness.⁸ A drooping façade or posture, whether of a Saint Bernard, flower,

or melody—say, one in a minor key and replete with descending leaps, as in the first two measures of Mozart's Mass in C minor, K. 427—is likely to convey a negative emotional quality, a dejected state; the opposite holds for an uplifted façade. In short, music is expressive partially due to its isomorphic relation to animate features.⁹

Emotional contour is not confined to melodic physiognomy. We also detect emotion in musical *behaviors* that are analogous to human behaviors—in particular, to physical gesture and vocal utterance. As to the former, just as we might infer an emotion from a person's gait, so might we from a musical gait, as conjured by tempo and rhythm. To take an obvious example, a slow tempo commonly intimates a sluggish gait, from which we infer sadness (especially if conjoined with the minor mode). On a more local level, much music is replete with gestures that can be understood as analogous to human ones; this is particularly true of the mature classical style, with its heterogeneous phrase rhythms and detailed articulations. Regarding vocality, Kivy states that we hear sadness in music when we “hear musical sounds as appropriate to the expression of sadness . . . when we hear them as human utterances, and perceive the features of these utterances as structurally similar to our own voices when we express our own sadness in speech” (1989:51).¹⁰

In short, whereas musical conventions bear a relatively arbitrary relation to emotion, musical contours are congruent with the human behaviors indicative of emotion. Kivy, however, is careful to note that the boundary between the two categories is permeable: some conventions are rooted in contour-resemblances; conversely, many contour-resemblances, often slight in themselves, accrue expressive force by dint of long-standing association—by becoming conventionalized. The minor mode, for example, may at first have expressed melancholy due to the fact that its mediant is a semitone lower than that of major and so has a comparatively drooping contour, but it has acquired expressive weight due to the influence of association over many years.¹¹ The sigh figure, to take a more localized example, is probably also expressive by virtue of both contour and convention. Kivy suggests that this figure might express sadness “by analogy to human expression,” but that its *intensity* depends on convention: “. . . the figure has been associated, since time out of mind, with intense rather than transient and shallow grief” (1989:78). In the cases of minor mode and sigh figure, then, a somewhat faint resemblance to human form amounts to a marked expression due to conventional association. Since a fine line separates convention and contour—or put differently, since they often operate in tandem—it is frequently difficult if not impossible to discern which, if either, is more responsible for establishing a particular musical emotion.¹²

Formal Process

Kivy's argument is compelling to a point but it does not sufficiently account for the influence of music-formal procedures upon affective conventions and contours. O'Dey notes that "Kivy's work has been criticized for focusing exclusively on small-scale musical details and for neglecting the expressive potential of overall form" (2000:10). A theory of musical emotion that does not sufficiently acknowledge the role of form will likely fail to discern many emotional particularities in musical works.

Enter Hanslick and Langer: both assert, in similar ways, that musical expression derives from formal unfolding. Hanslick denies that music is capable of representing specific feelings; these, he claims, can only arise in conjunction with specific thoughts and circumstances, which music is incapable of denoting. He does maintain, however, that music can represent the more general dynamic qualities associated with and capable of modifying emotions. Music can do so because such qualities are perfectly compatible with purely musical processes—the "tonally moving forms" that, for Hanslick, are the sole content of music. That is, such qualities are susceptible "to audible changes in strength, motion, and proportion" (1891:10).¹³ To paraphrase Hanslick, music can represent whispering, albeit not the whispering of love; it can represent violence, albeit not the violence of conflict. Music "can only express the various accompanying adjectives and never the substantive" (9).¹⁴ It is fine, he suggests, to extrapolate particular emotions from these abstract qualities, to imagine concrete scenarios, but one must not conflate the two.¹⁵

Langer has likewise argued that the dynamic processes of music are isomorphic with the general forms of emotional experience. Echoing Hanslick, she enumerates various processes or patterns that music shares with emotions, such as those of "motion and rest, of tension and release, of agreement and disagreement, preparation, fulfillment, excitation, sudden change, and so on" (Langer 1957:184–185). These dynamics are common to many if not most emotions.¹⁶ In fact, Langer argues, some emotions we consider oppositional might actually partake of the same or a similar dynamic pattern.¹⁷ Both happy and sad conditions, for example, often assume the form of initiation—climax—denouement (whether over short or long time-spans). Like Hanslick, she restricts expression to these general states, claiming that music can convey only the structure, not substance, of emotion: "*For what music can actually reflect is only the morphology of feeling*" (1957:238, her italics). Consequently, music is an "unconsummated symbol": it is expressive and significant, but not of any one thing in particular. Another, perhaps more affirmative way to put this is that music is emotionally multivalent or polysemous.

For Kivy, Hanslick, and Langer, then, musical emotion is synonymous with neither self-expression nor arousal. Rather, it is something that resides in the musical substance itself—the musical sound, whether actual or imagined, as denoted by notation. For all three, emotion arises from isomorphic correspondences: for Kivy, between musical contour and the external, demonstrable dimensions of feeling; for Hanslick and Langer, between musical processes and the dynamic structure of feeling—between music and the way feelings feel. Hence, Kivy allows only for the expression of concrete, “garden-variety” emotions, since these are the only ones inferable from physical contours, while Hanslick and Langer allow only for the expression of generalized emotional dynamics.

These two views are not incompatible, for, when combined, they can account for different dimensions of any given musical emotion: on Kivy’s view, contours and conventions indicate the physical or behavioral profile of the emotion; on Hanslick’s and Langer’s view, formal processes indicate the inner experience of an emotion, the way an emotion unfolds in time. Far from being mutually exclusive, it would seem that both dimensions would necessarily operate and reinforce one another in any instance of musical expression.

Beethoven, Piano Concerto in C Minor: Opening

Examining a brief passage from Beethoven’s C minor piano concerto will serve to consolidate my argument to this point. The opening thematic idea (Example 1, measures 114–117), with its minor key, *forte* dynamic, and stark octave doublings, possesses a severe quality; moreover, the fanfare topic, *sforzando*-accented G, and hammer blows in the last two measures suggest a somewhat aggressive stance. From these conventions and contours we may infer the emotion of anger—or perhaps, to be a bit more specific, bellicose anger.¹⁸ To be sure, this description is too reductive to precisely capture the emotional content of this passage as I perceive it (much less the emotional nuances others may hear). Here we encounter the inevitable problem of applying words to music, of how language is inadequate for fully describing musical emotion (or perhaps emotion generally), a problem I can hardly resolve here. Suffice to say, if we wish to talk about musical meaning at all, we must learn to live with the ineluctable disparity between words and music. However, two tactics can mitigate this disparity. First, in explaining musical emotion we should strive to employ language sensitively and artistically in order to bridge the language–music gap at least to some degree. Indeed, we can look to nineteenth-century critics such as E. T. A. Hoffman and A. B. Marx as models in this regard, for their hermeneutic readings often embody

114 piano

118

122

violin

viola

bass

elongation/contemplation

sequence/intensification

124

126

expansion/spilling-over

allusion/regression

129

Example 1: Beethoven, Piano Concerto No. 3 in C minor, Op. 37, first movement, measures 114–130

or exemplify some of the aesthetic qualities of the music they discuss. Bent (1994:141–142) points out, for example, that Hoffman, in his celebrated 1810 review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, at one point withholds verbs in his description of the opening in order to convey the music's sense of "breathless orientation" (Bent's words). To take a much more recent critic, Adorno, according to Michael Spitzer, often writes in a manner analogous to the music it treats—it exemplifies the very musical qualities to which he refers. For example, in referring to Adorno's remarks on Beethoven's String Quartet in A minor, op. 132, Spitzer claims, "This . . . synergy between the content and medium of representation, whereby criticism mimics qualities of its object, is absolutely typical of Adorno's philosophical aesthetics. Here Adorno's procedure is most pronounced in the late-Beethovenian fragmentation of his argument, which unfolds as cryptically as the actual quartet" (2006:39). Second, and more crucially, our descriptions of emotions, however imperfect, will derive a measure of objective—or better, intersubjective—validity from their basis in objectively present musical elements (conventional, contoural, and formal) as derived from astute observation and analysis.

Returning to our example, the next phrase (measures 118–121) features a homophonic, chorale-like texture/topic, which connotes harmonious communality and spirituality. This phrase thus transcends or assuages the anger of the previous phrase, especially given its *piano* dynamic and the trill figures in measure 120 that partially obscure the hammer-stroke rhythms of the left hand, attenuating their angularity. Yet this phrase is not entirely ameliorative: tension is still evident, especially in the pungent dissonance on the downbeat of measure 119, arising both from the minor ninth between A♭ and G (within each hand) and from the A♭ itself, which, as $\hat{6}$ in a minor key, has an inherently yearning or anxious quality. However, this tension is now more internally contained than acted out.

The anger is further assuaged in measures 122–123, which evince a contemplative stance toward the anger as well as a degree of emotional distance. This is because the fanfare—a vestige of which is present in the bass voice (circled in the example)—is somewhat eviscerated by its *piano* and *legato* treatment and by the fact that its final third (E♭–G) is transformed to a fourth (E♭–A♭). This figure thus delineates a first-inversion triad, which is somewhat milder than the root-position triad of the original fanfare. As the fanfare is softened, so is the anger with which it was previously associated; as it is modified (intervallically), so the anger is modified and redirected. The more reflective or contemplative stance is also evident in the rhythmic elongation: whereas the initial fanfare figure (the triad) occupied one measure plus one beat, this one is expanded to two full measures. Likewise with the fifth-motive (G–F–E♭–D–C) in the right hand: origi-

nally occurring over five quarter notes (measures 115–116₁), it now occurs over eight (measures 122–123). This expansion is the result both of the motive being embellished and of starting prematurely—it now coincides with the start of the fanfare rather than following it as before. In stark contrast to the terse, tense opening, both the bass and melody spin more leisurely, more lyrical lines. Consequently, this passage intimates a protracted, linear thought process, a more considered stance, rather than, as in the theme, an erratic emotional outburst.¹⁹ This holds even if, given the nature of music, the precise content of this thought process must remain “unconsummated.” However, the musical persona has not achieved complete emotional detachment—pain or tension is still clearly evident, as in the poignant dissonance (accented passing tone D) on the downbeat of measure 123 and in the continued emphasis on $\hat{6}$ (A \flat in the bass, measure 123).

Measures 124–128 initially continue this contemplative stance but grow increasingly restless: each sequential statement is a fourth higher, each one expressing a more intense yearning than the previous, as if one finds herself unable to maintain the emotional distance needed to reflect rationally upon the initial emotional state, and is inexorably devolving into it. Indeed, the statement beginning in measure 126 is unable to retain its composure—it exceeds the two-measure boundary established by the previous two statements, its accelerated activity in measure 127 (F–E \flat –D–C of the piano’s bass) spills into measure 128.²⁰ Then, the *sforzando*-accented G of measure 129, as a salient reference to that of measure 115, brings us full circle and seems to forebode a recurrence of the initial anger. Such a recurrence, however, is not to be found in the next statement of the theme starting in measure 138, which is garbed in the relative major and accompanied by buoyant eighth notes. This thematic statement perhaps consolidates the positive perspective toward which the persona was striving in measures 122–130, despite the threat of emotional regression in measure 129.

To summarize, the emotion of bellicose anger is derived from convention and contour. However, formal dynamics subsequently come to the fore, developing both the theme and its concomitant emotion. That is, as the theme is modified by the formal processes of elongation (augmentation), sequential repetition, (sub)phrase expansion, and return, the emotional correlate of the theme (anger) is likewise modified by the experiential correlates of those formal processes; in this context, these seem to be, respectively, contemplation, intensification, spilling-over (losing composure), and regression (review Example 1). These dynamics modify the basic mood in more fluid and subtle ways than conventions or contours by themselves could.

This example demonstrated how an emotion may be musically specified. In a moment, I will build upon this idea, exploring the role of tonal and motivic structure in music–emotional specification. First, however, I would like to step back and consider the crux of our issue more generally.

Music–Emotional Specificity

What is the relation of musical emotion to ordinary, non–musical emotion? We may adduce two polarized views. At one extreme, a musical emotion is considered not fundamentally different from the corresponding emotion one experiences in life, outside of music. At the other, a musical emotion is considered *sui generis*, uniquely and irreducibly musical, such that the musical experience of anger, for instance, is only nominally related to the anger we experience outside of music. The first view runs counter to the intuition that a musical emotion, if not wholly unique, is surely somewhat distinct from and perhaps more refined than a non–musical emotion. The second view runs counter to the intuition that musical emotions are not completely removed from the emotions we experience in non–musical settings—that music does not exist in its own, rarified realm, entirely divorced from ordinary experience. I think we need to mediate between these polarized views, regarding musical emotion as neither commonplace nor *sui generis*; that is, I regard musical emotion as at once musically specific and also related to everyday emotional experience.

Classic–romantic music commonly performs such a mediation. In such music, the theme, due to its relative conventionality and topicality, will usually establish a basic, relatively general emotion. (Of course, most pieces have multiple themes, with each one typically expressing a different emotion.) The opening theme of Beethoven’s Sixth Symphony expresses bucolic contentment, that of Liszt’s Piano Sonata demonic anger, and that of the Finale of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony funereal melancholy. As is evident from the adjectives “bucolic,” “demonic,” and “funereal,” even these emotions are not entirely general or “garden–variety”—most of us experience contentment at some point, but not necessarily *bucolic* contentment. An emotion presented so coarsely as to elicit no such qualification would rarely appear in the sophisticated repertoire under consideration here. Still, these emotions are relatively general in serving as emotional points of reference within their respective pieces, to be rendered even more specific by subsequent musical processes.

Indeed, once the theme has been stated and its process of development and variation begins, the emotion expressed by the theme will likewise be developed and varied.²¹ That is, it will be subjected to formal processes that

serve to specify the emotion in two, interrelated ways. First, the (relatively) commonplace musical emotion as established by contour and convention is progressively wed to the formal processes and musical events by which it is shaped, such that, ultimately, it is indelibly imprinted by musical qualities. In other words, an emotion that begins as an extension of, or reference to, common experience is progressively rendered more *specifically musical*—increasingly inseparable from its musical instantiation. Second, it would seem that the development of a theme would conduce to even greater emotional generality, since these formal processes, according to Hanslick and Langer, are isomorphic with the general dynamics of experience. Yet, in my view, this is not the case, for the simple reason that these processes and their experiential correlates occur *in conjunction with* or *in relation to* a theme and its basic expressive signification and hence serve to specify or modify that signification, whether demonstrably or subtly. In other words, when the theme is developed, its emotional correlate is colored by various dynamics, by varying degrees of tension, delay, fulfillment, dissolution, and so on; in this way, additional qualities accrue to the basic emotion, which thereby assumes a more particular meaning than it did initially.

The idea that a musical theme establishes or entails an emotional theme is hardly new: one can trace it back to the eighteenth century, where music was commonly viewed as analogous to rhetoric. In this view, the musical oration, no less than its linguistic counterpart, possesses a particular subject of interest, one that can be expressed and elaborated in manifold ways, both in terms of rhetorical tropes (*elocutio*) and in the sequence of ideas (*dispositio*). Such elaborations modify the emotional content of the subject (and, according to eighteenth-century theorists, arouse various passions in the auditor). Heinrich Koch, for example, claims the composer modifies the principal idea in order to “modify the feeling which he is treating” (1787, in Baker and Christensen 1995:188).²² That is, the principal idea defines the primary affect of the piece, and as the theme is developed, so is the affect with which it is associated.²³ Later, he emphasizes that for a basic affect even to be sustained, it must be varied, presented in various guises. He states, “if the feeling is to become a pleasure, then the touching of these nerves must be continuous, indeed, must persist in differing strengths and weaknesses, that is, the feeling must be presented in various modifications . . . In short, the feeling will be continuous by our imagining it in several contexts” (ibid:202–203). In Koch’s view, to sustain an emotion is necessarily to vary it. Carl Dahlhaus confirms that the concept of a theme in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries entailed not just a musical but also an emotional idea—an affect or character—and that development is not solely of the musical idea but also of its emotional correlate. He declares, “the motivic working of the ‘formal theme’ will have a correlative in a growing elaboration of the ‘aesthetic theme’” (1991:125).

Returning to our Beethoven example, we can now more fully appreciate the precise manner in which it specifies its basic emotion of bellicose anger. Again, the theme establishes this emotion primarily by virtue of convention and contour. The theme is not so much developed as sequentially restated on the dominant (typical of a sentence structure). Correspondingly, its mood is not so much developed as counterpoised by the quiescent chorale. Then the theme and its anger begin to be developed in earnest. As the theme is subjected to formal unfolding, its emotion becomes increasingly imbued with musical substance, such that it becomes increasingly difficult to extricate the emotion from its musical context. In other words, as the music proceeds, it refers to the idea of anger less and embodies it more—the anger becomes more musically specific (we might even call it “musical anger”). Yet, at the same time, this formal unfolding exposes general states of sentient experience that in turn specify and modify the anger: what was initially bellicose anger becomes bellicose anger contemplated, then gradually resurging, then (almost) regressed to.

This example amply demonstrates that, contrary to Hanslick’s assertion that music “can only express the various accompanying adjectives and never the substantive”—emotional dynamics but not emotion per se—a basic emotion (in this case, bellicose anger) can effectively serve as the substantive, the emotional subject that is adjectivally qualified by formal dynamics. In Hanslick’s model, even where discernible musical moods exist (and we have seen that Hanslick does unwittingly accede to such moods [see note 15]), they would ultimately be subsumed by formal processes. That is, they would ultimately yield to abstract states that for him are synonymous with purely musical structure. For Hanslick, in other words, the purely musical (or something close to it) is the end result. By contrast, I am arguing that these formal processes never (or rarely) become independent of the theme and its corresponding emotion; they necessarily particularize this emotion, and in doing so acquire much of their interest and import. Put another way, I contend that in classic-romantic music, the emotional point of reference will not cease to hold sway in the course of development; rather, it will continue, even amidst the most dense developmental permutations, to provide a clearly defined emotional context in relation to which these permutations carry significance.²⁴ This music almost always has an emotional subject (or several) which is susceptible to specification or predication.

Beethoven, Sonata, Op. 7, Second Movement

While we have considered the effect of formal processes and procedures upon musical emotion, we have yet to consider the effect of tonal structure, voice leading, and motivic relationships. An adequate theory of musical emotion

will need to account for these parameters as well, for music–emotional specificity derives not just from foreground thematic development but also from higher–level processes. Let us parse the opening of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E \flat , op. 7, second movement (Example 2) from this standpoint.

I begin with a formal overview. This passage, the A section of a large ternary form, itself comprises a small ternary: A $_1$, measures 1–8; B, pickup to 9–14; A $_2$, 15–24. The small B section is distinguished by its own theme and key (the dominant). A $_2$ is a variant and expansion of A $_1$; the expansion is due mostly to an evaded cadence on the downbeat of measure 20 and a subsequent interpolation, as I will discuss in a moment. In terms of voice leading, as my graph in Example 3 shows, an E *Kopft*on ($\hat{3}$) is prolonged within the A $_1$ section by means of two third–progressions, one nested within the other.²⁵ In the B section, the fundamental line is interrupted at $\hat{2}$ (D 2). A $_2$, naturally, reinitiates the fundamental line—the *Kopft*on $\hat{3}$ —whose descent is once again obstructed by the aforementioned evaded cadence into measure 20. The structural descent, when it finally arrives, is rather tenuous, given that the $\hat{2}$ (measure 23) is merely implied (or perhaps can be seen to retreat into the alto voice, covered by the soprano’s G, as in measure 2. Beethoven reserves the decisive descent for the final two measures of the movement (the descent in measures 73–74 is not definitive since it is not in the obligatory register. More prominent and perceptible than the underlying descent in measures 22–23 is the leap from G 1 –C 1 (measures 23–24), by which the G is registrally abandoned; its thread is picked up in the large B section by Ab 1 in measure 25 (this G–Ab motion serves to bridge the large A and B sections).

As for an emotive overview, the governing topic appears to be Sensibility (*Empfindsamkeit*). The piece exemplifies many of the features Ratner cites as characteristic of this idiom: “interrupted continuity, elaborate ornamentation, pregnant pauses, shifting, uncertain, often dissonant harmony” (1980:22). Such features suggest a mercurial emotional disposition. More specifically, A $_1$ is governed by a chorale–like topic, whose hushed chords couched within sighing figures (two–note slurs) suggest a gentle yearning—they are plaintive, but, because in the major mode, not morose. In B, the mood turns brighter due to the brighter key (the dominant tonicization), higher register, and increased rhythmic animation. If the A theme is listless and contemplative, the B theme is more lithe and outwardly expressive. A $_2$, finally, is even more taciturn than the opening due to its *pianissimo* dynamic but quickly gains a sense of urgency and motion in measure 17, the precise point at which A $_2$ deviates from A $_1$. The evaded cadence in measure 20 is then immediately followed by audacious hammer strokes, which comprise the emotional apex of the entire passage (the large A section). This aggression

Largo, con gran espressione.

5

9 *tenute*

15 *G linearly assimilated*

20 *interpolation*

24 *sempre tenuto*

p *f* *pp* *ff* *sf* *inf.* *f*

(F² picked up and resolved to E²)

Example 2: Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E^b, Op. 7, second movement, measures 1–24

is abruptly curbed, however, by a denouement that restores the serenity of the opening.

Each formal section, then, has its own distinctive emotional qualities, as defined by particular topics and contours. Now let us delve into greater detail, discussing for each section the finer, more localized emotions arising from conventions and contours; their specification by formal processes; and their specification by a few suggestive aspects of tonal and motivic structure.²⁶ I will not attempt an exhaustive emotive analysis but will rather weave a few narrative threads I find particularly salient.

A₁, measures 1–8

As I have already mentioned, the opening is a quasi-chorale partitioned into sigh-like figures, expressing a somewhat mournful quality. The pregnant pauses lend the persona a reticent character—she expresses her sorrow hesitantly, or perhaps merely contemplates it tacitly. The second measure presents a more overt sigh than does the first, in the form of a descending-fourth leap, G–D; a more solemn variant of this gesture, traversing a tritone, follows in the bass of measure 3. Moreover, the unexpected slide from V⁶/V to V 4/2 as well as the strident, *sforzando*-accented C appoggiatura in measure 4 create an unsettling, even tragic ambiance. Hence, the passage thus far expresses ever more intense instances of melancholy as it proceeds. The variants of the basic emotion derive from, or correlate with, variants of the initial two-chord and G–D gestures. (Notice that the motivic variants engender an emotional progression—one of increasing intensity or severity—even though formally the phrase is relatively static and paratactic.²⁷) Then, the angst that culminates with the chromaticism and dissonance of measure 4 is assuaged by the pristine diatonicism of measures 5–7.₂ This reprieve is slightly soured, however, by A♭, (♭6, a byproduct of modal mixture) in the alto of measure 7, which is evocative of a pang, given its tonal coloration and abrupt off-beat accent. The section comes full circle with the sigh figure of measure 8, which, like that of the first measure, is wistful but relatively benign in comparison with the others encountered in this phrase.

Now I will consider the tonal structure (Example 3) and its emotional implications. To begin, the G in m. 2₁ would seem to partake of a third motion: E–F–G (measures 1–2); yet I would contend that the G is actually a cover tone²⁸ and thus has no direct syntactical connection to the F. Rather, an E–F–E neighbor motion underlies the first two measures (I hear the D in measure 2 as embellishing the F). This reading is substantiated by the bass of measures 1–2, whose unambiguous lower-neighbor motion can be seen to crystallize and mirror—in the senses of both reflect and invert—the underlying upper-neighbor motion of the right hand. It is also substanti-

Example 3: voice-leading graph of measures 1–24

ated by subsequent events. In the transition from B to A₂, the *Kopfton* (E) is reintroduced by F. Even though F is part of a 8–7 passing motion, its octave–shift (measure 14) calls special attention to it as well as to the E to which it inevitably resolves. However, this resolution is somewhat equivocal: although F¹ resolves directly to E¹, F² is left hanging. This pitch is not picked up until measure 18, where it finally resolves to E². Hence, as the piece proceeds, F–E becomes increasingly explicit as a motive; this process, in turn, retroactively grants motivic status to the initial (E–)F–E of measures 1–2. If in the first two measures the conjoining of E and F (as an entity separate from the following G) is nebulous, subsequent events eventually clarify the relationship of these pitches, hypostatizing them as a distinct motive.²⁹

Based on this analysis, one might say the G desires to be integrated into a linear framework. Stated more metaphorically, the G in measure 2 intimates a character who longs to belong in some sense but is prevented from doing so (at least for the moment). The character connoted by G desires greater ontological certainty—the kind of identity and security one enjoys as a member of a community. The voice–leading environment, as I see it, thus specifies both a particular musical agent experiencing the melancholy or distress (the G, which throughout the piece is framed as an outlier with respect to the 3–line *Urlinie*) and, more importantly, a *reason* for the melancholy: G is denied what it apparently seeks, which is to be more firmly entrenched in its surroundings.

To summarize: the mood of melancholy as expressed by foreground conventions/contours is specified and rendered multidimensional by means of (a) the successive motivic transformations in measures 1–4, which render the melancholy increasingly intense; and (b) middleground structure, which establishes a context by which one can attribute the melancholy to a persona, and by which one can adduce a reason for the melancholy. The structure connotes both an agent and a circumstance by which that persona would possess a particular frame of mind, a desire. The outcome is no generic melancholy; rather, it is melancholy in response to frustrated desire.

B, measures 8–14


This section establishes a fresh, somewhat more buoyant mood since, in contrast to the previous section, it is fluid rather than halting; rests no longer abound and the melody, in a singing style, is marked by greater rhythmic heterogeneity and vivacity. Also, measure 9, preceded by an animating anacrusis, is itself anacrusic in relation to measure 10. As a result, the theme has a leading, directional quality, in marked contrast to the static, down-beat–oriented opening theme. Moreover, the open spacing of the right-hand chords in measures 9 and 11 creates a sense of expectancy, a raised-eyebrow physiognomy expressing (cautious) optimism. Relatedly, the ascent of the

upper voice in measures 10–12 through G^2 and B^2 —accented by a *sforzando* and in a high, conspicuous register—suggests a more assertive, even slightly fanfarish quality. However, this relative extroversion is somewhat countered by the cadenza-like ruminations of measures 10 and the last beat of 12. G^2 and B^2 , moreover, never continue to D^3 as one might expect on the basis that (per Leonard Meyer) the initiation of a triad implies its completion. Rather, measure 14 ascends merely to F^2 , undermining the tonicity and brighter mood of G major. Thus the register is noticeably curbed, connoting emotional inhibition and waning optimism.

Such inhibition is also evident in the manner in which this section formally unfolds. The first four measures seem to initiate a sentence: given that measures 9–10 state a basic idea and measures 11–12 its (partially) sequential variant, we might well expect a four-measure continuation, along the somewhat crude lines of Example 4.³⁰ This expectation is provisionally fulfilled in measures 13–14, especially given their harmonic acceleration (which Caplin [1998] cites as characteristic of a continuation). This expectation, however, is thwarted by the “premature” arrival in measure 14 of V^7 , which results in a foreshortened subphrase (two measures instead of four). This truncated phrase rhythm reinforces and is reinforced by the registral containment of the right hand, and both, in turn, dampen the elevated mood with which this section began.

This section, then, initially expresses a more positive mood than does the previous one, as evident in the contour elements of rhythmic animation and spacious voicings, and the convention of fanfare, followed by a dejection of mood based on registral and formal curtailment. This reading is substantiated by tonal and motivic considerations. The G, which in the previous section had trouble finding a niche, is now the local tonic as well as the focal point in the bass, where it repeated as part of an A–G motion that replicates that of the tenor voice in measures 6–7 (as shown by the arrow in Example 2). There the figure was quickly undermined by $A\flat$ ($\flat\hat{6}$); here it revels in an unproblematic presentation and the $\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ is offered as an antidote to the pessimism of $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ (both versions of the motive are highlighted in Example 3). Yet, this figure returns in measure 13,³¹ This $A\flat$, however, is less turbulent than the one in measure 7 since it exhibits greater rhythmic regularity and control—the chromatic line in which it participates unfolds with greater composure.

To summarize, the initial treatment of A–G supports and specifies the cautious optimism and extroversion of the right hand, providing a reason for it—the G has found a *raison d'être*, if only for the moment—and $\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ is proffered as a corrective to $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$. By contrast, the injection of $A\flat$ in measure



Example 4: hypothetical continuation phrase in the B section (starting measure 13)

13 communicates the dejection connoted by the formal and registral contraction of the next measure. The motivic interplay between $\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ and $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ mirrors and reinforces the emotional transformation as exhibited by surface contours and conventions.

A₂ measures 15–24

The melodic lead-in to this section (measure 14, second and third beats), by means of its tripping gesture, dissipates the tension that had arisen due to the resurgence of the $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ motive. The statement of the theme that follows is more reticent than that in *A₁*, perhaps in response to the extroversion of B, as if the melancholy subject is taken aback by her own momentary assuredness.³² This diffidence, however, is promptly reversed by an unexpected deviation from *A₁* in the form of a “premature” statement of the descending–fourth leap in measure 17. That is, here two such figures occur in consecutive measures (16 and 17), whereas in *A₁* the second figure (measure 4) was separated from the first (measure 2) by an entire measure. This surprise, enhanced by the *rinforzando*, in turn precipitates a marked increase in rhythmic and harmonic activity in the form of an ascending 5–6 sequence. The onset of this sequence induces a brief metric shift: as shown in Example 5, the second beat of measure 17 is heard as a downbeat—due both to the previous descending–fourth gesture arising prematurely, thus possessing an anacrusic quality, and to a fresh rhythmic idea starting on that second beat.

The sequence leads to the right-hand sigh figure, F–E in measure 18, which is intensely sorrowful, especially given the tense sonority—a full-diminished seventh chord, a *viⁱⁱ°/vi*—of which the F is part, not to mention the deceptive motion on which the measure ends. This gesture is the emotional apotheosis of the F–E neighbor motive I have discussed. This reading is both supported and qualified by the undercutting motive that follows in the left hand; as Example 6 demonstrates, measures 18–20 in a sense recompose measures 1–4. Yet the undercutting motive here is considerably softened, in three ways. First, though starting out in the lowest-sounding voice, the figure becomes absorbed by the tenor. Second, the figure is diluted by the G

sounding meters:

*dotted barlines = original barlines

Example 5: metric displacement in A2

that intervenes between F^\sharp and F^\flat , which eviscerates what was initially direct chromaticism. Finally, the F^\sharp is approached from A rather than from C as in A_1 , thus forming a milder minor third in contrast to the strident tritone. Hence, whereas the undercutting figure in A_1 intensified the melancholy, the one in A_2 mitigates it. However, this dark mood is restored forthwith: in measure 20, the previously missing tritone now returns in the form of the soprano's leap from G– C^\sharp . The undercutting, previously attenuated, returns with a vengeance, in the form of an evaded cadence that alights on *vii* 4/2 of *ii*, a tensely enigmatic sonority to say the least.³³ (This dark turn is immediately presaged by the funereal dotted rhythms of measure 19).

The hammer blows that follow in measures 20 and 21 are shocking as much due to the pregnant pauses by which they are framed as to the stentorian sonorities themselves. The exclamatory, intrusive demeanor of these chords derives not only from their *fortissimo* dynamic and rhythmic rigidity but also from the formal context in which they occur: these chords are part of an interpolation, an inserted module (in relation to A_1) that extends from the evaded cadence in measure 20₁ to the end of measure 23 (see the brackets in Example 2). Hence, measures 20–21 constitute not only a dynamic interjection but a formal one as well. This outburst is promptly pacified, however, by the resumption in measure 22 of a *pianissimo* chord progression and by a repetition and resolution of the cadence initially evaded (the G– C^\sharp leap is peaceably converted to G– C^\flat). However, the repetition of the solemn, funereal figure as well as the inconclusiveness of the lingering G (the subterranean resolution of the fundamental line notwithstanding) suggest that the persona is mollified only in the sense of coming to terms with her grief. That is, she accepts it rather than lashes out against it as she had in measures 20–21; but the grief is not extinguished.

The image displays a musical score for piano, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system (measures 1-5) is in 3/4 time and begins with a piano (*p*) dynamic. It features a complex texture with multiple voices and a wavy line drawn to the right. The second system (measures 18-19) is also in 3/4 time and begins with a mezzo-piano (*mp*) dynamic. Dashed arrows connect specific notes between the two systems, illustrating a recomposition. A label 'restores tritone to outer voice' points to a tritone interval in measure 19. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings.

Example 6: measures 18–19 as recomposition of measures 1–5

In short, the foreground in A_2 expresses in turn taciturn melancholy, waxing confidence and optimism, ambivalent anguish, funereal grief, bellicose defiance, and finally equivocal repose. In no other section of this movement is the governing *empfindsam* aesthetic and mercurial sensibility more patent.

Regarding structural processes, the G of measure 16 is assimilated by a full-fledged line, as shown in Examples 2 and 3: whereas the G of measure 2 was left hanging, it now continues upward to the A in measure 17 (which is conspicuous for the reasons already mentioned), initiating the 5–6 sequence, the upper line of which then transfers to the tenor voice. Hence, what was in measure 2 an isolated, alienated tone is now a bona fide member of a melodic line. This moment thus represents an actualization, a realization of G's desire to become linearly integrated—G finds a connection, musically and metaphorically, with other entities—initially with A and then, in turn, with the broader line that G–A relation initiates.³⁴ The positive emotion also derives from the fact that G's connection with A resonates with the A–G, $\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ motive. Only now, rather than A descending to G, a figure that, as we have seen, is susceptible to a dour $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ inflection, G ascends to A, a figure much less susceptible to an emotional downturn. This contour reversal, then, signifies an *emotional* reversal. Also symptomatic of emotional reversal is that the bass's G# in measure 18, part of the ascending chromatic 5–6 sequence, is arguably an enharmonic respelling of A \flat , $\flat\hat{6}$, such that what had been a morose A \flat –G is now a much more hopeful G#–A.

This reversal is also evident on a broader scale when we consider the transition from this large A section to the large B that follows it: as shown in Example 3, the G in measure 19, at least at the foreground, is left hanging—it is registrally abandoned. But ultimately finds a home in the Ab that begins the large B. This inverted statement of the $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}$ motive and the emotional reversal it intimates is a crucial impetus for the much more ebullient demeanor of the large B.

If G is momentarily actualized, given a sense of purpose and belonging by the unexpected, beneficent A (the emotional impetus, perhaps, behind A's *rinforzando*), a metric element is actualized as well. Recall that the second beat of measure 17 initiates a metric displacement; this can be construed as reframing the previously accented second beats (measures 4, 10, and 12) as a downbeat, as if they had aspired to downbeat-status all along. In other words, this moment actualizes the potential or desire of those rhythmic accents to become full-fledged metric accents. This event is arguably a metric counterpart to the integration of G: both the G and the second beat begin as ancillaries to structure (tonal and metric, respectively) but are ultimately transformed into integral components of structure.³⁵ Measure 17, then, is the culmination and resolution of both tonal and metric processes, and thus serves to motivate and substantiate the confidence, if ephemeral, suggested by the foreground.

Measure 18, on the other hand, evinces a discrepancy between the foreground topic and the broader structural process: the mournful character of the F–E sigh figure is mitigated not only by the bass's G \sharp –A, as discussed, and the subsequently softened undercutting, but also by the fact that F–E is a fulfillment of sorts. That is, the E² is a resolution of the F² neighbor left hanging at the end of the B section, as shown by the arrow in Example 2.³⁶ Topic and voice leading once again converge at the hammer strokes: the disruptive effect of these gestures is substantiated by and in part results from the voice leading. As the graph indicates, G (measure 21) is no longer neatly integrated into a continuous line. That was possible in measures 16 ff. due to the homogeneity of the sequential voice leading, where all notes were at the same level; here the G is clearly subordinate to, a passing tone in relation to, the surrounding F and A (the predominant is being composed out). Interestingly, the soprano in measures 20–22 can be read as recalling the bass line of measures 17–18, with slight modifications—it excludes the chromatic tones. This line too is dissolved (see brackets in Example 3). Hence, the sequential progression of measures 16–18 is subsequently dissolved, in terms of both underlying voice leading and surface rhythmic fragmentation. Such dissolution can be construed as a hostile response to the linear integration of G.

Conclusion

The above analysis demonstrates how emotional conventions and contours are modified and specified not just by thematic development and formal processes—phrase expansion or foreshortening, sequences, metric displacement, and so on—but also by tonal structure and voice leading, motivic interrelations, and melodic implications/realizations. That is, the structural refinement of basic moods is not only diachronic but also synchronic; it occurs not only in horizontal space, as the foreground linearly unfolds, but also in vertical (hierarchical) space, as a result of the foreground interacting with, perceived in relation to, deeper, concurrent levels of structure. Diachronically, a basic emotion is specified by the dynamic form it assumes, a form that predicates various attributes about its emotive subject. Synchronically, the basic emotion is specified by higher-level processes. The latter, metaphorically construed, yield states of mind, beliefs, attitudes, and desires that lend both cognitive complexity and situational specificity to emotions denoted by foreground signifiers. Musical emotions, in short, grow more specific and complex not only as the music unfolds in time but also as one delves into structural strata, as one uncovers the structural context of particular events.

In closing, I want to reemphasize that tonal and other structural processes do not necessarily conform to and confirm the emotional content of the foreground, but can imply a different, even opposing emotion. For examples of confirmation, we saw how the melancholy of the opening was created not just topically but also structurally—by the lack of linear connection. We also saw how the striving optimism of measure 17 was created not just by the energetic gestures at the foreground but also by the fulfillment of long-awaited tonal and metric promises. In these two cases, structural processes support and specify the comparatively vague emotional implications of the foreground by furnishing musical metaphors for mental attitudes or states of belief (“I desire to belong to something”; “I am now part of something”). Such mental states are arguably necessary components of an emotionally complex experience. For an example of incongruity, recall measure 18, whose sadness, as expressed by the sigh figure, is mitigated or countered by several factors, especially by the E^2 providing a long-range resolution of F^2 . The voice leading here connotes a positive emotional state at odds with the pathos of the surface. In cases such as this, one might contend that surface and structure offer mutually exclusive emotional scenarios one must choose between. Alternatively, and I think preferably, one might contend that multiple and conflicting emotional strata coexist, engendering irreducible emotional ambiguity. One might view such music as indicative of a psychologically conflicted and complex persona, one that

feels a particular emotion on one level of consciousness, a different or even antithetical emotion on another.

Whether structural processes amplify the emotions of the musical surface or, conversely, suggest emotional nuances at odds with them, one thing is clear: Schenkerian, motivic, and other analytical methods, in revealing and parsing a piece's structural complexity, also potentially provide a window into its music–emotional complexity. They afford us a glimpse beyond the often simple or basic emotions derived from foreground features into the more subtle tinges and subtexts that derive from non–obvious structural relations. Indeed, inviting these methodologies into music–emotional exegesis is advantageous precisely because they have the capacity to elucidate a music–emotional experience more nuanced than Kivy's "garden–variety" types;³⁷ this is because they connote the mental states that are integral components of specific emotions. By teasing out the experiential intimations of structural processes, one can more readily see how music is proximate to and expressive of our lived emotional experience.

Notes

This essay is based upon talks delivered in the fall of 2007 at Stanford University and Drury University. I thank Kumaran Arul and George Barth for inviting me to speak at the former, Christopher Koch at the latter. I also thank Scott Burnham, Kevin Korsyn, and Wayne Petty for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this essay.

1. The most ardent proponent of this view in recent scholarship is Kivy (1989); other "anti-arousalists" include Tischler (1972), Goodman (1976), Davies (1994), and Goldman (1995). Perhaps one of the earliest anti-arousalists was Johann Mattheson, on whose viewpoint Kivy (1993a) expounds.
2. Budd (1985:63) notes an exception: when the listener is sad or angry about the piece itself for some reason (such as its perceived poor quality). In such a case, the piece would be the intentional object, albeit not an aesthetically relevant one.
3. Karl and Robinson (1997) (whose phrase I borrow) and Levinson (1990) both argue for this thesis.
4. A caveat regarding Beethoven's music, on which I will focus in this paper: many themes of Beethoven's middle period are not at all the melodically distinctive, self-contained modules of earlier classical music, but rather relatively generic, consisting of primordial musical material. Recall the themes of the openings of the "Eroica" Symphony and "Appassionata" Sonata, for example—both consist of mere arpeggiated triads. Adorno (1988:23, *passim*), for one, attributes this phenomenon to Beethoven's proclivity in the middle period toward organic unity and processuality. Beethoven de-particularizes themes in order to give them over to the totality, to submit them to a thoroughgoing developmental process. Yet, I would suggest, most of the middle-style themes, even if not musically distinct and self-contained, are nonetheless emotionally distinct enough to serve as emotional points of reference. The opening motto of the Fifth Symphony is a case in point: thematically no more than an impetus for further motion and development, emotionally it is a rather concrete point of departure. In short, even where Beethoven attenuates (or negates) musical thematicity, he preserves emotional thematicity.

5. In Adorno's typology (1962:5), "structural hearing" is practiced by the "expert" listener. Structural hearing, in my view, does not require specialized, technical knowledge but merely a capacity to store musical events in memory, to hear them in relation to previous ones—in short, to hold them in a state of "conceptual tension" (to invoke Schenker's term [1926, *passim*]).
6. This view, which affords the listener/reader an indispensable role in the meaning-making process, strongly resonates with the reader-response theory of Wolfgang Iser (1978).
7. Kivy does not deal extensively with topics; for a general introduction, see Allanbrook (1983:31–70) and Ratner (1980:9–29). Incidentally, topics, like the major and minor modes, may also generate broad expressive contexts. Robert Hatten notes, for example, that in the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 101, the Pastoral is "the fundamental topical premise coordinating formal features and expression" (Hatten 1994:92).
8. The expressiveness of musical contours, Kivy argues (1989:172 ff.), also derives from our strong "animistic" tendencies, which in turn derive from basic survival instincts and are thus evolutionarily advantageous.
9. Davies (1994:201–278) similarly submits that music presents not felt emotion but "emotion characteristics in appearances"; that is, music utilizes the same primary expressions of feeling as operate in people. Small (1998, *passim*) expresses a related view: that music expresses emotions not directly but rather through the physical gestures with which emotions are associated.
10. Perceiving music as evocative of speech depends in no small measure upon performance, especially regarding articulation. The eighteenth century witnessed a significant shift in the manner by which performers conveyed a linguistic sensibility. Barth (1992:38 ff.) recounts how the "syllabic nonlegato" of C. P. E. Bach and Mozart gave way to Beethoven's predominately legato touch. While the latter would seem far less conducive to a declamatory style than the localized articulation and pianistic punctuation of earlier composers, in fact, Beethoven's "cherished innovations—the legato style, the slurs that more frequently crossed bar lines to subsume points of arrival, the lengthy passages of unarticulated figuration" (47)—became means of conveying larger dramatic arcs. Beethoven sublated the periodicity of eighteenth century rhetoric, preserving it but on a higher level, one compatible with his grander structural proportions. His use of legato less often conveyed long-lined lyricism than "dramatic breadth" (45).
11. Gioseffo Zarlino, who was perhaps the first to characterize the major triad as happy ("allegro") and the minor triad as sad ("mesto"), derives these affective qualities less from static, physiognomic aspects than from mobile, gestural ones. As recounted by Dahlhaus (1990:235), Zarlino supported these associations by "a psychological interpretation [of the] rule of thirds and sixths," by which major thirds and sixths derive their ebullient quality from their tendency to expand, to fifths and octaves, respectively, while minor thirds and sixths derive their melancholy quality from their tendency to contract, to unisons and fifths, respectively. I would add that the dialectical or dualistic theorists, such as Moritz Hauptmann and Hugo Riemann, similarly ascribed the sadness of minor to a dynamic quality, if one less pronounced than Zarlino's—to the fact that the minor triad, as the inversion of a major triad, is generated from the top down; in Hauptmann's words, it expresses "not upward driving force, but downward drawing weight . . . We therefore find in the minor chord the expression for mourning, the hanging boughs of the weeping willow," *The Nature of Harmony and Meter*, his italics; translated in Mickelsen (1977:13).
12. Meyer (1973:214) similarly posits a fluid boundary between melodic "archetypes," which are based on melodic contour and syntax, and melodic "schemata," which are based on conventional use. In fact, he no sooner establishes this dichotomy than dissolves it, conjoining

the two terms: “archetypal schemata.”

13. Sulzer (1774) claims that “every passion is actually a series of moving impressions” and “there are passions in which impressions flow evenly like a gentle brook . . . [others] which flow onward faster and with more turbulence. In a few the succession of impressions rush forward as if a raging stream” (in Baker and Christensen 1995:52). However, unlike Hanslick, he does not deny that music can express particular emotions; in fact, he seems to suggest that music can do so precisely by representing the motions with which particular emotions are associated.

14. Robinson (1987) likewise argues that music can describe an object but not depict it—that it can posit a predicate but not a subject.

15. Kivy (1993c) detects a telling inconsistency in Hanslick’s argument. At one point, Hanslick (1891:17–19) invokes Gluck’s famous aria “*Che farò senza Euridice!*” from *Orfeo ed Euridice*, noting that the music, though on its face appropriate to the grief expressed by the text, upon reflection proves not to be sad enough, such that, in fact, it could be used for a text expressing the opposite emotion: gaiety. From this situation—not an uncommon one among eighteenth-century composers, who often reused music to set emotionally disparate texts—Hanslick concludes that music possesses no definite emotion, for if it did, it would not be amenable to such multi-use. However, as Kivy notes, Hanslick’s argument is self-contradictory, since, in the case of “*Che farò*,” Hanslick seems initially to have implied that the music does indeed have an inherent, specific emotional quality (happiness) independent from and contrary to that of the text. Kivy ultimately concludes that Hanslick, despite himself, accedes to the possibility of particular emotions in music.

16. We might liken Langer’s processes to Johnson’s (1987) “embodied image schemata,” which are schemata derived from somatic experience, from our physical interaction with the world around us, and which are metaphorically extended to serve as models for internal, cognitive and emotional, experience. As defined by Zbikowski, the image schema “is a dynamic cognitive construct that functions somewhat like the abstract structure of an image and thereby connects together a vast range of different experiences that manifest this same recurring structure” (2002:68).

17. Meyer (1956:19) subscribes to this view as well, claiming that affect is inherently undifferentiated and can only be differentiated by a situational context, which music cannot provide.

18. By contrast, the theme as stated in the previous, orchestral exposition is emotionally milder, due to its piano dynamic and lack of *sforzando* on the G. In fact, we would probably attribute anger (or more precisely, subdued or latent anger) to this earlier passage only in retrospect—on the basis of its more overt appearance in the solo piano.

19. Sulzer (1774) states “All that is . . . serious, thoughtful . . . requires long phrases; the cheerful as well as the furious [require] very short phrases.” Quoted in Ratner (1980:174).

20. As a whole, this nine-measure passage of the second exposition (measures 122–130) is a slight expansion of the corresponding eight-measure passage of the first exposition (measures 9–16), as it augments the cadential progression of measure 15 to two measures (128–129). Hence, the local expansion (of the two-measure model) results from acceleration, the global expansion (of the first exposition) from *ritardation*.

21. In a sonata form, this will often happen right away, prior to the development section proper Schoenberg states:

There is development everywhere in a piece of music, especially in the first division [i.e., the exposition], where a number of themes are developed from a basic motive. Nothing can

remain without being elaborated or worked out. What happens in this second division [i.e., the development] is something different. Themes of the first division and their derivatives are found in a constant modulatory movement through many . . . [tonal] regions" (Schoenberg 1948:145).

For Schoenberg, what characterizes the development section is not thematic development per se, not developing variation as occurs in the exposition, but placing themes in various tonal environments. For this reason, he prefers for this section the term *Durchführung*: "which means that the themes which have not modulated in the first division are now [led through] contrasting regions in a modulatory procedure" (ibid.). One can trace back this stance toward development further still, indeed to the first two decades of the nineteenth century with Antoine Reicha's *grande coupe binaire*, a nascent formulation of what became known as sonata form. As documented by Hoyt (1996), Reicha adopted a very broad view of "développement," applying it to almost any modification the musical idea receives, which can happen anywhere in the form.

22. Koch's basic views on musical emotion—regarding the emotions music can elicit, the circumstances under which music can elicit them, how the composer can access them, and so on—are found throughout this section, especially pp. 144–57 (Baker and Christensen 1995). Incidentally, McCreless (2002) notes that, in the late eighteenth century, the centuries long connection between music and rhetoric began to dissolve. In particular, with the rise of the galant style and its emphasis upon tangible affects, the music–rhetorical figures (*Figurenlehre*) took a back seat; in other words, with the shift from a mimetic to an expressive aesthetic, figures became obsolete. However, Johann Forkel, among other theorists, attempted to preserve at least some components of rhetoric, in particular the notion of the subject of an oration. Indeed, as McCreless (2002:873) observes, "Late eighteenth–century compositional theory is full of discussions of the *Idee*, *Gedanke*, *Thema*, or *motivo*."

23. Within Koch's framework, the principal ideas are devised in the initial, planning [*Anlage*] phase, their modifications in the realization [*Ausführung*] phase.

24. To be accurate, Hanslick at one point actually comes close to articulating essentially this very point: "Everything in the structure is a spontaneous continuation and consequence of the theme, conditioned and shaped by it . . . The composer puts the theme, like the principal character in a novel, into different situations and surroundings, in varying occurrences and moods—these and all the rest, no matter how sharply contrasted, are thought and shaped with reference to it" (1891:82). Once again, we detect some ambivalence on Hanslick's part.

25. Forte and Gilbert (1982:139) read measures 3–4 as forming a local interruption on $\hat{2}$ (in measure 3, then prolonged in the following measure). I do not think an interruption is viable here since the $\hat{2}$ is not supported by a root–position dominant. The bass in these measures, in fact, is so chromatically unstable and fluid (with a progression of F^\sharp – F^\flat – E) as to promote unbroken continuity into measure 5.

26. In examining the interaction of topics and other foreground emotional signifiers with Schenkerian structure, I will employ a methodology similar though not identical to Agawu (1991). In a more general way, my approach is also indebted to Cone (1986), Hatten (1994), Maus (1997), and Klein (2004), to cite four of the more celebrated studies exploring the intersection of musical structure and meaning.

27. Both Schoenberg (1948:115) and Caplin (1998:76–77) read this phrase as a more tightly knit, linear unit—as a sentence, wherein measures 1–2 comprise the basic idea, 3–4 its variant, and 5–8 the continuation. However, given how fragmented the events are due to the pregnant pauses and slow tempo, I do not hear this phrase as a sentence; even if such a form applies theoretically, I do not think it is relevant perceptually. In particular, it is quite dif-

ficult to perceive measures 1–2 as a single module (the basic idea) since the figures in those respective measures are so isolated and distant.

28. Or rather, I was thus persuaded by an anonymous reader, whom I thank.

29. Cadwallader (1988) supplies several examples of this phenomenon—where initial foreground motivic ambiguity is eventually resolved or clarified by middleground structure—in the late piano music of Brahms.

30. The B section of Robert Schumann's *Albumblatt* in F \sharp minor (from his *Bunte Blätter*, Op. 99, and on which Brahms composed his Variations, op. 9) is remarkably similar to Beethoven's B section: both feature partial melodic sequences in which a triadic arpeggiation is promised but not fulfilled (Elsewhere [2012], I have demonstrated how Brahms's variations actualize the foiled arpeggiation in the theme). Yet, unlike Beethoven's B section, Schumann's does in fact delineate a sentence.

31. Interestingly, if the bass's A \flat –G (measures 13–14) recalls the alto of measure 7, the bass's larger A–A \flat –G motion recalls the alto's F \sharp –F \natural –E of measure 4 (see arrow in Example 2). Both have an undermining, or, at Robert Hatten terms it, “undercutting” quality (on this trope generally and its use in Beethoven's op. 101 in particular, see Hatten [1994:99–100]).

32. Or by someone else's, if we construe the B section to represent another persona. I think one of the central narrative ambiguities in wordless music generally is whether salient musical contrasts and oppositions are more indicative of conflicts between personae or rather of conflicting psychological states within a single persona. Though in a few rare cases certain factors might suggest one more than the other, I think the matter is usually ambiguous, and it certainly is here.

33. Chopin uses a V 4/2 of \flat II in measure 72 of the Nocturne in C Minor, opus 48, no. 1 to similar effect, except Chopin's chord, rendered fortissimo and placed at the apex of a quick crescendo, undercuts in a brazen manner, in contrast to Beethoven's cryptic one.

34. Meyer (1973) would probably consider the G in measure 2 a “potentiality,” in that its melodic prominence, as part of a salient sigh figure, is at odds with its lack of structural importance. This disparity, precisely because it is so conspicuous, suggests the potential for congruence between the melodic and structural domains; this potential is realized in measures 17 ff. I regard this actualization, like most, as having an empowering, positive emotional connotation.

35. This narrative of integration also applies to A \flat , \flat $\hat{6}$, which appears twice in this section as a chromatic outlier. The large B section starting in measure 25, whose key is A \flat major, might be seen to integrate and centralize the A \flat —this is yet another basis for this section's aura of repose and contentment.

36. The motion from F2 to E2 within measure 14 is, of course, no true resolution, for this E is merely a passing tone within a G7 sonority and is subsumed by the octave coupling F 2 –F 1 .

37. In this, I am in fundamental agreement with Anthony Newcomb, who, moreover, attributes Kivy's stance to a linguistic predilection among aestheticians “to discuss the expressivity of music only in simple, very general expressive predicates” and admonishes against reducing music–emotional possibilities “to the decidedly unrich repertory of basic expressive concepts which aestheticians are wont to use again and again” (1984:620).

References

- Adorno, Theodor. 1988. *Beethoven: The Philosophy of Music (Fragments and Texts)*. ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- _____. 1988 [1962]. *Introduction to the Sociology of Music*. Trans. E. B. Ashton. New York: Continuum.
- Agawu, Kofi. 1991. *Playing with Signs: A Semiotic Interpretation of Classic Music*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Allanbrook, Wye Jamison. 1983. *Rhythmic Gesture in Mozart: Le Nozze Di Figaro and Don Giovanni*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barth, George. 1992. *The Pianist as Orator: Beethoven and the Transformation of Keyboard Style*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bent, Ian (ed.). 1994. *Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. II: Hermeneutic Approaches. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Budd, Malcolm. 1985. *Music and the Emotions: The Philosophical Theories*. New York: Routledge.
- Caplin, William E. 1998. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cadwallader, Allen. 1988. Foreground Motivic Ambiguity: Its Clarification at Middleground Levels in Selected Piano Pieces of Johannes Brahms. *Music Analysis* 7 (1): 59–91.
- Cone, Edward T. 1986. Schubert's Promissory Note: An Exercise in Musical Hermeneutics. *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press: 13–30.
- Cook, Nicholas. 1987. *A Guide to Musical Analysis*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons.
- Davies, Stephen. 1994. *Musical Meaning and Expression*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1997. Why Listen to Sad Music If It Makes One Feel Sad? *Meaning and Music*, ed. Jenefer Robinson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 242–253.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. 1990. *Studies on the Origin of Harmonic Tonality*, trans. Robert O. Gjerdingen. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1991. *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to his Music*. Trans. Mary Withall. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Forte, Allen and Steven Gilbert. 1982. *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Goldman, Alan. 1995. Emotions in Music (A Postscript). *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 53 (1): 59–69.
- Goodman, Nelson. 1976. *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis, Hackett.
- Hanslick, Eduard. 1891 (8th edition). *On the Musically Beautiful: A Contribution towards the Revision of the Aesthetics of Music*. Trans. Geoffrey Payzant. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Hatten, Robert. 1994. *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Nakedness, Correlation, and Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hoyt, Peter A. 1996. The Concept of *Développement* in the Early Nineteenth Century. *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, ed. Ian Bent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 141–162.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Karl, Gregory and Jenefer Robinson. 1997. Shostakovich's Tenth Symphony and the Musical Expression of Cognitively Complex Emotions. *Meaning and Music*, ed. Jenefer Robinson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 155–178.

- Kivy, Peter. 1989. *Sound Sentiment: An Essay on the Musical Emotions*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- _____. 1993a. Mattheson as Philosopher of Art, *The Fine Art of Repetition: Essays in the Philosophy of Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 229–249.
- _____. 1993b. Something I've Always Wanted to Know About Hanslick, *The Fine Art of Repetition*: 265–275.
- _____. 1993c. What Was Hanslick Denying? *The Fine Art of Repetition*: 276–295.
- Klein, Michael. 2004. Chopin's Fourth Ballade as Musical Narrative. *Music Theory Spectrum* 26: 23–56.
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph. 1787. *Introductory Essay on Composition*, Vol. II, Part I, reprinted in *Aesthetics and the art of musical composition in the German Enlightenment: Selected writings of Johann Georg Sulzer and Heinrich Christoph Koch*, ed. and trans. Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Thomas Christensen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 137–204.
- Langer, Susanne. 1957. *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*, 3rd edition. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Levinson, Jerrold. 1990. Hope in The Hebrides. *Music, Art, and Metaphysics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 336–375.
- _____. 1997. Music and Negative Emotion. *Music and Meaning*, ed. Jenefer Robinson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 215–241.
- Maus, Fred Everett. 1997. Music as Drama. *Music and Meaning*, ed. Jenefer Robinson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 105–130.
- McCreless, Patrick. 2002. Music and Rhetoric. *The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*, ed. Thomas Christensen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 847–879.
- Meyer, Leonard B. 1956. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1973. *Explaining Music: Essays and Explorations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mickelsen, William C. 1977. *Hugo Riemann's Theory of Harmony*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Newcomb, Anthony. 1984. Sound and Feeling, *Critical Inquiry* 10: 614–643.
- O'Dea, Jane. 2000. *Virtue or Virtuosity: Explorations in the Ethics of Musical Performance*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Ratner, Leonard G. 1980. *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York: Schirmer.
- Robinson, Jenefer. 1987. Music as a Representational Art. *What is Music? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Music*. ed. Philip Alpert. University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 165–192.
- Schenker, Heinrich. 1926. Further Considerations of the Urlinie: II. *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*. Volume 2. Trans. John Rothgeb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1–22.
- Schoenberg, Arnold. 1948 (rev. ed. 1969). *Structural Functions of Harmony*. ed. Leonard Stein. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.
- Spitzer, Michael. 2006. *Music as Philosophy: Adorno and Beethoven's Late Style*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sulzer, Johann Georg 1774. *General Theory of the Fine Arts*, excerpts reprinted in *Aesthetics and the art of musical composition in the German Enlightenment: Selected writings of Johann Georg Sulzer and Heinrich Christoph Koch*, ed. and trans. Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Thomas Christensen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995: 25–108.
- Swinkin, Jeffrey. 2012. Variation as Thematic Actualisation: The Case of Brahms's Opus 9. *Music Analysis* 31, no. 1: 37–89.
- Tischler, Hans. 1972. A Proposal For A Multi-Relational Aesthetics. *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 3 (2): 141–159.
- Zbikowski, Lawrence. 2002. *Conceptualizing Music: Cognitive Structure, Theory, and Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Current Musicology

Scott Gleason is a PhD candidate in music theory at Columbia University. His dissertation historicizes philosophies informing a strain of modern theorizing about music. He edits for *The Open Space Magazine*, *Perspectives of New Music*, and formerly for *Current Musicology*. His articles have appeared in *The Open Space Magazine*, *Perspectives of New Music*, and *Philosophy and the Public Realm*. His research interests include historical music theories, critical theory, and phenomenological and experimental analyses of new music.

Clark Lunberry is an Associate Professor of English at the University of North Florida. His interdisciplinary scholarship has been published in such journals as *SubStance* and *Critical Inquiry*, and his book, *Sites of Time, Plays of Space: Other Theaters*, is forthcoming (Anthem Press). Also, Lunberry has recently completed a number of “writing on water/writing on air” projects that involve site-specific poetry in the landscape, with installations in Toronto, Paris, Durham (UK), Hiroshima and Tokyo.

Jeffrey Swinkin has published or has articles forthcoming on a wide array of musical topics, including variation form, aesthetics, performance and analysis, performance practice, and Beethoven. A graduate of the Eastman School of Music and University of Michigan, he is currently a doctoral candidate in music theory at the latter. His dissertation focuses on analysis as a performative tool, one that offers to the performer various possibilities for embodiment and narrative meaning. He previously taught music theory and piano at the University of San Francisco, and as a pianist has performed recitals and concerti across North America. His most recent article, on Brahms’s Variations opus 9, appears in *Music Analysis*.

Mehmet Vurkaç is a native of Turkey and an assistant professor of Electrical Engineering and Renewable Energy at the Oregon Institute of Technology, where he also teaches gen-ed humanities/cognitive science, machine learning, and samba percussion. Vurkaç earned his PhD in Electrical and Computer Engineering in 2011. His research is at the junction of machine learning, musicology, information theory, philosophy of science, and music information retrieval. His performing experiences include popular and traditional forms of Balkan, Brazilian, Cuban, and Japanese percussion. Vurkaç has performed in various Afro-Cuban and Afro-Brazilian ensembles, 1997–2010, including co-directing the *Lions of Batucada*. This group has shared the stage with Brazilian *pagode* pioneers Fundo de Quintal, as well as Sean Lennon, David Byrne, Aerosmith, Fishbone, Pink Martini, Oregon Symphony, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.