

---

September 2010

## Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata

Mark Richards  
trace@utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/gamut>



Part of the [Music Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Richards, Mark (2010) "Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata," *Gamut: Online Journal of the Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic*: Vol. 3 : Iss. 1 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/gamut/vol3/iss1/10>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by Volunteer, Open Access, Library Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Gamut: Online Journal of the Music Theory Society of the Mid-Atlantic by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/gamut>.

## REVIEW

*ELEMENTS OF SONATA THEORY: NORMS, TYPES, AND DEFORMATIONS IN THE LATE-EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SONATA*, BY JAMES HEPOKOSKI AND WARREN DARCY. OXFORD AND NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2006.

MARK RICHARDS\*

What we call classical sonata form encompasses such a wide array of compositional possibilities that to describe it in all its instantiations would seem to be an impossible task. And yet, it is toward this admirable goal that James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy aspire in their 2006 book *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. In their breadth of scope, richness of ideas, thoroughness, and attention to detail, the authors have no doubt succeeded in producing a book that will remain an important contribution to music-theory literature for years to come. The more than six hundred pages of text are divided into twenty-two logically flowing chapters that take the reader through virtually every imaginable aspect of the form. Each chapter is divided into relatively brief sections (or subsections) that are given a highly specific heading and focus on a single idea. And as these headings are all listed in the table of contents under each chapter, the clear organization of the book is evident from its opening pages. Likewise, the index is neatly divided into three separate sections: names, works, and concepts, making navigation through the text exceptionally easy.

---

\* I would like to thank Ryan McClelland of the University of Toronto for contributing valuable thoughts and insights during our numerous discussions of this book, and for his helpful suggestions for the present review.

Hepokoski and Darcy begin by situating their work in the context of scholarship on sonata form of the last century, and claim to adopt an all-inclusive approach of “remaining open to the positive insights that each has to offer and for the most part remaining methodologically compatible with them all” (3). At the heart of Sonata Theory is the notion that movements in sonata form cannot be explained with reference to a single, ideal “textbook” form, but rather are constructed from a series of formal choices the composer makes from a set of norms. These norms, or available options, “existed conceptually within the knowledgeable musical community as something on the order of tasteful generic advice . . . given by a shared knowledge of precedents” (9). The frequency of each norm in the late eighteenth century is captured by the authors’ hierarchical system of “levels of default.” A “first-level default” is the most common option, followed by a “second-level default,” and so on. If a composer chooses an option outside of these levels of default, it creates a generic “deformation” at that point. Above all, Sonata Theory stresses the importance of “interpreting the dialogue of an individual piece with the background set of norms” (11). For this reason, the theory aims to explain—and indeed relies on—a very large repertoire of late-eighteenth-century sonatas. The authors refer to an impressive number of sonata-form movements that include nearly all of the symphonies, piano sonatas, and string quartets of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, as well as lesser-known works by composers such as C. P. E. Bach, J. C. Bach, Cherubini, Clementi, and Dittersdorf.

Hepokoski and Darcy categorize sonata-form movements into five broad types, which they label only with numbers from 1 to 5 in order “to avoid the sometimes unhelpful connotations of prior terminology” (344). These types generally increase in complexity with the numerical label. Thus, sonatas that lack a development, which they view as the simplest type, are Type 1; those that lack a return of the main theme after the end of the development (and thus, to

Hepokoski and Darcy, lack a true recapitulation) are Type 2; those of the most common type, the so-called “textbook” type of exposition–development–recapitulation, are Type 3; those traditionally called “sonata-rondo” are Type 4; and those of concertos, which they view as the most complex, are Type 5. Although these five sonata types are of the utmost importance to an understanding of Sonata Theory, it is odd that their explanation does not appear until chapter 16, after they have already dealt with Type 3, codas and introductions, minor-key sonatas, and the multi-movement sonata cycle. And despite the fact that these types are addressed very briefly in the preface (vi), readers will find it beneficial to read the brief description of these types at the beginning of chapter 17 before diving into the core of the book in chapter 3.

Nevertheless, these distinctions are valuable. A separation of different types allows a refined view of structures that do not fall easily into any one type, but rather consist of a sort of fusion of types. This is particularly common with the often murky formal types of sonata-rondos (Type 4), of which most are hybrids with Type 3, but may also be hybrids with Types 1 or 2.<sup>1</sup> (Because Type 5 denotes a concerto, hybrids of Type 4 with Type 5 are considered in the discussion of the Type 5 sonata [431]). Likewise, Type 5 movements may be “in dialogue” with movements of Types 1, 2, 3, and even 4.

One of the central concepts of Sonata Theory is that of the “medial caesura” (MC), the break in texture which occurs immediately before the start of the secondary-theme zone (S), and which is usually built around a half cadence. The most important ramifications of the MC were the topic of Hepokoski and Darcy’s familiar article that appeared in *Music Theory Spectrum* nine

---

<sup>1</sup> An excellent summary of the Type 4 sonata, and its distinction from other similar forms the authors call “rondeau” and “rondo,” is provided in Graham G. Hunt’s review of *Elements of Sonata Theory*, in *Theory and Practice* 32 (2007): 213–238. Accordingly, the issue does not bear repeating here.

years earlier,<sup>2</sup> and have of course been absorbed into their book. Because of the significance of the MC in the context of their theory, a number of ideas are worth mentioning here, even if they are already known to some readers. Perhaps most crucially, if an exposition contains an MC, then there is an S, and a “two-part” exposition results; if there is no MC, there is no S, and the exposition is of the “continuous” type. Furthermore, the type of cadence that the MC is built around—usually either a half cadence in the dominant key (V:HC, the first-level default) or in the tonic key (I:HC, the second-level default)—creates implications for the rest of the movement: “A I:HC MC helps to predict a work on a relatively modest scale; a V:HC MC—suggesting a more harmonically complex option—proposes an exposition with ‘grander’ proportions” (25). Thus, when a large-scale movement contains a I:HC MC, one very often finds a V:HC MC later on in the exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy have called this type of structure the “trimodular block” (TMB), and the concept handily explains the relatively common situation of having “apparent double medial caesuras.” One addition the authors make to the discussion of the MC is that of “Troubleshooting MC Identifications” (48) in situations where either the MC is clear but S is unsatisfactory, or where S is clear but the MC is not normative.

The applicability of the MC concept, however, begins to diminish with many of Beethoven’s sonata-form movements. Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition of the MC essentially rests on two components, one rhetorical (the textural break) and the other tonal (usually a half cadence). Beginning with so-called middle-period works, Beethoven sometimes omits one of these components or does not coordinate the two, as in the first movement of the *Eroica* Symphony, which contains a V:HC before the start of S in m. 45, but lacks a textural break; see Figure 1. Although

---

<sup>2</sup> James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, “The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition,” *Music Theory Spectrum* 19/2 (1997): 115–154.

FIGURE 1. Beethoven, Third Symphony (*Eroica*), first movement, mm. 37–47

the authors identify an MC with this V:HC (143), they do not explain how the lack of an actual caesura creates the MC. William Horne has recently proposed the term “strong dominant complex” in this and similar situations in Beethoven, because “it would seem incongruous to refer to a ‘medial caesura’ in which little or no caesura is present. Ultimately, the dominant chord itself is the only element that is never absent from this type of cadential articulation, so I prefer a term that focuses on it.”<sup>3</sup> Even if one understands the *Eroica* as having a V:HC MC that is “flush-juxtaposed,” a term used by the authors (47), there are several other Beethoven first movements in which there appears to be a clear S-zone but no MC. In the Sixth Symphony, for example, Hepokoski and Darcy locate the uncontroversial start of S in m. 67 (50), but are unsure as to the placement of the MC, suggesting a “fourth-level default” I:PAC MC at m. 53, with expanded caesura fill; see Figure 2. The problem here is that there is not one but *four* breaks in texture, each of which follows a different harmony and contains “fill” led by the first violins. Moreover,

<sup>3</sup> William Horne, “The Hidden Trellis: Where Does the Second Group Begin in the First Movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony?,” *Beethoven Forum* 13/2 (2006), 105. Horne restricts this term to Beethoven’s sonata movements up to and including the *Eroica*, and hence does not intend it to be applied to later works.

FIGURE 2. Beethoven, Sixth Symphony, first movement, mm. 53–70

there is no cadence to speak of in this transition, as the tonic chord in m. 53 is approached through a tonic pedal, and the dominant chord of the new key at m. 63—which may seem to be a candidate for a V:HC MC—is inverted as  $V_5^6$ . Thus, the lack of a cadence is at odds with the MC concept’s demand for one.<sup>4</sup> In such situations, the term “medial caesura” (even with the admission of deformations) seems not to capture the transformation of the rhetorical and/or tonal components.

<sup>4</sup> It should be noted that a transition is not required to end with a cadence, as William E. Caplin has pointed out in *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 133: “Unlike a main theme or a subordinate theme, a transition need not necessarily end with a cadence. In some cases, a half cadential progression is present, but for a variety of reasons, the appearance of the final dominant fails to create a true cadence. In other cases, a cadential progression is absent, yet the final dominant still gives the impression of being an ending harmony.”

Another central feature of Sonata Theory is the notion of the “essential expositional closure” (EEC), a PAC that separates the secondary-theme zone (S) from a closing zone (C) in the exposition. In an attempt to add theoretical rigor to the traditionally more intuitive concept of a “closing” theme (or group or section), Hepokoski and Darcy claim that, once S has begun, the EEC constitutes “the first satisfactory perfect authentic cadence that proceeds onward to differing material” (120). In actual practice, however, there are a number of issues that are raised in applying the concept to the music of the classical repertoire.

First, and perhaps most importantly, to declare the EEC as the end of the second group renders the remainder of the exposition (Hepokoski and Darcy’s C-zone) formally inessential. But such a view does not account for the fact that, in nearly every case, all the material that appears after the MC in an exposition (i.e., that is in the new key) reappears in the tonic key in the recapitulation. Charles Rosen describes this procedure as the resolution of a “large-scale dissonance” that was essential to “sonata style.”<sup>5</sup> Thus, it would seem that the C-zone makes the same demands for resolution as does the S-zone, which suggests that it could perhaps be thought of as no less essential than the S-zone, at least from this one perspective.

Second, application of the EEC sometimes produces an S that is uncomfortably brief compared to C, as for example in the opening movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E $\flat$ , op. 7. Although Hepokoski and Darcy address this issue, their explanation is somewhat vague: “there seems to be a contextually informed limit below which S-space would reasonably be considered too brief to provide a sufficient sense of closure to the freshly launched zone” (124). And although they direct the reader to the following chapter for a more thorough discussion of the issue, one only finds their assertion that the proportion of S to the preceding primary-theme zone

(P) and transition (TR) “is a matter of feel and balance not to be captured by a simple rule” (163–166).

Third, they stress that “the EEC need not be—and often is not—the strongest cadence within the exposition” and note that rhetorically stronger cadences often occur in C-space (124). But one of the ways in which they claim a PAC may be unsatisfactory for an EEC (and therefore “deferred” to a later PAC) is if there is a sudden drop to a *piano* dynamic at the moment that the PAC arrives—a phenomenon they refer to as “The Attenuated PAC” (170). This sensitivity to rhetorical cues in the music thus undermines their idea of the EEC as a solely syntactical PAC that is independent of its rhetorical strength. Considering these issues together, one wonders whether the EEC is—rather than an entirely independent zone—perhaps more of a rhetorically articulated portion of the S-zone, as William Horne has suggested in connection with some of Beethoven’s works.<sup>6</sup>

In their discussion of the development, or “developmental space,” instead of accepting traditional notions that it is a section free from most formal constraints, Hepokoski and Darcy present a number of ideas on typical modes of organization concerning the tonal and “rhetorical/thematic” layout of development sections. Regarding the tonal structure, they summarize the various types of substitutions for the usual move to the V chord, or the “active dominant” ( $V_A$ ),

---

<sup>5</sup> Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, rev. edn. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1988), 229 and 287.

<sup>6</sup> In response to Hepokoski and Darcy’s C-zone, William Horne (“The Hidden Trellis,” 118, n. 23) has proposed, at least for Beethoven’s works up to and including the *Eroica* Symphony, that the second group comprises the entire space between his strong-dominant complex (see n. 3 above) and the end of the exposition, thereby avoiding the conceptual problem of the resolution of the “large-scale dissonance.” For Horne, however, the “closing zone” actually resides as a subsection within S-space, and begins after the occurrence of a “weighted perfect-authentic cadence” rather than after Hepokoski and Darcy’s EEC. Horne prefers the former term because he wishes “to prioritize the second-key PAC that carries the most ‘heard’ weight or strength in terms of observable theoretical and rhetorical parameters that affect its surface prominence” (105, n. 5). But because this closing zone depends largely on rhetorical devices, and the generally accepted view of classical form does *not* depend on such devices, it is questionable whether they actually contribute to formal structure.

at the end of the section, and the ways in which these substitutions make their way into the recapitulation (with or without intervening “mediating” harmonies). In major-mode sonatas, the most common substitution is V/vi, but, especially in mid-eighteenth-century works, other more unusual options may be encountered, such as V/iii, a vi:PAC, or even a iii:PAC.

One of Hepokoski and Darcy’s central tenets regarding rhetorical/thematic layouts of development sections is the principle of “rotation,” which they define as follows: “Rotational structures are those that extend through musical space by recycling one or more times—with appropriate alterations and adjustments—a referential thematic pattern established as an ordered succession at the piece’s outset” (611). Thus, their view of a development relies on a comparison of its ordering of material to that of the exposition. The idea that such a similarity can exist is not a new one, as Hepokoski and Darcy readily admit,<sup>7</sup> but the degree to which the authors pursue the idea certainly is a novel feature of their theory. Their central claim concerning the development is that, as a strong first-level default, its thematic layout retains the order of modules in the exposition (206). However, Hepokoski and Darcy also rightly state that, “as noted by virtually all of the theorists and as is readily confirmed by observation, by far the most common thing to do was to begin the development with a restatement of the opening of the P-theme, usually in the same key (V) in which the exposition had just ended” (207). But considering their claim that “the first step in understanding developments as rotational is to be aware that individual modules from the exposition may be and usually are left out” (206), it becomes clear that if a development

---

<sup>7</sup> In their discussion of their use of the term “rotation,” they quote from Rosen’s *Sonata Forms* as an example (612–613). Also see Caplin, *Classical Form* (139 and 157), and Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980), 228. In all of these cases, the observed similarity in the thematic layout of the development appears to incorporate all of the thematic units in the exposition, unlike Hepokoski and Darcy, who do not insist on such a requirement.

begins with the P-theme, any module that follows it would be considered rotational: P+S, P+C, and even P+TR they consider a “half-rotation” (217).

Identifying the boundaries of a recapitulation would seem to be a simple matter, but Hepokoski and Darcy are particularly precise in their definition. For them, the recapitulation is “another complete rotation through the action-zone layout initially set forth in the exposition. . . . Its expanse begins with the layout’s first module (P<sup>1</sup>) and continues until the last one has been sounded” (231). Consequently, when a development proceeds directly on to TR or S material, they do not consider the resulting section to be a recapitulation, but instead it is usually the “tonal resolution” within a single rotation that began with the start of the development, and therefore is “a variant of or intermixture with the Type 2 sonata” (232). In addition, Hepokoski and Darcy have devised a useful set of terms to describe those aspects of a recapitulation that may be self-evident, yet are highly important to our understanding of it as a section (rotation) that is compared to the exposition. For example, “correspondence measures” describe the opening measures of the recapitulation that map onto those of the exposition; “crux” describes the point at which the recapitulation becomes a transposed version of the exposition; and “referential measures” are those bars that are varied, but still correspond to those of the exposition.

The Type 2 sonata itself is a welcome contribution to the theory of sonata form, primarily because Hepokoski and Darcy identify it as a *bona fide* sonata type, whereas “most sonata-form discussions in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries overlooked the Type 2 option” (353). But even when it was recognized, terms such as “binary variant” and “sonata with incomplete recapitulation” were used to describe it. Hepokoski and Darcy’s separation of this type from the Type 3 sonata relieves analysts from attempting to force the lesser-known Type 2 into the mold of the more familiar Type 3. Some authors have even questioned whether these Type 2

structures deserve the label of “sonata,” but Hepokoski and Darcy are clear that it is a double-rotational structure to be identified under the rubric of the sonata. The neglect and confusion of this sonata type, the authors argue, arose from the fact that it was far more common during 1740–70 (366), whereas Type 3 sonatas became “overwhelmingly the most common option by the last decade of the century” (364). For Hepokoski and Darcy, the Type 2 sonata was simply another option available to late-eighteenth-century composers, albeit one that was employed much less frequently in the years after 1770.

When Type 2s appear after 1770, however, things are not so straightforward. Hepokoski and Darcy’s claim is that, even as the Type 2 sonata continued to be used throughout the nineteenth century, and even into the twentieth by composers ranging from Cherubini and Weber all the way to Bruckner and Sibelius, it still remained conceptually distinct from the Type 3. The rise to prominence of Type 3 at the end of the eighteenth century would surely have influenced composers’ views of Type 2, a possibility that the authors admit (384). But once Type 3 became the predominant type of sonata movement in the late eighteenth century, it seems unlikely that the far less common Type 2 would have remained resistant to its influence. The two types are, after all, highly similar forms that are applied to the same types of movements. Hence the difficulty in determining the form in such pieces as the first movement of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in D, K. 311. Is this a Type 2 sonata with a P-based coda, as Hepokoski and Darcy argue? Or is it a Type 3 with reversed recapitulation? Sonata Theory does not allow for the latter interpretation due to the theory of rotations: “Whenever it is also participating in a larger rotation, S never begins a large structural unit but continues one already in progress. . . . This is a fundamental characteristic of S *qua* S, one that is established in the expositional *Anlage* [i.e., rotation]” (354). While I agree that the expositional rotation provides a layout to which the following sections are

FIGURE 3. Beethoven, String Quartet in B $\flat$ , op. 130, fourth movement, mm. 125–132

compared, I would argue that this same process of comparison at least allows for the possibility of a reversed ordering of material. On the measure-to-measure level, consider the *Alla danza tedesca* of Beethoven’s String Quartet in B $\flat$ , op. 130, mm. 125–132, in which a statement of the main theme’s consequent phrase is followed by a quirky reversed ordering of its measures; see Figure 3. On the modular level, consider the first movement of the same composer’s Piano Sonata in B $\flat$ , op. 22. Here, the development begins with an explicit reversed ordering of the last three modules of the exposition. Why, then, could this same principle not exist on a larger level, presenting entire thematic groups in reverse order? It would seem that this conceptual grey area in the Type 2 form is at least worthy of more discussion.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to the wealth of conceptual thought that Hepokoski and Darcy present in *Elements of Sonata Theory*, another of their significant contributions is their system of analytic notation. This extensive set of symbols (filling four pages at the start of the book, xxv–xxviii) is

<sup>8</sup> Graham G. Hunt (review of *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 229–232) argues for the interpretation of Brahms’ *Tragic Overture* as Hepokoski and Darcy’s “expanded Type 1 sonata” (as, Hunt admits, the authors themselves propose on p. 350 of their book). While this view may well work in this particular piece, Hunt, like Hepokoski and Darcy, rejects the “reversed recapitulation” only with the unsupported claim that “these constructions, when found, are better interpreted as Type 2 sonatas with P-based codas or CRIs [coda-rhetoric interpolations], or expanded Type 1 sonatas with large developmental/episodic interpolations in the second rotation, and P-based codas or CRIs” (232).

able to convey much analytical detail in a minimum of characters. For example, I:HC MC (a medial caesura built around a half cadence in the tonic key), TMB (the trimodular block), and  $V_A$  and  $V_T$  (active V and tonicized V, which are respectively equivalent to Tovey's familiar "on the dominant" and "in the dominant").<sup>9</sup> Superscript numerals to the symbols keep track of PACs, "because so much of Sonata Theory is concerned with the attainment or nonattainment of cadences" (71), and decimal points in these numerals indicate a module before a PAC. Thus  $P^{1.2}$  denotes the second module occurring in the piece proper (i.e., after any introduction) but before the first PAC. With this sort of detail available in their notational system, it is disappointing that none of the musical examples are adorned with them to demonstrate their usage. In the application of their notation, Hepokoski and Darcy are open to variation to suit different tastes and purposes. In my own view, the system would be enhanced with a greater use of formal functions as set down by William E. Caplin.<sup>10</sup> In this way, modules that are introductions (in form-functional terms), for example, may be distinguished from those that are true themes; and thus the concept of a "zero module" (denoted by  $P^0$ ,  $S^0$ , or  $C^0$ ) as "a preparatory module that sets up or otherwise precedes what strikes one as the 'real' initial theme of the zone" (142) could be more narrowly defined.

The final four chapters (nearly one third) of the book are concerned with sonata form in Mozart's concertos—Hepokoski and Darcy's Type 5. The authors, astutely aware of the importance of knowledge about the form's history, provide a succinct account of the concerto as it developed from the non-sonata-form tutti–solo alternation formats of the "Vivaldian" concerto to, eventually, a Type 3 sonata with no initial ritornello in the romantic era with composers such

---

<sup>9</sup> Donald Francis Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas* (London: Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1931), 5–6.

<sup>10</sup> Caplin, *Classical Form*.

as Mendelssohn.<sup>11</sup> The classical concerto thus falls somewhere in between, adopting the principles of the sonata inherited from the symphony while still retaining much of the tutti–solo alternations of the earlier baroque concerto.

Hepokoski and Darcy identify six subtypes of the Type 5 sonata that are adapted from Joel Galand’s work,<sup>12</sup> by far the most common in Mozart’s concertos being Subtypes A and B (shown in their Table 19.1, reproduced here in Figure 4). The difference between the two subtypes hinges on the approach into the recapitulation with the module labeled “R3” (for “third ritornello”). In Subtype A, R3 is a retransitional passage leading into the recapitulation, whereas in Subtype B it actually begins the recapitulation in a merger with the third solo, S3. This point in the Subtype B layout has been the source of much controversy in the literature, for scholars are divided as to whether to deem this R3 module a “ritornello” or simply a “tutti interjection,” “because of its occasional brevity and because it does not reinforce a cadential close led by the soloist” (440) as the other ritornellos do. Some have followed Georg Joseph Vogler’s description of concerto form, which states that one may write a concerto by first composing “an ordinary sonata” (i.e., a Type 3) and adding ritornellos “before the first, after the second [and] between the first and second parts” (435). What results is a five-part structure that resembles Subtypes A and B with the R3 module omitted (which is Hepokoski and Darcy’s Subtype C, not shown). Other scholars have preferred to follow the model provided by Heinrich Christoph Koch, which is Subtype A. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that “what is needed is a sense of the variability of the recapitulatory R3, acknowledging its functional difference from the other ritornellos and its un-


---

<sup>11</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy’s view of Brahms, with his return to the initial ritornello, is one of “archaizing or retrospective efforts, recalling largely eclipsed traditions of enhanced monumentalization” (435).


<sup>12</sup> Joel Galand, “The Large-Scale Formal Role of the Solo Entry Theme in the Eighteenth-Century Concerto,” *Journal of Music Theory* 44 (2000): 381–450.

**FIGURE 4.** Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 5 Sonata, Subtypes A and B

Subtype A: Seven-part (four ritornello) format: cf. Koch’s 1793 concerto plan.



Subtype B: Seven-part (four ritornello) format: variant of Koch 1793: (vestigial?) “Ritornello 3”-effect launches the tonic return (=recapitulation); the most common format in Mozart’s mature concertos.



certainty with regard to genuine ritornello status” (440). Their label of R3 thus “refers to that (vestigial) ‘ritornello’ or pronounced tutti-effect in the area of the recapitulation [and] normally signifies either a retransitional function . . . or . . . an orchestral recapturing of the opening sounds of R1 to begin the recapitulatory rotation” (442). Acknowledging both R3’s “vestigial” status as a ritornello and its lack of equivalent function to the other ritornellos, the authors cleverly defuse much of the debate.

Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of rotations becomes especially important in the Type 5 sonata. Since the opening ritornello (R1) and the first solo (S1) share modular material and are therefore interdependent, and “because this modular interdependence usually also encompasses at least the later portions of R2 (and consequently brings up the concept of governing rotations)” (444), S1 cannot be considered a completely separate entity from the following ritornello, R2. The authors therefore recognize both a “solo exposition” stated entirely within S1 and a “larger

exposition” that includes both S1 and R2. Likewise, they recognize both a “solo recapitulation” and “larger recapitulation” (which considers the tuttis surrounding the cadenza as two parts of a single ritornello, R4). Thus, “neither is ‘the’ (only) exposition, but both are present from different perspectives” (444).

The analytical notation for Type 5 sonatas utilizes not only the same module labels as the other sonata types (P, S, MC, etc.), but also includes the tutti or solo section in which that module first appeared. For example, R1:\P indicates “the P-theme introduced in the first ritornello” (452). This innovative system provides a concise way of denoting whether or not a module is new to that section—a distinction especially useful in the solo exposition, where new modules are frequently added.

Throughout these last four chapters, one gains a sense of the overwhelming variety that exists in Mozart’s concertos. And yet, Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory is flexible enough to allow these practices to be grouped into categories (appropriately, a large number of them). A particularly noteworthy example is the “*sujet-libre*” (“‘free subject,’ as opposed to the ‘first’ and ‘second’ subjects” [526]), a term coined in the 1930s by Georges de Saint-Foix that Hepokoski and Darcy adopt to describe a new idea that begins S1:\TR<sup>1.1</sup>. Given the frequency of such an occurrence in Mozart, it is clear that the term has an advantage over a simpler one such as “new theme.”

On the whole, *Elements of Sonata Theory* is a rich and highly nuanced resource essential to anyone interested in the classical sonata. Even if one does not always agree with their point of view, the very breadth of the text enables one to find discussions on nearly any issue in relation to the sonata. Thus, at least for the period of Western musical history they address, Hepokoski and Darcy demonstrate unequivocally Arnold Schoenberg’s assertion that the “greatest merit” of

sonata form “is its extraordinary flexibility in accommodating the widest variety of musical ideas, long or short, many or few, active or passive, in almost any combination.”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Arnold Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, ed. Gerald Strang (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1967), 200.

## WORKS CITED

- Caplin, William E. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Galand, Joel. "The Large-Scale Formal Role of the Solo Entry Theme in the Eighteenth-Century Concerto." *Journal of Music Theory* 44/2 (2000): 381–450.
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . "The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition." *Music Theory Spectrum* 19/2 (1997): 115–154.
- Horne, William. "The Hidden Trellis: Where Does the Second Group Begin in the First Movement of Beethoven's *Eroica* Symphony?" *Beethoven Forum* 13/2 (2006): 95–147.
- Hunt, Graham G. Review of *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*, by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy. *Theory and Practice* 32 (2007): 213–238.
- Ratner, Leonard G. *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York: Schirmer, 1980.
- Rosen, Charles. *Sonata Forms*. Revised edition. New York: W. W. Norton, 1988.
- Schoenberg, Arnold. *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*. Edited by Gerald Strang. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Tovey, Donald Francis. *A Companion to Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas*. London: Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1931.

---

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Mark Richards is a fourth-year Ph.D. candidate in music theory at the University of Toronto. His dissertation examines relationships between sonata form and the expression of musical tension and drama in Beethoven's first movements. While his primary research interest is form and structure in music of the classical period, he also researches counterpoint and fugue as it relates to music of the nineteenth century. He has articles forthcoming in *Theory and Practice* and *Intersections: Canadian Journal of Music*, and has given papers at the annual meetings of the Music Theory Society of New York State, and the Canadian University Music Society.

*This article uploaded to the [Gamut](#) site on 15 January 2012.*