# "Breakout" Themes in Classical Sonata Forms

## JEFFREY SWINKIN

Ever since William Caplin inducted Schoenberg's notion of a sentence (*Satz*) into English-language theoretical discourse, scholars have been codifying the myriad guises that sentences can assume. One guise, however, that has not been sufficiently explained is what I call—after James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, who discuss it only briefly—a "breakout" sentence. Here, a presentation module is followed by a continuation module that retrospectively becomes a new presentation, thus triggering a new sentence. The opening of Mozart's *Eine kleine Nachtmusik* is a paradigmatic example. Classical composers exploit this sentence type in order to enter into a primary theme, less often a secondary theme, in a fluid, processive way. This essay will survey examples of such themes. In addition, it will demonstrate how periods can arise retrospectively, and how both sentences and periods can "break out" not only from presentation modules but also from compound basic ideas and from what James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy call "Mozartian loops." All of these formal phenomena provide object lessons in how the three currently most pervasive *Formenlehren*—Caplin's form-functional theory, Hepokoski and Darcy's Sonata Theory, and Janet Schmalfeldt's theory of formal becoming—can and indeed must work together to elucidate certain formal occurrences.

It has been over thirty years since William E. Caplin revived Schoenberg's notion of the sentence (*Satz*), inducting it into mainstream English-language music-theoretical discourse (1987). Since then, scholars have been building on Caplin's work, augmenting our understanding of this crucial form considerably.<sup>1</sup> Although the sentence, perhaps more than any other form, is associated with a single *locus classicus*—the incipit of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2 no. 1 (Example 1)—it assumes remarkably diverse guises, the codification of which has kept form-theorists very busy.

However, there is one such guise that, to my knowledge, has hitherto not been sufficiently accounted for: I shall refer to it, after James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, as the "breakout" sentence (2006, 80–86). Consider the first movement of Haydn's Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, Hob. XVI: 49. Its secondary theme, shown in Example 2, rehearses—in varied form and of course in the dominant key—the opening gestures of the piece.<sup>2</sup> But after only a few measures, the listener is disabused of any notion that the piece will be monothematic, because a new thematic idea, in the brilliant style and

<sup>1</sup> See in particular articles by Matthew BaileyShea (2004), David Forrest and Matthew Santa (2014), and Mark Richards (2011). Although Schoenberg holds the sentence to be essentially an instrumental form, several scholars have recently focused on its presence in vocal music by Wagner (BaileyShea 2002/3 and 2003), Schubert (Rodgers 2014), Schumann (Krebs 2015), and in American popular song of the early- and mid-twentieth century (Callahan 2013).

<sup>2</sup> I thank an anonymous reader for referring me to this passage. More generally, I want to extend the utmost gratitude to all four readers for their probing and generous feedback. I must also thank William Caplin and Janet Schmalfeldt for their responses to a talk I presented at the 2014 meeting of the Society for Music Theory in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a talk that evolved into this essay. Finally, I would be remiss not to acknowledge Clara Boyett for her scrupulous fact-checking and Kyle Vanderburg for his handsome typesetting of musical examples.



\*Legend of abbreviations used in this essay: ANT antecedent BI basic idea CBI compound basic idea CC contrasting continuation CI contrasting idea CONS consequent CONT continuation (/cadential) PRES presentation X repetition of BI (literal or modified)

# **Example 1** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2 no. 1, i, mm. 1-8.



3

driven by a bustling Alberti bass, begins in m. 28.<sup>3</sup>

The form thus far would seem to be a straightforward sentence: mm. +25-28, comprise a presentation module, complete with a two-measure basic idea and twomeasure repetition, all atop a symmetrical progression of I-V<sup>7</sup>-V<sup>7</sup>-I.<sup>4</sup> The continuation arrives on cue in m. 28 with the expected accelerated motion-the sixteenth notes of the previous motives are now in moto perpetuo. As the music continues, however, the listener starts to sense that this is no standard continuation, because the acceleration is entirely on the surface. Typically, the rate of motivic repetition established in the presentation will quicken in the continuation. In Example 1, for instance, the presentation repeats its basic idea after two measures; the continuation repeats the fragmented basic idea (the  $\gamma$ motive) after only one measure. Even where the continuation has new motivic material rather than fragments of previous material (a contrasting continuation), those new motivic units will still usually repeat at a faster rate than the previous units did.<sup>5</sup> This is not the case with Haydn's contrasting continuation: in mm. 28-32, the repetitions occur at two-measure intervals, just as they did in mm. +25-281. Such repetition, in conjunction with the tonic expansion, indicates a new presentation, which is indeed confirmed by the onset of a continuation in m. 33.

Haydn has evidently performed a feat of formal prestidigitation, mutating what was poised to be a continuation in m. 28 into a new presentation, which is then followed by its own continuation (and that, in turn, by a separate cadential module). In other words, what was initially the continuation of the first sentence retrospectively *becomes* the beginning of a new sentence. Such a phenomenon, the breakout sentence, is schematized in Example 3. As we will see, breakout periods are also possible.

My assertion that mm. 28–42 can stand on their own as an independent sentence is affirmed by the secondary theme (S) in the recapitulation featuring only that module (mm. 158–172); the preceding "monothematic" material of mm.  $\pm$ 25–27 has been expunged. Here a question of thematic labeling arises. In the recapitulation, there is no confusion as to what the first secondary-theme module (S<sup>1.1</sup>) is, but the exposition is

<sup>3</sup> Matthew Riley (2011) sees this new idea as restoring the continuation module that was conspicuously absent from the primary theme's sentence, which jumps directly from the presentation (mm. 1–8) to the cadential module (m. 9). Riley affirms that Haydn's works are often polythematic for precisely this reason—that the secondary theme, in supplying the primary theme's "missing middle," supplies a new thematic idea.

<sup>4</sup> The abbreviation "mm.  $\pm 25-28_1$ " denotes "from the anacrusis to m. 25 to the first beat of m. 28."

<sup>5</sup> The term "contrasting continuation" comes from Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 84). The line separating developmental (*derivative*) from contrasting continuations is somewhat fuzzy. Just how little need a continuation have in common with the presentation in order to be properly called "contrasting"? There is no hard-and-fast rule. For convenience, and taking Hepokoski and Darcy's cue, I will call all but the most blatantly derivative continuations (as typified by Example 1) contrasting. That said, it matters less what we label continuations and more how we explain the balance between derivation and deviation that most entail.



# Example 3

A schematic of the breakout sentence.

another matter. Do mm. +25–28 comprise that first module, even though the sentence they initiate is aborted, yielding to a new and complete sentence starting in m. 28? How one might adapt Hepokoski and Darcy's system of thematic numeration to this kind of formal circumstance is an issue to which I will return.

It should already be evident that breakout sentences (and periods) stand at the crossroads of the three currently most pervasive and august *Formenlehren*: William Caplin's form-functional theory (1998), James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's Sonata Theory (2006), and Janet Schmalfeldt's theory of formal becoming (2011). Those might strike one as uneasy bedfellows. Caplin, for one, does not usually speak of retrospective formal transformation. Yet, Caplin (2010) is generally sympathetic to Schmalfeldt's (1995) reading of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in D Minor, op. 31 no. 2 ("Tempest"), her paradigmatic example of formal becoming, even if he also offers alternate readings.<sup>6</sup>

As for Sonata Theory, it would seem to regard formal modules as minimally susceptible to retrospective transformation. After all, it asserts a goal-oriented sequence of action-spaces, "generic zone-grids that [composers] historically inherited" (Hepokoski 2010, §19). And though Hepokoski and Darcy employ Schmalfeldt's becoming arrow, in their hands it usually denotes a fusing of formal functions—as when, for example, a primary theme (P) dissolves into transitional (TR) rhetoric, which they symbolize (in its most general form) as  $P \Rightarrow TR$ . To my understanding, a formal entity in their system may lead into another seamlessly and unsuspectedly but never *becomes* another in retrospect. Their teleological ethos permits them mainly to move forward, not backward, as it were. Elsewhere, however, Hepokoski recognizes that the Classical triumvirate, Beethoven in particular, often injected a spirit of formal process into the sonata schema, "a concentrated and continuous process of motivic expansion and cross-referencing transformation" (2010, §19). In fact, Hepokoski goes as far to aver, "In every strongly composed sonata form one may, without too much difficulty, discern

<sup>6</sup> Schmalfeldt's essay is essentially an extension of Carl Dahlhaus's dialectical reading of Beethoven's "Tempest" (Dahlhaus 1991, 6–7, 89, 116–18 and 169–71). She subsequently incorporated this article into her book as Chapter Two (2011).

telling indications of 'the process of coming into being'" (§4).<sup>7</sup> And, as mentioned, Hepokoski and Darcy speak, if briefly, of "breakout modules" in Mozart, of a new sentence emerging from a previous one (2006, 80–86).

The three theories, then, seem somewhat susceptible of integration, or at least of being used in conjunction. Accordingly, I aim to infuse a greater sense of processuality into form-functionality and Sonata Theory's thematic architecture. But methodological rapprochement is a secondary concern here, a means to an end; that end is to elucidate a curious but not uncommon formal phenomenon by which Classical themes come into being gradually and retrospectively. (Although, as we have already seen, secondary themes can come into being, this essay will concentrate almost exclusively on primary themes.) A plastic, ambiguous structure demands a diversified toolkit. The three *Formenlehren* will work in tandem in order to illuminate different facets of the same animal.

I begin my investigation in earnest by defining the sentence and its breakout counterpart, offering two paradigmatic examples of the latter, and discussing implications for thematic labeling. Then, I consider a sibling of the breakout sentence—the breakout period; discuss a hybrid theme-type that is especially amenable to formal becoming; and finally, ponder another idiom that tends to trigger a breakout sentence, what Hepokoski and Darcy call "Mozartian Loops." With one exception, all examples fall between *circa* 1780 and 1800 and thus belong to the high-Classical style.

# The Sentence: Preliminaries

I abide by Caplin's definition of a sentence as "an eight-measure theme" (1998, 35).<sup>8</sup> As Caplin acknowledges, the prototypical length can be altered—more often expanded than compressed, and more often involving the continuation than the presentation. Also, the sentence will frequently exceed its normative eight-measure length when its cadential unit follows the continuation rather than being coextensive with it. I disagree, however, with Caplin's contention that those eight measures are "built out of two four-measure phrases." Caplin does not think a phrase must end with a cadence (2004, 58–60), but I do, since I hold a phrase to be a relatively complete harmonic unit.<sup>9</sup> Importantly, Caplin considers the presentation a phrase but one that

<sup>7</sup> The last phrase is taken from Dahlhaus (1991, 118).

<sup>8</sup> By "measure," Caplin means a unit *perceived* as a measure—what he calls a "real measure" (1998, 35). The "real measure" is not always synonymous with the notated measure: in a very rapid tempo, several notated measures might equate with one real measure; conversely, in a very slow tempo, a single notated measure might equate with two or more real measures.

<sup>9</sup> This view is in accordance with William Rothstein (1989).

7

*cannot* end with a cadence, precisely because it is a beginning module—not just by presenting a basic idea but by repeating that idea, which "actually reinforces the sense of formal initiation" (1998, 45). In my view, since a presentation, on account of being initiatory, cannot end with a cadence, it thereby cannot constitute a complete phrase. Instead, I apply the term *module* to presentations, continuations, and, for that matter, to any formal unit beneath the phrase level.

I define a sentence, then, as a normatively eight-measure thematic phrase, one with a single bona fide cadence. Nevertheless, expansive sentences might have a (seeming) cadence prior to the final one. A common scenario, which is presented twice below, is where "a sentence ends with an imperfect authentic cadence [such that] the continuation phrase, or a portion thereof, is... repeated in order to provide greater melodic closure by means of a perfect authentic cadence" (Caplin 1998, 45). In such cases, I regard the imperfect authentic cadence as retrospectively *declined* or overturned by the repetition of the continuation module; in the end, there is only one true cadence and thus only one phrase. (In my analyses, I enclose the overturned cadence in parentheses.) Similarly, the breakout sentence in Example 2 (mm. 28–42) at first blush has a deceptive cadence in m. 36. Yet, that cadence is declined by the onset of a separate cadential module, one that brings greater closure with a perfect authentic cadence. Ultimately, the sentence is a single phrase.

The dimensions of sentence-modules are also important to consider. The presentation subdivides into a two-measure basic idea and a two-measure (modified) repetition, which are then followed by a four-measure continuation; hence, the typical scheme is 2+2+4. The continuation, in turn, often subdivides into 1+1+2. It is thus homologous with the broader sentence to which it belongs, and not just in its proportions but also in its behavior: the continuation states a brief idea (a new one or a fragment of a previous one), repeats it, and then moves on to something different. Both of these quantitative and functional properties are evident in Example 1. Notice, in addition, that the two-measure unit within the continuation itself subdivides into  $\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}+1$ . As one descends the tiers of the formal hierarchy, each module is a smaller microcosm of the previous, like so many Russian nesting dolls.

Proportions are crucial to consider when deciding if an event is a complete sentence and theme (the two of which, again, go hand in hand, per Caplin). For, 1+1+2 dimensions abound, not only in sentence continuations but in antecedent and consequent phrases as well, such as those of the theme of Mozart's Piano Sonata in A Major, K. 331, i (not shown). Mark Richards uses "sentence" to refer to cases where the basic idea is less than two measures, and "sentence theme" where the basic idea is two measures (2011, 183–85). Thus, in his terminology, the antecedent of K. 331 is a sentence but

not a sentence theme. I, by contrast, designate that antecedent as *sentential*, reserving *sentence* for a full-fledged, eight-measure theme.

Proportions are also determinative in identifying where a breakout sentence begins. As noted, continuations tend to have sentential dimensions (n+n+2n) where n < 2 measures). Such recursiveness might cause confusion as to whether a continuation doubles as a breakout sentence if not for the fact that a breakout presentation, just like a normative one, *will still be four measures* in length (possibly with small expansions or, less commonly, compressions). Put another way, in a breakout sentence, the grouping of the breakout presentation will be of the same hierarchic level as that of the initial presentation. For this reason, m. 5 in Example 1 does not begin a breakout sentence while m. 28 in Example 2 does, since there the new basic idea and its repetition occupy two measures each, the same length as the previous basic idea and repetition. Hence, it is largely on the basis of metric dimensions that one can distinguish between a sentential continuation and a continuation that actually becomes a new sentence.

Finally, although Example 2 appears to contain two sentences spliced together, the entire event relies on and deforms (in Hepokoski and Darcy's sense) the basic eightmeasure sentence prototype. As a result, Example 2, and similar examples, should be considered a *single* secondary theme, albeit one with many subthematic modules, the labeling of which will be dealt with below.

#### **Breakout Sentences**

This section supplies examples of breakout sentences, while further refining the concept. Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 7 (Example 4) opens with a fanfare-like basic idea and its sequential repetition, both accompanied by a *Trommelbass* tonic pedal. The continuation (mm.  $\pm 5-8$ ) is contrasting; it liberates itself from the harmonic and melodic rigidity of the preceding module by means of a wider harmonic palette and a more conjunct and intricate melody. Both provide a sense of acceleration, the primary characteristic of a continuation. The harmonic variety goes hand in hand with faster harmonic rhythm, the melodic variety with a greater sense of flow. The melody is more mobile not only in relation to the melody of mm. 1–4 but also in relation to the bass of those measures, since now the eighth-note stream dresses a multitude of tones, not just a single, static one.

The acceleration, unlike that in the Haydn Sonata (Example 2, mm. 28–42), lies not on the surface alone. The rate of motivic repetition in mm.  $^{+}5-8$  relative to that in mm. 1–4 is four times as fast: initially it was two measures, now it is a half-measure (mm. 5–6 subdivide into  $\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}+1$ ). When mm. 5–6 are sequentially restated in mm. 7–8, they retrospectively congeal into a larger, two-measure unit—a basic idea and





its repetition. In this way, mm. 5–8 discharge the duties of *both* a continuation (by accelerating motivic units at a lower level) *and* a presentation (by perpetuating two-measure units at a higher level). It is precisely that form-functional overlap that accounts for the ambiguity, for the new sentence (SENT<sup>B</sup>) coming into existence gradually.<sup>10</sup>

In Examples 2 and 4, the ambiguity attending the presentation of the breakout sentence (SENT<sup>B</sup>:PRES) was attributed to the simultaneity of continuational acceleration at one level and presentational two-measure units at another. A similar ambiguity pervades the *Fortspinnungstypus*, a theme-type that was ubiquitous in the Baroque and of which the Classical *Satz* is arguably a descendent.<sup>11</sup> As Example 5 illustrates, the *Fortspinnungtypus* is essentially a tripartite framework in which a motivic complex (*inventio*) is stated and possibly reiterated (in the same voice or by a *comes*); certain motives from the complex are spun-out in various permutations (sequence, inversion, etc.); and this teeming activity is arrested by a cadence.<sup>12</sup> The paradox of the *Fortspinnung* module proper is that, on the one hand, it is medial in function: it recycles preestablished motives and bridges the initial motivic complex with the cadence. On the other hand, it is, in a sense, initiatory in function: its motoric, continuous motion elicits a strong, kinesthetic sense that the piece is now truly underway.

In the Classical style, such continuous motion following a motivic statement is achieved through more homophonic means—namely, an active accompaniment. As Janet Levy states, "The beginning of a conventionally figured and regularly measured accompaniment pattern, such as an Alberti bass, is a sign that we will hear a presentational [i.e., expository] passage—probably a full statement, such as a stable phrase-group or period" (1982, 489). She cites in this regard the opening of the first movement of Mozart's String Quartet in F Major, K. 590, which features a breakout sentence (Example 6). It contains a three-measure basic idea and a three-measure sequential repetition;<sup>13</sup> then, "the regular repeated-note accompaniment pattern on beats 1 and 2

<sup>10</sup> Although SENT<sup>B</sup> ultimately prevails—since it, not SENT<sup>A</sup>, finds formal completion—the promise of SENT<sup>A</sup> never completely dissipates; the initial presentation is not entirely effaced by the subsequent one. Indeed, the chordal exclamations of the opening measures return at the cadence in mm. 15–17.

<sup>11</sup> I frame the two theme-types as cognates while taking to heart Dahlhaus's (1978) admonition against conflating them (for which he takes Erwin Ratz to task). The main differences between *Satz* and *Fortspinnungstypus*, Dahlhaus instructs, are (1) the former is bipartite (presentation and continuation), the latter tripartite (*Vordersatz*, *Fortspinnung* proper, and cadence); (2) the first part of the former features motivic repetition, the first part of the latter need not; (3) the former entails symmetry, two parts of roughly equal length, the latter does not (symmetry may be imposed upon it, but it is not intrinsic to the form).

<sup>12</sup> Other particularly lucid examples among Bach's Two-Part Inventions are the exordia of No. 3 in D Major (mm. 1–12), No. 4 in D Minor (mm. 1–18), No. 7 in E Minor (mm. 1–7), and No. 8 in F Major (mm. 1–12).

<sup>13</sup> A three-measure basic idea also graces the third movement of Mozart's Symphony No. 40 in G Minor, K. 550. In both cases, the asymmetry of the three-measure modules is partially offset by the symmetry of their repetition (3+3).





Bach, Two-Part Invention No. 1 in C Major, BWV 772, mm. 1-7.

Example 5





of measure 8 quickly... assure[s] us that this time we will hear a more stable, more fullyformed line" (491). Yet, that module also develops preexisting material, fragmenting the basic idea as to spotlight and round off motive *y*. Measures 8–12 are thus in a sense both medial (where a previous motive is developed) and initiatory (where the piece first kicks into gear). That ambiguity partially accounts for why SENT<sup>B</sup> comes into being gradually, why it takes the listener time to register it as a new sentence.

My claim, then, is that the breakout sentence seizes on an ambiguity immanent in the *Fortspinnungstypus*, actualizing the potential of the latter's second-place module to serve a first-place function.

#### Thematic Labeling

We have already established that, although much internal form-functional transmutation occurs in Examples 2, 4, and 6, each is in essence a single complete theme. However, each is also a multimodular entity, one housing several distinct subthematic units. To parse these, Hepokoski and Darcy's detailed method of thematic labeling, which employs decimal numerical notation, can be helpful; using that method in the present context, however, will require altering it somewhat and using it more flexibly than those authors do.

To review their system, Hepokoski and Darcy use P<sup>1.0</sup> for quasi-introductory modules such as (a) an "accompanimental stream" preceding the onset of the melodic theme (for example, the first measure of the soloist's entrance in Mozart's Piano Concerto in C Major, K. 467, ii); (b) an extended anacrusis leading into the theme proper (for example, the first four measures of Schubert's Symphony No. 5 in B-flat Major); and (c) a curtain-raising motto, "common in minor-mode works, where we often find... an abrupt, peremptory initial stamp, a negative head motive, played forte, usually in octaves, before the 'real' theme (P<sup>1.1</sup>) starts to flow forward" (for example, the opening of Haydn's Symphony No. 44 in E Minor ["Trauer"]) (2006, 87). They reserve P<sup>0</sup> for the rarer module that is evidently rather dispensable, such that one could easily imagine the piece beginning without it (72–73). Superscripts <sup>1.1</sup>, <sup>1.2</sup>, and <sup>1.3</sup> apply to smaller thematic units within a larger one, all prior to the first perfect authentic cadence (whether in the home or secondary key). P<sup>2</sup> would thus indicate a second primary theme following the first such cadence. Within a sentence, Hepokoski and Darcy typically designate the presentation P<sup>1.1</sup>, the continuation P<sup>1.2</sup>, and the cadence P<sup>1.3</sup> (assuming it is separate and distinct from the continuation).

My substantive departure from Hepokoski and Darcy is that, whereas they affix a single number to a thematic event (for the reasons mentioned earlier), I affix multiple ones when formal transformation occurs. Consider Example 7, the famous incipit of





*Mozart's Eine kleine Nachtmusik*, K. 525. Like Beethoven's op. 7 (Example 4), it opens with fanfare-like material (P<sup>1.1A</sup>) followed by a contrasting continuation (P<sup>1.2A</sup>). P<sup>1.1A</sup> is disjointed, pockmarked with intervallic and rhythmic gaps. It thereby anticipates and elicits greater continuity; the presentation beckons the continuation. The continuation (starting in m. 5) supplies such continuity by means of a more conjunct melody and a regular accompanimental stream (which includes a *Trommelbass*, *à la* Beethoven's op. 7). P<sup>1.2A</sup> thus fills the gaps of P<sup>1.1A</sup>, generating flow.

That greater propulsion fulfills a medial purpose, but at the same time (per Levy), it evokes the sense that a new and perhaps more definitive thematic statement is underway. That middle/beginning ambiguity is supported by the grouping structure. On the one hand, there is local acceleration by the fact that m. 6, rhythmically speaking, is a modified repetition of m. 5, which suggests a one-measure rate of motivic repetition, a rate twice as brisk as that of the presentation. On the other hand, as in Example 4, such local grouping yields to a higher-level, two-measure grouping—mm. 5–6 are repeated in mm. 7–8—which signals a bourgeoning presentation and breakout sentence (SENT<sup>B</sup>). Correlatively, where the contrasting continuation becomes a new presentation, P<sup>1.2A</sup> becomes P<sup>1.1B</sup>. This process is symbolically distilled in Example 8. Notice in Examples 7 and 8 that, whereas the block arrows indicate *that* formal transformation occurs, the dotted arrows show approximately *where* it occurs. It is approximately where the first two measures of SENT<sup>A</sup>:CONT are repeated, where the lower-level grouping yields to a higher-level one, that one retrospectively suspects that a new presentation/sentence has already begun to emerge. But, there is no precise point at which SENT<sup>B</sup> comes into focus; its dawning is irreducibly incremental.

I should also clarify why I use P<sup>1.1A</sup> and P<sup>1.1B</sup> to distinguish between the initial and subsequent P<sup>1.1</sup> modules—between the one that is distinctly commenced but whose



#### Example 8

A schematic of the breakout sentence showing thematic mutation.

continuation is hazy, and the one whose beginning is hazy but continuation distinct. I apply the superscript <sup>1.1</sup> to both entities precisely because they are in some sense coequal and alternate openings, even though the second ultimately trumps the first. For the same reason, I resist the temptation to demote the first P<sup>1.1</sup> to an introductory module such as P<sup>1.0</sup> when P<sup>1.2</sup> becomes P<sup>1.1(B)</sup>. That interpretation would belie the extent to which P<sup>1.1A</sup> continues to function as a beginning, albeit one that bleeds into another. In a similar vein, I designate the contrasting continuation of SENT<sup>B</sup> P<sup>1.2B</sup>—again, in order at once to distinguish it from and to place it on a par with the initial continuation, P<sup>1.2A</sup>. Such numeration squares with the core Dahlhausian precept of processive form: the meaning of such form is not what it eventuates in, is not a single point to which everything leads; rather, it is the sum total of all events, including those that are seemingly circuitous. "The fact that musical form consists in the process of coming into being, as well as in the result that is seen at the end of the process, is of course particularly obvious in works like the D Minor Sonata [Beethoven's "Tempest"], in which it is scarcely possible to say that those formal functions that are recognized later outrank those that are assumed at first" (Dahlhaus 1991, 118).

Finally, in Example 7, I label the cadential module P<sup>1.3</sup> because it is temporally separated and, at least initially, melodically distinct from the continuation. Notice how it leads to an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) in m. 14, which prompts a repetition leading to a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) in m. 18. The first cadence is retroactively subordinated to the repetition of CAD and the PAC with which it ends. Hence, at least in retrospect, the sentence-*cum*-theme is essentially a single phrase.

# **Breakout Periods: Preliminaries**

The breakout sentence is not the only vehicle by which to broach a theme in a processive way; breakout periods are also possible. Although Example 9 is not such a period, it will prove a useful point of departure. Its sentence, at least up through m. 8, could not be more normative: the presentation module features a two-measure basic idea comprised of two distinct motives, its sequential repetition, and a harmonic framework of  $I-V-V^7-I$ . The continuation module fragments the basic idea, homing in on motive x but slyly eliding it with y in the first half of m. 6 and of m. 7. The metric dimensions of the continuation are 1+1+2, a microcosm of the sentence as a whole. The last two measures (mm. 7–8) contain a standard cadential progression, the melodic component of which liquidates the motivic material by repeating the more generic y to the exclusion of the more characterful x.

As with Example 7, the CONT(/CAD) module in Example 9 initially closes with an IAC. That cadence catalyzes a repetition of CONT (mm. 9–13), which concludes



Beethoven, Piano Sonata in C Major, op. 2 no. 3, i, mm. 1-13.

with a more resolute PAC. The stronger closure is derived not only from the PAC per se but also from its elongation: the previous cadential progression traversed seven beats (mm. 7– $8_3$ ), this one traverses nine (mm. 11– $13_1$ ). The phrase expansion elicits longing for resolution and a sense of release when that resolution is achieved. As with K. 525 (Example 7), the first cadence is retroactively demoted by the repetition of the module it caps, such that, in the end, the sentence occupies a single phrase.

Now, imagine that Example 9 began at m. 5; the resulting entity would be a period whose antecedent and consequent phrases are each structured sententially. Indeed, that structure would be homologous with, for instance, the opening period of Mozart's Piano Sonata in A Major, K. 331 (not shown). This fact might cause one to wonder whether, in the context of the actual composition, mm.  $5-13_1$  might constitute a breakout period. (There is no question of mm. 5-8 forming a breakout sentence since the dimensions are too small.) They do not, for the simple reason that their motivic content is not different from that of mm. 1-4 and thus we do not hear it as a new entity (a P<sup>1.1B</sup>).

Indeed, motivic contrast is an absolutely crucial criterion of breakout periods, more so than of breakout sentences. With breakout sentences, the dimensions are determinative—the maintenance of 2+2 in the SENT<sup>A</sup>:CONT signals SENT<sup>B</sup>:PRES whether or not the motivic material is contrasting. The continuation was patently contrasting in Example 4, a bit less so in Example 2, and even less so in Example 6. Nonetheless, in each case, the breakout sentence was clear. With breakout periods, however, the dimensions are not determinative: whether a presentation is followed by a sentential continuation or a sentential antecedent (the only type considered here), the dimensions are the same: 1+1+2. Hence, without distinctly new motivic material, we would have little reason to hear the second module as anything other than a continuation of the ongoing sentence (and would have little reason to hear the repetition of that second module as anything other than a repeated continuation).

A breakout period, therefore, arises when a presentation (or, as we will see, a compound basic idea) is followed by a sententially-structured contrasting continuation, one that ends with a less-than-perfect cadence, such that it is repeated to achieve stronger closure. The continuation and its repetition become a sententially-structured antecedent and consequent.

A secondary criterion of breakout periods, as with breakout sentences, is that the opening material allows for a more continuous subsequent module. As we have seen with all of the breakout sentences thus far—Examples 2, 4, 6, and 7—when the opening module is rhythmically disjointed or discontinuous, it tends to beckon a more mobile module. And, as Levy maintains, such motion fosters a sense of a more bona fide beginning, or at least a fresh one. The same is true of breakout periods. Example





Example 10

PAC

10, though possessing many features that conduce to a breakout period, does not assert such a period, precisely because the module beginning at m. 5 is not more continuous than the preceding module. To elaborate, Mozart's structure is practically identical to that of Beethoven's op. 2 no. 3 (Example 9): after a four-measure presentation module, a sentential continuation leads to an IAC in m. 8, which precipitates a repetition leading to a PAC in m. 12.<sup>14</sup> The repetition is expanded, as it is in Example 9, but here the expansion occurs after the cadence—externally rather than internally. Another, more crucial difference between the examples is that where Beethoven's continuation is demonstrably derivative, Mozart's is clearly contrasting. Yet, that motivic novelty does not ensure a breakout period because the presentation in mm. 1–4 is already rhythmically regular; its accompaniment flows, uninterrupted, into and through the continuation. The textures of the presentation and continuation are not different enough to warrant hearing the continuation as becoming a new beginning.

To summarize, an environment ripe for a breakout period (one with sentential phrases) will feature:

- 1. a fairly discontinuous presentation (or compound basic idea)
- 2. a subsequent module that features
  - » a more regular rhythmic pattern
  - » 1+1+2 dimensions
  - » new motivic material
  - » a less-than-perfect cadence

3. a repetition of that module with a more resolute cadence The phenomenon is schematized in Example 11.



#### Example 11

A schematic of the breakout period.

<sup>14</sup> For comparison, see Caplin's analyses of Beethoven op. 2 no. 3, and Mozart K. 330 (1998, 44 and 38, respectively).

#### Examples of Breakout Periods

I offer two examples that fulfill these conditions; the first example is fairly straightforward, the second is more complex. Measures 1-4 of Mozart's Piano Concerto in C Major, K. 467 (Example 12) comprise a classic presentation: over a I-V<sup>7</sup>-V<sup>7</sup>-I progression, a basic idea nesting two contrasting motives is stated and sequentially restated. The presentation, with its stiff, march-like mien, implicates and awaits a more fluid response. In addition, its sparse, monophonic texture awaits a fuller, homophonic one. Sure enough, the next module brings more regular rhythmic motion—an eighthnote stream in mm. 5 and 6 created by composite rhythm—and a lusher texture. At first glance, this module is merely a contrasting continuation, with its telltale metric reduction and recursive proportions. Yet, after a half-cadential close, the presumed continuation is repeated (starting at m. 9), gingerly embellished, slightly foreshortened, and ending with a PAC. It is upon hearing this repetition, starting in m. 9, that we reinterpret what was at first a *de rigueur* sentential continuation as the sentential antecedent of a breakout period. Correlatively, what was initially P<sup>1.2A</sup> becomes P<sup>1.1B</sup>.  $P^{1.1B}$  does not so much replace  $P^{1.1A}$  (or, for that matter,  $P^{1.2A}$ ) as coexists with it as part of a rich, multidimensional Gestalt.

A more complicated example of a breakout period is shown in Example 13.<sup>15</sup> In this excerpt, a muscular presentation is followed by a meek response, but one that gathers gumption when, after a half cadence in m. 8, it is repeated and forcefully expanded by means of insistent reiterations of motive *b*.<sup>16</sup> That repetition discharges its accumulated tension into the downbeat of m. 17. Also, the intervallic and rhythmic fissures of the opening measures are filled; fluid motion and continuity betoken a "more stable, more fully-formed line," to resound Levy's phrase.<sup>17</sup> In all these respects, this passage is homologous with Mozart's (Example 12), except that here Beethoven's consequent phrase is generously expanded. Both pieces generate a breakout period that ultimately outweighs, though by no means annihilates, the sentence that was initially promised.

Interestingly, in the recapitulatory statement starting at m. +227 (not shown),

<sup>15</sup> Caplin analyzes mm. 1–17 as one large sentence with an "extension of continuation function" (1998, 47 and 265, fn. 52).

<sup>16</sup> The first four measures do not comprise a zero-module because their motivic material returns and, indeed, is central to the movement as a whole.

<sup>17</sup> The skeptic might cite Beethoven's lack of a root-position tonic on the downbeat of m. 5, but, I suggest the tonic is implicit here: mm. 1–4 establish a clear tonic-oriented context which is not counterindicated until the second beat of m. 5; there is no reason to hear the first three pitches (Bb–C–D) of P<sup>1.1B</sup> as anything other than the root and third of a tonic chord being bridged by a passing tone (though that third is immediately coopted by a vii<sup>ø7</sup>/V).







the presentation is no longer cordoned off by a fermata and is now accompanied by a rhythmic stream that flows directly into the continuation. Such rhythmic continuity (and relative textural uniformity) militates against hearing the continuation as becoming a breakout antecedent. Another counterindication is that the would-be consequent (at m. +235) is not thematically parallel to the beginning of the would-be antecedent, as it was in the exposition. Here, instead, it reiterates the last few measures of the previous module and is thus more a continuance than a varied repetition of that module. Not to mention, the would-be consequent never reaches a PAC; after a massive build-up, it detonates upon a deceptive cadence (on  $\downarrow$ VI) in m. 249, the juncture corresponding to m. 17. In summary, P entails a breakout period in the exposition, but not in the recapitulation. Beethoven's primary theme thus involves impressive formal transmutation both within the expository statement and between it and the recapitulatory statement.

# Hybrid Themes

The last two examples were of a hybrid nature in that a sentential function (the continuation), overlapped with a periodic function (the antecedent). Can hybrid themes, in Caplin's sense, also play a role in thematic becoming? Of his four types, the compound basic idea + continuation seems to do so the most often.

By way of review, a compound basic idea (CBI) offers, in lieu of a basic idea and (modified) repetition, a basic idea and a contrasting idea.<sup>18</sup> In this respect, it is similar to an antecedent, with the crucial difference that a CBI, like a presentation, does not have a cadence at the end. A CBI thus embodies elements of both periods and sentences; it is itself a hybrid of sorts. That hybridity is multiplied when a CBI is conjoined with a continuation (Caplin's Hybrid 3).<sup>19</sup> Consider the Haydn Sonata in Example 14, which Caplin also analyzes (1998, 60–61). This theme is sentence-like in every respect except for the first four measures housing a two-measure basic idea and a two-measure contrasting idea (i.e., a CBI) rather than a basic idea and repetition. Note that there is no half cadence in mm. 3–4 because a mere I–V does not comprise a complete progression; mm. 1–4 expand the tonic.

In contrast, consider Example 15, the first of Mozart's so-called "Viennese" Sonatinas, K. 439b, which are transcriptions of his Divertimentos for 3 Basset Horns, K. Anh.229.<sup>20</sup> Here too, in lieu of a basic idea and repetition, we get a CBI in mm. 1–4.

<sup>18</sup> See Caplin 1994 and 1998, 59–70.

<sup>19</sup> Caplin enumerates four types of hybrid themes (1998, 59–63).

<sup>20</sup> It is uncertain who transcribed these pieces, but Hans Kann, in his preface to the Universal Edition of the Sonatinas (UE13354), states that it was probably Ferdinand Krauer. I thank Jane Magrath for helping me track down this information.











This module does not close with a cadence because it essentially prolongs a tonic chord. The CBI is followed by a continuation, as it was in Example 14, but this continuation is sentential, replete with a flowing chromatic bass line counterpointing a changing-note figure in the upper voices (mm. 5–6). Following the IAC in m. 8, the module is repeated in varied form and concludes with a PAC. Upon the IAC and repetition, we retrospectively hear mm. 5–8 as a sentential antecedent and, more broadly, mm. 5–12 as a period. Correlatively, we retrospectively hear P<sup>1.2A</sup> as P<sup>1.1B</sup>. In the first twelve measures of this Sonatina, we witness essentially the same formal phenomenon as we did in K. 467 (Example 12); the key difference is that in K. 467 a presentation (mm. 1–4) preceded the breakout antecedent/period, in the Sonatina a CBI does.

Granted, the first four measures of the Sonatina are so sparse that one might chalk them up to an introductory zero-module. As Caplin asserts, "Some main themes begin with... gestures that evoke a heraldic, fanfare style. Such powerful passages are ideal for projecting a strong opening, but they often obscure a clear sense of basic idea and its repetition, or its juxtaposition with a contrasting idea. The lack of a conventional initiating function thus makes it difficult to classify such a theme as one of the standard types" (1998, 199). For Caplin, in other words, such cases present clear openings topically but not formally. The piece that Caplin invokes to support that claim, Haydn's Symphony No. 97 in C Major (not shown), has an incipit somewhat similar to the Sonatina's (198). Still, I believe the Sonatina's opening has greater thematic identity than does the opening of the Haydn Symphony. Its motivic components are distinct and 2+2 dimensions intact, and it features two independent ideas, each occupying roughly two measures. Both ingredients are essential; one without the other will not suffice to establish a standard theme-or, put in Hepokoski and Darcy's terms, will not establish a P<sup>1.1</sup> module, only a P<sup>1.0</sup> module. For instance, another of Mozart's "Viennese" Sonatinas—No. 6 in C Major (Example 16)—opens with two different motives but only over two measures. Due to such small dimensions, there is no CBI. Consequently, no conventional theme is implied, only the introduction to one (hence the  $P^{1.0}$  designation). As a further consequence, the sentence that follows is not a breakout sentence, since what comes before is patently prefatory. The sentence just *is*, it does not *become*.

What Caplin stated mainly in reference to Haydn's Symphony No. 97 he parenthetically applies to Beethoven's String Quartet in A Major, op. 18 no. 5 as well. The spirit of his commentary is that these cases are somewhat amorphous and, in the end, can only be vaguely described as "nonconventional in organization" (Caplin 1998, 199 and 208 fn. 21). As an alternative, I propose that the breakout concept and my analytic method can lend greater definition to such openings—or, more precisely, can capture the form-functional definition they in fact have.





Example 16



 $\ast$  not counting the repeat of the CC (mm. 152–24), which dissolves into a transition leading to I: HC MC



That Beethoven quartet, shown in Example 17, juxtaposes a CBI with a continuation that becomes a new presentation. The first four measures display some jovial repartee between the cello and first violin, which pass a three-note figure back and forth (the cello's is chordal, the violin's linear) until the violin runs away with it in m.  $3_2$ . The resultant grouping is 1+1+2-too diminutive for a full-fledged sentence. Nor does this indicate a sentential antecedent: there is a dearth of harmonic motion, and thus no cadence, and the four-measure module is not repeated. It is, rather, a CBI and thus boasts some thematic definition. The first idea, x, occupies mm. 1–2, the second idea, y—really a linking together of x fragments—occupies mm. 3-4. Motive x happens to be stated twice, contributing to the appearance of a tripartite, sentential unit, but at a higher level two-measure units are maintained.<sup>21</sup> What follows in m. 5 is distinctly continuational in its acceleration, which arises from more constant melodic activity and, starting in m. 7, more constant bass activity as well. At a higher level, however, two-measure units remain, such that a presentation evolves, and a trifold one at that.<sup>22</sup> Hence, the CBI + continuation hybrid has morphed into a CBI + presentation and, correspondingly, P<sup>1.2A</sup> into  $P^{1.1B}$ . The latter has a contrasting continuation (m.  $11_2-15_1$ ) with progressively diminuted motivic units and micro-sentential proportions. The continually compressed grouping culminates with a climactic PAC in mm. 14–15, rhetorically reinforced by the whole ensemble playing in intervallic and rhythmic unison.

This section showcased two CBI + continuation hybrids, one of which mutated into a period (Example 15), the other into a sentence (Example 17). These two excerpts illustrate how thematic hybridity and thematic becoming interact.

# **Mozartian Loops**

The previous sections have demonstrated how breakout sentences and periods arise in the wake of both presentations and compound basic ideas. There is yet a third environment, related to these, in which breakouts thrive—one in which a piece opens with a multiply-stated cadential progression, what Hepokoski and Darcy dub "Mozartian Loops." In reference to Mozart's Piano Sonata in C Major, K. 279 (Example 18), they say that its first four measures create "the impression... of circular repetition, a 'loop' of self-replication that could continue indefinitely unless something intervenes" (2006, 80). Measure 5 is what intervenes: "here the music breaks free of its initial

<sup>21</sup> Richards (2011, 211–12) notes a similar phenomenon in the primary theme of Haydn's Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, Hob. XVI: 49 (whose secondary theme was shown in Example 2). In his reading, mm. 1–4 are a bipartite CBI at a higher level, and a tripartite sentence (as Richards uses the term) at a lower level. Apropos of both my and Richards's examples is Humal's notion of an "evolving presentation" (1999).

<sup>22</sup> That term comes from William Horne (2006, 135) and is adopted and adapted by Richards (2011, 189 ff.).



Example 18

Mozart, Piano Sonata in C Major, K. 279, i, mm. 1-12.

circularity and shoots forth with a differing idea in a more clearly linear vector" (80). To invoke another metaphor the authors use, mm. 1–4 bounce twice on a diving board before taking the plunge in m. 5 (84, fn.14). The latter launches a "breakout module."

The authors view this entire structure as being in dialogue with the sentence: "a presentation module appears twice in the manner of a potentially continuous loop and releases itself into a broader, forward-moving continuation. ... We consider such structures to be specialized stylizations of the sentence, 'sentences of the loop type'" (80 and 84). In other words, mm. 1–4 of K. 279 are like a presentation in that they contain a two-measure basic idea and a two-measure repetition, but whereas a typical presentation prolongs the tonic over a four-measure span, this passage repeats a cadential progression; the harmonic vector is circular rather than linear.<sup>23</sup>

Hepokoski and Darcy further recognize that "the breakout itself is often constructed as a sentence" (85), as is the case with K. 279: "mm. 5–6 provide a musical pattern that is imaginatively varied and intensified in mm. 7–8; taken together, [mm. 5–8] may be understood as a new presentation, with the corresponding continuation  $\Rightarrow$  cadential portion... beginning at m. 9 and finally arriving at the desired structural I:PAC on the third beat of m. 12" (85). In this case, Hepokoski and Darcy refer to a "'new sentence' breaking free from the loops" (85).

The scare quotes around "new sentence" likely evince equivocation toward the notion of formal becoming and retrospection, as does their assigning the new presentation  $P^{1.2}$  (and only that). Their position thus contrasts with my own, which is that the breakout sentence becomes decidedly independent of the preceding module; mm. 5–12 indeed form a new sentence in retrospect. Accordingly, I assign the new presentation  $P^{1.2A} \Rightarrow P^{1.1B}$  and the continuation/cadential module of the new sentence  $P^{1.2B}$  (they label it  $P^{1.3}$ ).

Before parsing P<sup>1.2B</sup> and the module following it, the SENT<sup>B</sup>:PRES module warrants further examination, and in terms that are more processual than the ones Hepokoski and Darcy use. Normatively, the basic idea has two different (if not entirely unrelated) motives. That is, the presentation, breakout or otherwise, usually has two distinct cells in its first two measures (see Examples 1 and 9). In K. 279, by contrast, the same motive is stated and sequentially repeated in mm. 5–6. Consequently, one might initially hear those two measures as the beginning of a sentential antecedent, of the sort observed in Example 12. (Example 19 reimagines the passage along these lines.) However, when mm. 7–8 vary mm. 5–6 as an entity, they retrospectively render mm. 5–6 a basic idea, albeit one with the motivic design a-a' rather than a-b. I call this a *composite basic idea*. Example 20 represents this process symbolically.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy call the cadences in mm. 1–4 "unmistakable" but at the same time acknowledge Caplin's principle that presentations do not end with cadences. They square these contradictory claims as follows: "although the two cadences are obvious enough... they are incapable of serving as structural goals" and are local events that are "subsumed under their larger presentational function" (2006, 84). Moreover, they propose that the first cadence is subsequently declined by the immediate repetition of the module to which it belongs, and the second cadence is declined by the "breakout-continuation" (85). In sum, "the positionality of those cadences within the larger sentential-thematic structure, along with their subordination to the circular loops within which they are generated, weakens the usual sense of a PAC as a sign of emphatic structural closure" (85). Accordingly, the authors label the breakout module P<sup>1,2</sup> rather than P<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Steven Vande Moortele describes this type of situation as follows: "a simple basic idea is... immediately restated, most often as an exact repetition. Initially, this basic idea and its repetition may appear to constitute the entire presentation. When the subsequent measures do not bring a continuation, but instead repeat both the basic idea and its repetition, the first presentation of the basic idea and its repetition turn out to function merely as a model" (2011, 145).







Example 20 A schematic of the composite basic idea.

It is possible to interpret this excerpt another way: one might salvage the initial perception of mm. 5–6 as being a kind of micro-presentation, since the harmonic progression is more typical of a presentation than of a basic idea. That is, the progression is a self-sufficient tonic expansion: the tonic is composed-out by means of a lower-neighbor  $V_5^6$  chord, exactly as in Example 1 where the composing-out spans the entire presentation. Measures 7–8 prolong the tonic in a similarly self-contained way. From this perspective, one might parse mm. 5–8 as a micro-presentation (mm. 5–6) + repetition (mm. 7–8), what I call a *composite presentation*. Example 21 demonstrates this device on a broader scale. Its first four-measure module comprises a basic idea and modified repetition. That complete presentation is then treated to a minor-mode or "lights-out" repetition in mm. \*41–44. Caplin considers such presentation + repetition to be a standard loosening device within secondary themes (1998, 99).

Thus far, the structural plot of K. 279 has consisted of an atypical loop-like presentation—of two cadential go-arounds (two measures apiece)—and then a contrasting continuation with accelerated one-measure motivic units. That continuation evolves either into a single four-measure presentation consisting of a composite basic idea and its repetition or into two two-measure micro-presentations (a composite presentation). The labeling in Example 18 reflects the first of these two possibilities. In either case, the primary theme comes into being in stealthy, bottom-up fashion. Not until the contrasting continuation in m. 9 are we on terra firma. The module there is functionally transparent in diminuting motivic units with recursive rigor. That process unfolds over a cadential progression, one that initially dead-ends at a deceptive cadence (m. 10), and which prompts a repetition ending with a PAC (m. 12).

The PAC in m. 12 overlaps with the onset of the next and final P-module (mm.  $12_3-16$ ). Shown in Example 22, this module is what Hepokoski and Darcy call a "dissolving P-codetta"—a codetta that devolves into transitional rhetoric. Hepokoski









Mozart, K. 279, mm. 12-16.

and Darcy parse this passage in sentential terms: mm.  $12_3-14_3$  sound two iterations of a cadential pattern: I–[V<sup>7</sup>]–IV–vii<sup>o6</sup> (or V<sup>7</sup>)–I over a tonic pedal along with a melodic schema of  $\hat{8}$ – $\hat{b}$ 7– $\hat{6}$ – $\hat{4}$ 7– $\hat{8}$ .<sup>25</sup> "What originally seemed marked as P-codetta begins to take on the presentation function of a TR-sentence" (2006, 105). The transitional behavior is especially apparent in the micro-contrasting continuation, one that drives to a I: HC MC.<sup>26</sup>

In addition, I suggest that this codetta-*cum*-transition, with its 1+1+2 dimensions and *a a*' *b* motivic scheme, is not just a microcosm of a sentence generally, but of the P-theme sentence it appends in particular. That is, the post-cadential loops are similar to the cadential loops of the first four measures, and the contrasting idea of mm.  $14_3-16_1$ begins with the selfsame C-D-C-B-C-E figure (taking the short trill into account) with which the contrasting idea of m. 5 began. The P-codetta, then, summarizes the entire primary-theme zone by means of both formal homology and motivic allusion.

The final musical example, the opening of Mozart's Piano Concerto in E-flat Major, K. 271 (Example 23), exemplifies a Mozartian loop but one discernibly distinct from that of K. 279. This one is much more differentiated, obviously due in large part to the concerto medium in which it is situated. The opening module features banter between the orchestra and piano soloist (making an anomalously early appearance), monophonic and homophonic textures, fanfare and gavotte *topoi*, and a blunt chordal declaration (m. 1) followed by a more nuanced response (mm. 2–3). The piano, in stark contrast to the orchestra, has appreciable harmonic and melodic content. Together, the two forces articulate a more complex and multifaceted idea than that of K. 279. Hepokoski and Darcy describe this as a CBI, such that the loop is "compound" or "binary." Again, they regard the ostensible cadence with which each go-around ends as more apparent than functional, no sooner stated than demoted by repetition and by the emergence of a broader form.<sup>27</sup>

This harmonic/melodic schema is also used as an opening gambit (although not necessarily in sentential form). Such gambits are legion in Bach—the opening of the Prelude in C Major from the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, Book II is merely one example. They are also fairly common in Mozart. Two examples in F major come to mind: the opening of the Piano Sonata, K. 332 and, indeed, the breakout sentence at m. 8 in the first movement of the String Quartet, K. 590 (Example 6). Incidentally, this schema is known as the *Quiescenza*. Vasili Byros, in his astute analysis of K. 279, remarks that Mozart juxtaposes that schema with a *Fenaroli-Ponte* hybrid schema (in mm. 14<sub>3</sub>–16<sub>1</sub>), yielding a witty non-sequitur of sorts, a grammatical "impropriety" (2013, 227).

<sup>26</sup> Caplin more generally describes this type of event as a "false closing section," where "codettas appear at first to have a post-cadential function in relation to the main theme, but they are then understood retrospectively to initiate (usually as a presentation) the transition proper" (1998, 129).

<sup>27</sup> Schmalfeldt suggests that these elided PACs "invit[e] the immediate repetition of a phrase" (1992, 15). She colorfully continues, "the orchestra will not wait politely to give the pianist's cadence its normal full measure of cadential tonic. Instead, that measure... will be simultaneously both 'suppressed' and represented when the orchestra reenters... at m. 4." The resulting effect is of "a dramatic argument between the orchestra and the



The form of this excerpt is basically of the same ilk as that of Example 17—a CBI + continuation that becomes a CBI + presentation with the difference that here the CBI is cadentially closed off and repeated.<sup>28</sup> The breakout presentation is introduced in m. 7 by a more pointed and extended iteration of the gavotte-anacruses that graced the piano's opening statement. Thereafter, two-measure modules fall neatly into place: mm. 8–9 and mm. 9–10 house the basic idea and its repetition. The basic idea is an ingenious motivic retrograde—in enlarged and mildly decorated form—of the cell in m. 3 (see the boxed notes). (Of course, the permutation is intricate enough that the continuation is sufficiently contrasting.) The repetition is melodically sequential and harmonically responsive; but whereas it is normally V that would respond to I, here the reverse holds, for the initial tonic harmony was relegated to m. 7. The next module is, harmonically speaking, purely cadential (ii<sup>6</sup>–[V<sup>6</sup><sub>S</sub>]–V, for the dominant lock) but very continuational in its surface acceleration and progressive diminution of groupings, as evident in the second violin.

In the orchestral exposition, the orchestra breaks free of the loops with a differing idea, and the piano does the same in the solo exposition (starting in earnest in m. 63). This is not surprising in itself, for in a Classical concerto it is *de rigueur* for the solo instrument to establish its centrality at the start of the second exposition. What is surprising is that the piano achieves this by retaining and varying the *orchestra's* motivic material (m. 69). Also unusual here is the trifold presentation. A *Fortspinnung* continuation ensues in m. 75 followed by a cadential module in m. 78, marked by an elongated predominant within the dominant key.<sup>29</sup>

# Conclusion

I have offered a working model for how to recognize and analyze breakout sentences and periods in (mostly) primary themes in Classical sonata forms. My approach deploys three form-theory methodologies to elucidate three different and equally important aspects: formal function, broader thematic context, and the processuality that infuses both. Example 24, although not an exhaustive list of breakout scenarios, summarizes all of the types encountered in this paper.

soloist: the orchestra's premature *forte* reentry at m. 4 says to the pianist, 'No! How dare you close this work before we've had a chance to open it?'" (16). Incidentally, Schmalfeldt uses this passage to *counter*exemplify her "one more time" technique, since Mozart's tonic here is elided but not evaded.

<sup>28</sup> The opening of Mozart's Piano Sonata in D Major, K. 311, also exemplifies the compound loop followed by a breakout sentence.

<sup>29</sup> See Hepokoski and Darcy's analysis of this passage (2006, 533, fn. 37).



What might have attracted Classical composers to these ways of opening pieces? Most obviously, they likely wanted to afford the listener an experience of entering a work in liquid, graduated fashion. Another possibility is that these strategies emphasize a critical juncture, the beginning of a work, by providing (in a sense) multiple and alternate beginnings. This is not unlike composers' penchant for emphasizing closure by providing multiple codetta- or coda-modules. Perhaps both strategies stem from their implicit recognition that initial and terminal musical moments are among the most impactful, and the most marked for consciousness and long-term memory. Breakouts capitalize on that cognitive fact. Whatever their precise motivation, it is clear that high-Classical composers valued formal becoming. We tend to associate such becoming with Beethoven's middle style and mature Romanticism but, as the foregoing discussion attests, its first stirrings can be felt in Viennese Classicism.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Schmalfeldt makes this clear in her third chapter, entitled, "The Processual Legacy of the Late Eighteenth Century" (2011, 59–86).

#### Works Cited

BaileyShea, Matthew. 2002/3. "Wagner's Loosely Knit Sentences and the Drama of Musical Form." Intégral 16/17: 1–34.

\_\_\_\_. 2003. "The Wagnerian *Satz*: The Rhetoric of the Sentence in Wagner's Post-Lohengrin Operas." Ph.D. diss., Yale University.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2004. "Beyond the Beethoven Model: Sentence Types and Limits." *Current Musicology* 77: 5–33.

Byros, Vasili. 2013. "Trazom's Wit: Communicative Strategies in a 'Popular' Yet 'Difficult' Sonata." *Eighteenth-Century Music* 10/2: 213–52.

Callahan, Michael R. 2013. "Sentential Lyric-Types in the Great American Songbook." *Music Theory Online* 19/3. http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.13.19.3/mto.13.19.3.callahan.html.

Caplin, William E. 1987. "The 'Expanded Cadential Progression': A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form." *Journal of Musicological Research* 7/2–3: 215–57.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Hybrid Themes: Toward a Refinement in the Classification of Classical Theme Types." *Beethoven Forum* 3: 151–65.

\_\_\_\_. 1998. Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. New York: Oxford University Press.

\_\_\_\_. 2004. "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57/1: 51–118.

\_\_\_\_. 2010. "Beethoven's 'Tempest' Exposition: a Response to Janet Schmalfeldt." *Music Theory Online* 16/2. http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.2/mto.10.16.2.caplin.html.

- Dahlhaus, Carl. 1978. "Satz und Periode: Zur Theorie der musikalischen Syntax." Zeitschrift für Musiktheorie 9/2: 16–26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to His Music* [1987]. Translated by Mary Whittall. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Forrest, David, and Matthew Santa. 2014. "A Taxonomy of Sentence Structures." *College Music Symposium* 54. http://dx.doi.org/10.18177/sym.2014.54.sr.10629.

- Hepokoski, James. 2010. "Formal Process, Sonata Theory, and the First Movement of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata." *Music Theory Online* 16/2. http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.10.16.2/ mto.10.16.2.hepokoski.html.
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Horne, William. 2006. "The Hidden Trellis: Where Does the Second Group Begin in the First Movement of Beethoven's Eroica Symphony?" *Beethoven Forum* 13/2: 95–147.

 Humal, Mart. 1999. "Structural Variants of Sentence in Main Themes of Beethoven's Sonata Form."
In Composition as a Problem II: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Music Theory, Tallinn, April 17–18, 1998, ed. Mart Humal, 34–48. Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music.

Krebs, Harald. 2015. "Sentences in the Lieder of Robert Schumann: The Relation to the Text." In *Formal Functions in Perspective: Essays on Musical Form from Haydn to Adorno*, ed. Steven

Vande Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin, 225–51. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.

- Levy, Janet. 1982. "Texture as a Sign in Classic and Early Romantic Music." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 35/3: 482–531.
- Richards, Mark. 2011. "Viennese Classicism and the Sentential Idea: Broadening the Sentence Paradigm." *Theory and Practice* 36: 179–224.
- Riley, Matthew. 2011. "Haydn's Missing Middles." Music Analysis 30/1: 37–57.
- Rodgers, Stephen. 2014. "Sentences with Words: Text and Theme-Type in Die schöne Müllerin." *Music Theory Spectrum* 36/1: 58–85.
- Rothstein, William. 1989. Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music. New York: Schirmer.
- Schmalfeldt, Janet. 1992. "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique." *Journal of Musicological Research* 12/1–2: 1–52.
  - \_\_\_\_. 1995. "Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the "Tempest" Sonata." *Beethoven Forum* 4: 37–71.
  - \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vande Moortele, Steven. 2011. "Sentences, Sentence Chains, and Sentence Replications: Intraand Interthematic Formal Functions in Liszt's Weimar Symphonic Poems." *Intégral* 25: 121–58.