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Abstract

This dissertation presents a theory of development sections based on their roles in Felix Mendelssohn’s instrumental sonata forms. Given its contextual perspective on developments, my theory critiques established approaches in Schenkerian studies and recent formal treatises by Caplin (1998) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), which focus mainly on the inner workings of formal areas rather than their inter-relationships. My theory for classifying an extensive body of developments holds the potential to further sonata-form study across works by other nineteenth-century composers.

I apply what I call an “inner-outer perspective” to offer local and global delineations of developmental space. My “inner perspective” enables detailed discussions of developments by contributing concepts like the “developmental gap (DG)”, “retransition (RT)-prep zone”, “retransitional sequence”, “retransitional caesura (RTC)”, and “retransition (RT)-connect”, and it expands on what I call “development-recapitulation (D-R) overlap”. The “outer perspective” of my theory proposes that all developments are classifiable according to two criteria: (1) developments achieve a tonic- or a non-tonic-articulated “development-recapitulation (D-R) border”, and (2) developments have either a minimal or a strong tie to the rest of the form. I
combine these criteria to produce four “development classes”—I, II, III, and IV—but focus on those fifty Class-I and -II developments that exhibit a strong tie to the rest of the form.

My analyses identify five DRTs, or “developmental relationship types”, by which to classify all fifty of Mendelssohn’s developments selected for detailed study. In DRT1, the development forwards material to the coda (“development-coda pairings’’); in DRT2, the development forwards material which helps to defer the essential structural close (ESC); in DRT3, the retransition calls for “compensation” towards the movement’s end; in DRT4, the development furthers an aspect from the exposition or introduction into the recapitulation and/or coda; and in DRT5, the underplayed D-R border channels motion and contributes to the movement’s single-sweep design.

DRTs offer important insights on developments, large-scale form, and Mendelssohn’s music. The pathways that arise from considering the confluence of various musical parameters within developments and beyond suggest transformation narratives through the form. DRTs therefore highlight the development’s importance to Mendelssohn’s aesthetic and early-nineteenth-century sonata form.
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Chapter 1
Literature Review and Overview of the Dissertation

Felix Mendelssohn’s position in Western music history has remained unusually open to debate, owing to various aspects of his biography and compositional style. Mendelssohn and his reception have become strongly linked to the notions of “falling between,” of escaping neat and tidy consignment within music history’s standard compartmentalizations.¹ A flurry of studies on Mendelssohn’s sonata forms is marking the present decade as an important one for reassessing Mendelssohn’s instrumental music and its historical significance, and, more broadly, for refining our understanding of early to mid-nineteenth-century form.²

This dissertation examines the development sections of fifty sonata-form movements—the majority of which are first movements—in Mendelssohn’s instrumental music (see Appendix 1). Despite the considerable and growing body of research on sonata forms, the development section mostly remains uncharted territory, and its importance within the form overlooked. Workable models for analyzing developments have been proposed in landmark books on form by William Caplin (1998) and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy (2006), but given their primary focus on music of the eighteenth century and the first two decades of the


nineteenth, it is uncertain to what extent these models apply to music following even as closely as the second quarter of the nineteenth century. A theory of development sections in Romantic music, and specifically in Felix Mendelssohn’s music, still eludes us. Musical form in the second quarter of the nineteenth century remains comparatively untouched with writers more often gravitating towards the century’s later decades. In my pursuit to advance our understanding of early to mid-nineteenth-century sonata form, this dissertation contributes to the literature on Mendelssohn’s music in two ways. First, it deals with a much wider selection of Mendelssohn’s instrumental music than is typical in existing analytical studies. Second, it offers a stronger delineation of developmental space and a method for classifying developments across an extensive body of music via a theory of the development, the latter of which is based on the role Mendelssohn’s developments play in the form. As we shall see, my theory is applicable across an extensive body of developments and enables trends based on genre, movement position, and across specific pieces to come to the fore. I also make larger claims about the importance of the development and its contribution to the expressive trajectory of movements.

---


5 Janet Schmalfeldt effectively summarizes “…Mendelssohn’s Songs without Words has served as the almost exclusive genre of choice for…Schenkerians, including Schenker. As for Mendelssohn’s chamber and symphonic works, there seems to be a dearth of effort on the part of theorists and analysts of form…” See Schmalfeldt (2011), 164. As I discuss later in this chapter, an exception is Wingfield and Horton’s study on 74 of Mendelssohn’s instrumental sonata forms, which follows a year after Schmalfeldt’s commentary.
The following literature review draws on sources in the English-language literature and positions this dissertation within four broader fields of inquiry: (1) Mendelssohn’s reception history; (2) analytical approaches to his instrumental music; (3) theories of musical form and perspectives on early nineteenth-century sonata form in particular; and (4) theories on and analytical approaches to the development section.

I. Mendelssohn’s Reception History

The need to expand Mendelssohn scholarship has been noted by commentators on his troubling reception history and scholars who have focused on Mendelssohn’s life and music. Indeed, Mendelssohn scholarship presents a paradox; relatively little has been written until recent decades despite Mendelssohn’s contemporary fame, the musical public’s familiarity with his name, and the popularity of his music today. This dissertation contributes to the long, drawn-out pursuit over past decades to construct a better understanding of Mendelssohn and belongs to more recent efforts to do so through his music and by considering him as a composer in his own right.

Several factors contributed to the posthumous descent of Mendelssohn’s lifelong acclaim. R. Larry Todd’s preface to his Mendelssohn biography, *A Life in Music* (2003), cites two serious blows: Richard Wagner’s anti-Semitic critique of Mendelssohn in his tendentious 1850 essay, “Judaism in Music,” and the subsequent reaction against the Victorian era towards
the twentieth century. First, Wagner’s essay notoriously disputed Mendelssohn as a major contributor of musical progress based on Mendelssohn’s Jewish heritage. According to Todd, Wagner’s anti-Semitic attack worked with the cultural reforms aimed for by the 1848 revolutions in Europe. It also furthered Wagner’s avocation for “the politically ‘liberal,’” Neudeutsche ‘school’ of Wagner and Liszt” as the future of German music. In both cases, Mendelssohn’s music was charged for its backward references (e.g., to J.S. Bach) and adherence to classicist forms. These traits opposed the new-age ideals of evolution and teleology.

As Colin Eatock describes in *Mendelssohn and Victorian England* (2009), anti-Victorian sentiments in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century England echoed similar desires for dissociation from the past, and contributed to the strain on the composer’s popularity away from the continent. Mendelssohn’s ten successful English sojourns (1829–1847) earned him admiration and an unerring level of cultural authority through his service to improving England’s musical status. He also convinced the English of their potential for becoming a ‘musical nation’ like Germany. According to Eatock, these contributions forged a deep association between Mendelssohn and Victorian musical culture by the mid-nineteenth century. Around the turn of the century, however, attacks against Mendelssohn and his music became symptomatic of the aversion from the Victorian values of the 1830s and 1840s.

---


7 Todd (2003), xxiii.


9 Ibid., ix and 148.
The diminishing of Mendelssohn’s cultural authority in Germany and England was only precursory to the travesties against Mendelssohn a hundred years after his peak. The German Nazi regime banned Mendelssohn’s music and destroyed documents about him because of his Jewish heritage. The quiet removal and destruction of his commemorative statue from the front of the Leipzig Gewandhaus in 1936 represented the composer’s fall from grace and was a part of the lowest chapter in his posthumous reception.10

Scholarly efforts towards Mendelssohn’s reappraisal began soon after the Second World War’s end in 1945. John Michael Cooper’s (2004) chapter on Mendelssohn’s reception chronologically outlines the advancements in Mendelssohn scholarship from this time forward.11 As Cooper notes, early-post-war scholars gradually became more aware of the injustices against Mendelssohn in past scholarship. They therefore took more critical approaches in their study of Mendelssohn’s life and works by looking at primary source documents. Several positive outcomes resulted, including Bernhard Bartels’ (1947) Mendelssohn biography, a new critical edition of Mendelssohn’s 1830–1832 letters, Donald Mintz’s (1960) systematic study of Mendelssohn’s compositional process, and although problematic, Eric Werner’s (1963) thorough life-and-works study on the composer.12

---

10 Todd (2003), xx.
12 Bernhard Bartels, Mensch und Werk (Bremen: Dorn Verlag, 1947); Donald Mintz, “The Sketches and Drafts of Three of Felix Mendelssohn’s Major Works” (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1960); Eric Werner Mendelssohn: A New Image of the Composer and His Age, trans. Dika Newlin (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963). Jeffrey Sposato exposes the problems with Werner’s Mendelssohn biography. Sposato claims that Werner over-represented Mendelssohn’s Jewish identification, and that this was the result of Werner consistently and specifically mistranslating and mistranscribing passages from primary source documents pertaining to Mendelssohn’s relationship with the Jewish heritage. Peter Ward Jones supports Sposato’s view and Leon Botstein provides commentary on Sposato’s discovery. See first Jeffrey Sposato, “Creative Writings: The [Self-]
By the 1960s and 1970s, Mendelssohn’s reappraisal continued. Achievements included: the influx of short articles around the sesquicentenary of his birth, the completion of a critical body of collected works through the publication of over twenty critical editions of his unpublished pieces, and especially, through the rise of academic conventions, journals, and societies—all dedicated to Mendelssohn. As Cooper elaborates, the Mendelssohn symposium in Berlin (1972), the founding of the scholarly journal *Mendelssohn-Studien*, and the growth of the new *Internationale Felix-Mendelssohn-Gesellschaft* represented strides in Mendelssohn scholarship during this time.

Mendelssohn scholarship increased as the twentieth century ended. Edited volumes of essay collections arose with greater regularity. *Mendelssohn and Schumann: Essays on their Music and its Context* (1984), edited by Jon W. Finson and R. Larry Todd, presented topics related to critical responses to Mendelssohn by his contemporaries, studies on Mendelssohn’s interactions with selected contemporaries, and his literary influences. Two collections edited solely by Todd—*Mendelssohn and His World* (1991) and *Mendelssohn Studies* (1992)—later expanded on these topics, but still largely continued the post-war efforts aimed at rehabilitating
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13 Cooper (2004), 249.

14 Ibid., 249.


Douglass Seaton’s *The Mendelssohn Companion* (2001) was the first and focused more on Mendelssohn’s compositions through overviews of his music. Excerpts from relevant primary source documents also consider the composer’s context, like his intellectual milieu, social circles, and professional activities. Mendelssohn’s sister Fanny and related matters of gender and race also began to be discussed in John Michael Cooper and Julie D. Prandi’s *The Mendelssohns: Their Music in History* (2002). Most importantly, Peter Mercer-Taylor’s *The

---


18 Todd (2003).


Cambridge Companion to Mendelssohn (2004) addressed many of the biographical, historical, and creative complexities tied to Mendelssohn’s life, art, and legacy to highlight a central underlying issue: Mendelssohn’s “falling in between” (i.e., the sense that, with regards to his life and music, Mendelssohn represents being more things than one, and yet, of being neither/nor, as Mercer-Taylor’s preface elaborates). This was a critical step towards understanding Mendelssohn on his own terms.

Two other noteworthy collections arose in the year approaching the bicentenary of Mendelssohn’s birth: Siegwart Reichwald’s Mendelssohn in Performance (2008), the first volume on performance studies of Mendelssohn’s music, and Todd’s Mendelssohn Essays (2008). Most of Todd’s essays are reprinted from previous publications, but two new essays take different perspectives on reception than previously, since Todd gauges Mendelssohn’s own response to British musical culture as a German visitor to England. Todd also considers current reception from a more stylistic standpoint, specifically how our reception of his mature style is influenced by his early aptitude. Todd’s preface recognizes the strides in research in the past few decades, noting that “from a postmodern perspective…[Mendelssohn’s] image has been largely rehabilitated,” and that “the intensifying revival…shows no signs of abating.”

---


23 Todd (2008), xi.
Nicole Grimes and Angela R. Mace’s *Mendelssohn Perspectives* (2012) testifies to Todd’s statement. This most recent compendium highlights lacunae in Mendelssohn research, like Mendelssohn’s stage works, and continues current trends, like his contemporary and posthumous reception, by applying different methodologies. The volume’s section “Between Tradition and Innovation” addresses Mendelssohn’s “border-dweller” status further with three essays on Mendelssohn’s artistic outlook and relationship to the past. These essays suggest that Mendelssohn was more dynamic in his stylistic approach as a composer and conductor-performer in his own right.

Collectively, these nine compendia reflect the need for greater music-theoretical engagement with the music, which I aim to provide in this dissertation. While three of these volumes show a slightly stronger music-analytical orientation, most still provide a general survey. In Seaton (2001), Thomas Grey’s chapter on Mendelssohn’s orchestral music lightly discusses formal, stylistic, and other musical aspects, as does Friedhelm Krummacher’s chapter on the string quartets. In Mercer-Taylor (2004), genre-specific profiles of the music are given

---


through Seaton’s chapter on the symphony and overture, Steve Lindemann’s on the solo instrumental and orchestral works, and Thomas Schmidt-Beste’s on the chamber music.\textsuperscript{28}

Grimes and Mace (2012) is perhaps more music-theoretical given Benedict Taylor’s chapter, as mentioned above, and Paul Wingfield and Julian Horton’s “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms,” which I discuss below.

\section*{II. Analytical Approaches to Mendelssohn’s Instrumental Music}

What music analytical scholarship there is on Mendelssohn’s instrumental music has largely remained within the realms of rhythmic and Schenkerian analysis. Many of these endeavours have tended towards Mendelssohn’s \textit{Songs without Words}, rather than his larger-scale instrumental works. William Rothstein’s chapter on Mendelssohn in his book, \textit{Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music} (1989), is a case in point. Rothstein demonstrates the composer’s aptitude for maneuvering what he calls “the Great Nineteenth-Century Rhythm Problem”—the danger of submitting too easily to the squareness of simple, symmetrical phrase structures.\textsuperscript{29} He explores how Mendelssohn’s music preserves rhythmic vitality through phrase expansion, deceptive recapitulation, and metrical conflict, but draws exclusively from the \textit{Songs without Words}. An almost exclusive focus on the \textit{Songs without Words} characterizes other rhythmic

\begin{flushright}

\end{flushright}
studies on Mendelssohn’s music, too, such as those by Carl Schachter (1976) and Allen Cadwallader (1990), with the exception of Erez Rapoport’s more recent Schenkerian and rhythmic study of formal boundaries (2004). Rapoport’s study includes a broader selection of Mendelssohn’s instrumental music, but is still weighted somewhat in the direction of the *Songs without Words*. These small-scale pieces are also addressed plentifully in the Schenkerian literature. Music analysis has only more recently begun to shift focus towards Mendelssohn’s sonata forms.

This study on Mendelssohn’s developments fits into a relatively recent and expanding body of music-theoretical work on his treatment of sonata form. Books by Greg Vitercik (1992) and Benedict Taylor (2011) are the two most important studies of form in Mendelssohn. Both view Mendelssohn’s idiosyncratic approach to form as a reinvasoriation of, rather than a disregard for, conventional principles. Vitercik’s book has been a useful starting point for scholarship in this area. He argues the importance of considering the nineteenth-century change


in the conception of sonata form in order to understand Mendelssohn’s idiosyncratic treatment of a highly conventionalized musical structure. Drawing on just a handful of early pieces, he explains how Mendelssohn reconciles Romantic lyricism with the drama of Classical form through cyclicism so that thematic processes are carefully worked out across formal sections.

Taylor also focuses on cyclic form and thematic process, but his contribution lies in his interpretative approach that unites history and theory to contextualize Mendelssohn’s cyclic aesthetic. He argues that cyclicism is a natural byproduct of the age in which Mendelssohn lived, and an expression of the composer’s tie to the contemporary trend towards historicism. Taylor does not include close readings that apply specific analytical methodologies to a broad range of Mendelssohn’s music, however.

Other analytical studies on Mendelssohn’s sonatas continue to reflect the need for a more in-depth analysis of the fuller corpus of Mendelssohn’s instrumental music. R. Larry Todd’s work (1993) on Mendelssohn’s overtures, for example, has served more as an influential study of Mendelssohn’s style than as a model for detailed analysis.\(^{33}\) Schenkerian approaches to Mendelssohn’s sonatas have been undertaken by William Lyle Pelto (1993) on the concert overtures and, in conjunction with rhythmic analysis, Erez Rapoport (2004) on the smoothing-over of formal junctures at all structural levels in Mendelssohn’s instrumental music.\(^{34}\) Robin Wildstein Garvin (2008) situates unexpected events in the string quartets within the context of Romantic irony, while Janet Schmalfeldt’s (2011) brief chapter on the expansion of late
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\(^{34}\) William Lyle Pelto, “Musical Structure and Extramusical Meaning in the Concert Overtures of Felix Mendelssohn” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Texas Austin, 1993); Rapoport (2004).
eighteenth-century theme-types in the exposition of Piano Trio No. 1 in D minor, Op. 49 (I) and on motivic-harmonic transformation in Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20 (III) considers form as process in Mendelssohn’s music.\(^{35}\) Paul Wingfield and Julian Horton’s chapter on norm and deformation in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms is the most recent contribution, which, as the discussion in the next section below makes clear, complements my study.\(^{36}\)

Two studies appear in the literature with specific regard to Mendelssohn’s developments, but both refrain from applying a wide range of analytical techniques to a broad range of his works. Marilyn Barnes Holt’s thesis (1973) on developments only includes Mendelssohn among Beethoven, Schubert, and Schumann, and draws attention to descriptive elements like dynamics, instrumentation, and texture in the symphonies.\(^{37}\) Rohan Stewart-MacDonald’s article (2009) identifies types of recession (a decrease in energy) in Mendelssohn’s developments, but his observations seem oriented towards the descriptive as well.\(^{38}\) My in-depth analyses of Mendelssohn’s developments and their role in the form respond directly to the continuing need for stronger music analytical focus in Mendelssohn scholarship.


\(^{36}\) Wingfield and Horton (2012).


III. Theories of Musical Form and Views on Early Nineteenth-Century Sonata Form

Studying development sections makes pertinent an overview of William Caplin’s *Classical Form* (1998) and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006). These are the foremost theories of form, with the latter representing the largest and most detailed account thus far. My focus on Mendelssohn’s sonata forms also requires a discussion of commentaries on early nineteenth-century form in particular.

Caplin’s theory of “formal functions” arises as an attempt to revive the *Formenlehre* tradition of Arnold Schoenberg and his pupil Erwin Ratz by devising a more solid method for analyzing Classical sonata form from the lowest to highest levels of structure within a single movement. The resulting bottom-up approach is highly detailed and applies a consistent terminology to identify the formal units that articulate a movement’s overall structure. The theory therefore begins by explaining how sub-phrase units, like the basic idea, combine in different ways to form a variety of larger, theme-like units—or “tight-knit themes”—which are characteristic of main themes (e.g., the sentence, period, hybrids, small ternary, and small binary). Procedures within broader expanses of the form (e.g., the subordinate theme, transition, development, recapitulation, and coda) are then pursued up to the level of large-scale formal designs of entire movements (e.g., sonatas with and without a development, rondo, etc.). This outline of procedures is based on empirical observations of instrumental music by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven from approximately 1780 to 1810.\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\) Caplin (1998), 3.
Hepokoski and Darcy’s top-down approach, on the other hand, categorizes five different types of sonata forms (i.e., in order from Types 1 to 5: sonatas without development, those with development, those with partial development, sonata-rondos, and those of concertos) and outlines the procedures in each structural space within the form. The central aspect of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, though, is their concept of “dialogic form.” According to Hepokoski and Darcy, individual sonata-form movements enter into dialogue, or are interpreted against a background set of normative procedures or available options, from which composers choose. As Hepokoski and Darcy explain, such norms “had been internalized through [composers’] experience and familiarity with the style” and “existed conceptually within the knowledgeable musical community…given by a shared knowledge of precedents.” Hepokoski and Darcy arrange these norms into a hierarchical system of leveled defaults based on their respective frequencies in the late eighteenth century. Sonata-form movements therefore comprise a chain of choices made by the composer for each zone, and if an option outside of these default levels is chosen instead, a generic “deformation”—“a markedly exceptional procedure” and interesting occurrence in the piece—results.

By acknowledging the variety of options within any given sonata space, Hepokoski and Darcy present a flexible theory aimed at explaining an extensive repertoire of late eighteenth-century sonata forms in many genres by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and some of their lesser-known contemporaries. This flexibility enables their theory to operate in tandem with an
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40 Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 10.
41 Ibid., 9.
42 Ibid., 11.
analytical approach that is more inclusive and far-reaching in scope with regards to repertoire
than measuring individual sonata-form movements against a reductive, ideal “textbook” model.
Despite focusing on late eighteenth-century music, Sonata Theory is open to interpreting
slightly earlier and later works, as the authors point out through several examples. As of yet,
however, no comprehensive theory devoted exclusively to early nineteenth-century musical
form exists. The present literature in this area highlights the need to address an important lacuna
in scholarship.

Commentaries on early nineteenth-century form have remained rather descriptive, with
scholars generally outlining how aspects of sonata form gained new meaning due to stylistic
changes. James Webster’s Grove article on form (2007–2012) provides a succinct yet
informative overview of these changes, noting especially the lessened importance of the
exposition’s tonal duality through the increased emphasis on the second theme as a contrasting
entity to the first theme, the tendency towards four-bar phrases, the expanded system of tonal
relations as represented by the appearance of remote keys in the second group, the increased
harmonic fluidity offered by chromaticism, and the bias against literal repeats of themes and
both the first and second parts of the form.43 Webster adds that the full recapitulation of both
theme groups was nonessential, that thematic returns were varied, that the continual
development of themes often engendered new ones, and that such thematic transformation
combined with the avoidance of literal repetition weakened the importance of the simultaneous
return, shifting the structural weight of the movement towards the coda, where it was possible
for the main theme to return as a climactic apotheosis.

Webster’s encyclopedic entry serves as a useful starting point for researching form in the early nineteenth-century, but more extensive sources like William S. Newman’s *The Sonata Since Beethoven* (1972 [1969]), Leonard Ratner’s *Romantic Music* (1992), and Charles Rosen’s *The Romantic Generation* (1995) and his earlier *Sonata Forms* (1988 [1980]) similarly emphasize the need to pursue early nineteenth-century form more thoroughly given their descriptive accounts of style.\(^4^4\) Ratner, for example, responds to the sonic changes induced by the evolution of particular instruments and the orchestra during the Romantic period, and taking a piece-specific approach to analysis, investigates the impact of the nineteenth century’s changing climate of sound on musical expression and form from the level of the phrase to entire sonata movements. By contrast, Rosen’s *The Romantic Generation* explores a variety of mostly composer-specific topics of interest to the author, but generally avoids technical discussions on formal procedures. Only “Sonata Form after Beethoven” (the final chapter of Rosen’s *Sonata Forms*) and Newman’s *The Sonata Since Beethoven* embark upon fuller discussions of Romantic form, drawing on stylistic features specific to the age and—especially as in Newmans’ more extensive study—of those features specific to the composers surveyed.

One topic that looms largely in these sources and others, like Carl Dahlhaus’ *Nineteenth-Century Music* (1989) and James Hepokoski’s chapter in *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Music* (2001), is, as Newman’s title suggests, Beethoven’s influence on form.\(^4^5\) As


these authors relate, Beethoven achieved unprecedented monumentality with his ‘Eroica’ Symphony, which radically changed the traditional concept of theme through its combination of large-scale form and goal-directed structure. Through this feat, Beethoven not only transformed the symphony into a monumental genre, but also established the sonata as a vehicle of the sublime—a medium in which composers could attain their highest musical ambitions.

Beethoven’s legacy left Romantic composers with the challenge of maintaining the achievement he had attained in confronting sonata and large-scale form (especially in the symphonic genre), and of doing so in different ways to avoid copying his style. This challenge, though weighing heavily on composers in the early part of the nineteenth century, remained pervasive throughout the era, and also resulted in Romantic form’s complex reception history; the reification of sonata form through its early nineteenth-century codification together with the omnipresence of Beethoven’s sonatas led to a nonlinear, discontinuous history of sonata form in the Romantic era. Essentially, the prestige of an idealized textbook form
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46 Dahlhaus (1989), 152. Compared to Dahlhaus’ discussion of Beethoven’s influence, Hepokoski (2001) emphasizes the effect of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. This difference pertains to a point Dahlhaus makes: “...to speak of “the” Beethoven symphony drawn upon by later composers is to distort our view of an important aspect of the history of reception. The range and variety of Beethoven’s symphonies made it impossible to construct an ideal type...and turned these works separately into starting points and prerequisites for the conflicting trends within the nineteenth-century history of [the symphonic] genre. Schumann took his bearings on Beethoven’s Fourth and Seventh Symphonies and Berlioz primarily on the Eroica, whereas Bruckner’s works everywhere reflect the model of the Ninth.” See Dahlhaus (1989), 153.


49 Dahlhaus (1989) suggests a “circumpolar” model for the history of the nineteenth-century symphony, while Rosen (1988 [1980]) succinctly explains, “When sonata form did not yet exist, it had a history—the history of eighteenth-century musical style. Once it had been called into existence by early nineteenth-century theory, history was no longer possible for it; it was defined, fixed, and unalterable.” See Dahlhaus (1989), 152 and Rosen (1988 [1980]), 365. For an account of the codification of sonata form, see also Scott Burnham, “Form,” in The Cambridge Companion to the History of Western Music Theory, ed. Thomas Christensen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
“sometimes provided a well-built but artificially designed channel for the newer modes of expression,” while later examples of the symphony in particular seemed often to “relate directly and immediately to models left by Beethoven, with intermediate stages playing only a minor role.”

This schism between classicism and romanticism presents understandable challenges to pursuing a comprehensive theory of early nineteenth-century form, but two very recent studies have dealt with them in commendable ways. In her book *In the Process of Becoming* (2011), Janet Schmalfeldt deals with the issue through her piece-specific approach (i.e., she analyzes thirteen compositions in detail by a wide range of composers beginning with Beethoven in his middle period and including Schubert, Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Robert and Clara Schumann), and by conducting her analyses with the conviction that form is a process. According to Schmalfeldt, the processual nature of form results from “the special case whereby the formal function initially suggested by a musical idea, phrase, or section invites retrospective reinterpretation within the larger formal context.” The opening passage of a movement may at first suggest characteristics of an introduction, for example, but in retrospect, function as the first theme.

Paul Wingfield and Julian Horton’s chapter “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms” (2012), on the other hand, contributes to the study of early nineteenth-century
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50 For the former quote, see Rosen (1988 [1980]), 366. For the latter, see Dahlhaus (1989), 152.
51 Schmalfeldt (2011).
52 Ibid., 9.
form by focusing exclusively on Mendelssohn’s music.\(^\text{53}\) Aware of the complexities involved with applying the classical sonata-theoretical model of form to nineteenth-century sonata forms, the authors opt for an empirical approach based on the analysis of a corpus of works—74 of Mendelssohn’s sonata-type movements (excluding movements of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 4 variety) from 1825 to 1847—to establish what is normative for Mendelssohn’s sonata-form music.\(^\text{54}\) As methodology, Wingfield and Horton assess whether normative or deformational procedures prevail in Mendelssohn’s compositional practice. These are the same norms and deformations outlined by Hepokoski and Darcy for the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. In Sonata Theory, these deformational categories reflect the various circumstances in which a normative procedure is stretched or overridden. Three deformational categories identified by Hepokoski and Darcy include introduction-coda frames, reversed or partly reversed recapitulations, and non-resolving recapitulations.

Through their analysis of the 74 movements, Wingfield and Horton challenge what is meant by “deformation,” since they identify the statistical prominence of twelve categories of what could be construed as “deformation” in Sonata Theory in Mendelssohn’s 1825–1847 output. These categories include the three examples mentioned above (see categories 1, 10, and 11): (1) introduction-coda frames; (2) three-key expositions; (3) tonal regions outside the I–V and i–III/i–v tonal opposition; (4) theme groups presented as harmonic fields rather than prolongations of a single key; (5) second groups occurring substantially over dominant pedals or first-inversion triads; (6) elisions of exposition and development; (7) the appearance in

\(^{53}\) Wingfield and Horton (2012).

\(^{54}\) As Wingfield and Horton make clear, this chapter presents but a small portion of their larger project involving the 80 sonata-type movements written before 1825 for a total of 154 sonata-type movements.
development space of ostensibly new non-tonic (often fugal) material that is often resolved in coda space; (8) elisions of development and recapitulation, including themes returning over dominant pedals, or harmonic progressions, or first-inversion tonic triads; (9) truncated recapitulations; (10) reversed or partly reversed recapitulations; (11) non-resolving recapitulations; and (12) the return of themes from earlier movements in finales. Wingfield and Horton also suggest common themes among these categories: “the disruption of sonata activity by elements beyond its confines” (categories 1 and 12), “the use of complex expositional key structure” (categories 2, 3, and 4; 11 is related), “the elision of formal boundaries” (categories 5, 6, and 8), and “structural revisions of the ‘generic layout’” (categories 7, 9, and 10). Overall, the prominence of these twelve categories leads Wingfield and Horton to state that the analytical evidence “could…be reconstrued simply as a taxonomy of sonata practices rather than of sonata deformations.”

Wingfield and Horton continue by emphasizing their overarching idea that “there is scarcely a sonata movement by Mendelssohn that does not contravene sonata theory’s ‘generic’ norms.” To this observation, the authors make four additional observations on the twelve categories they outline. First, some categories are mostly or completely movement- or mode-
specific (e.g., non-resolving recapitulations occur in the minor mode, and non-standard tonal oppositions in first movements). Second, the two most common categories which happen across all movement types are: major formal truncations in the recapitulation, and elided reprises. Third, Mendelssohn uses many procedures to achieve both of these categories. For the latter in particular, the first theme’s return over a dominant pedal is by far the most common procedure. Fourth, certain categories or devices tend to be used together. As an example, the authors refer to elided recapitulations. According to Wingfield and Horton, elided recapitulations occur with second groups over dominant pedals or first-inversion triads such that the structural resolution is delayed into the coda.

Given the above observations, Wingfield and Horton assert their suggestion to “understand Mendelssohn’s sonata forms empirically, as a body of works revealing more-or-less common strategies which can be named and assessed in terms of context and prevalence.”  

The authors do not deny Mendelssohn’s association with tradition, though. Not only is it appropriate to analyze and compare Mendelssohn’s sonata forms with one another to identify frequent strategies, it is also viable to consider that Mendelssohn absorbed his conventions from repertoire of past practice—seen as “a fund of procedures” from which he drew.  

To illustrate this latter point, Wingfield and Horton identify the antecedents of the first movements of Mendelssohn’s Piano Sonata No. 3, Op. 106 and his Piano Concerto No. 1 in Beethoven and Weber respectively. These two pieces comprise specific examples of how it is possible to locate Mendelssohn’s classical precedents in particular models by particular composers, which are
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59 Ibid., 107.

60 Ibid., 107.
genre specific.\textsuperscript{61} Taken collectively, these observations lead Wingfield and Horton to conclude Mendelssohn’s “self-consistent style that both absorbed and superseded the precedents of high classicism, and above all the models bequeathed by Beethoven, to which [he] often overtly alludes.”\textsuperscript{62} This view of Mendelssohn—of seeing him in his own light and being of his own time—is a valuable perspective that coincides with how I establish groups based on the roles Mendelssohn’s developments play and their connection to the rest of the form.

IV. Theories on the Development

The theory of development I offer responds directly to the need for a method that can classify developments across an extensive body of works across genres by various composers. Theories on the development are scarce because developments vary so greatly between pieces, making it difficult to identify common patterns among them. References in the literature therefore describe and comment generally on the instability caused by modulation and sequence. Schoenberg, for example, calls the development an “elaboration” or “contrasting middle section” which “tends to be modulatory” given the exposition’s harmonic stability.\textsuperscript{63} At best, 

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 109.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 112. This statement seems to work well with Steven Vande Moortele’s sense that a multi-dimensional approach to nineteenth-century form is likely the most effective. This model begins with a centre representing “the Classical norms and conventions [that cast], as a kind of prima prattica, a long shadow across the nineteenth century. The outer circles stand for a multifarious seconda prattica, with every circle representing the normative practice of a different period (including a composer’s personalized practice). With each new generation of composers, the canon grows, and a new layer is added to the stack of available formal options. For any specific piece, a composer may choose to activate—or, perhaps more accurately, the analyst may choose to emphasize—certain sets of conventions while ignoring others.” See Steven Vande Moortele, “In Search of Romantic Form,” \textit{Music Analysis} 32 (2013): 411.

Schoenberg notes the emphasis on transient harmonies, like dominant-functioning chords and deceptive progressions, while observing that “the thematic material may be drawn from the themes of the exposition in any order.” The sense of composers’ arbitrariness in determining tonal and thematic layout across developments is eminent in Schoenberg’s description, and has remained largely ingrained in the standard view of developments in general.

Despite the complications in studying developments, the pursuit towards a stronger delineation of developments is slowly taking shape. Recent work on sonata form by theorists like Charles Rosen (1988 [1980]), William Caplin (1998), and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy (2006) attempts more systematic accounts of the development, each achieving something along more specific lines. Rosen notes that developments in the latter half of the eighteenth century typically began with the main theme in the dominant and ended with a cadence on the relative minor before either the retransition or recapitulation, and that an alternative was a cadence on V of vi directly preceding the tonic and main theme. He also maintains that

as it denotes the prioritization of thematic working out in characterizing the development section (“Durchführung”). His *Structural Functions of Harmony* shows that on the contrary, this is not the case; he primarily views the development in terms of its tonal-harmonic instability. See Arnold Schoenberg, *Structural Functions of Harmony*, ed. Leonard Stein (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1969 [1954]), 145.


65 Considering the development primarily in harmonic terms, for example, Leonard Ratner suggests the term “X section,” to denote the unpredictability of this zone in the form. James Webster also states, “Hardly any rules can be laid down regarding the choice or treatment of [thematic] material.” See Leonard Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980), 225, and Webster (accessed 18 August 2016).

66 Caplin (1998); Hepokoski and Darcy (2006); Rosen (1988 [1980]).

sequences are important to the development’s function of postponing stability, especially in the nineteenth century.68

The most significant efforts towards a general model for developments belong to Caplin in his Classical Form and Hepokoski and Darcy in Elements of Sonata Theory. Like Rosen, Caplin comments on the tonal organization of developments but provides further detail. Caplin remarks that “certain tonal regions regularly appear, depending on the modality of the home key.”69 For major-key movements, these regions tend usually to be vi and iii (because minor-mode regions in the home key contrast the major-mode exposition), and for minor-mode movements, iv and v (which contrast the relative major—or subordinate key—of the exposition).70 Sequential structure is equally important as it is to Rosen, but Caplin is more specific about its use within the section. Caplin identifies three sections in most developments: a “pre-core” of “lesser emotional intensity,” the “core” (a large model repeated sequentially one or more times before fragmentation leads to a dominant arrival, either of the home key or a development key), and a standing on the dominant to prepare the recapitulation.71 Hepokoski and Darcy also divide the development into referential subsections, and although they cite four such zones (i.e., an optional link between the exposition and development space proper, an entry to the central action that follows, and the exit or retransition) their model essentially amounts to

68 Ibid., 275.
69 Caplin (1998), 141.
70 Ibid., 141.
71 Caplin uses the term “model-sequence technique” to refer to an initial unit (which he calls a “model”) and its sequential repetition. Ibid., 11 and for specific reference to the development’s core, see 142–144.
Caplin’s. Caplin focuses on the syntactic (or phrase-structural) organization of these units, but Hepokoski and Darcy emphasize the order in which thematic modules from the exposition reappear.

Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of rotation seeks to describe thematic ordering in developments: “the [thematic] modules that are taken up in the development appear in the same order as that in which they had been presented in the exposition.” They also determine thematic-ordering choices, which they organize into leveled default categories based on frequency, and clarify that not all thematic modules need to be present. Fully-rotational developments include all or some thematic modules, as long as one pre-MC and one post-MC module return in order. Developments with more than one cycle through thematic modules are multiply-rotational, while half-rotational developments only involve the first or, under specific conditions, possibly the second half of the exposition. Non-rotational developments, by contrast, only use material from the exposition’s second half. The flexibility with which Hepokoski and Darcy apply their theory of rotation makes their theory questionable.
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72 The entry, central action zone, and retransition described by Hepokoski and Darcy are respectively analogous to Caplin’s pre-core, core, and standing on the dominant. The optional link preceding the development proper which Hepokoski and Darcy add as a “fourth zone” to Caplin’s original model is a possibility that Caplin allows for as well, namely, a special type of pre-core that he calls a “transitional introduction.” Ibid., 147.

73 Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 206.

74 The MC, or Medial Caesura, is a main tenet of Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory. In a two-part exposition, the MC is the rhetorical “gap” which separates part 1 (P and TR in the tonic key) from part 2 (S and C in the secondary key). The MC articulates an arrival, usually on the dominant or HC of the secondary key, which “clears the way” for part 2. Ibid., 25–30.

75 Paul Wingfield offers an informative critique of rotation, among other ideas in Hepokoski and Darcy’s book. Wingfield contends that their rotational theory is asserted without any real explanation and that the rotational principle requires the abandonment of concepts which have already been widely disseminated (e.g., the “reverse recapitulation”). With the development in particular, Wingfield questions why thematic order should take
the development is thematically structured on the order of expositional elements reforms the long-held notion that the development is somehow exempt from normative formal architecture.

Only a small handful of analytical studies focus on the development, perhaps because of the general sense of composers’ arbitrariness towards developments compared to other formal sections. The relative lack of analytical pursuits notwithstanding, many of these few extant studies are Schenkerian, and reflect a general preoccupation with aspects of tonal structure. The rest of this small handful focuses on the retransition.

The tonal structure of developments provides insight on the syntactical tension created by how far the music ventures away from “home” and an account of how goals are achieved, forestalled, and of key relationships. Schenkerian studies clarify these relationships at a deeper level and show the importance of Schenkerian analysis in providing insights on structural aspects in the development and in form. Carl Schachter (1999 [1987]) and Wayne C. Petty (1999) have advocated that Schenkerian analysis elucidates deeper structural meanings of tonal and harmonic procedures in developments than would otherwise be possible. Schachter includes examples from developments to show how keys function within the larger perspective of Schenker’s monotonal approach. Schachter specifically differentiates between the true, governing tonic and chords as prolonged triads, and raises awareness on the insufficiencies of analysis based on key succession. As a case in point, Schachter takes Rosen’s approach to developments. Rosen identifies cadences tonicizing the submediant as a frequent procedure

________________________________________________________________________

towards the end of developments in the eighteenth century’s latter half, but for Schachter, more can be gained about the submediant’s functional differences at this point in the form if voice-leading procedures are studied in addition to features like key succession to determine style elements. Petty’s Schenkerian analyses of three developments by C.P.E. Bach similarly demonstrate different harmonic and voice-leading structures despite common key and cadence plans.

Other Schenkerian studies have clarified the function of specific tonal goals in developments by particular composers. David Beach’s article (1983) identifies a large-scale bass arpeggiation through V–III♯–I across the developments of nearly half of Mozart’s major-key sonatas. 77 Channan Willner (1988) furthers Beach’s observations, citing that the major mediant is a frequent tonal goal in Haydn’s developments. 78 Poundie Burstein (1998) similarly notes VII♯’s unusual use at the development’s end in the first movement of Beethoven’s Op. 18, No. 3 and in some of Haydn’s music, but demonstrates that although VII♯ is locally disruptive (i.e., as a distant key pointing towards III, rather than I at the moment of recapitulation), it functions more deeply as a V substitute. 79

Two additional studies investigate more specific phenomena in developments that present a conflict between structure and design. Mark Anson-Cartwright’s brief article (2006) is the narrower in scope of the two, and focuses on C major’s role as an unexpected tonal conflict


nearing the development’s end in the first movements of Haydn’s Symphonies Nos. 93 and 102 in D and B-flat major respectively.\textsuperscript{80} Anson-Cartwright’s Schenkerian perspective clarifies the C-major passage’s decorative function within II’s prolongation from the beginning of the former, and C major’s structural function as a main middleground harmony prolonging the structural dominant from the exposition’s end in the latter.

Jack Adrian’s work (1990; 1991), on the other hand, is broader in scope, since it addresses the structural problem created by the tonic’s return with the main theme at the starts of developments in the ternary-sonata, a new type of sonata form.\textsuperscript{81} Adrian’s Schenkerian perspective differentiates between “real” and apparent tonics and clarifies that in the ternary-sonata, the “real” tonic’s return at the development’s start initiates the motion to the structural dominant right before the recapitulation. The second theme’s motion to V produces an interruption at the middleground only such that the background level maintains the tonic to the structural V at the development’s end. In addition, the tonic at the development’s start is usually apparent or subsidiary to some other chord or progression.

Three other Schenkerian studies represent efforts for more categorical descriptions of developments by studying types of voice-leading procedures. Steven B. Jan (1992) categorizes certain recurrent background and middleground structures in Mozart’s minor-mode developments according to three patterns: (1) an ascent via a rising linear progression to $\hat{5}$ in
the upper voice which is typical of movements with an exposition ending in III; (2) a bridge or link represented by an implied V pedal at the deepest structural level for movements with an exposition ending in V; and (3) a descending motion, which Jan notes is rare, but perhaps applicable to minor-mode developments with descending harmonic progressions in the foreground.⁸² Jan suggests that these patterns are also relevant to eighteenth-century minor-key movements in general.

Edward Laufer’s (1991) outline of various middleground prototypes of developments at later levels is especially useful, as are his insights on voice-leading procedures.⁸³ These outlines of typical development-section paradigms are applicable across a variety of major- and minor-key developments by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Brahms. Laufer elaborates on Schenker’s account that the development harmonically prolongs V and melodically prolongs and/or moves towards the 2 of the interruption at the first middleground level. Laufer notes that several middleground prototypes at later levels—and their variations—display possible tonal trajectories of developments. He also includes paradigms with bass-motion to the structural V, particularly the III–V motion in minor-mode developments. Mark Anson-Cartwright’s dissertation (1998) on Haydn’s late instrumental developments also

---


⁸³ Edward Laufer, “Voice Leading Procedures in Development Sections,” *Studies in Music from the University of Western Ontario* 13 (1991): 69–120. These include, for example, techniques at the exposition-development and development-recapitulation divide, use of sequences, and incipient key areas and retransitions.
contributes deep middleground plans which overlap with Laufer’s; but Anson-Cartwright uses these as a reference to determine more specific aspects of structure and design.  

Other analyses focus on retransitions in Haydn’s (Beth Shamgar 1984; Michael Spitzer 1996), Mozart’s (James Fairleigh 1986; Roman Ivanovitch 2011), and Beethoven’s (Poundie Burstein 2006) music. Shamgar’s influential article “On Locating the Retransition in Classical Sonata Form” explores where the retransition begins in Haydn’s, Mozart’s, and Beethoven’s piano sonatas. She identifies three border types which initiate retransitions: (1) those clearly articulated by a cadence stabilizing the development key, (2) those elided via phrase overlap, (3) and those with a gradual change in rhetorical and harmonic elements. Shamgar states that articulated openings were common in Haydn and Mozart, but Beethoven favoured gradual beginnings made identifiable through his characteristic use of the dominant pedal. These observations correlate to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century treatises on form. Although present-day writers tend to associate the retransition with Beethoven’s characteristic, climactic dominant pedal, Shamgar clarifies that other Classical techniques for signalling the retransition became stylistic traits of the composers who used them.

Scholars have pursued retransitional technique as a style element in sporadic fashion since Shamgar’s article, but still focus on the First Viennese School. Shamgar (1984) and

---

84 Mark Anson-Cartwright, “The Development Section in Haydn’s Late Instrumental Works” (Ph.D., diss., The City University of New York, 1998).

Spitzer (1996) demonstrate different aspects of Haydn’s retransitional technique.\(^{86}\) Shamgar cites rhythm as the most important dramatic factor, and identifies three basic states of movement—intensification, detensification, and equilibrium. Shamgar’s analysis remains mostly descriptive, however.

Spitzer, on the other hand, demonstrates the “double-retransition” or “false retransition—true retransition model” in some of Haydn’s music. The false retransition prepares the wrong key, but is “corrected” by the true retransition, which prepares the “right” key. The false retransition on the dominant of a minor-mode development key (usually vi) recalls the more archaic V/vi–I retransition before the true retransition prepares the tonic through the Classical, prototypical dominant pedal.\(^{87}\) Spitzer provides two main ideas for understanding the retransition. The first pertains to analyzing retransitions: there is no reason to view retransitions as exclusively tonal since they are texturally and rhetorically marked to signal impending resolution, especially when the original tonic is not explicit from a local perspective, as in the V/vi–I scenario.\(^{88}\) Second, the double-retransition model shows how composers still achieved markedness differently than the tension-inducing pedals popularized by Beethoven. Haydn’s

---


\(^{87}\) Drawing from James Webster’s work on Haydn, Spitzer discusses how Haydn reinterpreted the V/vi–I progression as a V–I alternative around 1770, specifically demonstrating Haydn’s use of the III–I retransition in eleven first movement sonata forms between 1770 and 1802. He suggests that Haydn’s use of the III chord as tonic preparation is akin to the “dominant substitutes” found in some of Beethoven’s piano sonatas by Charles Rosen. See Spitzer (1996): 39–41.

\(^{88}\) With respect to this point, Spitzer does not dismiss the role that “relational factors” (i.e., pitch reference, voice leading, and tonal hierarchy) have in our perception of closure; rather, he believes that “relational factors” reinforce the immediacy of rhetorical and textural devices which have a more direct impact on local-level hearing. Ibid., 20.
double-retransitions achieve markedness through structural (i.e., its loose antecedent-consequent) and stylistic discontinuity (i.e., its “false” and “true” counterparts are juxtaposed).

Still, two studies on Mozart’s retransitions and another on Beethoven’s demonstrate alternative approaches to those discussed above. Fairleigh (1986) studies Mozart’s sonatas and notes that in many cases, retransitions develop materials from at least one other formal area. Fairleigh concludes that Mozart’s retransitions usually use the first theme (since the retransition anticipates the recapitulation), and that when Mozart features both principal theme groups, they are related. Fairleigh notes how Mozart treats retransitions based on the first theme and those on a new theme (less frequent). Retransitions based on the former use the head motive in sequence and/or imitation, or may begin as a false reprise. Mozart also uses the head motive in the latter, but the new theme is treated like the expositional material earlier in the development. In addition, phrase and period constructions are generally avoided for more continuous structures in retransitions.

Ivanovitch (2011) also identifies Mozart’s retransitional procedures, but explores the technical and contrapuntal features over the dominant pedal. Ivanovitch identifies three strategies for treating this pedal. The first two lead to an Eingang going into the reprise, and the third goes directly to the tonic of the reprise. All three can be used independently or in


90 Roman Ivanovitch, “Mozart’s Art of Retransition,” *Music Analysis* 30 (2011): 1–36. Ivanovitch refers to the retransition as a gradual process in which the dominant pedal represents the lattermost stage. As he states, “If a retransition can be described as a potentially multistage process whose function is to return to the tonic... then we are interested in one of a small family of procedures at the very end of such a process, involving what has come to be called a ‘standing on the dominant’.” See Ivanovitch (2011): 2.
combination: (1) an ascent towards the chordal seventh, which sometimes involves a voice exchange against a possible descending inner-voice line, (2) a chromatic neighbour inflection of the dominant pedal using $\hat{6}$, which may alternatively appear in the upper voice, and (3) a descending line embellished contrapuntally against an inner line of suspensions accompanied by a working out of a descending-fifths sequence and the treatment of the pedal. The third technique is distinctively Mozartian (typically found in his slow movements), and displays Mozart’s prowess in making the retransition particularly expressive.

Burstein (2006) also explores how retransitional technique indicates compositional prowess. He demonstrates how Beethoven increases tension in his retransitions by revising those in his String Quintet in E-flat major, Op. 4 (1795) from those in his earlier draft—the Wind Octet in E-flat major, Op. 103 (1793). Beethoven’s revisions intensify the motion towards the tonic reprise in Op. 4. The dominant pedal now contrasts the older and less tonally direct retransitions in Op. 103. Beethoven also disrupts the climactic approach to E-flat major with E major in all four movements. Burstein’s Schenkerian perspective clarifies that the retransition’s overall harmonic drive and tonal cohesion are maintained, though, such that the retransition remains a point of structural focus. These techniques characterize Beethoven’s “heroic” style.

These studies collectively highlight the importance of the retransition as a critical point in the composition and thereby reinforce the development’s in musical form. Of these studies, Shamgar’s (1981) insight on locating the retransition is particularly useful. As we shall see, the start of most of Mendelssohn’s retransitions—like Beethoven’s—is marked with the proposal or

---

$^{91}$ Although the E/E conflict problematizes the main key’s return, E functions more deeply as F, subsumed within broader motions in E, more specifically.
onset of an extended V pedal. At other times, Mendelssohn’s retransitions reflect different approaches like his use of development-recapitulation overlap, the ascending 5–6 sequence or sense of “wrong key” leading up to the recapitulation, or much less frequently, use of more archaic choices like V/vi (or III)-I at the development-recapitulation border. As Spitzer (1996) reminds, retransitions can still show markedness of impending resolution when tension-inducing pedals are not used. Last but not least, as with Ivanovitch (2011) and Burstein (2006), I view the retransition as a particularly important area in the form that is worthy of greater attention, and as with Ivanovitch and Spitzer, I view the retransition as processual.

This study will show that developments hold an important aesthetic function as the dramatic crux of movements and to the sense of narrative across the form. My analyses of developments and entire movements are especially informed by a handful of studies on thematic, rhythmic, and tonal perspectives of music and form, as well as formal process. With regards to the thematic and phrase-structural dimension of developments, theories by Hepokoski and Darcy and Caplin are informative, although treated with caution. I also generally consider the development in three zones: the introductory zone (inclusive of the optional link preceding development space in instances when there is one), the central action zone, and the retransition. Hepokoski and Darcy’s statistical default levels for tonal procedures in developments are also informative, but my thinking and observations remain primarily

---

92 Considered on their own, thematic ordering and layout (Hepokoski and Darcy) and form-functional organization (Caplin) provide a very limiting view of the music in particular, and I do not consider either incontestable, especially with regards to Mendelssohn’s music. Following Paul Wingfield’s (2008) critique, I particularly treat Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of rotation with caution.

93 Although Hepokoski and Darcy treat the optional link and introduction separately, I consider these two zones as one, since most of Mendelssohn’s Type 3 sonatas omit the opening link. Having three sections will therefore provide a more consistent and reliable method of comparison.
Schenkerian, as informed by Laufer’s middleground prototypes for developments, for example. Rhythmic dissonance and phrase rhythm, especially phrase expansion and contraction, are also of interest to me. Important methodological texts are by Carl Schachter (1976), which differentiates between tonal and durational rhythm, and William Rothstein (1989), which discusses aspects of phrase rhythm and particularly phrase expansion. Other informative methodological sources include studies on congruence relations between tonal and rhythmic factors in Frank Samarotto (1999) on Beethoven’s late music and Ryan McClelland (2010) on Brahms’ scherzos. For formal process and expression, my approach is informed by Schmalfeldt (2011), who views the early nineteenth-century sonata as a vehicle for “the process of becoming.” Reddick (2009) is also informative. Her study explores formal fusion and rotational overlap—which includes how developmental function can be fused with the exposition and recapitulation—but in the late nineteenth-century sonata.

---

94 Not only does the Schenkerian approach clarify relationships at a deeper level, many of the few extant studies on developments are Schenkerian as well, as I have already explored at greater length in this chapter.

95 Rhythmic dissonance involves conflicts in grouping structure at the metrical level, while phrase rhythm denotes the interaction between phrase structure (length, placement of tonal goals) and hypermeter (meter above the level of the notated meter).

96 Rothstein (1989); Schachter (1999 [1987]).

97 Ryan McClelland, Brahms and the Scherzo (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010); Frank Samarotto, “A Theory of Temporal Plasticity in Tonal Music: An Extension of the Schenkerian Approach to Rhythm with Special Reference to Beethoven’s Late Music” (Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 1999).

98 Schmalfeldt (2011).

V. Objectives, Organization, and Methodology

This dissertation addresses three broad pursuits: (1) the need to understand the development better; (2) the need for more in-depth analyses of Mendelssohn’s sonatas given the mere handful of studies on his instrumental music; and (3) the need for a stronger understanding of early nineteenth-century sonata form. To do so, I offer a theory of Mendelssohn’s developments based on their role in the form that is applicable across a large body of works and that groups developments according to specific trends.

My in-depth analyses of fifty of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms treats various musical parameters as interrelated, and the development as a contextualized entity that holds different relationships to the rest of the form. By analyzing developments within the context of entire movements, my analyses provide insight on the expressive trajectory of Mendelssohn’s forms. As we shall see, viewing Mendelssohn’s developments within the context of large-scale form suggests narratives of transformation in Mendelssohn’s formal process.

My study limits its purview in three ways. First, it bypasses the String Symphonies composed during Mendelssohn’s student years. I thereby focus on the instrumental music from his Op. 1 onwards. Second, my study focuses exclusively on two specific types of sonata forms. Among these is the type of sonata form with complete exposition, development, and
Those sonata forms with truncated recapitulation are also included. Third, my analyses will focus only on those developments that suggest a strong tie to the rest of the form (as I will elaborate further upon in Chapter 2), which will result in fifty of Mendelssohn’s developments for in-depth study. While movements in all positions are included, observations from the study remain sensitive to the different functions of movements within the multi-movement work. I also consider the dramatic trajectory of movements based on the different roles and ties that Mendelssohn’s developments have with the rest of the form.

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1 has situated my study in the literature. Chapter 2 then proposes new theoretical concepts based on my analyses of Mendelssohn’s developments. I rethink formal function and suggest new terms and concepts for the form-functional analysis of the development’s core, I demonstrate the applicability of the new terms and concepts I devise for the more specific delineation of the retransition, and I
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100 Hepokoski and Darcy refer to movements with complete exposition, development, and recapitulation as “Type 3” sonata movements. With regard to the concerto movements, furthermore, one should note that although opening movements of Classical concertos generally fall within Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 5 given their double expositions and relationship to ritornello forms, those of Mendelssohn’s concertos are of the Type 3 variety. Hepokoski and Darcy specifically note that “with Mendelssohn especially, the initial ritornello of the Type 5 concerto came to seem redundant, old-fashioned, something that had outworn its original raison d’être. With its excision, what had been the favored format for concerto first movements—the Type 5 sonata—collapsed into the Type 3 pattern.” See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 434–435.

As further note, I exclude the type of sonata form (Hepokoski and Darcy’s “Type 2” sonata) whereby the development features material from the first part of the exposition—usually in a nontonic key—and takes on “recapitulatory” characteristics when material from the exposition’s second part arises. Ibid., 353–387.

101 In his chapter on full-movement forms, Caplin states that in those instances of sonata form with truncated recapitulation, “the composer creates a form that resembles the large ternary, one whose interior theme has been replaced by a transition and subordinate theme.” He also states that “until the transition and subordinate theme are perceived to be eliminated from the recapitulation, the listener has every reason to believe that the movement is a regular sonata.” See Caplin (1998), 216. Although Caplin refers to regular sonata without development, Hepokoski adds that this is the norm, but not always the case; it is possible for movements or pieces with truncated recapitulations to give the impression of a regular sonata with development as well. See James Hepokoski, “Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form,” in Musical Form, Forms, & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 71–89, and specifically, the endnote on 115.
I propose a theory of the development based on my analysis of the development’s role in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. My theory more specifically outlines five distinct groups of developmental relationships—or as I call them, developmental relationship types (DRTs)—amongst which I distribute all fifty of Mendelssohn’s developments under consideration (see Appendix 1).

I then demonstrate the applicability of my theory through analyses of entire movements with special consideration of the development’s role in Mendelssohn’s formal process. I present these analyses in Chapters 3 to 7. Chapters 3 and 4 present developments with a strong thematic tie to the rest of the form, while Chapters 5 to 7 exhibit those with structural- and content-driven ties. Each chapter explores a specific DRT that represents a specific relationship Mendelssohn’s developments have with the rest of the form. As the case studies for each DRT will show, my theory highlights the importance of Mendelssohn’s developments to the rest of the form, especially with regards to the intersection between form and narrative. Many of Mendelssohn’s developments can be seen to facilitate an overarching trajectory suggestive of transformation through the form. Chapter 8 closes with a summary of my findings, including trends in distribution across the five DRTs. Associations between specific traits of development with particular DRTs and trends with narrative and form are discussed. I also summarize the new concepts I devise for the form-functional analysis of development sections in Mendelssohn’s music (which I outline in Chapter 2) before I discuss the larger contributions and implications of my work with suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2
Mendelssohn’s Developments: New Theoretical Concepts and Terminology

This chapter introduces what I call an inner-outer perspective as an approach to my study of Mendelssohn’s developments. I propose this term to refer to both the local and global perspectives on development space which form the basis for my theory of development sections. My inner perspective addresses the inner structure of developments and enables new theoretical concepts and terminology based on my form-functional analysis of Mendelssohn’s developments. I then apply my outer perspective to identify the roles held by development sections and the relationships held by developments to the rest of the form. My focus remains on this outer dimension of development space even though the inner component of my theory outlines a structural aspect. The proposed theory sets the necessary groundwork for the in-depth discussion of developments within the context of the movements and pieces I pursue in Chapters 3 to 7.

In the first part of this chapter, the inner perspective of my theory more specifically outlines a new layout for the developmental core, which differs from Caplin’s form-functional outline of Classical developments. I then contribute a more specific understanding of the RT zone and Mendelssohn’s procedures for approaching and treating the development-recapitulation border, which I call the D-R border. In so doing, this chapter also proposes that

1 Recall that for Caplin, “core” refers specifically to model-sequence technique, which he presents as the main structural component of developments. See Caplin (1998), 141–147.
there are two kinds of developments if one considers the border used: (1) developments with a
tonic-articulated border and (2) those with a non-tonic-articulated D-R border. Mendelssohn has
particular methods for underplaying both kinds of border, which I explore. These methods play
a role in the relationships between developments and the rest of the form. The upcoming
analytical chapters further illustrate that as a crucial aspect of developments, underplayed D-R
borders participate in the musical narratives that arise from such developmental relationships
across individual movements.

Towards the end of this chapter, the outer perspective of my theory moves towards a
broader method for classifying developments. I propose that all developments are classifiable
according to two criteria: (1) a development may have a minimal or a strong tie to the rest of the
form, and as I have already stated in the paragraph above, (2) a development may achieve a
tonic- or a non-tonic-articulated D-R border. The end of this chapter specifically expands on the
first criterion. I focus on those developments with a strong tie to the rest of the form and propose
the concept, developmental relationship types (DRTs), to refer to the relationships between
the development section and the rest of the form. DRTs offer a lens through which to gauge
similarities between developments based on their large-scale function within the form. At the
same time, DRTs embrace and allow one to explore the plethora of differences that make
developments unique from one another. In these ways, the theory of DRTs stands as a viable
method for organizing an extensive body of developments into groups while drawing attention
to the important role that developments play. No longer to be solely regarded as self-contained
entities, developments are much more far-reaching; they are essential to how sonata form
unfolds, the meanings that accrue from Mendelssohn’s music, and, as I discuss at the very end of
this chapter, the kinds of narratives that arise from specific movements.
Together, the delineation of form-functional aspects of developments and DRTs that my inner-outer perspective on developments offers constitute a significant contribution to the study of Mendelssohn’s developments and the broader pursuit of developments in general. Not only have developments not been pursued in this way, the inner-outer perspective on developments that I implement through this study offers both local and global delineations of developmental space in Mendelssohn’s instrumental sonata forms. As we shall see, the pursuit of Mendelssohn’s developments via DRTs contributes a stronger understanding of Mendelssohn’s formal processes. Given the consistent applicability across an extensive body of movements in general, this method also holds potential for wider application to sonata forms across various instrumental genres by Mendelssohn’s contemporaries and other composers of the nineteenth century.

I. Rethinking Formal Function

The concepts, “pre-core”, “core”, and “retransition”—as reviewed in Chapter 1—are all applicable to the form-functional analysis of Mendelssohn’s developments. Often, though, Mendelssohn omits the pre-core and begins his developments directly with the core. These cores

---

2 As I mention in Chapter 1, these are Caplin’s terms, although Hepokoski and Darcy also identify zones analogous to these. Caplin writes that the “pre-core” is anticipatory in nature, more relaxed, and soft in dynamic such that the rhythmic motion is usually discontinuous or less active than the development’s upcoming sections. Pre-cores can also be complete or incomplete thematic units, and frequently derive their material from the main theme or closing section of the exposition, although new material is possible. The “core,” being more active and unstable, then moves through various keys, and usually consists of a four-to-eight-measure thematic unit called a “model” that is sequentially repeated and fragmented. While Caplin’s idea of “retransition” involves modulation back to the home key and then the terminal home-key V pedal, I follow Hepokoski and Darcy’s application of the term to the V pedal at the very end of the development that prepares for the recapitulation’s start on the tonic. For more on these three concepts, see Caplin (1998), 139–159. For the retransition, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 196–205.
are more freely structured than those of the Classical era. In particular, Mendelssohn’s cores usually eschew strict model-sequence technique as a principle for their structure, and are more free-flowing, driven by textural, rhythmic, thematic, and tonal impulses.\(^3\) Still, through a close look, developments are quite organized. Mendelssohn’s developmental cores demonstrate a very clear interior organization and delineation of constituent formal units. As I discuss below, one can use changes in one or more musical parameters to differentiate between spaces at different stages in the development, especially in the core. The interior organization of cores suggests the applicability of a more formalized set of terms and concepts for greater specificity in analysis. The four sections of this chapter introduce: (1) the developmental gap (DG), two-part core, and RT-prep zone; (2) the retransition-complex (RT-complex); as well as a theory of development based on (3) D-R borders and development classes, and (4) the role of the development in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms.

i) The Developmental Gap (DG) and the Two-part Core

This study proposes that some of Mendelssohn’s cores consist of two parts, core\(^{part1}\) and core\(^{part2}\), which are separated by an articulation called the developmental gap (DG) (Example 2.1).\(^4\) These two-part cores require the DG to be present. The DG can consist of either a half

\[^3\] My application of the term “core” therefore eschews implications of model-sequence technique (Caplin), and more generally implies the space that occupies the bulk of the development, this despite specific exceptions like the overture to Athalie (although this piece is excluded as a part of the limitations set for this study).

\[^4\] Caplin does mention that “lengthy development sections are likely to contain two different cores.” Quoted from Caplin (1998): 141. He does not elaborate on, or describe, this concept further, however, even despite one very brief example in the latter part of his discussion on the development’s core. Caplin otherwise exclusively dedicates several musical examples of developments with only one core.
cadence or an authentic cadence, or an arrival on an inversion of the tonic or dominant, usually of a development key.

**Example 2.1: The Developmental Gap and Fill; Op. 56, IV, mm. 169–183**

I theorize that the DG forms part of a larger set of events called the **DG-complex** (**developmental-gap-complex**), which has similar components to the MC-complex at TR’s end, although the DG does not achieve the same structural weight as the MC.5 A DG-complex with a

---

My concept of two-part core fundamentally differs from Caplin’s idea. My concept does share similarities with Caplin’s in that my corepart1 establishes a development key before corepart2 leads to the retransition (his core 1 and core 2, respectively). The difference is that Caplin seems to equate model-sequence technique with his concept of core. Not only is his discussion on the development’s core preoccupied with demonstrating model-sequence technique, but he also includes a discussion on developments without core that seems to suggest that without model-sequence there is no core (I refer specifically to Caplin’s “pseudo core”). In addition, that Caplin refers to two different cores suggests that he views each as discrete zones with respect to one another. I, by contrast, suggest two parts under one core, which are defined, in part, by the DG’s presence.

5 The MC-complex is a main tenet of Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory. The MC, or Medial Caesura, refers to the rhetorical “break” or “gap” that separates part 1 (P and TR in the tonic) from part 2 (S and C in the dominant or the mediant in minor-key sonatas) in a two-part exposition. In an MC-complex with the full set of events, the “break” is terminal, usually very brief, or slightly more elaborate in that it consists of nonfunctional material called caesura-fill. This break is usually instigated by an HC- or a V-arrival of the secondary key that is prepared by a set of proposals and V pedal. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 23–50. In this way, the DG-complex is similar to the MC-complex insofar that it can also feature a proposed and secured stage for the V pedal, a terminal articulation, and gap.
full set of events has proposals on an HC or V(7) arrival, usually in the development key. These proposals initiate, continue to propose, and ultimately secure a dominant pedal that leads to the DG. In the proposal stage, short, repeated phrase lengths, usually of about one to four measures in the upper voice articulate stresses in the pedal that eventually stop at the onset of the secured phase, which often consists of one phrase. At that point, the phrase length and/or use of thematic content changes to broaden the motion to the DG. The DG can then initiate a rhetorical gap in the texture that can be filled by what is usually a brief passage of nonstructural melodic or textural material called **DG-fill** (*developmental-gap-fill*; refer back to Example 2.1). The DG, however, is not dependent on the presence of all or any of these other components. More often than not, developments with two-part cores have a **sealed DG** that occurs without proposals, a pedal, or fill. As an articulation point, sealed DGs always simultaneously end **core\textsuperscript{part1}** and initiate **core\textsuperscript{part2}**. Whether sealed or not, the DG marks the turning point—a change in the development’s path to the recapitulation—which separates and distinguishes **core\textsuperscript{part1}** from **core\textsuperscript{part2}**. This change may occur in any one or combination of musical parameters, and expresses an advancement in the action—the next stage—in the development’s journey. Much as how the MC separates P (and TR) from a contrasting S zone in the exposition, furthermore, the DG typically announces a change in thematic material for **core\textsuperscript{part2}**. The two musical

---

\textsuperscript{6} As Example 2.2 will demonstrate more clearly, my use of the term “dominant arrival” differs slightly from Caplin’s. I allow for dominant arrivals to serve as the terminal articulation at the end of the dominant pedal in the DG-complex. Caplin also allows for formal sections to end noncadentially with dominant arrivals, but he applies the term to the entry onto the pedal only. He also uses the more specific term “premature dominant arrival” when “the final harmony appears before the section’s ‘structural’ end.” See Caplin (1998), 79–81, and specifically, Example 6.9 on p. 80. In the DG-complex (and RT-complex), however, the use of a dominant pedal to achieve the terminal articulation is processual. A dominant arrival at the pedal’s onset should be understood only as the proposal of the dominant arrival that ultimately materializes as the DG at the pedal’s end. As upcoming examples in this chapter will show, this same conceptualization of the dominant pedal is applied to the RT-complex.
examples below demonstrate how change occurs, and explore typical characteristics of core\textsuperscript{part1}, core\textsuperscript{part2}, the DG, and DG-complex.

The first movement of Cello Sonata No. 2 in D major, Op. 58 features a DG-complex (mm. 195–198) with DG (m. 198) and DG-fill (m. 198) that separates the core’s two contrasting parts (Example 2.2). These parts differ thematically, structurally, and with regards to mode. Core\textsuperscript{part2}’s C-major (,II) expression of S material presents a change from P’s use in core\textsuperscript{part1}’s B-minor setting. Core\textsuperscript{part2} also initiates a second bass line ascent (mm. 199ff.) after that of core\textsuperscript{part1}.

This DG-complex demonstrates the full range of events possible. A proposal stage (mm. 195–196) secures the dominant pedal (mm. 197–198) that achieves the G\textsuperscript{7} arrival (m. 198).

Although the arrival appears first as Ger. 6 in B minor, it turns out to be the V\textsuperscript{7} arrival DG in the development key of C major that initiates DG-fill. Specific characteristics help to identify each of these four events. The proposal stage is marked by the cello’s repeated emphasis on C–B (mm. 195–196; downbeats). The secured pedal is then signaled by the cello’s longer duration (mm. 197–198) such that the V\textsuperscript{7} chord feels built up and drawn out. The crescendo builds to the DG. There, the cello resolves the C\# appoggiatura at the DG-complex’s texturally thickest and highest point. The arrival opens the “gap” in m. 198’s latter half (note the cello’s dotted-quarter-note rest, the piano’s eighth-note rest, and the right hand’s ceased sixteenth-note

\begin{itemize}
\item Note how the bass ascends from B–G (mm. 182–198) through core\textsuperscript{part1}. When the bass ascent starts again in core\textsuperscript{part2}, it begins slightly lower from where it left off on E, and now specifically in C major.
\item The piano’s left hand gradually builds the complete V\textsuperscript{7} chord, more specifically, as the right hand extends higher in the register.
\end{itemize}
Lastly, the DG-fill—expressed by the bass’s change to 4/2 position—fills the gap to core\textsuperscript{part2}'s I\textsuperscript{6} start. This 4/2 chord participates in the descending bass solo line of DG-fill that recalls Hepokoski and Darcy’s bass 5–4–3–2–1 MC-fill line. Here, the DG-fill’s descent stops short at 3, though, and elides with core\textsuperscript{part2}'s onset.\textsuperscript{10} In addition to these events, the DG-complex is anticipated by the bass motion (mm. 190–195) that circles around, and lands on, G.

As further support for the DG-complex (mm. 195–198), it is worth noting that mm. 180–181 might have suggested the complex. It did not happen there for specific reasons, though. Despite the V6/5 arrival (m. 180) and textural fill (mm. 180–181; the piano’s left hand stops playing), P’s immediate repeat (mm. 182ff.) suggests that core\textsuperscript{part1} continues to m. 198. P’s expanded eight-measure structure (mm. 182ff.; compare mm. 174–181) via internal repeat also generates a strong sense of ending. This expansion anticipates and emphasizes the true DG.\textsuperscript{11}

---

\textsuperscript{9} The “gap” is maintained, despite the two eighth notes at the end of m. 198 (piano’s right hand). These eighths articulate the upbeat to the next measure where core\textsuperscript{part2} material begins.

\textsuperscript{10} As I discuss later in this chapter, the bass solo line of caesura-fill also occurs in specific instances of caesura-fill that feature the same descending line at the very end of Mendelssohn’s retransitions. For more on this type of caesura-fill with regards to Hepokoski and Darcy’s MC concept, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 40–45. My outline of the different kinds of caesura-fill for Mendelssohn’s retransitions later in this chapter are also theoretically applicable to the DG-complex.

\textsuperscript{11} The repetition here is especially important since the G\textsuperscript{7} chord initially functions as a German sixth in B minor. The repetition greatly facilitates the chord’s reinterpretation as a dominant seventh in C major.
Example 2.2: DG and Two-part Core; Op. 58, I, mm. 154–216

Core part (P-based)

DG-complex here? No.

theme repeated and expanded
B- (vi):

187

P6/4 Ger. 6 P6/4

DG-complex

193

[vii\(^6\)] P6/4 Ger. 6

= V\(^7\) arrival DG proposed pedal secured [DG]

Core part 2 (S-based)

199

C\(+(bII\) of B-, vi) = change to MAJOR mode; ascent

207

ascent continues etc...
While DG-complexes with fill occur in Mendelssohn’s music, they are not as common as the sealed DG. Sealed DGs do not initiate DG-fill; instead, they initiate core\textsuperscript{part2}. An example occurs in the third movement of Piano Trio No. 1 in D minor, Op. 49. The sealed DG (m. 82) marks a turning point in theme, hypermeter, and tonal structure between the core’s two parts (Example 2.3).

Core\textsuperscript{part1} (mm. 54–82) and core\textsuperscript{part2} (mm. 82ff.) are different from one another. Thematically, core\textsuperscript{part2} is more homogenous in texture than core\textsuperscript{part1}. Structurally, moreover, core\textsuperscript{part1} and core\textsuperscript{part2} each undergo distinct phases that become more intense. Core\textsuperscript{part1} undergoes intensification in three phases. Phase 3 (mm. 72–82), the most intense phase, features a chromaticized variant of the ascending 5–6 sequence and hypermetric reinterpretation, which builds to the V arrival DG in B minor, the development key.\textsuperscript{12} The DG initiates a change. Core\textsuperscript{part2} immediately instates regular four-bar hypermeter over static harmony (mm. 82–89) before core\textsuperscript{part2} begins its own two-phase intensification. Core\textsuperscript{part2}’s second phase ultimately builds to another chromaticized variant of the ascending 5–6 sequence (mm. 92ff.) via a hypermetric reinterpretation (m. 92). This sequence begins over a sentential unit that adds to the intensification to the RT’s preparatory passage (mm. 100ff.). The DG therefore organizes the core into two distinct parts: core\textsuperscript{part1} intensifies to the DG, which initiates core\textsuperscript{part2}’s own intensification.

\textsuperscript{12} Phase 3’s persistent hypermetric reinterpretation (4=1) might also be thought of in triple hypermeter (mm. 72–77), in which case, an adjustment to four-bar hypermeter would still occur (mm. 78–81). Core\textsuperscript{part2} would also still represent a less intensified state since the hypermeter might be the most stable—although in the context of a distant key—given the alternation between triple and quadruple hypermeter in the movement overall (that is, if one interprets the use of triple hypermeter, rather than hypermetric reinterpretation, in the first place; note the seven-bar theme in mm. 1–7).
Example 2.3: DG and Two-part Core; Op. 49, III, mm. 54–100

Core → Intensification

Phase 1: hypermetric reinterpretations

Phase 2: liquidation and stronger use of Phead

Phase 3: chromaticized variant of 5–6 sequence

model sequence


hypermeter: 1 2 3 4=1 2 3=1 2
Phase 1: return to 4-bar hypermeasures

B- (vi): V6/4 [vii07]

V arrival

sealed DG

Phase 2:

chromatic bass

3=1 ascent

chromaticized variant of 5–6 sequence

chromatic bass ascent

RT-prep
ii) RT-prep zones

The RT-prep zone is a subsection that may appear at the developmental core’s end to prepare the RT. Characteristics of the RT-prep zone therefore signal the development’s pending end. Characteristics might include slower harmonic rhythm, thematic material that the RT will soon feature, or material associated with ending function (e.g., from the expositional closing and codetta zones). RT-prep zones generally convey a sense of anticipation up to the RT. Features that often define RT-prep zones are emphasis on the predominant of the home key, as well as pedal point, and recession. These elements help to distinguish the RT-prep zone from the rest of the core. I present some of these RT-prep zone characteristics with two examples.

The first example (Example 2.4) is from the opening movement of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11. Mendelssohn pairs the arrival on the subdominant (m. 217) with the onset of codetta(P) material (compare mm. 149ff.) in this RT-prep zone.\(^\text{13}\) The pedal point on iv contributes to the anticipation through this zone, as does the repetitive use of the thematic material in four-measure units. While the \textit{fortissimo, tutti} texture signals the climax of the core, the passage’s static nature continues to build tension.\(^\text{14}\) Eventually, the thematic material

\footnote{My use of P in parenthesis directly following the label “codetta” without space indicates a codetta that is P-based. I use this method to indicate when a formal unit or section is based on previous material.}

\footnote{This kind of static tonal design which Mendelssohn uses here in the RT-prep zone is more commonly reserved for the onset of the RT and its V pedal in Classical developments. That Mendelssohn uses this static design as a defining feature of the RT-prep zone rather than for the RT’s start demonstrates a striking difference to the Classical development as such.}
broadens from four-measure units to six (i.e., three groups of two measures; mm. 225–231) directly ahead of the RT.\footnote{The slight change in the thematic material from mm. 225ff. occurs over six measures, more specifically, while four-bar hypermeter prevails (a hypermetric reinterpretation of $3=1$ occurs in m. 231).}
Example 2.4: RT-prep Zone; Op. 11, I, mm. 199–238

Core\textsuperscript{part1} \hspace{1cm} Core\textsuperscript{part2}

199

D: V6/4 - V\textsuperscript{7} \hspace{1cm} i

PAC/sealed DG

RT-prep (Codetta(P))

210

C- (i): iv pedal
An RT-prep zone also prepares the RT in the first movement of Cello Sonata No. 1 in B-flat major, Op. 45 (Example 2.5). The sudden drop to piano, the slower harmonic rhythm, the cello’s oscillating triplets, and the piano’s static accompaniment convey a sense of decreased activity that anticipates the development’s end. With this drop in activity, the passage is less thematically and harmonically driven and sparser in texture than the rest of the core. The sense of pending RT: V pedal is also attributed to the bassline’s steady stepwise descent from B♭ to F, which passes through unstable seventh chords. Eventually, the vii⁰4/2 on G♭ provides further anticipation for the RT.
Example 2.5: RT-prep Zone; Op. 45, I, mm. 185–218
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II. The Retransition-complex (RT-complex)

Mendelssohn’s retransitions demonstrate a more nuanced language than the theoretical literature outlines for RT zones. Following Hepokoski and Darcy, current analytical practice marks the RT from the start of a terminal home-key V pedal to the recapitulation’s form functional onset. Although I apply the term “retransition” as Hepokoski and Darcy do, this approach invites refinement given a close look at Mendelssohn’s RTs and recent trends in scholarship which delineate aspects of musical form more precisely.

Based on Mendelssohn’s RTs, this study proposes that RTs consist of more specific events than merely a V pedal. RTs can be analyzed consistently using terms and concepts that reflect a more detailed perspective. Figure 2.1 presents these terms and concepts, and illustrates the full range of events that are typical of Mendelssohn’s RTs.

Figure 2.1: RT-complex with RTC (Full Range of Events)

---

16 Recall that Hepokoski and Darcy equate the retransition with the “active dominant” (i.e., the terminal V pedal in the home key), such that retransitional procedures include a “dominant-lock” and energy-gain. To Caplin, however, the “retransition” implies modulation back to the home key. Caplin therefore typically applies the term “retransition” before the standing on the dominant begins (since the V pedal is already in the home key), and often after the cadential arrival in a development key. Compare Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 196–205 with Caplin (1998), 157–159.
As the diagram demonstrates, the **retransition-complex (RT-complex)** refers to the full set of events in the RT zone. The complex begins with the RT: V pedal’s onset, which is signaled by an initial RT: V proposal on a home-key HC or an arrival on a position of V(7). During the proposal stage, one or more RT: V proposals secure the pedal. These proposals are stresses on the pedal that are produced by repeated, articulative, rhythmic, thematic, or melodic elements on the musical surface. These elements occur in relatively short, repeated groups or phrase lengths of about one to four measures in the upper voice. When the phrase length and/or use of content change—typically to suggest broader motion and intensification towards the terminal articulation—the pattern of proposals stops, and the RT: V pedal becomes secured. This secured phase is the ultimate stage of the RT: V pedal, and usually consists of only one phrase length whose content is different or appears in a different way than in the proposal stage. The complex then culminates with the **retransitional caesura (RTC)**, the terminal articulation at the pedal’s end that opens a gap in the texture. This articulation will normatively be an arrival on some position of V(7). The RTC can initiate **retransitional-caesura-fill (RTC-fill)**—a passage of nonstructural material—that bridges over the gap to segue to the recapitulation’s start. Such aspects collectively reflect a syntax similar to that of MC-complexes, which suggests the applicability of RT-complexes to a wider repertory outside of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms.

---

17. The discussion of some of the musical examples below demonstrates these repeated elements and how to distinguish between the RT’s proposal and secured stages.

18. As Hepokoski and Darcy point out, retransitional procedures can recall those on the way to the MC in expositions. “Indeed, what is usually produced at the end of the development is a prominent HC caesura, sometimes followed by caesura-fill bridging the way to the subsequent relaunch of the tonic. Thus apart from their similar local functions there can be important parallels between the expositional MC and the caesura that typically occurs at the end of the development.” See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 199. For more on the MC-complex, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 23–50. Although I also draw similarities between DG- and MC-complexes,
As with MC-complexes in general, and Mendelssohn’s MC-complexes specifically, the RT-complex may include all or some of these components. The only part of the RT-complex that is required is the RTC itself. This is also the case in another kind of RT-complex that I discuss later in this chapter—the **RT-complex with RT-connect**. All that is required is the terminal articulation—the **RT-connect**, an authentic cadence or tonic arrival—which simultaneously initiates the recapitulation.

This chapter section on the RT-complex consists of six subsections. The seven examples in the first three subsections show aspects of the RT-complex with RTC using musical excerpts from the movements in this study. These examples demonstrate variations of the complex, and they specifically draw attention to three different kinds of RTC-fill that can bridge over the caesura. Each kind of RTC-fill is covered in a subsection (**Table 2.1**; left column), and I begin with the most basic form of RTC-fill. After covering the RT-complex with RTC, I discuss the RT-complex with RT-connect in further detail (subsection iv), before considering other issues pertaining to the RT-complex (subsection v) and D-R overlap (subsection vi).

Moreover, RT-complexes hold significantly greater structural weight and formal importance than the DG, and they should not be considered the same.

19 For an illustrated example of an RT-complex with the full range of events, however, see Example 4.1 in Chapter 4 on the RT-complex in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 3 in B-flat Major, Op. 106.
Table 2.1: Overview of RT-complexes with RTC and those with RT-connect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RT-complex with RTC (Not Bridged Over)</th>
<th>RT-complex with RT-connect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No RTC-fill (Terminal Gap)</td>
<td>proposals and/or pedal to D-R border</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RT-complex with RTC (Bridged Over)</th>
<th>retransitional sequence to D-R border</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Continued Textural/Accompanimental RTC-fill (Brief)</td>
<td>Other Issues:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Solo-line RTC-fill (Melodic)</th>
<th>Diversions in the RT-complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 RTC-fill on V Pedal Secured by the RTC (High-energy)</td>
<td>“Wrong-key” RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D-R Overlap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3 RTC-fill on V Pedal Secured by the RTC (Gentle) |                         |

i) No RTC-fill (Terminal Gap) and Continued Textural/Accompanimental RTC-fill

Some RT-complexes with no RTC-fill end with a terminal gap—a short break in the texture. At other times, RTC-fill bridges over the gap. Below, I provide three examples of the RT-complex with RTC to demonstrate three basic ways that the complex ends: (1) with a clear terminal gap; (2) with continued textural/accompanimental fill (brief; no more than one measure) that fills the gap; and (3) with continued textural/accompanimental fill (extended) that fills the gap and extends beyond the D-R border.

An RT-complex with terminal gap occurs in the finale of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (see Example 2.6). At first, the pedal is proposed and secured (mm. 133–135). In this secured stage of the pedal, the strings build the energy through the broad, four-measure length of the initial unit that is also unified by the woodwinds’ tune in half and whole notes. An applied V7 (m. 136) temporarily breaks the V pedal, but ultimately helps to initiate a proposal stage (mm. 137–140). In this stage, repeated one-measure units place stresses on the downbeat of each measure as proposals until the pedal is secured (mm.140–142). The secured phase features a
broader two-measure length that builds to the V\(^6\) arrival RTC (downbeat of m. 142; note the already Fortissimo dynamic and thickened texture that directs to this point, as well as the way the violins and violas arpeggiate the upper notes of V\(^7\)).\(^{20}\) A tutti rest—the terminal gap—then occurs before the violins resume on the recapitulation’s Pa return on the tonic.\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\) Although the bass note moves off and on the dominant in mm. 140–141, the main bass note remains G; the motion to A\(_5\) is only subsidiary.

\(^{21}\) For another example of an RT-complex that ends with a terminal gap, see Op. 49 (I).
Example 2.6: RT-complex with No RTC-fill (Terminal Gap); Op. 11, IV, mm. 132–142

RT-complex
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broad 4-measure unit

C- (i); V

6/4 9/7 7/3 6/4 [V7]

HC RT: V pedal proposed and secured

Terminal Gap Recapitulation

137

repeated 1-measure units broader unit

RT: V

7 7 7 proposed again secured V6 arrival

Pa

RTC
Mendelssohn more commonly bridges this gap with **brief continued textural / accompanimental RTC-fill** of no more than one measure. In the finale of Symphony No. 5, Op. 107, the eighth-note texture to the V⁷ arrival RTC (m. 198) continues in the upper strings through the brief gap at the D-R junction to the recapitulation’s start (see **Example 2.7**).²² Complexes like these maintain sharp border distinctions. At other times, Mendelssohn extends this type of RTC-fill into recapitulations for continuity through tonic-articulated D-R borders. The first movement of Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 serves as a prime example of **extended continued textural/accompanimental RTC-fill**. The soloist’s sixteenth-note stream continues at length into the recapitulation (see **Example 2.8**).²³ This extension constitutes one way that the development participates in how the movement unfolds structurally, as the analysis of this movements conveys in Chapter 7.

---

²² Brief RTC-fill similar to that of Op. 107 (IV) also occurs in Op. 58 (I).

²³ I take m. 328 towards the end of the cadenza to be the start of the RT-complex.
Example 2.7: Continued Textural/Accompanimental RTC-fill (Brief); Op. 107, IV, mm. 194–200

RT-complex

Recapitulation

one broad unit
continued textural fill

D+(I): V\(^7\) arrival
RT pedal proposed
and secured

\[ \text{RTC} \]
Example 2.8: Continued Textural/Accompanimental RTC-fill (Extended) Continues through the D-R Border; Op. 64, I, mm. 333–339

ii) Solo-line RTC-fill

RT-complexes with more extensive RTC-fill feature a single melodic line that fills the gap at the D-R border. Sometimes, this line is doubled or contrapuntally supported by other voices, such that the solo line is texturally reinforced. This solo-line RTC-fill can be expressed either melodically or via descending bass line.

**Melodic solo-line RTC-fill** occurs in the first movement of String Quartet No. 1 in E-flat major, Op. 12 (Example 2.9; second violin). This RTC-fill becomes contrapuntally and texturally supported by the lower strings on the same material. Here, the RTC-fill maintains fluidity into the recapitulation, but does not continue past m. 128.24

---

24 Melodic solo-line RTC-fill also occurs in Op. 64 (III), Op. 87 (III), Op. 2 (I), Op. 44/3 (I), and Op. 20 (I). This dissertation demonstrates the RTC-fill for the first three of these movements in Examples 7.4, 4.7, and
Example 2.9: Solo-line RTC-fill (Melodic); Op. 12, IV, mm. 126–129

On the other hand, one finds descending bass solo-line RTC-fill in the overture to Die erste Walpurgisnacht (Example 2.10; see the bassoons and horns in unison). The timbral change contrasts the strings’s proposal and articulation of the V6/5 arrival RTC, as well as their return to the recapitulation’s main theme. The RTC-fill also occurs over a broader six-bar hypermeasure (mm. 223–228) that anticipates the recapitulation’s return to four-bar hypermeter.

For a look at the RTC-fill in the last two movements in this footnote, consult the score. Note that in String Quartet No. 5 in E-flat major, Op. 44/3 (I), an additional articulation echoes the RTC as reinforcement during the fill-passage. In Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20 (I), the solo-line RTC-fill is texturally reinforced by the octaves spread out across the ensemble (sempre fortissimo tutti).

Note how the proposals in the complex fall on mm. 219 and 221 given the repeated two-measure units that articulate the bass note on the downbeats of these measures.

For another example of solo-line RTC-fill in the bass, see Piano Sonata in B-flat major, Op. 106 (I). The RTC-fill features a melodic descent through 5–4–3–2–1. As mentioned earlier in the section on the DG-complex—and with respect to the DG-fill in Example 2.2, this is a type of caesura-fill Hepokoski and Darcy discuss with regards to the MC. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 40–45.
Example 2.10: Solo-line RTC-fill (Descending Bass); Overture to *Die erste Walpurgisnacht*, Op. 60, mm. 219–230
iii) RTC-fill on V Pedal Secured by the RTC Continues to the Recapitulation’s Start

Other complexes end with fill on a V pedal secured by the RTC. One can think of this RTC-fill as an expansion of the RTC articulation that fills the gap at the D-R junction. This RTC-fill is often high-energy. High-energy RTC-fill on a V pedal secured by the RTC builds in tutti or near-tutti texture, features a melodic—sometimes chromatic—ascent in the uppermost voice, and pushes to the D-R border without surpassing it. This technique occurs in the overture to *Die Hochzeit des Camacho*, Op. 10 (Example 2.11).

Gentle RTC-fill over a V pedal secured by the RTC is also possible. In the first movement of Piano Quartet No. 3, Op. 3 (Example 2.12), a lengthy passage of this RTC-fill leads to the recapitulation’s start (m. 393). The V arrival (m. 369), which is preceded by fortissimo, suggests the RTC. Thereafter, a passage with sparse texture and ‘soft’ dynamics echoes the RTC as reinforcement.

---

27 This type of “high-energy” RTC-fill recalls Hepokoski and Darcy’s “juggernaut” MC-fill, although it does not occur over a pedal. Ibid., 41, 44–45.

28 Note how the proposal stage involves the repetition of the four-measure thematic unit (mm. 191–194; see from mm. 179ff. in the score), and that the stresses occur on the downbeat of each four-measure group.

For other examples of high-energy RTC-fill over the RT: V pedal secured by the RTC, see Op. 11 (I) and String Quartet No. 6 in F minor, Op. 80 (IV).

29 For another example of “gentle” RTC-fill, see Op. 11 (II).
Example 2.11: RTC-fill on V pedal (High-energy); Op. 10, mm. 190–200
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Example 2.12: RTC-fill on V pedal (Gentle); Op. 3, I, mm. 361–392
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iv) RT-complex with RT-connect: Terminal Articulation Initiates the Recapitulation

Not all RT-complexes culminate with an RTC that is articulated through an HC or an arrival on V(7) or its inversions. Other RT-complexes have no RTC, terminal gap, or RTC-fill. These RT-complexes lead directly to the recapitulation’s start on the tonic. As the terminal articulation of the RT-complex, this tonic forms part of a home-key authentic cadence or articulates a tonic arrival in root position or first inversion. I call this articulation the **RT-connect**—the point at which the end of the RT-complex connects to, or elides with, the recapitulation’s start. Given this function, the tonic arrival RT-connect and authentic cadence RT-connect are ways that Mendelssohn bridges over the D-R juncture.\(^{30}\) **Figure 2.2** illustrates the RT-complex with RT-connect. Like the RTC, the RT-connect can be preceded by a set of proposals and then pedal on V, or one or the other, or neither. All that is required in the RT-complex is the RT-connect itself.

**Figure 2.2: RT-complex with RT-connect (Full Range of Events)**

RT-complex

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
| \underline{\text{RT: V pedal proposed one or more times}} \mid \underline{\text{pedal secured}} & \text{Recapitulation} \\
& I \\
& \underline{\text{RT-connect}} \\
& (\text{PAC, IAC, or tonic arrival})
\end{array}
\]

\(^{30}\) As I mention in Chapter 1, the smoothing over of borders at small- and large-scale formal junctures is a trait of Mendelssohn’s music. See Rapoport (2004).
That the tonic arrival and authentic cadence can act as a connection point between the development’s end and recapitulation’s start has not appeared in the literature on the D-R border. The three examples below demonstrate that intensification to the recapitulation’s start achieves the RT-connect. This intensification can be expressed in two ways: (1) via surface-level features when the RT: V pedal is involved or (2) structurally, via cadential progression or sequence, usually when there are no other elements from the RT-complex other than the RT-connect. I show the first way in the first example: an RT-complex with the full range of events (as illustrated in Figure 2.2). I then demonstrate the second way in the second and third examples. In the second example, a cadential progression at the development’s end achieves the PAC/RTC-connect. Sequence then achieves the PAC/RT-connect in the third example. The stronger consideration of surface-level features to locally distinguish half from authentic cadences is more recent. \(^{31}\) Features like rhythm and chromaticism traditionally do not affect how cadences are labelled. The RT-connect implies a more surface-oriented approach, since surface features can undermine the sense of a V ending for an authentic cadence.

In the first movement of Symphony No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 52 (Example 2.13), a proposal stage (mm. 247–256) secures an RT: V6/5 pedal (forte-fortissimo; mm. 256–260). A few factors contribute to the syntax that achieves the tonic arrival RT-connect (m. 260). The six-bar hypermeasure (mm. 251–256) in the RT’s proposal stage broadens the motion to anticipate the secured pedal. Then, the hypermetric reinterpretation at the secured stage’s onset suggests a renewed energy that pushes through the pedal. The pedal intensifies the motion to the RT-

\(^{31}\) Burstein, for example, challenges the sense of V ending (as in m. 9 of “Der Wegweiser” from Schubert’s Die Winterreise) for an IAC (m. 10) given dynamics and the scalar bass descent from V to the tonic. See Poundie Burstein, “The Half Cadence and Other Such Slippery Events,” Music Theory Spectrum (2014): 203–227.
connect via the bass’s eighth-note runs (mm. 256ff.), the repeated descending eighth-note figures that prolong C6 (mm. 256–258), and the chromatic motion to C♯6 (sforzando; m. 259; full-bar emphasis). While the energy in mm. 256–259 might recall Hepokoski and Darcy’s “juggernaut” MC-fill (any crescendo or forte through expanded caesura-fill that may end with a piano collapse), the passage is not fill. There is no RTC; the V6/5 (m. 256) is not strong enough as an arrival despite the hypermetric reinterpretation. Instead, the energy pushes through mm. 256–259 to the tonic arrival RT-connect at the recapitulation’s start.

---

32 For more on “juggernaut” caesura-fill, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 41, 44–45.
Example 2.13: RT-complex with Tonic Arrival RT-connect; Op. 52, I, mm. 247–262

RT-complex
247\textsuperscript{7}
P-based

Recapitulation

P

4-measure unit
unit repeated and expanded

B♭+ (I): [vi\textsuperscript{7}]
V6/4 [V6/5] V\textsuperscript{7} 6/4 V\textsuperscript{7}
RT pedal proposed

hypermeter: 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 5 6 = 1 2 3 4 1 etc...

mm. 243-246

6/4 V6/5 pedal secured

D prolonded

I arrival

RT-connect
Intensification to the RT-connect is also achieved structurally in two ways without an RT pedal and proposals. In the first, the PAC/RT-connect (m. 120) resolves the cadential progression to the recapitulation, as in the finale of Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 (Example 2.14).

**Example 2.14: Authentic Cadence RT-connect; Op. 105, III, mm. 118–121**

In the second, stronger intensification via sequence achieves the RT-connect. I introduce the term *retransitional sequences* to refer to these sequences. Usually an ascending 5–6 sequence, this device generates less anticipation for the return than a V pedal. The return may be strong, more specifically, but the recapitulation’s onset will often seem *in medias res* given the sequence’s instability, drive, and potential to forge beyond the D-R border. In the finale of Piano Sonata in E major, Op. 6 (Example 2.15), an ascending 5–#5–6 sequence in two- and then one-
measure segments achieves the PAC/RT-connect (m. 130). The recapitulation becomes fully realized as P unfolds more.\(^3\)

**Example 2.15: Retransitional Sequence to the Authentic Cadence RT-connect; Op. 6, IV, mm. 120–133**

could expect: 5 - #5 - 6 ascending sequence to continue

[I: PAC/RT-connect] (retrospectively realized)

\(^3\) Despite the sequence being broken in both the upper voice and in the bass, the potential to forge onwards is upheld by the overall push forwards by the steady, and ongoing, stepwise ascent.
v) Other Issues: Diversion in the RT-complex and “Wrong-key” RT

As I have outlined so far in this chapter section, there are two kinds of RT-complexes: (1) the RT-complex with RTC; and (2) the RT-complex with RT-connect. A few of Mendelssohn’s RT-complexes have diversions or propose a “wrong-key” RT: V pedal. In this brief subsection, I provide three examples: (1) a diversion that reinstates the home-key V pedal; (2) a diversion that does not reinstate the home-key V pedal; and (3) a “wrong-key” RT that continues to the recapitulation. Although these examples only involve the RT-complex with RTC, diversions and “wrong-key” RTs also occur in the RT-complex with RT-connect. The “wrong-key” RT is exclusive to the RT-complex with RTC, however, if the sense of “wrong-key” persists to the D-R border.

In the first movement of Piano Quartet No. 2 in F minor, Op. 2, the diversion in the RT-complex constitutes a temporary shift off the secured home-key V pedal (Example 2.16). When the RT-complex resumes shortly after, the home-key V pedal is proposed again, secured, and the RTC and fill materialize. The RT-complex still prepares for the recapitulation’s tonic start as such.
Example 2.16: Diversion in RT-complex; Op. 2, I, mm. 166–212

166

RT-complex

F- (i):

V arrival

RT pedal proposed

173

pedal secured

180

diversion

[V^7] Dm [V^7]
187

RT-complex resumes

EbM Fr.6 V RT pedal proposed

195

201

RTC-fill

pedal secured V arrival RTC

207

Recapitulation
Another diversion in the RT-complex occurs in the finale of Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56, but does not reinstate the home-key V pedal (Example 2.17). Instead, the diversion leads to the RTC right before the recapitulation’s tonic start. Without reinstating the V pedal, the RTC and recapitulation are somewhat less prepared.

As the examples have shown so far, diversions within the RT-complex can have a little to a moderate effect on the RTC’s and recapitulation’s preparation. “Wrong-key” RTs, by contrast, diminish this sense of preparation more greatly. Such is the case in the first movement of String Quartet No. 1 in E-flat major, Op. 12 (Example 2.18). G minor (iii) persists to the recapitulation’s start on the home-key tonic. The recapitulation is unprepared, as such, and only retrospectively realized (note also pianissimo’s persistence and the delayed return to a tempo to a few measures beyond the D-R border).

---

34 I apply the term “wrong-key” RT to instances where the composer pre-empts the normative home-key V pedal, as such. In these cases, a harmony implying another key persists, instead, to the recapitulation’s onset, which still occurs on the home-key tonic. “Wrong-key” RTs still hold dominant function; they simply act as substitutes for retransitional home-key dominants. In this example, the RT begins on V/iii (m. 171), and the RTC occurs four measures later on the same harmony (mm. 175–176) before the recapitulation resumes on the home-key tonic. As Hepokoski and Darcy write, “one sometimes finds a replacement of the structural-dominant lock (dominant preparation) on Vₐ at the close of a development with a seemingly “wrong” dominant, most typically V/vi… The effect is that of predicting a recapitulation that will begin on the submediant (“relative minor”) but that is actually followed by one that begins in the proper tonic, I (198).” They also call this a “wrong-dominant”-lock (199), which can also commonly be V/iii, as in Op. 12 (I). For more on this topic, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 198–205.
Example 2.17: Diversion in RT-complex; Op. 56, IV, mm. 228–246

RT-complex (continued)


238 | RTC achieved Recapitulation

F pedal

2-mm. harmonic rhythm

iv^6 4/2 ii^7 V6/5 arrival i RTC
vi) D-R Overlaps

In addition to diversions and “wrong-key” RTs, both kinds of RT-complex remain applicable when there is D-R border overlap. When overlap happens, the end of the RT-complex does not align or elide with the recapitulation’s start. Components of the RT-complex—or the RT-complex as a whole—will not occur in their normative positions, although the components themselves remain identifiable. In overlap, more specifically, the RT-complex begins with the thematic recapitulation or continues into recapitulatory space, where the terminal articulation occurs. Many of the analyses in Chapters 3 to 7 will demonstrate the RT-complex in instances of D-R overlap.
Overlap and smoothing over boundaries is a technique Mendelssohn uses at different levels of structure (see Rapoport 2004). The strength and complexity of Mendelssohn’s D-R overlaps vary, and although instances of non-overlap outnumber those of overlap in his sonatas, those instances did so by only a slight margin, such that the distribution was almost even (as Table 2.7 will show later in this chapter). In this section, I explore Mendelssohn’s techniques for D-R overlap. I begin with overlaps with a tonic-articulated border and then those with a non-tonic harmony at the D-R juncture.\(^35\)

When Mendelssohn uses thematic overlap to treat his tonic-articulated borders, he does so in a variety of ways which I outline in order of increasing complexity. As basic method, Mendelssohn allows thematic material from the development to continue into the recapitulation. This material can be RTC-fill (as in String Quintet No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 87, III) or a new theme (N; as in Op. 64, III). At other times, the development utilizes introductory-P material or adjacent segments of P to span the border.\(^36\) Other instances are more complex, and perhaps, abstract. When the development culminates in a retransitional sequence, for example, the forward motion channels through the border and underplays the tonal return at the recapitulatory opening, where it is only retrospectively realized (as in Op. 6, IV; refer back to Example 2.11). Yet another technique involves a subsumed tonic at the D-R border (as in the overture to Ruy Blas, Op. 95). In these cases, the tonic at the recapitulatory opening is only apparent, and

---

\(^{35}\) By tonic-articulated border, I refer to instances where the development achieves the tonic at the recapitulatory opening regardless if there is an RTC or RT-connect.

\(^{36}\) As I show in my analysis of the overture to Heimkehr aus der Fremde, Op. 89 in Chapter 5, Mendelssohn uses the premature entry of beginning material in the RT such that P-zero-P spans the D-R border. Pa-Pb or P\(_{head}\)-P may also span the border in other similar instances of D-R overlap.
appears at the surface level only. The deep-level motion reaches beyond the border to the tonal return at a slightly later point in recapitulatory space.

Other D-R overlaps feature a dominant pedal that continues through the D-R border (as in Op. 6, I) or coincides with the thematic return at the recapitulation’s onset (as in Symphony No. 4 in A major, Op. 90, I).\(^{37}\) As such, the tonal return is delayed to a slightly later point in the recapitulation. This delay also occurs when the deep-level motion reaches beyond the D-R border with a non-tonic harmony other than the home-key dominant at the recapitulation’s onset (for example, the V\(^7\) of IV at the recapitulation’s start in String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44/2, II).

My analyses in Chapters 3 to 7 demonstrate that Mendelssohn’s D-R overlaps play an important role in formal process and how form unfolds. D-R overlaps also constitute an element in the classification of developments, particularly with regards to \textbf{border class}, which I introduce in the section below.

\section*{III. D-R Borders and Development Classes: Towards a Theory of the Development}

As I have outlined in this chapter so far, features like the RT-prep zone, the two-part core, and DG- and RT-complexes can be applied across Mendelssohn’s developments. Insofar that these concepts comprise a theory of development, these form-functional elements only offer

\(^{37}\) Although P also begins on a V6/4 pedal in the exposition of Op. 90 (I), this notwithstanding the pizzicato root-position tonic chord on the downbeat of m. 1, the avoidance of what should typically be the moment of tonal return at the recapitulation’s onset is highlighted by the persistence of “wrong-key” RT towards the D-R border, which plays an important role in the large-scale aesthetic of the movement.
an inner perspective on this formal section. This perspective provides a limited view of the development that does not speak to the importance of the development as a formal section. On its own, furthermore, this inner perspective on the development is not enough to stand as a theory of the development, since it does not provide a basis for a method of organizing a large body of developments into groups. In this section, I work towards a theory and method for grouping developments that is based on the development’s role in the form and the kind of articulation at the border. This method is important, because it combines two criteria or commonalities that are specific and yet general enough to be applied to any given development, and theoretically, across the music of various composers.

In my theory, more specifically, each development can belong to one of four development classes (shown with a roman numeral: I, II, III, and IV). Summarized in Table 2.2, these development classes are based on a combination of two commonalities which pertain to the function of developments, and which, I propose, are shared by all developments. First, all developments play a role through their relationship to the rest of the form; the stronger the role, the more explicit the relationship. One can therefore assess that developments either have a minimal or strong tie to the rest of the form. Second, developments have the distinct function of achieving the return at the recapitulation. The articulation at the D-R border—or what I call the border class—therefore becomes a common point of contention for developments. One can distinguish between developments that achieve a recapitulatory opening on the tonic and those which, by contrast, achieve a non-tonic harmony instead. As Table 2.2 displays, these two commonalities produce four development classes. There are four, because one can distinguish between developments in two ways per each of the two commonalities I have just mentioned, and since each of these two ways is put in combination with one another to form a development class. These development classes are specific enough as criteria to group developments. These
development classes are also general and flexible enough to account for the structural
differences between developments that make classification difficult in the first place.

Table 2.2: Four Classes of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tie to the Rest of the Form</th>
<th>D-R Border</th>
<th>Development Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Tonic-articulated</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-tonic-articulated</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Tonic-articulated</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-tonic-articulated</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this dissertation, I focus on developments with a strong tie to the rest
of the form, since I am interested in the roles developments play. All developments have some
tie to the rest of the form in that they recycle thematic material. Strong relationships are explicit,
though, when specific material or a new theme from the development plays a role later in the
form. Ties are also explicit when the development picks up an aspect from earlier in the form
and draws meaning to it by highlighting and furthering it in some way. Often, the way the
development highlights this aspect represents an intermediary step or precursor to the state of
the aspect later in the form. Other strong relationships are more abstract. In these instances, the
development underplays the D-R border in some way through retransitional procedures, such
that attention directs into the rest of the form where material more normative to the RT often
arises. This material arises and facilitates structural closure as “compensation” for the sense of
unfulfillment earlier at the D-R border given the potential for a strong articulation there. Among
the two border classes, I also denote instances of D-R overlap with a lowercase “b”—to be
distinguished from lowercase “a” (for those instances without overlap). Tonic-articulated
borders made more complex by D-R overlap in some way are therefore represented by
“Ib”/“IIb”, which I distinguish from tonic-articulated D-R borders without overlap (“Ia”/“IIa”; see Table 2.3). Non-tonic openings, by contrast, constitute D-R overlaps in and of themselves,
meanwhile, and therefore do not require further specifications within their development classes (i.e., II and IV). As the analyses of full movements demonstrate in Chapters 3 to 7, considerations of border class and how the development negotiates the D-R border are very important to the development’s role in how the rest of the form unfolds. My analyses also show that many developments can have a strong tie to the rest of the form despite tonic-articulated borders.

**Table 2.3: Specification of D-R Overlaps per Development Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tie to the Rest of the Form</th>
<th>D-R Border</th>
<th>D-R Overlap</th>
<th>Development Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Tonic-articulated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tonic-articulated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Tonic-articulated</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IIIa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IIIb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tonic-articulated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given my focus on developments with a strong tie to the rest of the form, I analyze movements with Class I and II developments and devise additional categories that specify the kinds of relationships these developments have with the rest of the form (Class III and IV are excluded from further study; see Table 2.4; for a full list of the movements in this study and their classification, see also Appendix 1). I call these additional categories developmental relationship types (DRTs), which I discuss below.

---

38 For examples of Class III development, see Violin Sonata in F minor, Op. 4 (I, II, and III). These developments feature clear use of the RT-complex without D-R overlap, and show clear correspondence between exposition and recapitulation without significant recomposition. For an example of a Class IV development, see Piano Quartet No. 1 in C minor, Op. 1 (IV). Despite the recapitulation’s launch on V6/4 there, the exposition and recapitulation are mostly the same.
### Table 2.4: Distribution of Movements Across the Development Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Class</th>
<th>Number of Movements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I (strong tie—tonic at D-R border)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (strong tie—non-tonic harmony at D-R border)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (minimal tie—tonic at D-R border)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV (minimal tie—non-tonic harmony at D-R border)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Theorizing the Role of the Development in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms

#### i) Developmental Relationship Types (DRTs) in Mendelssohn’s Instrumental Sonata Forms: An Overview

**Developmental relationship types (DRTs)** place focus on developments, their tie to the rest of the form, and the roles developments play in how form unfolds. Thinking about developments in this way proposes a reorientation away from the more traditional efforts taken to categorize developments based on analyses of their interior construction and constituent parts alone.\(^{39}\) These efforts have presented difficulties given the differences between developments in the first place. Although one might identify specific characteristics in an ample number of developments via analysis as concepts in a broader theory, those concepts might only find relevance in certain developments, while others might not. It can therefore be difficult to use these existing theories as a meaningful method for designating developments to one of a few particular kinds. This difficulty has precluded the rise of a theory of developments that is based

\(^{39}\) As I have outlined in Chapter 1, Caplin’s theory focuses exclusively on the internal organization of developments. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of rotation highlights the development’s relation to the exposition given that, according to their theory, developments recycle the events in the order they are first presented in the exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory might therefore be seen to emphasize the development’s tie to the surrounding movement as the theory of DRTs do. In and of itself, however, rotation relates to something very specific about the internal organization of the development—the thematic layout.
on a coherent method for their categorization across a large body of movements, however that corpus might be defined.\textsuperscript{40} In addition, the focus on identifying specific characteristics tends to place too much emphasis on the characteristics themselves. To reduce the music to its component parts eschews a pursuit of developments that contributes to the broader quest for musical meaning. A more meaningful approach would be conducive to understanding the important role that developments play in musical form and aesthetic. In short, the difficulty surrounding developments lies in the negative perception commonly associated with the differences between them that can hinder categorization.

DRTs help with organizing whole developments in a way that is meaningful to understanding why the development should be studied in the first place. DRTs offer a lens through which to conduct analysis and find distinct commonalities between developments without dissecting developments for their individual parts. By looking at developments within the context of entire movements, I identify five ways in which developmental ties occur. These five ways are proposed as DRTs in Mendelssohn’s music (see Table 2.5; an in-depth outline of each DRT appears further below).

\footnote{While the theory of DRTs would seem to apply only to those movements with a strong tie to the rest of the form (Class I and II developments), it should be noted that DRTs are also applicable to those movements with a minimal tie (Class III and IV). For Mendelssohn, there are two DRTs for Classes III and IV: (1) developments where the exposition and recapitulation correspond; and (2) developments that highlight an aspect from the beginning, but do not further it (as opposed to DRT4, as the outline of each DRT for Classes I and II will clarify further into this section of the chapter below.).}
### Table 2.5: Summary of Developmental Relationship Types (DRTs) in Mendelssohn’s Instrumental Sonata Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRT1</th>
<th>The Development Forwards Material for a Strong Connection with the Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRT2</td>
<td>The Development Forwards Material towards the Movement’s End which Participates in Deferring the ESC to a Later Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT3</td>
<td>The RT Calls for “Compensation” Towards the End of the Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT4</td>
<td>The Development Comments on an Existing Situation or Aspect from the Introduction and/or Exposition and Furthers the Action into the Recapitulation and/or Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT5</td>
<td>Underplayed D-R Border Channels Motion into the Rest of the Form and Contributes to the ESC’s Delay and the Movement’s End-weighted, Single-sweep Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapters of this thesis each explore a specific DRT in the order listed above. DRTs 1 and 2 are pursued first, because these DRTs are thematic. A thematic tie involves thematic content that is specific to the development and any of its constituent zones. Thematic ties are therefore regarded as explicit relationships that are bound to the development. The reappearance of the development’s material at any point later in the form acts as a sign or token, which, on its own, is enough to signify the development’s continued role. While the reappearance may not be a literal, verbatim repeat, as is the norm for Mendelssohn’s music, the reappearance retains defining characteristics of the original material that indicate the development.

I then explore DRTs 3, 4, and 5, since these DRTs represent ties that are more abstract in nature. These ties are structural and/or content-driven, rather than exclusively thematic. In these cases, the development’s role can be tied to a specific structural component, namely, the RT and D-R border. As the analyses for these DRTs demonstrate, RT procedures have an effect on the D-R border and how motion and the search for a strongly articulated return continues through the rest of the form. Not only can RTs drive forward motion through and underplay the D-R
border, but they can also detract from the border and participate in overlap and fusion heading into the recapitulation. Sometimes, processes in the core play a role in generating energy towards forward-driving RTs as well. For DRTs 3 and 5 in particular, and many times with regards to DRT4, the path to the recapitulation is considered carefully for the effects that the RT has at the D-R border and the sense of connection to the rest of the form.

The discussion below outlines each DRT before comments are made on how the DRTs play out across individual movements and pieces, and the use of DRTs as a method for organizing developments into groups.

**DRT1—The Development Forwards Material for a Strong Connection with the Coda**

That the development can exist in a direct thematic relationship with the coda is mentioned in the literature on Classical developments. This relationship is attributed to the analogous position of the development and coda following the exposition and recapitulation, respectively, which also correspond with each other. As Caplin mentions, the coda may destabilize the recapitulation just as the development destabilizes the exposition. To weaken the sense of home-key tonic, the coda may recapture components like the start of the development or the development’s core-like model-sequence organization. Hepokoski and Darcy echo this lattermost observation. For them, however, the reuse of developmental material holds rotational or repeat-scheme implications. As such, the coda may follow the development in being fully or

---

partially rotational or evoke some sense of its repeat. Hepokoski and Darcy refer specifically to the expanded (or what they call “discursive”) coda in the first movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica*. The coda there gives “the impression of a recomposed or telescoped repeat of the development and recapitulation,” such that a literal restatement is eschewed for a compressed, order-preserving review of main events from the development: the P-based link precedes the development’s “new theme” (N) and the retransition before P’s return. This correspondence between development and coda, as seen in Beethoven’s music, has led to the view of the coda as a “second” or “terminal development.” The idea that a movement ends with a sense of the development is not inconceivable, as such; it is, rather, indicative of the development’s far-reaching relationship, which can extend to the end of the form.

In Mendelssohn’s sonata forms, it is relatively common for the development to produce thematic material which may reappear in the coda. Although Mendelssohn’s codas are far from expansive, the development may be involved in something similar to that described of Beethoven’s discursive codas. In DRT1, the development may forward its thematic layout or specific material from a particular developmental zone(s) to the coda.

---

42 Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 284.
43 Ibid., 284.
44 Ibid., 285–286.
45 Caplin and Hepokoski and Darcy both reference these terms. See Caplin (1998), 187; Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 284.
46 Parallelism from the substantial reuse of musical material from an earlier section in a later one as a characteristic of musical form is mentioned by Linda Roesner on Schumann’s sonata forms, and subsequently, by Joel Lester on the music of J.S. Bach. See Linda Roesner, “Schumann’s ‘Parallel’ Forms,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 54 (2001): 49–96.
Preserved layouts will feature enough of the same events in the order in which they are first presented by the development. Although Mendelssohn’s D-C pairings will not be a verbatim repeat of the development where a layout is concerned, the presence of the events themselves are enough to signal the development’s reach in the coda. As the analyses in Chapter 3 demonstrate of DRT1, the recomposition of developmental elements in the coda often expresses resolution in a way that helps to bring the movement to an end.

For pairings that involve more specific material, the material originates in the development in one of two ways: (1) as a passage with distinct characteristics incurred in the development from zones ranging from the link/entry to the RT; or (2) as a distinct theme, like N, and occasionally, \( N^1 \), as some finale movements feature for cyclic effect.\(^{47}\) When transferred, especially with regards to N and RT, this material will often appear towards the end of the coda. The development’s presence in this late stage provides an opportunity to reinforce the closure already achieved by the ESC in sonata space. Often, this material will lead directly to an ultimate rendition of P material that caps off the movement triumphantly as a strong statement of the end.

To similar effect, DRT1 can apply to movements with a “failed recapitulation” and apparent coda. Although the movements in this study did not provide particular instances of this, D-C pairings remain theoretically possible, but only given two conditions. First, D-C pairings should apply if the development’s layout is transferred, such that a strong parallelism between development and apparent coda is maintained despite a “failed recapitulation”. Second, if the

\(^{47}\) I use roman numerals in superscript to indicate the movement from which the material originates. \( N^1 \) therefore denotes N from the first movement.
material from the development is a specific theme or passage, DRT1 applies if the material returns after the ESC occurs within apparent coda space.\textsuperscript{48} This latter scenario will likely provide further opportunity to reinforce closure through the development’s return.

DRT2—The Development Forwards Material towards the Movement’s End which Participates in Deferring the ESC to a Later Point

DRT2 also involves thematic material from the development. Whereas DRT1 must involve the coda, the developmental material in DRT2 expands the recapitulatory S zone and must play an active role in the ESC’s deferral further within sonata space or possibly into an apparent coda. As the analyses in the following chapters will show, expanded S zones are typical for Mendelssohn in large-scale and small-scale genres. These expanded S zones are a characteristic of Mendelssohn’s recapitulations, and often follow compressed P and TR zones, which are usually fused. When Mendelssohn expands his S zones, he will likely do so through P insertion, by implementing an apparent C zone, or by repeating S material such that the I: PAC/ESC is delayed.\textsuperscript{49} That the ESC can be pushed into the coda is mentioned by Hepokoski and Darcy with regards to nonresolving recapitulations. In these instances, the recapitulatory S

\textsuperscript{48} I use the term “apparent coda” to refer to the space beyond S in those instances where an ESC is not secured within sonata space. The apparent coda has coda rhetoric, more specifically, but unlike the coda, is left to achieve closure through the ESC.

\textsuperscript{49} With regards to the lattermost point, Hepokoski and Darcy specifically refer to the expansion of S zones via the persistence of S material past the first PAC. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 151–152. With regards to the “apparent C zone”, I use this term to refer to the formal section that has the rhetoric of a closing zone but that is “apparent” because the S theme has not achieved the EEC/ESC. The apparent C zone is technically a form of S expansion, and is left to achieve the EEC/ESC, upon which a true closing, codetta, and/or if in the case of ESC, a coda may follow. Thematically, the material of the apparent C zone is often P-based like a closing zone, and will not lead back to or feature S material. The apparent C zone begins right after the EEC/ESC is evaded.
zone does not secure the ESC and tonal closure is deferred beyond sonata-space into the coda.\textsuperscript{50} This deferral is regarded by Hepokoski and Darcy as a strong expressive gesture in the trajectory of sonata forms.\textsuperscript{51}

When Mendelssohn expands his S zones via material from the development in DRT2, the development exhibits a strong thematic tie to the rest of the form and plays a role in the structural and overall aesthetic shape of the movement. Any distinguishable passage from the development may return, this often being N or RT material. As a determining feature of DRT2, this material will reappear as part of S expansion. Once the moment of anticipated ESC is evaded, one of three situations occurs: (1) following initial expressions of the ESC’s evasion, the potential for another chance at securing the ESC dissipates or is overtaken shortly thereafter by the development’s thematic return on the way to—and as preparation for—the apparent coda’s onset (RT will often be involved); (2) given the conditions in (1), the potential to secure the ESC dissipates when the development’s thematic material returns at the head of the apparent coda (N will often be involved); or (3) the development’s thematic return is directly responsible for the ESC’s evasion as insertion within S which appears at first to be the apparent coda’s onset (often this will not be N or RT, but a distinct passage from, or take on material in, the development’s core). The onset of contrasting material that the development contributes as S expansion gives the impression that the music at least temporarily abandons further attempts for the ESC.\textsuperscript{52} This

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 245.

\textsuperscript{51} As Hepokoski and Darcy state, “such a ‘failed’ recapitulation is a strong expressive gesture—a deformation…” Ibid., 245.

\textsuperscript{52} Recall that DRT1 may involve an apparent coda when specific material from the development returns. In DRT1, however, the thematic return occurs after the ESC is achieved within apparent coda space.
impression is also given by the fact that the development’s return also precludes S’s continuation thereafter. More generally, the development’s thematic return occurs at a point where it may be seen to interrupt the path to closure and play a distinct role in the ESC’s evasion. In addition, the analyses in Chapter 4 demonstrate that although the development’s thematic return helps to defer the ESC, the return does not achieve or help to achieve the ESC either.

DRT3—The RT Calls for “Compensation” Towards the End of the Movement

DRT3 involves a tie to the rest of the form through the RT that leads to the D-R border. In and of itself, this border is full of potential for a strong arrival on the tonic as the first major point that confirms the tonal return in the formal process. When Mendelssohn eschews an extended RT: V pedal that leads directly to, and that builds anticipation for, the return, the potential is shifted to a later point. Usually, this point will be the ESC or a final cadence that reinforces the ESC and triumphantly draws the movement to its end. In these cases, Mendelssohn underprepares and therefore downplays the tonic at the D-R border. He does so by downplaying the sense of RT in the first place (i.e., what is retrospectively realized as the RT initially seems like a continuation of the core’s processes or specifically, RT-prep), or in other ways, like via D-R overlap so that the thematic and tonal return misalign, or via a “wrong-key”

53 This tenet helps to distinguish from those instances of DRT4 of the thematic subtype, wherein the development may further a new version of a thematic element into the recapitulation, possibly as insertion within S.

54 In these cases, the ESC will be achieved by the apparent closing or processes in the apparent coda.
RT, or a retransitional sequence. The latter may also arise as culmination of the forward-driving processes that one sometimes finds in the core.

This chapter has already outlined that when Mendelssohn employs these retransitional devices, the tonic arrives underprepared and in medias res, which leaves the recapitulation retrospectively realized. With the potential unfulfilled at the D-R border, the development channels the motion through that boundary and into the rest of the form. Often, this motion forges through the recapitulation’s start. P is abbreviated and fused with TR, so that the motion directs towards the S zone. DRT3 “compensates” for the lack of preparation for the tonal return earlier at the D-R border in one of two ways. In the first, the recomposition of the expositional elements (mentioned two sentences above) paves a more direct path to an expanded S zone that directs the ESC to a later point for a stronger, more fulfilling close. In the second, “compensation” arises via what I call a “compensatory” V pedal, which aims for a strong ESC or reinforcement of closure towards the movement’s end.

This V pedal achieves “compensation” when it achieves one of three outcomes. The pedal: (1) reinforces closure after the ESC is achieved, usually as an RT to the coda’s onset following the ESC and possibly, the closing and codetta zones; (2) leads directly to the ESC before the closing and/or coda, still as part of S, after the ESC is initially evaded; or more typically, (3) expands the form further into an apparent coda, where ample space allows the music to build up to the ESC for a more satisfying close. In this lattermost outcome, the pedal will appear already within the apparent coda or as part of the apparent closing. The pedal may achieve the ESC from both locations. As a couple of the analyses in Chapter 5 demonstrate, however, the pedal directs to a thematic return with cyclic implications before the ESC is achieved. That the pedal directs attention towards this event carries importance in the overall
aesthetic of the movement and piece as a whole. Overall, the anticipation that the pedal
contributes for the confirmation of the home key via the ESC to happen in the apparent coda
fulfills the potential lost earlier at the D-R border given the development’s lack of anticipatory
RT.

DRT4—The Development Comments on an Existing Situation or Aspect from the Introduction
and/or Exposition and Furthers the Action into the Recapitulation and/or Coda

DRT4 developments, by contrast, comment on and further an aspect from the
introduction and/or exposition into the recapitulation and/or coda. The development changes the
aspect as part of a progression towards a final state in the recapitulation or coda. When the
development plays this role, it highlights and gives that particular component its meaning in the
aesthetic trajectory of the movement. This aspect can be motivic, thematic, or harmonic/tonal.
When the development furthers any one of these aspects, a subtype of DRT4 is expressed. The
three subtypes of DRT4 each occur in specific ways that help to identify DRT4 in analysis.

In the motivic subtype, the development acts in two ways. The development: (1) furthers
the motivic interplay of specific motives from the exposition; and (2) amplifies a motive to a
higher level(s), such as the thematic and/or harmonic/tonal levels. If to the thematic level, the
motive develops into a full-fledged theme as N in the development. If to the harmonic/tonal
level, the motive is usually tied to a specific pitch that the development elevates in its core as a
key in its own right.

In the thematic subtype, the development acts in one of three ways. In the first, the
development contributes a new version of specific thematic material from the exposition. The
development introduces changes so that the thematic material acquires distinct characteristics that tie it to the development. This transformed version reappears in the recapitulation, usually in TR, or possibly as insertion within S. In the second, the development highlights P’s layout when it spans P’s initial segments (e.g., P-zero-P1, 1P-Pclosing) across the D-R border. The development introduces incongruence through this thematic D-R overlap given P’s misalignment with the recapitulation’s start. The development’s introduction of incongruence inspires the search for congruence by the movement’s end that is achieved when P’s segments are united (i.e., no longer separated by a border such that theme and phrase-structural organization align). In the third, the development highlights a more abstract component related to how the theme is presented in the exposition. Often, the theme seems insufficient in some way; form-functional analysis may expose a content-function disparity and/or render the theme odd in dimension, making it seem syntactically incomplete or that it “had more to say.” The development will take up this theme and/or trait, leaving more to be desired in the recapitulation, either with specific regard to the theme in question or for stronger developmental activity to be had, usually in TR.

In the harmonic/tonal subtype, the development furthers the role of a particular sonority in the exposition. Often, the sonority is tied to tonal destabilization in that it destabilizes the sense of key at the local level. More than once, the sonority will reharmonize a principal tone that is more typically tied to the tonic. In a slightly different circumstance, the sonority may be tied to tonal misdirection, also at the local level. When there is an opportunity for a return or an arrival, the sonority will temporarily allude elsewhere than expected. Opportunities may arise in the retransition to Pa’ in a small ternary, within the MC-complex that prepares S’s onset in the secondary key, or within S when closure is trying to be obtained. In these cases, the
development elevates the sonority and its role to the level of being a tonal diversion or “wrong-key” RT on the way to the D-R border.

As I have outlined for each of these three subtypes—motivic, thematic, and harmonic/tonal—the development highlights a specific component from the exposition and amplifies it in some way that appears in the core or RT. In this way, the development expresses the intermediary step in an ongoing commentary that has a clear beginning, middle, and end. As the analyses in Chapter 3 to 7 demonstrate, the development continues this commentary in the recapitulation and coda in different ways that relate specifically to the development and what it has achieved already as an intermediary step. In light of the development—especially when the D-R border is underplayed—the recapitulation will usually feature a recomposition of its elements through the fusion and/or abbreviation of P and TR to direct attention to the specific component that the DRT4 development is highlighting. That component might be changed slightly to show some progress towards resolving what the development has amplified, but resolution is typically found in the coda. There, the component will be clearly featured as a way to highlight its importance all along in the aesthetic of the movement. As resolution, the component will be recomposed to sever its tie to destabilization, misdirection, or incongruence. When this happens, the development’s presence will continue. The component will often reappear in one of two ways: (1) in a way that is directly related to the development’s influence (i.e., as a continuation of the version contributed by the development in the development) or (2) near the return of other development material that may act as a supporting element to the main trajectory articulated by DRT4 in a given movement, and as a signal, by association, of the development’s role in highlighting that particular component from the beginning.
While one might take the perspective that it is the beginning of the movement that exhibits the tie to the rest of the form, the development’s role is quite clear in particular cases. As I have outlined for the various subtypes of DRT4 in the paragraphs above, the development advances the action as the intermediary stage in the form. In so doing, DRT4 demonstrates the development’s crucial role in formal process. Three additional points can be made on the role of DRT4 developments in furthering an aspect from the beginning. First, ties may be ascribed to the beginning, but only insofar that the beginning acts as a reference against which to gauge the differences inherent in subsequent appearances of the material in question. Materials offered by the beginning might better be thought of as a foundational reservoir of options from which the other formal sections can draw. Thematic materials from the beginning are therefore seen to exist as default material for the rest of the form. This perspective avoids the pitfall of attributing everything to the beginning, since to do so becomes recursive and diminishes the importance of the remaining formal sections. Second, to relate everything to the beginning undermines one of the development’s key functions: to develop pre-existing material, this in addition to achieving the start of the recapitulation. Third, the development has greater freedom in the first place regarding whether or not it picks up beginning elements and the extent to which it may treat them. In short, one must consider the development as a space in its own right rather than as a space that exists in the shadow of the beginning.

DRT5—Underplayed D-R Border Channels Motion into the Rest of the Form and Contributes to the ESC’s Delay and the Movement’s End-weighted, Single-sweep Design

DRT5 developments also have strong ties to the rest of the form, but play a particular role in how movements unfold in a single sweep. As Chapter 7 will demonstrate, these DRT5
developments generate forward-driving motion through their cores, which DRT5 developments then channel through the D-R border via retransitional processes—like D-R overlap and sequence—into the rest of the form. The motion, in turn, underplays the D-R border, and contributes to the ESC’s delay and the end-weighted trajectories of DRT5 movements. These DRT5 developments work in conjunction with blurred E-D boundaries, which were blurred even in cases where an EEC was achieved. DRT5 developments also reveal a trend with respect to genre, since DRT5 developments occur in all four of Mendelssohn’s concerto movements in sonata form.

As this thesis will demonstrate, the implementation of DRTs in the study of development sections is particularly useful. From a methodological standpoint, the structural differences between developments no longer stand as an issue in devising a method for their classification. DRTs instead enable the application of systematically devised and consistent categories of developments based on their ties to the rest of the form across Mendelssohn’s sonata-form movements via analysis.55 With this broader perspective on developments, these categories offer a lens through which to view formal process. DRTs are also proposed as a theory of Mendelssohn’s developments, and more broadly, as a theory of formal process and aesthetic in Mendelssohn’s music.56 Combined with Development Classes I and II, moreover, one can

55 While some movements may show traits of more than one DRT, the narrative interpretation of the movement helped to clarify which specific DRT played the principal role in the overall aesthetic of the form for classification.

56 While DRTs are listed next to movement titles in Appendix 1 or referenced to specific movements as classification, it should be noted that the classification should not be with reference to what Hepokoski and Darcy refer to as a type of sonata form. Instead, classification by DRT indicates that a particular movement features a particular developmental relationship type, and that that DRT plays a primary role in the formal process of that movement.
distinguish between the two border classes—tonic- and non-tonic-articulated D-R borders—for
each DRT. **Table 2.6** below demonstrates that Class I developments with tonic-articulated
borders prevail across the DRTs and that there tended not to be D-R overlap. This was the case
except for DRT3 and DRT5, for which D-R overlap prevailed as a majority. When classes Ib
and II were considered together, however, D-R overlap occurred just as frequently as instances
of no overlap in DRT4 (see **Table 2.7**).

**Table 2.6: Distribution of Class I and II Developments by DRT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Class</th>
<th>Development Class I</th>
<th>Development Class II</th>
<th>Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRT1 (D-C pairings)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT2 (Development material delays the ESC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT3 (RT calls for “compensation” later in the form)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT4 (Development furthers material from earlier to</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later in the form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT5 (Underplayed D-R border channels motion into the</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest of the form, delays the ESC, and contributes to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the movement’s single-sweep, end-weighted design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Class I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.7: Distribution of Class Ia/Ib/II Developments by DRT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRT</th>
<th>Tonic/D-R Overlap (Ib)</th>
<th>Non-tonic/D-R Overlap (II)</th>
<th>Total (Ib + II)</th>
<th>No Overlap (Ia)</th>
<th>Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRT1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>No overlap (Ia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the DRTs outlined in this study pertain to Mendelssohn’s music specifically, the
orientation around DRTs as method may easily constitute a framework for the broader pursuit of
nineteenth-century musical form. Through their application, analysis views formal process through the lens of the development and its ties to the rest of the form. In this way, DRTs show that developments are far-reaching entities which extend beyond the scope of their existence, and that it is meaningful to consider developments within the context of entire movements. As Chapters 3 to 7 demonstrate, the conceptualization and identification of DRTs in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms bring to light a number of things: process, aesthetic—and as the section directly below discusses—narrative, transformation, and meaning. In short, DRTs show that developments are important, not simply because they exist, but because they are much more far-reaching and meaningful than we have previously made them out to be.

ii) The Development at the Intersection between Narrative and Form

As the “middle” section, the development has the potential to play a strong role in the sense of narrative that can arise through the form. Given this position, the development carries the distinct and unique function of achieving return at the D-R border, of highlighting and bringing meaning to specific aspects from earlier in the form, and of generating material which can play some role later on in movements. By fulfilling these functions, the development plays a


At the same time, analytical studies and theories by scholars like, respectively, Michael Klein (2004) and Byron Almén (2008), continue to show the interpretative richness that arises from thinking about music as narrative. See Byron Almén, A Theory of Musical Narrative (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Michael Klein, “Chopin’s Fourth Ballade as Musical Narrative,” Music Theory Spectrum 26 (2004): 23–56.
part in how form unfolds, how the formal trajectory incurs meaning as it unfolds, and how formal process achieves its end. In this way, the development holds an important place at the intersection between narrative and form in Mendelssohn’s sonatas.

These functions are encapsulated by the five DRTs, each of which facilitate the rise of musical narrative through the form. That the D-R border can play an important role in how form unfolds is explicitly tied to DRT3 (RT calls for “compensation” towards the movement’s end) and DRT5 (the underplayed D-R border channels motion into the rest of the form for the movement’s single-sweep design). That the development can draw meaning to a specific component given the development’s position in the form is tied to DRT4 (the development highlights and furthers an aspect from before into the rest of the form). That the development generates material which plays a role later on in the form is tied to DRT1 (the development-coda pairing) and DRT2 (delayed ESC via material from the development). These DRTs highlight the development and its interaction with other formal sections in such a way that transformation becomes a prevalent narrative aesthetic and metaphor for the process observed over the course of movements given the vital roles that developments play in how form unfolds.

I understand narrative to be a “story” in the sense that there is a progression—a transformation—from an initial state to an ending state that runs as a unifying thread through the form. This transformation happens to a motivic, thematic, and/or harmonic/tonal element that is traceable because it recurs throughout the form from beginning, middle, to end—or at least from the development to the recapitulation and/or coda. In the narrative, transformation and resolution become consistent metaphors for, respectively, (1) the process of recomposition—or the final act of recomposition following a handful of previously failed attempts—or the role of compensation (as mentioned in the outline of the DRTs above)—that ultimately achieves (2) the
ending state, which usually expresses a resolution of the initial condition. The difference between the initial and ending states can be expressed through some of the following transformations listed in Table 2.8.

Table 2.8: Transformation Narratives in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Incongruence</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Blockage</th>
<th>Unblockage</th>
<th>Destabilization</th>
<th>Stabilization</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Evasion</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Disunity</th>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Global (involves cyclic recall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The analyses in Chapters 3 to 7 demonstrate that narrative, transformation, and form as process become concepts relevant to the development’s role in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. While the analyses discuss the movements in full and in detail, despite the focus being on a specific DRT, it was necessary to discuss how various elements play out to show the development in context and its role within the aesthetic of the whole form. Some further details also arise to showcase specific features of developments along the way. In addition, some analyses are longer because they require stronger engagement with the literature and existing analyses—for example, the finale movements of Piano Sonata in E major, Op. 6 and Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56. These analytical chapters also reinforce the idea that all developments share two things in common: (1) all developments have a tie to the rest of the form and (2) all
developments function to achieve the recapitulation’s onset. This thinking serves as the theoretical underpinning for this project. The following analytical chapters demonstrate the consistent applicability of this method I have outlined for grouping developments based on DRT and border class. As many of the analyses show, I recognize the D-R border—alongside DRTs—as an important element of structure, formal process, narrative, and the development’s tie to the rest of the form.
Chapter 3
Developmental Relationship Type 1 (DRT1): The Development Forwards Material for a Strong Connection with the Coda

Developments that generate material for the coda make the most straightforward ties with the rest of the form and lay the foundation for strong connections like the development-coda (D-C) pairing to arise.¹ These pairings are the most frequent among the DRTs and occur either as thematic development-coda pairings or abstract development-coda pairings.

The thematic D-C pairing is the more common and explicit subcategory of DRT1. In this DRT, thematic material from the development is forwarded and literally recalled in the coda. This material varies between D-C pairings, and as I further suggest, pairings themselves facilitate transformation narratives across the form. Over the course of this chapter, I explore eight thematic D-C pairings in an order based on the increasing complexity of narratives across movements. I start with five of the most basic instances. The DRT1 developments in the first movement of Op. 11, the finale of Op. 11, and the first movement of String Quintet No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 87 generate the thematic layout for the coda. These transferred layouts demonstrate the importance of D-C pairings in emphasizing resolution, because the sense of the development’s return helps to reinforce closure. I then go on to demonstrate how developments generate specific material for the coda. In the second movement of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11, the development forwards its RT-complex, the transference of which

¹ Although “C” is used as a standard abbreviation for the closing zone, the C’s reference to the coda stands only with respect to the D-C pairing.
participates in the narrative of transformation towards resolution across the form. The development in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2 in G minor, Op. 105 then shares its RT material and plays a transformative role in achieving a stronger finish for the movement. All five of these narratives involve the recomposition of previous materials later in the form. The recomposition of some aspect from the development in the codas constitutes an important aspect in the sense of transformation across Op. 11 (I) and Op. 105 (I) especially.

The remaining three thematic D-C pairings continue to act as frameworks for transformation to take place, but for what seem to be more intricate narratives across the form. In the third movement of String Quartet No. 5 in E-flat major, Op. 44, No. 3, the development gradually brings about a new theme which destabilizes the tonic key directly prior to the recapitulation and which Mendelssohn resolves in the coda. The development in the opening movement of Piano Quartet No. 2 in F minor, Op. 2 directs its link material to the coda as a means to amplify the destabilization of the tone D, before resolution is achieved by the movement’s end. In the first movement of Piano Trio No. 2 in C minor, Op. 66, the development forwards its thematic layout to the coda as a framework for transformation to occur in the guise of P’s and S’s stronger integration of one another. As with the earlier examples from this chapter, transformation narratives supported by these three thematic D-C pairings achieve resolution via recomposition as such. Transformation in these three D-C pairings, however, are intensified by the extent to which the sense of narrative plays out across developments, and certainly with Op. 66 (I), across the entire form.²

² Other examples of thematic D-C pairings not covered in this chapter are found in Piano Quartet No. 3 in B minor, Op. 3 (IV), String Quartet No. 2 in A minor, Op. 13 (IV), String Quartet No. 1 in E-flat major, Op. 12 (IV), Symphony No. 5 in D minor, Op. 107 (I), String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44/2 (I), String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44/2 (II), String Quartet No. 5 in E-flat major, Op. 44/3 (I), Symphony No. 2 in B-flat major, Op.
By contrast, the **abstract development-coda pairing** occurs when only the essence of the development—rather than literal thematic material—persists into the coda, as specific events recapture there. In the **first movement of String Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20** the development imprints the coda with the sense of blockage that becomes associated in the movement with instances of sudden rhetorical recession in F minor, the supertonic key. As culmination of the transformation narratives explored thus far, this closing analysis for the chapter demonstrates how the D-C pairing can generate strong coherence across the form via the framework it provides for narrative to take place. Resolution, which this abstract D-C pairing facilitates, seems to represent liberation from blockage, which I interpret as a pervasive element of this movement.

**i) The Thematic Development-Coda Pairing**

Some of the clearest examples of **thematic D-C pairings** occur when the DR1 development generates the layout, near-exact material, and thematic treatment for the coda. A transferred layout occurs in the **opening movement of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (1824–1829).** As **Figure 3.1** demonstrates, the development (mm. 165–248) forwards material

---

52 (I), Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (I), Cello Sonata No. 2 in D major, Op. 58 (I), and String Quartet No. 6 in F minor, Op. 80 (I). The development builds a connection with the coda in different ways in these movements, since the development forwards different material—developmental texture (Op. 107, I), N (Op. 44/2, II; Op. 13, IV), N(I) (Op. 12, IV), the layout and treatment of thematic material (Op. 3, IV; Op. 44/3, I; Op. 52, I), RT material (Op. 44/2, I; Op. 58, I), and specific passages of “storm music” (Op. 56, I; Op. 80, I)—to the coda.

3 In my analysis here, as in those of subsequent movements in this dissertation, I use “blockage” loosely to refer to a momentary lapse in the motion, usually with regards to a surface-level feature, like melody and texture. Harmonically, the lapse in motion may also refer to a temporary diversion from a more direct path to a specific goal. Here, the representations of “blockage” generally contrast a more literal meaning through which “blockage” implies a full stop or cessation of any further activity.
from both parts of its core (mm. 165–231) and the PAC/sealed DG (m. 201) into the coda (mm. 395–487). In its latter zone (mm. 441–457) which corresponds to the RT (mm. 231–248), the coda also features P\textsuperscript{head}, but in smaller fragments to claim a i: PAC (m. 457). This cadence reinforces the closure achieved earlier through the i: PAC/ESC (m. 331), and leads to a strong concluding passage (mm. 457–487) which emphasizes the tonic in \textit{fortissimo}, and eventually, \textit{tutti} texture. The coda’s stronger reinforcement of the i: PAC/ESC via the i: PAC in m. 457 is appropriate given S’s (mm. 291–331) rather uncharacteristic digression to A-flat major (VI) in the recapitulation (mm. 249–395). The music also returns to C minor (i) just a mere handful of measures before the ESC. The additional closure offered by the coda is crucial, as such, to the stronger sense of stabilization for the movement as a whole. The additional closure also provides a fitting conclusion to the more gradual sense of resolution spread more sparsely across the movement given S’s initial resistance to the home key in the recapitulation.

\footnote{In Figure 3.1, I use “2TR” and “3TR” to refer to distinct thematic ideas from within TR. For reference, see 1TR (mm. 13–35), 2TR (mm. 35–43), and 3TR (mm. 43–68) in the exposition.}

\footnote{I use the label “\textit{phead}” to refer to the head motive of P.}

\footnote{This choice of VI key is especially odd considering the exposition’s (mm. 1–164) rendition of S (mm. 67–102) in the expected key of E-flat major (III).}
The thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 in the finale of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (1824–1829) similarly features a development (mm. 94–142) that provides the near-exact material and layout for coda I (mm. 225–255). Figure 3.2 demonstrates this correspondence from the beginning on Pb material (compare with mm. 7–11), to the fugato (mm. 102ff.), and finally, Pa material (compare mm. 1–7).\(^7\) Just as Pa is featured in the RT (mm. 133–142), the coda uses Pa to build to a cadence (m. 255) in the tonic major. This cadence in C major still reinforces the closure given earlier by the i: PAC/ESC (m. 200), but also marks the start of the \textit{più stretto} section or coda II (mm. 255–284), which brings the movement to a more climactic, apotheosis-like finish, and the symphony’s triumphant close.

\(^7\) I use “Pa” and “Pb” to refer to the ‘a’ and ‘b’ sections of P’s small ternary structure. For more on the ternary structure as a theme-type in its own right, see Caplin (1998), 71–86.
In addition, Mendelssohn strengthens the sense of Pa heading into the coda when he slightly rewrites the final measures of the codetta (mm. 212–225) in the recapitulation (mm. 142–225). He does so in a way that recaptures Pa more closely than the codetta (mm. 77–94) from earlier in the exposition (mm. 1–94). By comparing mm. 221 and 223 with mm. 90 and 92 in **Example 3.1**, more specifically, one sees how the music reinstates Pa’s disjunct G–C bass motion at the recapitulation’s close in place of the static B♭ in the exposition’s final measures.

Notwithstanding the coda’s clear thematic pairing with the development, this heightened sense of Pa directly ahead of Pb at coda I’s launch gives the sense that P’s reprise spans the R-C boundary. P’s reprise here resembles the appearance sometimes of an additional P segment at the end of sonata-form finales, which often serve to bring the sonata to a strong close. Certainly in this finale, the sense that P’s reprise spans the R-C boundary helps to segue effectively into the broader, more extensive build to the finish, which codas I and II collectively achieve.
Example 3.1: Heightened Sense of Pa in the Recapitulation Heading into the Coda, Op. 11, IV
Like Op. 11 (I) and Op. 11 (IV), the first movement of String Quintet No. 2 in B-flat Major, Op. 87 (1845) features a thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1. This D-C pairing acts as a framework that facilitates the narrative of transformation through the form. In this movement, the development (mm. 129–226) forwards its layout of substantially S-based material (mm. 129ff.; compare mm. 54ff.) to the coda (mm. 310–372). This S-based material in the development leads to P (mm. 144ff.) fairly early on in the core and ultimately to P at the recapitulation’s (mm. 226–309) start. Once forwarded to the coda, the layout appears transformed. As an act of resolution to the development’s descent towards its V4/2–I₆ evasion of an authentic cadence at the D-R border (the development culminates with a I₆ arrival RT-connect in m. 226), the bassline in the coda now ascends, and S, now featured all the way through, leads directly to the I: PAC in m. 350 (see Examples 3.2 and 3.3). This cadence not only reinforces the I: PAC/ESC (m. 301), but initiates P’s—specifically Pa’s (mm. 350–372; compare mm. 1–15)—fortissimo cap-off to the movement as well.
Example 3.2: Descending Bassline in the Development; Op. 87, I, 129–226

Development

F+ (V): VI#$ (passing notes) V7 of E- 

V7 $\frac{4}{2}$ i$^6$ V$\frac{3}{4}$ i 

i$^6$ V$\frac{3}{4}$ i [VI$\flat$] of G- (vi): 

i V$^7$ i$^5$ 6 viio$^7$ [vii$\flat^4$] [IV$^6$] i$^6$ of C- (ii): $\frac{5}{3}$ 

$\frac{4}{2}$ [V$^7$] $\frac{4}{2}$ ii$^6$ 

V$^2$ viio$^4$ i$^6$ ii$^6$ [V$\frac{3}{4}$] iv$^6$ V [HC/DG]

C-(ii): V $\frac{7}{4}$ [V$^6_3$] +VI $\frac{7}{4}$ 2 [V$^6_5$] [V$^6_2$] viio$^7$ [VII$^6$ of B$^\flat$+(I)] 

B$^\flat$+(I): V$^6$ $\frac{7}{4}$ [vii$\flat^4$] $\frac{7}{4}$ $\frac{2}{2}$ I$^6$ arrival RT-connect
Example 3.3: Ascending Bassline in the Coda; Op. 87, I, mm. 310–350

Coda

predominant (C minor, ii) expansion
ascent begins here

\( B_3^+ (I): IV^6 \) (chrom. pns) \([vii^6]^7\) \( V^7 \) \([vii^6]^7\)

\( V^6 \) \[\( V^4_{5} - 7 \) \( vii^6 \) \( V^6_5 \) \( V^7 \) \[\]

\( ii \) \[\( vii^6 \) \( I^6 \) \[\( vii^6 \) \( ii^6 \) \( V^6_5 \) \( P^4 \) \( V^6_5 \) \( vi \) \( ii \) \]

\( V^4_3 \) \[\( ii - V^4_3 \) \( ii^6 \) \( V^6_4 \) \[\( V^7 - \frac{6}{5} \) \( vi \) \]

\[ \]

e etc... (I prolongation to the end)

\[ V^6_3 \] \( V^6_{4} - 7 \) \( I: PAC \)
That S initiates Pa via a PAC in the coda suggests resolution as transformation, which runs through the form: the development furthers the V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} evasion of cadences between S and P references into the recapitulation until resolution is reached in the coda via the aforementioned PAC. As Figure 3.3 demonstrates, S (mm. 54ff.; mm. 243ff.) leads to the apparent C(P) zone (mm. 90–120; 271–301) in both the exposition and recapitulation. The development, meanwhile, furthers the V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} cadential evasions between S–P references in core\textsuperscript{part1} (mm. 129–188) and then at the D-R border. Given this path and the way the development channels the fluidity through the D-R border, S’s importance in the narrative is highlighted by Pa=>TR’s (mm. 226–242) direct path to the recapitulatory S zone. S’s ultimate lead-up to Pa via the I: PAC in m. 350 of the coda, then, suggests resolution of the string of evaded cadences, which persists through the form. It is also the first time in the movement that S material fulfills its generic function of achieving a PAC.\textsuperscript{8} Resolution is further expressed, since this I: PAC is supported by the development’s projection of C minor (ii) onto the coda. Transformed from being a key in its own right (note the ii: HC/DG in m. 188, which initiates core\textsuperscript{part2}), more specifically, C minor now holds predominant function to the PAC in the coda’s rising bassline. This rising bassline (as Example 3.3 encapsulates at the start of this discussion) functions as antithesis to C minor’s earlier use as a developmental key and to the development’s descent to evasion at the D-R border. The antithesis expressed by this thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 and the allusion to C minor in the coda ultimately facilitate the path to cadential resolution, and indeed, P’s triumphant cap-off to the movement as a whole.

\textsuperscript{8} With regards to S’s function, Hepokoski and Darcy state that “the onset of S is a signal that we are being urged to listen with a keen readiness for the cadence-to-come—the PAC that will be the next obligatory generic station in the sonata’s process of realization.” Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 118.
Figure 3.3: V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} at Borders where S Material Leads to P Material, Op. 87, I, mm. 1–372

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa-Pb-Pa=&gt;TR</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. C(P)</td>
<td>Codetta (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core\textsuperscript{part1}</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core\textsuperscript{part2}</td>
<td>Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–53</td>
<td>54ff. 90–120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} (EC)</td>
<td>121–129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} (EC)</td>
<td>129–144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144–172</td>
<td>172–188 189ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii: HC/DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dev. (cont’d)</th>
<th>Recap</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=&gt;RT</td>
<td>Pa=&gt;TR</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>App. C(P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codetta (S)</td>
<td>Core\textsuperscript{part1}</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core\textsuperscript{part2}</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206–216</td>
<td>216–226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226–242</td>
<td>243–271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271–301</td>
<td>302–310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310–350</td>
<td>350–372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} arr.</td>
<td>V4/2–I\textsuperscript{6} (EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT-connect</td>
<td>I: PAC/ESC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The monothematic second movement of Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (1824–1829) provides another example of the thematic D-C pairing among Mendelssohn’s DRT1 developments. In this movement, the development (mm. 56–78) forwards its exclusively TR-based (mm. 8–33) layout to the coda (mm. 106–125), so that the development and coda are paired thematically through their preservation, more specifically, of the MC-complex (i.e., the rhetoric that suggests proposals and then caesura-followed-by-fill; see Example 3.4a below), at their ends. As Example 3.4 demonstrates, the MC area serves as a model for the RT-complex in the development, as well as reinforcement of the tonic at the coda’s end. The most poignant feature that is shared is the caesura-fill first heard in mm. 29–33. This CF material is recalled exactly as RTC-fill (see Example 3.4b), where it sounds like a tonic transposition of the...
exposition’s MC-S juncture. The CF material is also recomposed in the terminal portion of the coda, where it appears above harmonic reinforcement of the tonic below as thematic “resolution” (see Example 3.4c). The development’s and coda’s rendition of the MC-complex runs like a continuous thread through the movement. The discussion below demonstrates how this thread acts as a cohesive narrative in which the ongoing reinstatement—and recomposition—of CF material within different harmonic contexts articulates the gradual path towards resolution (the home key) in the end.

9 Although a V pedal continues through mm. 29–32, I call this passage “caesura-fill”. The sense of arrival on the downbeat of m. 29 suggests the MC, because it seems to be the culmination of the preceding measures. The three repeated articulations in eighths (i.e., in the upper strings on vii°4/2 of V directly ahead of m. 29) form the last of another set which appears two measures earlier, namely. Caesura-fill is also suggested by the decreased energy thereafter (note the placement of the accents on the weak second beat, which detracts from the downbeats, and the ensuing diminuendo). The change in melodic figuration after the downbeat of m. 29 seems to imply the onset of a new zone, as well. Still, with the V pedal here, my use of the term “caesura-fill” is slightly different than Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition. They describe “caesura-fill” as “the sonic articulation of the gap separating [TR and S],” which is represented by energy-loss and a brief link, usually in one voice, such that a held note or a simple scalar figure might appear. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 34 and 40–45. The MC-fill in this movement also recalls those instances of RTC-fill on a V pedal that I outline in Chapter 2.

10 Thematic “resolution” is also suggested by how the coda “completes” the complex thematically within the D-C pairing. Note specifically how the strongest thematic resemblance to the MC area (in two parts—the proposal stage followed by caesura-fill—as bracketed in Example 3.4), is given by the fill stage in the development and the proposal stage in the coda.

11 The recapitulation (mm. 79–106) is excluded from recapturing TR to avoid its overuse, especially since CF material reappears exactly as RTC-fill heading into the recapitulation. Although TR—and more specifically, CF—is furthered by the development and coda, moreover, this movement demonstrates DRT1 rather than DRT4, because the development’s layout (and subsequently, the coda’s) consists solely of TR material in the first place.
Example 3.4: The Recomposition of the MC-complex in the Development and Coda as Transformation Towards Resolution in Op. 11, II

a) The Expositional MC-complex; Op. 11, II, mm. 22–33
b) The Development Recomposes Expositional CF as RTC-fill in the Tonic Key; Op. 11, II, mm.68–80

Recapitulation

| 68 |

| RT-complex |

| RTC-fill (derived from MC-complex's caesura-fill) |

| P |

RT: V proposed ____________________________ V arrival RTC

hypermeter: 3

4=1 2 3 4 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 etc...
c) The MC-complex Recomposed Offers Thematic “Resolution” Above the Tonic in the Terminal Portion of the Coda; Op. 11, II, mm. 112–125
The development and coda preserve pre-MC material and C-flat major’s presence from TR to draw attention to the MC-like complexes across the form. In so doing, the D-C pairing highlights the gradual sense of resolution that each complex contributes successively over the course of the movement. In the exposition, TR opens with a distinct idea (mm. 8–14) which reinforces P’s (mm. 1–8) close before the viola presents a new theme (mm. 14–17). This TR theme becomes fully realized in the woodwinds (mm. 17–23) over a pulsating accompaniment (see violins). The theme also begins on \( \text{VII} \) (C-flat major) of the secondary key (B-flat major) and features a quasi-chromatic bass ascent (mm. 17–23) to the MC-complex prior to S(P) (mm. 33–47). When the development begins (m. 56), this TR theme appears straightaway (see first cello; mm. 56–63), but progresses farther than its original entrance in the strings (see exposition). The winds also take up the theme (mm. 63–69) and carry it above the same quasi-chromatic bass ascent in TR towards the RT-complex (mm. 69–78). Once in the coda, TR’s separation of strings and winds remains, while the pulsating string accompaniment (headed initially by the viola figure; m. 106) leads directly to four tonic articulations and fill for the movement’s close.

C-flat major’s role in launching each successive complex also heightens the movement’s gradual claim of resolution. As Example 3.5a and Example 3.5b demonstrate, the development exactly retains the quasi-chromatic ascent first heard on the way to the MC area in TR, but recomposes the initiating C-flat major sonority as B major to reach the RT-complex. At the same time, the development includes C-flat major (\( \text{V}^7 \) of \( \text{VII} \)) as Ger. 6 to directly precede the i: HC/RTC proposal and facilitate the journey home. When C-flat major sheds its leading-to-dominant function in the coda (see Example 3.5c), it becomes relegated to the pitch level as part of the vii\(^6\)/43 sonority that finally goes directly to the tonic over the tonic pedal to complete the movement’s overall journey towards resolution in the end. In this way, the thematic connection
expressed by the thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 articulates a gradual progression towards resolution through recomposition of the pre- and MC-like complexes both the development and coda retain from TR in the exposition.\textsuperscript{12}

Example 3.5: The Preservation and Role of C-flat in Launching Each Complex; Op. 11, II

a) C-flat-major Tonicization and Quasi-Chromatic Ascent Leading to the Expositional MC-complex; Op. 11, II, mm. 17–23

\textsuperscript{12} The development’s featuring of TR and beyond for a connection to the rest of the form also occurs in the DRT4 movement, Op. 105 (III), which is discussed in Chapter 6. There, a similar narrative advances towards resolution, but whereas Op. 11 (II) pursues a path towards thematic and tonal resolution, Op. 105 (III) seeks to resolve an initial conflict, which it achieves in the end.
b) C-flat-major Tonicization and Quasi-Chromatic Ascent Leading to the RT-complex;

Op. 11, II, mm. 63–69
c) C-flat Sheds its Leading-to-Dominant Function and Resolves to the Tonic in the Coda; Op. 11, II, mm. 105–125

Coda

TR-based material leading up to the final complex
MC-complex recomposed

Fill-like passage (derived from MC-complex's caesura-fill)

I pedal (vii°4/3) (vii°4/3) (vii°4/3) (vii°4/3)

C-flat resolves into the tonic chord as resolution
In another **thematic D-C pairing**, the development forwards specific material to the coda for a stronger finish to the movement. Such is the case in the monothematic **first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2 in G minor, Op. 105 (1821)**; the last few measures (mm. 102–106) of the development’s (mm. 60–106) RT (mm. 94–106) generate the thematic material for the coda (mm. 159–171) (see **Example 3.6**). The coda, in turn, extends the use of this RT material, and through it, leads to \( P \) head’s brief, yet triumphant reprise (mm. 167–171). This strong, **fortissimo** cap-off to the movement directly contrasts the recapitulation’s (mm. 106–159) “soft” onset, and is achieved via a **crescendo** through the acceleration of this RT material’s characteristic chromatic descent. As **Example 3.7** demonstrates, descending motion prevails in a more structural way in the development’s path to the RT. C’s arrival in the bass at the start of the thematic unit in m. 65 initiates a descending motion that reinforces C (m. 71). The motion then continues onwards to B\(_\flat\) (m. 72), A (m. 73), and G (m. 79) at the false recapitulation, and even farther through F (m. 82), E\(_\flat\) (m. 84), D\(_\flat\) (m. 87), C (m. 88), prior to another descent that finally reaches the bass note, D, where RT (m. 94) begins.

---

\(^{13}\) Note how the D-C pairing is specifically generated by the same sixteenth-note figurations that begin their descent from G in the right hand in Example 3.6a (i.e., mm. 102–104) and Example 3.6b (i.e., mm. 159–161, 163–164, and 165–166). The descent of these figures from this pitch does not happen elsewhere.
Example 3.6: The RT-based Thematic D-C Pairing in Op. 105, I

a) Towards the RT Zone’s End; Op. 105, I; mm. 102–108

b) RT Material in the Coda and Terminal *fortissimo* phead Cap-off; Op. 105, I, mm. 159–171
Example 3.7: Descending Bassline in the Development’s Core; Op. 105, I, mm. 60–94

Development
Link/Entry Zone

Core

60

66

71

76

82

88

94

False Recapitulation
descent

descent

descent

descent
e tc.
That the RT generates material for the coda as a way of achieving a much stronger rendition of P\textsuperscript{head} to cap off the movement is fitting; now in \textit{fortissimo}, P\textsuperscript{head} serves as the culminating expression of all prior P\textsuperscript{head} utterances heard across the movement, all \textit{in piano} dynamic. This string of P\textsuperscript{head} appearances endures as a thread through the entire form; it extends from P\textsuperscript{head}\textsuperscript{'}s initiating role in the antecedent and consequent phrases of both P (mm. 1–18) and S(P) (mm. 32–51) in the exposition (mm. 1–59), to the false recapitulation (mm. 79ff.) in this DRT1 development, and penultimately, to both P (mm. 106–123) and S(P) (mm. 133–143) in the recapitulation. By tracing P\textsuperscript{head} through the form, then, the movement transpires towards P\textsuperscript{head}\textsuperscript{'}s transformed rendition in \textit{fortissimo} as the RT facilitates through its projection unto the coda to draw the movement to its close.

In contrast to the five \textbf{thematic D-C pairings} explored so far, those three remaining from Op. 44/3 (III), Op. 2 (I), and Op. 66 (I) facilitate more complex narratives across the form. The \textbf{third movement of String Quartet No. 5 in E-flat major, Op. 44, No. 3 (1838)} features a thematic D-C pairing in which the development (mm. 47–81) forwards its main material—N in \textit{espressivo} (mm. 56ff.)—to the coda (mm. 113–131).\textsuperscript{14} As \textbf{Example 3.8} suggests, the pairing plays an essential role in the narrative through this A-flat-major movement. This narrative traces two aspects. The first is N\textsuperscript{'}s maturation in F minor (vi; mm. 74–81) by the development\textsuperscript{'}s end. The second is N\textsuperscript{'}s transformed reappearance (mm. 113–125) in the coda, a third higher, which resolves N\textsuperscript{'}s former F-minor tie in the tonic key. Although N\textsuperscript{'}s tonicization of IV in the coda

\textsuperscript{14} The development in this movement might more specifically be labelled C=>development, given that from the V: PAC/EEC in m. 47 onwards, the passage begins by reinforcing E-flat major (V) before modulating to other keys, while maintaining the same texture for coherence (note the persistence of the sixteenth-note figures and texture as the music changes to E-flat minor and then C-flat major). While N is new and therefore exclusive to the development (and coda), moreover, the sixteenth-note figures derive from TR (mm. 19–35).
harks back to N’s destabilization of A-flat major via F minor at the end of the development, it essentially helps to achieve a stronger I: PAC (m. 123) closer to the movement’s end. This cadence reinforces the covered I: PAC/ESC (m. 113) at the coda’s onset, and more significantly demonstrates how N achieves resolution via its tonicization—here, its expansion—of IV within a phrase reinforcing the tonic. As such, N’s ability to reinforce closure as resolution in the coda compensates for N’s earlier F-minor rendition which underprepares the recapitulation (mm. 82–113). The recapitulation, by contrast, could have been better prepared by N in A-flat major over a V pedal.

\[\text{Footnote 15: The I: PAC/ESC is covered, since the bass functions simultaneously as the melody, achieving both harmonic and melodic resolution on the tonic, while the first and second violins’ entrances merely overlap with this resolution. Although the later PAC in m. 123 may seem stronger than this covered I: PAC in m. 113, furthermore, m. 113 corresponds with the V: PAC/EEC in m. 47.}\]
Example 3.8: Thematic D-C Pairing Involving N's Maturation Across the Development and N's Resolution in the Coda; Op. 44/3, III

1) Quarter-note Dyads Only → 2) Dotted Figure Added → 3) Fragment Articulated More Prominently

4) N Theme Matures in F minor Prior to the Recapitulation → V6/4 - V7 of F minor

5) N Finds Thematic Resolution in the Home Key

F minor: [IAC]

A5+ (I): I: PAC/ESC (covered) [V4b7] IV V7 I... etc.

IV tonicization expands reinforcement of the tonic
Resolution is also expressed by three additional aspects following the I: PAC in m. 123, which N claims. These include the tonic pedal, the full measure of C–A, thirds (m. 124), and the movement’s closing on P recall (mm. 125–131). The latter two features are especially important to convey resolution, since the full measure of C–A, followed by P recaptures m. 81 on the way to the recapitulation, while demonstrating a transformation of its function. Now at the movement’s end, this third functions as tonic reinforcement, which prepares the movement’s closing on P recall in contrast to its former modulatory role as a common-tone third shared between F minor and A-flat major. In this way, the narrative of resolution (as traced through the thematic D-C pairing) is essential to the overall aesthetic of this DRT1 movement. This pairing specifically features a progression from N’s maturation by the development’s end in F minor (a non-tonic key) to N’s transformed reappearance which expands IV in the coda.

A more intricate narrative transpires from the thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 in the first movement of Piano Quartet No. 2 in F minor, Op. 2 (1823). This pairing arises from the correspondence between the link (mm. 123–135) to the development (mm. 135–208) and the link (mm. 306–314) to coda I (mm. 314–345). As Example 3.9a and Example 3.9b demonstrate, both of the links progress through keys that express a large-scale articulation of the B-flat-minor triad. Repeated and accented as half notes, D, and B, also become more

---

16 The coda I designation is used here, since the thematically contrasting section marked by the change to Più Allegro suggests coda II (mm. 345–381).

17 As Example 3.9a demonstrates, more specifically, the link to the development modulates away from the secondary key (A-flat major, III), with iterations of its four-measure idea which leads through F minor (i), D-flat major (VI), and then B-flat minor (iv) for the development’s onset. This large-scale B-flat-minor articulation recurs, albeit in a slightly different way, towards coda I. Example 3.9b shows that the very end of the codetta (mm. 298–306) produces a shift from the tonic pedal to the D-flat-major triad (VI) before the link’s (mm. 306–314) B-flat-minor tonicization, which coda I continues (note specifically, mm. 314–321; 336–337; 342–343).
prominent in the approach to, and within, the latter link that reaches the coda. This change between corresponding formal areas demonstrates D♭’s increasing emphasis as a destabilizing entity that is represented tonally and harmonically through D-flat major (VI) and B-flat minor (iv). Through this change, the D-C pairing’s importance becomes apparent in the sense of narrative, which expresses growing destabilization via D♭ through the form. D♭’s narrative significance becomes more apparent with the link material’s heightened prominence. Resolution is ultimately reached, however, when the narrative returns to D♭’s neutralization in the home key for the movement’s end.
Example 3.9: Thematic D-C Pairing in Op. 2, I

a) Large-scale Articulation of B-flat-minor Triad in the Link to the Development; Op. 2, I, mm. 119–136

b) Large-scale Articulation of B-flat-minor Triad Heading into and through the Link to Coda I; Op. 2, I, mm. 302–315
As the paragraphs below point out, link material, D♭, B♭—and particularly, D♭’s destabilizing role—are emphasized by the development and coda, as well as elsewhere throughout the form. The development itself highlights the link’s ascending chromatic material, since it features an ascending chromatic bassline through its core (mm. 135–169). There, both B-flat minor and D-flat major gain prominence as keys in their own right before they resume their function as predominant chords. These chords work to initiate the home-key RT (mm. 169–208). As mm. 135–155 demonstrate, a large-scale chromatic ascent extends from B-flat minor at the core’s start to D-flat major at Phead’s reintroduction (m. 155). D-flat major only serves briefly as a local tonic, however, when it becomes D♭7 or V7 of the subsequent G-flat-major chord (mm. 163–166) which supports the same Phead material from several measures back. This G-flat-major sonority then initiates a more localized chromatic ascent to the B-flat-minor (iv) chord (m. 168) on the way to the proposal of RT: V (m. 169). After a temporary divergence, however, D♭7 returns as Ger. 6 (m. 188) to reclaim the RT: V. In addition to this, RTC-fill (mm. 205–208) features the chromatic ascent in a highly localized fashion once the V-arrival RTC (m. 205) is achieved for the recapitulation’s (mm. 209–314) onset.

In the recapitulation, the link material achieves an even greater presence and helps to further D♭’s destabilizing role through the D-flat-major and B-flat-minor sonorities it facilitates. Ascending chromatic material appears as caesura-fill (mm. 236–245) in the MC-complex in contrast to the exposition (mm. 1–135; for caesura-fill, compare mm. 48–57). More significantly, link material also returns as S (mm. 246ff.) expansion. This reappearance originates from S’s (mm. 58–81) end in the exposition. There, it serves only as cadential reinforcement (mm. 77–81), oddly in the form of a thematically modified “one-more-time” segment, which nevertheless achieves the III: PAC/EEC (m. 81). Mendelssohn extends the use of this same material in the recapitulation, however. In so doing, he evades the ESC through
deceptive motion (m. 269; the corresponding measure to the EEC); this material in F major (mm. 265–269) becomes destabilized as F4/2 which leads to an iteration in D-flat major (mm. 269–273) and then B-flat minor (mm. 273–276). Restatements of link material articulate a large-scale B-flat-minor triad again as such, but now in a more impactful way that delays the ESC. An apparent closing (mm. 277–298) opens on a dominant pedal in place of the true closing (mm. 81–113; see the exposition) before the i: PAC/ESC (m. 298) materializes. After D4’s intensified role as a destabilizing factor through the link’s infusion into S to delay the ESC, the D-flat-major and B-flat-minor chords exhibit stronger emphasis heading into coda I. There, iv continues to be tonicized. Given this intensification, coda II (mm. 345–381) seems to function as an additional spotlight that summarizes the role that these entities play in the D-C pairing and narrative through the movement. Coda II also seems to integrate these entities within the home key as resolution for the movement’s close. With coda II’s start on the tonic which then heads to tonicize VI and then iv, namely, the music articulates a large-scale B-flat-minor triad once again. Now, however, this large-scale articulation occurs as part of the phrase’s more direct path to cadential close (mm. 345–353; 353–361). Once the music reaches the i: PAC in m. 361 and stabilizes the tonic further through i–V7 repetitions (mm. 361–369), the viiº4/2 (m. 370) within the tonic pedal (mm. 369ff.) also neutralizes D4’s destabilizing effect towards the end as resolution to the increasing destabilization traced as narrative through the form.

---

18 A i: PAC/ESC as opposed to IAC materializes here, since the piano’s right hand fulfills an accompanimental role covering the first violin’s melodic resolution to the tonic. This articulation also corresponds to the codetta’s (mm. 113–123) start in the exposition.
As it turns out, this viiº7-sonority-above-tonic-pedal originates from P=>TR’s (mm. 1–58) start, and therefore draws attention to D♭’s initially subtle presence at the movement’s outset. The opening measures introduce D♭’s pending role as a destabilizing entity through 5–6–5 or chromatic neighbour motion, namely. This neighbour motion becomes increasingly emphasized through the form, especially in the build-up to the D-C pairing. In the C zone, this motion becomes a defining feature in triplets (note the accented 5–6–5 motions in mm. 83–84) and then in quarters (mm. 102–109) after the ascending 5–6 sequence in mm. 89–94.

Eventually, the codetta’s end isolates C–D♭–C (m. 122) as if to draw attention to D♭’s pending emphasis via B-flat minor and D-flat major in the link to the development. In the development itself, the initial B-flat-minor key and later G♭M6 sonority (m. 163) articulate a 5–6 relationship that continues to gain prominence in the recapitulation. There, the apparent C zone makes its way through the ascending 5–6 sequence (mm. 285–290; as the expositional C zone first expresses), but goes on to tonicize VI♭ (mm. 294–298) in light of the increased emphasis on VI in the deceptive motion that evades the ESC (as discussed above). The melodic C–D♭ motion at the codetta’s end also becomes more prominent; rather than appearing as a mere melodic embellishment as it did (recall C–D♭–C in m. 122 at the codetta’s end in the exposition), C–D♭ now becomes harmonically supported by i–VI (mm. 302–305).

With the viiº7-sonority-above-tonic-pedal, and therefore, 5–6–5 motion, then, the movement finds resolution at the end when it recalls an aspect of its beginning. This resolution simultaneously offers retrospective insight on D♭’s journey through the form: D♭’s subtle introduction becomes intensified, which the link material’s growing emphasis facilitates. The thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1—as created by the similarity of link material—is therefore essential to the narrative, because it demonstrates D♭’s increasing role as a
destabilizing entity that becomes expressed as D-flat major and B-flat minor (or VI and iv) as the movement unfolds.

The last thematic D-C pairing that this chapter on DRT1 explores is from the opening movement of Piano Trio No. 2 in C minor, Op. 66 (1845). In addition to the start of the development (mm. 140–212) paralleling that of the coda (mm. 305–400), there is a clear correspondence in the rest of their layout. In this D-C pairing, the development transfers two aspects to the coda. The first is the development’s opening $P_{\text{head}}$-based material followed by tranquillo (e) sempre pianissimo affect.\(^{19}\) The second is the RT’s (mm. 204–212) intensification which involves $P_{\text{head}}$.\(^{20}\) This discussion illustrates the importance of the D-C pairing to the movement’s progression from the more oppositional relationship between $P=>TR$ (mm. 1–62) and $S$ (mm. 63ff.) to $P$’s and $S$’s transformation in the coda. As I explain by the end of this discussion, $P$ and $S$ express resolution in the coda when they adopt essential features from one another and therefore become more integrative of one another.

The development provides a sense of this opposition between $P$ and $S$ straightaway from the core’s (mm. 140–197) start. There, $P$ breaks down for $S$ to be featured more strongly. In mm. 140–155, specifically, the repeated $P_{\text{head}}$ fragments within recurring two-measure spans in

\(^{19}\) This pairing might be considered different from the previous examples in that I refer to the tranquillo section as a shared affect between development and coda even though it does not pertain to specific material that is transferred. The material at the development’s start does return to initiate the coda, however, so that the overall layout is maintained, this also especially since the tranquillo affect seems to function as a main component of this development.

\(^{20}\) The development’s start in m. 140 is realized only retrospectively, and might more specifically be labelled codetta=>development. On first hearing, mm. 140ff. seem to suggest codetta function given the reiterating i–V articulations in the secondary key, while the sudden onset of descending sixteenths in m. 142 suggests the development’s start. With the continuity garnered by the music thereafter paralleling mm. 140ff. via the same i–V motions (mm. 144–145) followed by descending sixteenths (mm. 146–147; albeit now modulating), however, one retrospectively realizes the start of the development in m. 140.
piano (e.g., mm. 144–145) produce a stilted quality which the descending sixteenths in every other two-measure segment amplify. The intrusive nature of these animated sixteenth-note units beginning in forte and sforzando seems to threaten or interrupt P^head (see Example 3.10).

Eventually, the sense of P^head’s disintegration becomes more acute given P^head’s eventual lack of energy; its extended repetition over four measures (mm. 152–155) diminuendos to pianissimo over a static bass as the texture thins.
Example 3.10: Phead Alternates with Intervening Sixteenths at the Development’s Start and Eventually Becomes Weaker; Op. 66, I, mm. 140–155

Codetta? No. => Development

Phead

Intervening 16ths

Phead

Hypermeter: 1 2 3 4 1 2

Phead becomes weaker
With $\text{p}^{\text{head}}$ in F minor (iv) now weakened, S in the major mode takes on the more dominant role as the featured theme and in directing motion further through the rest of the development. This is apparent in how S achieves modulation faster than $\text{p}^{\text{head}}$ does in the previous section. Beginning with D-flat major (mm. 156ff.) and moving through G-flat-major-turned-minor (mm. 162ff.), specifically, S establishes D major (mm. 171ff.) fairly quickly, where it stays considerably longer.\(^{21}\) As it turns out, both of S’s two earlier keys feature a six-measure segment that represents an expanded four-bar hypermeasure (i.e., 1–2–3–4–3–4) each. The fourth hyperbeat falls in m. 171 as such, despite the onset of triplet accompaniment in D major in that measure. As Example 3.11 demonstrates, this hypermetric setup results in the incongruence (mm. 172–195) between four-bar hypermeter and the placement of tones in the bassline. This misalignment of bass-note reiterations and the stronger first and third hyperbeats contributes to the more weightless effect of this \textit{tranquillo} section. It also fuels the desire for resolution (or congruence) and therefore contributes to S’s ability to direct motion onwards.

\(^{21}\) That D major is reached quickly can be attributed to its close relationship to G-flat major, since it functions as $\flat\text{VI}$ (E-double-flat major) of that key. The modulation to D major is specifically achieved by resolving G-flat to a minor chord (m. 167) notated enharmonically as F-sharp minor—or iii of D major—for convenience. Through these major keys (i.e., D-flat, G-flat, and D major), moreover, S extends a warmth that is only briefly held in the exposition (mm. 1–140). There, E-flat major (III) fulfills only a transitory role on the way to the dominant minor, the true secondary key.
Another factor that contributes to the motion forward is the texture gained through \( p^{\text{head}} \)'s addition (mm. 186ff.), since \( p^{\text{head}} \)'s interaction with the existing S and piano layers adds further tension to the misalignment mentioned above. Generally, a growing intensity emerges from here to the development’s end as P and S interchange between the strings; P gradually becomes more prominent while S ultimately reduces to \( S^{\text{head}} \) in three quarter notes (i.e., the upper neighbour figure that wavers on the perfect fourth).\(^{22}\) This \( S^{\text{head}} \) figure eventually appears in the piano as a framework for the triplets towards the development’s end after the piano’s build-up to sixteenth-note texture. Rhythmically, though, the interaction of these layers perpetuates the tension and unrest through this section. \( p^{\text{head}} \) in eighth notes rubs against the

\(^{22}\) As with \( p^{\text{head}} \), I use the label “\( S^{\text{head}} \)” to refer to the head motive of S. Although this three-note figure originally appears within the first few measures of S, I view it as a derivative that originates from the first three notes that initiate S.
piano’s triplets, and eventually produces mid-bar emphasis (mm. 203ff.) in conflict with $S^{\text{head}}$ in the piano in the RT. As Example 3.12 demonstrates, the incongruence of these metrical layers weakens the tonic-articulated D-R border, since the development’s $S^{\text{head}}$-based piano figures continue into the recapitulation (mm. 213–305). The RTC-fill (mm. 208–213) that the V-arrival RTC (m. 208) initiates also occurs over a six-bar hypermeasure with reinterpretation at the recapitulation’s onset. In this way, the recapitulation seems to begin in medias res with its onset only retrospectively realized.

Example 3.12: Incongruent Metrical Layers Soften the D-R Border; Op. 66, I, mm. 208–215
S plays a key role in furthering motion through not only the development (as the paragraphs above discuss), but the recapitulation as well. This is especially because of the oppositional relationship expressed by the hypermetric conflict between both themes in the RT and because S in the development persists through this conflict to beyond the D-R border. S’s stronger role in these formal areas counters P’s insistence and ability to push motion further in the exposition. There in the exposition, the 1P-P\text{\textsuperscript{codetta}} =\text{TR} structure makes P rather lengthy.\hspace{1em}^{23}

More significantly, though, P material returns to overtake S when S in E-flat major (III), the expected key, dissolves by modulating to G minor (v), the true secondary key.\hspace{1em}^{24} The outcome is that S reverts back into TR(P) (mm. 95–105), which features the violin’s mid-bar emphasis. This mid-bar emphasis conflicts with the piano’s regular four-bar hypermeter. S’s brevity and the sense that P overshadows S continue after the move to G minor. There, an additional lyrical theme (mm. 105ff.) derived from P\text{\textsuperscript{codetta}} (mm. 22–42) arises. Even still more 1P material (mm. 128–140) takes hold beyond this theme over a dominant pedal, however. This pedal achieves the v: PAC/EEC (m. 140), which simultaneously initiates the development.

In the recapitulation, a few changes to these events attribute S’s prominence over P. S\text{\textsuperscript{head}}’s continuation past the recapitulation’s start infuses a transitory nature into P’s antecedent phrase (mm. 213–220). P is robbed of the clarity it has in the exposition, especially since the

\hspace{1em}^{23} P’s layout is as follows: 1P (mm. 1–22), P\text{\textsuperscript{codetta}} (mm. 22–42), and P =\text{TR} (mm. 42ff.). 1P is a sixteen-measure period with an eight-measure antecedent and expanded consequent, both in sentence structure.

\hspace{1em}^{24} Mendelssohn’s use of three-key exposition involving an arpeggiation through i–III–v in this movement recalls Beethoven’s \textit{Coriolanus} Overture in C minor, Op. 62. There, an S theme is introduced in the expected key of E-flat major (III) before moving onwards to G minor (v). While Hepokoski and Darcy do not consider these “wrong keys”, they do consider the S-theme’s inability to sustain the major-mode III and resulting susceptibility to slipping into the minor-mode v “tragic”. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 179. This interpretation seems to correspond with the illustration of S’s weaker role in the exposition of this present movement.
metric conflict from S in the development carries on (note the juxtaposition between P’s duple subdivisions and S$^{\text{head}}$ in the piano’s triplets). This perpetuation of conflict inspires the hypermetric incongruences at the start of the consequent phrase (mm. 221ff.) of P$\Rightarrow$TR given the mid-bar emphasis of the violin’s rendition of P against the piano’s. P$\Rightarrow$TR also demonstrates P’s lesser use than in the exposition, as does S’s (mm. 242ff.) exclusion of the TR(P) reversion (in mm. 95–105 of the exposition). These latter P-based zones maintain the opposition between P and S, as does S’s appearance still in the major mode (here, the tonic major), which continues to contrast P’s minor-key association.

In the coda, however, P’s and S’s oppositional relationship begins to waver, even though the coda features P$^{\text{head}}$ throughout its take on the development’s events. Now, P and S adopt essential features from one another as integration and resolution to their earlier opposition. P appears in the rhetorical guise of S in the coda’s tranquillo [e] pianissimo section, first in major and then minor keys on the flat side: A-flat major (VI), C-flat major, E-flat minor, and B-flat minor. The major-mode start is significant as a signal of S, but so is the I–♭III–v or arpeggiated progression. This progression involves the first three keys in A-flat minor which recalls the transitory nature of S’s initial III key in the exposition. E-flat and B-flat minor’s appearances, meanwhile, hark back to the flat keys associated with S in the development (recall D-flat major and G-flat major/minor). At the same time, P preserves its own eighth-note texture and harmonic 5–6 motion (compare mm. 327–331 with mm. 1–4; both produce the subdominant in 6/4 position). With P replacing S here, though, S’s role is decreased, and continues to be when it parallels the development thereafter with an RT-like passage. This passage intensifies P$^{\text{head}}$’s

---

25 Note that S proceeds directly to another lyrical theme (mm. 270ff.) instead before S closes with the same return of Pa material that secured the EEC and that now achieves the i: PAC/ESC (m. 305).
use, crescendo, gradually thickened texture, and ultimately, home-key V⁷ pedal (mm. 349–352) which builds to fortissimo (m. 352). Like the RT, this RT-like passage also reaches material that recalls the recapitulation’s onset given P’s return (mm. 353ff.)—albeit at pitch-level only—on the tonic in the piano. P also becomes more prominent from mm. 353ff. through its augmentation in the strings when it takes on the quarter-note guise formerly given to S’s three-note liquidation in the piano at the recapitulation’s start.

With S’s absence felt acutely in the coda thus far—especially given the coda’s parallelism with the development—attention directs even further to the movement’s end as one wonders if S will reappear again. From mm. 353ff. then, the coda pursues more intensification as it reinforces the tonic. The piano’s P material in eighths builds to octaves before the texture thickens with the onset of sixteenths as fortissimo persists. Eventually, the passage culminates with the static, pounding effect of the repeated and accented I–V⁷ and then tonic articulations (mm. 383–384), which lead to S’s reprise (mm. 386–393). This F-minor (iv) octave rendition with tutti, fortissimo-sforzando onset seems to represent S in P’s guise, especially since S appears for the first time in the minor mode, and in the subdominant nonetheless (recall iv6/4’s use in P). S also ends on a V⁷ chord in this key, which recalls the prominent half-cadence in P’s antecedent phrase to anticipate further completion. As such, S’s iv-key appearance helps to direct the motion even closer towards the movement’s end; P’s (mm. 394–400) octave rendition (fortissimo, a tempo) picks up on the F-minor chord as iv in C minor and drives the movement to its strong close on a series of i: PACs.

S’s F-minor statement near the very end expresses resolution in a couple of ways. F minor’s use to prepare the closing cadences—and therefore resolution—seems to express the transformation of F minor’s role as a destabilizing entity. Although the subdominant is not
typically linked to destabilization, the exposition’s start demonstrates F minor’s function as iv6/4 moving away from the tonic in P. As a key in its own right, F minor also leads away from the secondary key at the development’s start. That S takes on P characteristics seems to suggest integration as resolution, meanwhile, to the more oppositional roles P and S carry against one another throughout most of the movement. S’s integration of P’s characteristics in the coda also balances P’s earlier absorption of S’s in the coda’s tranquillo [e] pianissimo section. These expressions of integration in the coda demonstrate a transformation of P’s and S’s opposition—as one finds especially in the development—such that the thematic D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 articulates a narrative thread through the form. In this transformation, moreover, both P and S help to further the motion towards the movement’s end, where resolution is finally achieved.

ii) The Abstract Development-Coda Pairing

Another narrative that eventually claims resolution—in this case from “blockage”—is suggested by the abstract D-C pairing in the first movement of Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20 (1825). In this subtype of DRT1, the correspondence between development and coda is not as obvious as in the thematic D-C pairings explored thus far, since the development instead forwards specific characteristics for similarity in affect. This DRT1 development (mm. 127–216) is striking for its gentle passage of S recall in F minor (ii) (mm. 164–185), which the coda (mm. 280–318) recaptures abstractly. By comparing Example 3.13a and Example 3.13b below, one sees how the coda eschews restating this passage literally, and opts, instead, to carry on the same characteristics and sense of energy loss that the development presents. The static plagal motions (mm. 173–176) in E-flat major (I) in the development’s core set the precedent for the
coda’s IV use (mm. 290–292) also in the tonic key. In addition, the sense of energy loss is transferred to the coda when IV accompanies what I call “blockage” figures—static sixteenth-note figures that produce a temporary lull in the surface-level motion. As this discussion elaborates further, these “blockage” figures appear intimately tied to F minor (ii) throughout the movement and play a role in the D-C pairing, albeit abstractly. The figures do not appear overtly in the development, but the start of the development’s core takes up the F-minor (“blockage”) key to accompany the recession produced by “soft”, lyrical S material and slow harmonic rhythm. This affect is transferred to the coda; the development’s recession sets up the gentle character of the pianissimo passage (mm. 284–289) in broader durations shortly after the coda’s start. As I discuss below, the resulting abstract D-C pairing becomes a poignant aspect of the movement’s aesthetic of blockage.

Example 3.13: Abstract D-C Pairing via the Preservation of Blockage in Op. 20, I

a) Blockage in the Development; Op. 20, I, mm. 164–177

26 Once again, I use the term “blockage” in a loose sense; that rather than a complete cessation of further motion, “blockage” implies a temporary lull as in this movement.
b) Blockage in the Coda; Op. 20, I, mm. 280–292

Example 3.14: Expositional Blockage; Op. 20, I, mm. 21–37
The way the development reaches an early climax (mm. 137–148) only to draw to a
near-standstill ties into the idea of blockage precisely; it articulates the same sense of crisis that
befalls the coda, where the staccato sixteenth-note figures (refer back to Example 3.13)
reference the blockage from the exposition (see Example 3.14 above). Unlike the exposition,
though, the coda overcomes the blockage produced by these figures when it achieves P’s
climactic cap-off to the movement. As this discussion suggests, the D-C pairing plays an
important role in the movement’s transformation narrative in which blockage—as amplified by

\[ \text{blockage} \]

\[ \text{Pa'} \]

\[ \text{I: PAC} \quad \text{ii [V6/5]} \quad \text{ii V/ii} \quad [V^7]V-----4/2 \quad I^6 \quad \text{V6/4} \quad [V4/3]IV \quad I \]

\[ \text{F-minor tonicization} \quad \text{plagal collapse} \]

---

As a part of this abstract D-C pairing, the development does not recall these sixteenth-note figures. Although the development takes up aspects of blockage from the exposition, moreover, the poignancy of the sense of recession in the development (and subsequently, the coda) urges one to consider the movement within the framework of the pairing.
the development—eventually reaches resolution through recomposition in the recapitulation and coda.  

Blockage is first encountered in the exposition, where B-flat major (the secondary key), is achieved only after a series of diversions involving the staccato sixteenth-note (“blockage”) figures, which fail to move away from E-flat major (the home key). These figures, first introduced in what initially seems to be TR (mm. 21ff.), stay anchored for some time on V of ii (F minor) before reaffirming the I: IAC (m. 21) with another cadence (mm. 25–29) (refer back to Example 3.14). The figures also continue to cling to their F minor allusions immediately thereafter (mm. 29–37), and eventually, their reluctance to leave the home key reveals the Pa (mm. 1–21)-Pb (mm. 21–37)-Pa’=>TR (mm. 37ff.) structure of the opening when Pa returns on the tonic (m. 37). Pa’s restatement is anything but climactic, though; it emerges in piano directly after the plagal collapse of the harmony (mm. 33–37), and therefore results in another manifestation of blockage.

---

28 This interpretation contrasts existing studies of the Octet which focus on the inter-thematic relationships within, and the reuse of themes between, individual movements. See Vitercik (1992), 71–136. These observations on thematic process and cyclicism are expanded on by Benedict Taylor (2011) through his more recent chapter-length study of this piece, which offers analytical insight in this area as well, but contextualizes Mendelssohn’s organic approach, arguing that the Octet’s circular narrative design musically represents similar trajectories prevalent in the literature and philosophy of Mendelssohn’s time. Seeing that for the philosopher, Hegel, in particular, “…the art-work, must…embody the qualities of a self-sustaining inner teleology and organic wholeness” (p. 58), Taylor makes the connection to the Octet, believing that it likewise operates as “a self-generating organic system, coming to self-knowledge at its end through the recollection of its own history in an overall circular journey or spiral journey…” (p. 58). As such, Taylor’s analysis ultimately operates within the framework that “towards the end of the finale..., the musical past becomes increasingly drawn into the present, [as] reminisces of earlier movements are heard fleetingly amidst the seemingly irrepressible drive of the music to its final bars” (p. 52). See Taylor (2011), 52–102.

Although my interpretive reading of the Octet’s opening movement offers a new perspective, the idea that it traces a narrative trajectory towards resolution through recomposition (essentially, transformation) over the course of the form—and as especially expressed through the D-C pairing—provides a fitting complement to Taylor’s emphasis on the Octet’s sense of historical consciousness and self-progression, even if what is brought back in the coda abstractly recalls the events of the development.
In Pa’=>TR, the motion to the true secondary key continues to be impeded by the “blockage” figures, and even when B-flat major is finally achieved, the effects of blockage continue into the S zone. Not only does the primary theme now tonicize F minor in Pa’=>TR, the “blockage” figures ultimately produce a wrong-key MC in G minor. The caesura-fill (mm. 53–59) erodes away the notion of G minor via the G-flat in the bass (m. 58), though, and the move initiates a V pedal (mm. 59–66) in B-flat major to propose a V\(^7\) arrival MC (m. 66) prior to the V: PAC/MC articulation (m. 68) which opens S (mm. 68–113). Coloured by the effects of blockage, S’s continuation phrase becomes multiply expanded, resulting in an indirect route to the EEC. At first, the continuation reverts briefly to G minor prior to suggesting C minor for some time. When the V6/4 pedal (mm. 96–102) seems to stabilize the music more firmly in B-flat major—possibly preparing for the pending close, furthermore—the music suddenly tonicizes E-flat major (i.e., IV; see mm. 102–109) before the V pedal resumes (m. 109), and the V: PAC/EEC (m. 113) is achieved for C(P) (mm. 113–123), the codetta (mm. 123–127), and ultimately, the development to follow.\(^{29}\)

As the movement’s transformation narrative from blockage to resolution continues, the development’s strong thematic tie to the exposition’s layout becomes critical to the development’s amplification of blockage at a larger level; its tie to the exposition sets the groundwork for a development in which an early climax and strong exit are juxtaposed in between by an area that is much gentler by contrast. The F minor emphasis previously accompanied by the “blockage” figures in the exposition is projected as a key in its own right in this gentler section, and is coupled with S to produce blockage—a near-standstill of the

\(^{29}\) The sudden tonicization of IV recalls the plagal collapse of the music leading up to Pa’ earlier in the exposition.
motion—following the development’s highly active and strong start. The development specifically recalls materials from the exposition’s first and second parts: Pa (mm. 127–137), Pb (mm. 137–148), MC-like proposal (m. 147), MC articulation (m. 148), and de-energizing fill (mm. 148–164) prior to S (mm. 164–195). With this overall layout intact, Pb’s revitalized character, now in \textit{tutti} and \textit{fortissimo} (compare Pb here with its expositional appearance in mm. 21–37), allows for the development’s climax earlier rather than later. The development’s “soft” latter portion (i.e., de-energizing fill and lyrical S) also provides a starting point from which RT can build up towards Pa’s marked return at the recapitulation’s (mm. 216–280) start.

Blockage is also amplified at a larger-scale level by the development’s layout. The development’s immediate launch into music of “stormy” character suggests the core’s onset, but given the overt reference to an MC area inclusive of fill material and the reference to calm S thereafter, a two-part core—with recession in its latter portion (i.e., blockage)—seems plausible.\textsuperscript{30} One might also entertain the idea of pre-core fused with core-like properties, whereby the four-measure P\textsuperscript{BI} material (mm. 127–131) is heard as a theme-like unit which retrospectively loosen by becoming energized fill (mm. 132–137) following the downbeat of m. 131. Within this context, the climactic passage (mm. 137–164) can be interpreted as a further preparation zone given the relatively stagnant material (notwithstanding its rhetorical emphasis) and the way the music prepares F minor. This “blockage” key—now the primary development key—is stabilized in the S zone, which can also be thought of as a gentle core (mm. 164–185) and the main bulk of the development.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} In this case, an F-minor PAC/sealed DG in m. 164 initiates core\textsuperscript{part2}.

\textsuperscript{31} Overall, the motion towards the S zone in F minor (the “blockage” key), and the way the music settles in the latter portion, suggest that S might be the main point of the development. One could infer that the weight of S
That the F minor recession featuring S constitutes the development’s core is a strong projection of blockage at the larger-scale level; not only does this F minor material stall the motion, but it also leads to the core’s disintegration to emphasize blockage further. Towards its end, the core dissolves via its *pianissimo* dynamic, sustained notes, omission of eighth-notes (mm. 173–185), and its lingering effect (mm. 186–195) later on. The arrival on V of the home key (m. 195) thereafter initiates the gradual energy build-up, though, so that mm. 186–195 retrospectively suggest RT-prep. Following the blockage represented by the core’s near-standstill, RT then gradually gains strength and grows into fruition. The RT: V proposal in m. 195 is retrospectively suggested by the additional articulation in m. 204, and is accepted in m. 208. Ultimately, the RTC (m. 212) initiates energetic RTC-fill that leads straight to the recapitulation.

The way the recapitulation sets up a more direct route to the ESC than towards the EEC demonstrates the movement’s gradual progression towards resolution from blockage. Here, the small ternary structure (and therefore, the “blockage” figures from Pb) is eschewed so that P=>TR leads directly to the right-key MC (I: V6/4 arrival MC; see m. 233) which launches S (mm. 233–266). The multiple expansions of S’s continuation phrase still appear in the recapitulation, but are not as extensive as they were in the exposition. The lyrical presentation material is not recycled as much here, and the blockage cited earlier with the strong in the development fulfills one of a few compensatory relationships to the exposition. In the development, S’s broad, lyrical, and relatively stable expanse directly contrasts the exposition’s more “developmental” treatment of S (mm. 68–113), and the rather clear reference to an MC-like area in the development compensates for the initially less clear situation involving the exposition’s wrong-key MC. The climactic Pb material in the development also sharply juxtaposes its first appearance in the exposition (mm. 21–37), where it lacked rhetorical emphasis.

32 The PAC confirming B-flat major (V) in m. 185 would seem to support this interpretation.
subdominant inflections (mm. 102–109) is adjusted to tonicize V of the home key for a more straightforward path to the I: PAC/ESC (m. 266), which initiates C(P) (mm. 266–276).

Then, the coda recomposes previous aspects significantly to resolve blockage for the movement’s strong, triumphant close. The coda maintains its developmental tie since it produces a similar reference to F minor (i.e., V of F minor, now the coda’s first harmonic goal; see mm. 280–283), a *pianissimo* passage that mimics S’s sustained-note texture (mm. 284–289), and later intensification (mm. 290–313). The recomposition of Pb material leading to the coda is a key to the movement’s transformation from blockage to resolution. Previously the climax of the development where it facilitated the modulation to F minor, Pb is now adjusted to remain in the tonic as a four-bar codetta (mm. 276–280). Once in coda space, the “blockage” figures return (mm. 280–283) as a momentary crisis in which the motion nearly ceases. Ultimately, though, their reappearance offers a way to resolve the complications the exposition introduces.

In stark contrast to the lead-up to the anticlimactic return of Pa’ (m. 37) and wrong-key MC in the exposition, namely, the coda recomposes the “blockage” figures to bring the movement home. After a momentary detour to IV (i.e., via the unexpected G♭ in m. 284 and the bass D♭), the figures shed their negative association; they initiate the expanded cadential progression that reaffirms the home key (mm. 290–312). This progression also builds up to P’s brief, yet triumphant return (mm. 313–318) which caps off the movement. The abstract D-C pairing subtype of DRT1 is therefore important to the movement’s transformation from blockage to resolution. The coda resolves the development’s amplification of the blockage introduced by the sixteenth-note figures’s F-minor allusions (i.e., the lethargic core’s F minor key). The coda

---

33 The reinterpretation of the subdominant in the coda also demonstrates a resolution of the home-key plagal motions (mm. 173–177), which accompany S in disintegrating the development’s core.
reintroduces the “blockage” figures into this F minor recession, namely, but recomposes them so that they cease to impede, and instead, participate in the movement’s homecoming via transformation and resolution in the end.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Through this chapter on \textbf{DRT1}, I have shown the importance of \textbf{thematic and abstract development-coda pairings} to the narratives across several of Mendelssohn’s movements and the overall aesthetic these movements seem to convey. Through the unique ways in which DRT1 developments project themselves onto coda space—through a distinguishable theme, material from a specific zone, entire thematic layout, or abstract idea—each D-C pairing is an integral part of the narrative that arises. In \textbf{Op. 11 (II)}, the development projecting its RT-complex onto the coda sets the framework for the slight recomposition of the material to convey resolution. Similarly, in \textbf{Op. 105 (I)}, the movement’s stronger finish is achieved by the development forwarding its RT material to the coda, where the material takes on a more aggressive drive for the transformation of $\text{P}^{\text{head}}$ to ultimately occur. The development’s imprinting of entire thematic layouts onto the coda in \textbf{Op. 11 (I), Op. 11 (IV), and Op. 87 (I)}, meanwhile, provides a greater sense of resolution and helps to build towards climactic, apotheosis-like ends. Still, more intricate narratives demonstrate transformation towards N’s resolution in the home key, D’s stabilization, and P’s and S’s stronger integration of one another in \textbf{Op. 44/3 (III), Op. 2 (I), and Op. 66 (I)}, respectively. While \textbf{Op. 20 (I)} stands apart

\textsuperscript{34} Narratives of liberation from evasion or blockage via transformation and subsequent resolution are facilitated by DRT2 developments like those in Op. 12 (I) and Op. 87 (III), which are discussed in the next chapter.
for its abstract D-C pairing, moreover, the sense of narrative is just as strong, articulating the gradual journey towards resolution from blockage.

Through the development forwarding material to the coda in DRT1, these narratives transpire across the form to the ends of movements, despite rather sharply articulated D-R borders and claimed ESCs. The following chapter shows the development in DRT2, which contributes to the increasingly end-weighted trajectories of movements when, by contrast, material from the development participates in delaying the ESC closer towards the end of the form.
Chapter 4
Developmental Relationship Type 2 (DRT2): The Development Forwards Material Towards the Movement’s End which Participates in Deferring the ESC to a Later Point

DRT2 developments, like DRT1, generate ties to the ends of movements when they forward material there. Although far less common, this DRT2 connection carries stronger structural weight, since the material the development forwards—either a literal or feigned developmental reference—delays the ESC to a later point than expected. In this chapter, I explore the three examples of DRT2 developments found amongst Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. I pursue these developments in order of their composition date: the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 3 in B-flat major, Op. 106 (1827), the first movement of String Quartet No. 1 in E-flat major, Op. 12 (1829), and the third movement of String Quintet No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 87 (1845).

Literal references involve the explicit return of developmental material. Op. 106 (I) shows how a literal reference, via the return of a distinct passage from the development, “compensates” for some “deficiency” encountered earlier in the form.\(^1\) Op. 12 (I) then demonstrates a literal reference via N’s return, which plays an active role in carrying out the movement’s overall narrative. At first, N appears as evasion in the development, but then

\(^1\) The terms “compensation” and “deficiency” denote no negative value judgment whatsoever with regards to the aesthetic construct of the movement in question. For lack of better terms, these words simply convey that the developmental reference plays a crucial, transformative role in recomposing earlier aspects from an analogous position in the form to help these aspects fulfill more normative tendencies as part of a larger all-encompassing strategy for the movement.
ultimately transforms when it disintegrates and facilitates resolution in the apparent coda. As third and final analysis, I then explore the **feigned developmental reference** in Op. 87 (III). The feigned developmental reference is a less obvious method by which developments forward material to defer ESCs. At first, this subcategory of DRT2 seems to recall the development as a literal reference towards the movement’s end before this reference turns out to be thematic material of a different sort. As I suggest through my interpretation of the movement, the material still remains crucial to the positive outcome of the narrative spanning the form. Together, my analyses demonstrate how each kind of reference expands the recapitulatory S zone in one of three ways. These developmental references expand the recapitulatory S zone by:

1. adding to the process of ESC evasion within recapitulatory space as in Op. 106 (I);
2. initiating an apparent coda which exhibits an obvious parallelism with the development as in Op. 12 (I);
3. seeming to initiate an apparent coda at first, but ultimately serving as S expansion still within the recapitulation, as in Op. 87 (III). Despite these variances, all three analyses collectively highlight the importance of **literal** and **feigned developmental references** in the end-weighted designs these movement encompass.

**i) Literal Developmental Reference**

In the **first movement of Piano Sonata No. 3 in B-flat major, Op. 106 (1827)**, the DRT2 development forwards a **literal reference** towards the end which evades the ESC into the apparent coda. There, the ESC is achieved triumphantly through sufficient build-up. As such, the movement finishes more strongly. The apparent coda’s more satisfying rendition of P’s return also “compensates” for the recapitulation’s somewhat dissatisfying onset earlier in the
form. Drawing its thematic inspiration from the movement’s monothematic exposition (mm. 1–81a), the development (mm. 81a–120) features a fugue-like theme based on $P^{BI}$ (mm. 1–3) throughout, which facilitates the basic idea’s reintroduction in its original form to anticipate the recapitulation’s start. This fugue-like theme initiates the core (mm. 81–95) and is eventually sequenced (mm. 91–95) towards the transition leading to the RT-prep zone. The core gradually becomes RT-prep in the way that $P^{BI}$ is incorporated into a two-measure sequential model headed by the fugue-like theme (mm. 95–98), and in how the fugue-like theme reintroduces the “hammer” motive (mm. 99–102) before breaking down (mm. 103–106) to allow for the motive’s increased prominence. Three consecutive articulations of this motive lead directly into RT-prep (mm. 107–110). There, a near-exact version of $P^{BI}$ comes into fruition, repeated once per measure in the vi key above a bass ascent from B to F. This ascent culminates in increased harmonic rhythm and $P^{BI}$’s fragmentation (m. 110) towards the RT: V proposal (m. 111) in the tonic key. With this articulation, the fugue-like theme reappears in the right hand and initiates the RT-complex with RT1 (mm. 111–116) (see Example 4.1). Here, the RT: V pedal is proposed and secured, and the music begins to crescendo towards m. 116 for the RTC, which initiates RT2, or as it functions here in this movement, RTC-fill (mm. 116–119). This energetic

---

2 The “compensation” here might bring DRT3 to mind, but Op. 106 (I) is different. The movement’s DRT2 designation (as this analysis will make clear) comes from the sense that the movement’s literal reference to developmental material seems principally for the purpose of not only claiming a more satisfying rendition of P’s return in the apparent coda than at the recapitulation’s start, but also evading the ESC to a later point where a much stronger version can materialize. In the next chapter, by contrast, two DRT3 finales from Opp. 6 and 56 demonstrate that “compensation”—in the form of a lengthy V pedal aiming for the ESC and not its evasion—happens much later into the apparent coda to facilitate the movement’s greater sense of arrival, albeit much closer to the end.

3 The change in direction of the melodic line and the appearance of a closer representation of the original $P^{BI}$ in m. 116 suggest that the RTC occurs on the downbeat of that measure. In m. 115, forte is reached as well, and the left hand exhibits greater intensity in surface rhythm leading up to that moment which also falls on a hypermetric downbeat (i.e., mm. 111–115 constitute a hypermetric group of five measures).
RTC-fill in *fortissimo* culminates with the development’s strong ending and continues to articulate $P^{\text{BI}}$ to anticipate $P$’s return in the recapitulation.

**Example 4.1: The Development’s RT-complex; Op. 106, I, mm. 111–122**
The recapitulation mostly corresponds with the exposition. Given the movement’s monothematic design and exclusively P-based development, however, changes forego S(P) after the I: IAC/MC (m. 145) until P’s recall at the movement’s very end. P (mm. 120–145) leads directly into the apparent C (mm. 145–165) theme, namely, which gets expanded via a descending stepwise sequence (mm. 159–164) so that the codetta is excised. The sequential motion loosens the pull towards, and ultimately abandons, the ESC and dissolves the apparent C zone into another RT (mm. 165–171), but this time to the apparent coda (mm. 171–191).

This RT to the apparent coda recaptures development through its return to 4/4 time in a movement otherwise in 2/4, and more specifically, when it recalls RT1 almost exactly (see Example 4.2 below).\(^4\) Measures 165–168 parallel mm. 111–114 precisely. Whereas RT1 consists of a five-bar hypermeasure (i.e., the fifth hyperbeat falls on m. 115), however, the RT to the apparent coda does not. In this latter zone in the movement, the retransitional dominant receives its final articulation (m. 169) on a hypermetric downbeat before fill leads directly to the apparent coda’s onset (m. 171).\(^5\) The result is the original RT zone’s compression and a more direct path to P’s return at the peak of the crescendo from pianissimo straight to forte. This alteration is effective for the apparent coda’s climactic onset and for rectifying the somewhat anticlimactic moment leading up to the recapitulation’s start. There, P\(^\text{BI}\) appears at pitch level on the I\(^6\) chord (m. 118) prior to P’s true return a couple of measures later.

\(^4\) The development occurred entirely in 4/4 time. In the recapitulation, the codetta facilitates this change in meter by altering the melodic figuration to suggest a four-note descent in the right hand over a span of two measures in 2/4 (mm. 163–164). The link to development (mm. 78–81) also segues to 4/4 time by thickening the texture in mm. 80–81.

\(^5\) It is also possible to interpret mm. 165–170 as a hypermetric group of six measures, but m. 169 caps off the ascent begun in m. 165, and is also the turning point, with regards to melodic direction, as seen in the right hand.
Example 4.2: Literal Reference to the Development’s RT-complex; Op. 106, I, mm. 165–172

RT1’s insertion to evade the ESC therefore allows for the movement’s culmination with P’s strong rendition, which delivers a stronger sense of return that in a way makes up for any “deficiencies” along the path towards achieving the recapitulation earlier. The development’s recall at this point also avoids a weak ESC. This articulation parallels the rather fragile VI: IAC/EEC (m. 74), and instead, allows for a declamatory I: PAC/ESC (m. 182) later in the apparent coda, where it is prepared for quite sufficiently. As a result, the tonic prolongation

Note specifically how the ESC is strongly anticipated by the reiteration of cadential material and the increasing dynamics in mm. 178–180. Given the movement’s success through this very moment of ESC situated
following immediately thereafter at the very end of the movement solidifies closure, and provides a satisfying counterweight to the V pedal recalled through RT1’s resurrection. In this way, the DRT2 development forwards a literal developmental reference that evades the ESC and fulfills some kind of “compensatory” function later in the form.

The DRT2 development in the opening movement of String Quartet No. 1 in E-flat major, Op. 12 (1829) also provides a literal reference to be recalled that ultimately plays a strong role in the narrative through the form. In this movement, more specifically, the ominous theme (N; mm. 245–258) from the development returns and defers the ESC to the apparent coda (mm. 245–292), resulting in yet a further instance of evasion on the movement’s path towards overcoming adversity. Here, though, evasion is surpassed when N fades for P’s return (mm. 259ff.), which finally achieves closure through a gentle I: PAC/ESC (m. 274) as if to suggest the quiet resignation that can follow a long period of struggle. This artistically sensitive end eschews a recapitulation that is failed, since it provides a positive outcome—one that is facilitated by the delayed ESC via N’s return—to the movement’s overall narrative. This narrative cycles through instances of evasion and unfulfilled recollections of P (mm. 18–37) to ultimately reclaim P’s unsullied state from the exposition’s (mm. 18–93) start. There, P (see Example 4.3) attains closure easily through its straightforwardness (its cadential segment

now closer to the end, the recapitulation—and as it follows, this sonata movement—seems far from insufficient, even though its nonclosure signals “failure” by Hepokoski-and-Darcian standards. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 177–178. To attribute any notions of failure to this or any sonata by virtue of its mere lack of ESC seems premature at best, however, because it discounts how the evasion, working in conjunction with other musical factors, might, on the contrary, point to a movement’s ultimate success. This movement, in particular, offers a strong critique of Hepokoski and Darcy’s term “failed recapitulation” (or “sonata failure”) especially since to refer to the recapitulation of Op. 105 (I) in this way would be to unjustly overlook the successful aesthetic trajectory the movement achieves through its triumphant close, which the ESC’s evasion makes possible in the first place (consider, by comparison, the effectiveness of this—Mendelssohn’s triumphant close—against the ineffectiveness of an ESC paralleling the earlier, albeit weak, VI: IAC/EEC in the recapitulation had the ESC not been evaded and subsequently delayed). As such, this present study offers the term “recapitulation with non-attained ESC” as a possible substitute.
descends to a gentle I: PAC in m. 37). As this discussion explores, however, this uncomplicated state soon becomes an ideal of the past.

Example 4.3: Expositional P; Op. 12, I, mm. 18–41

The development’s downplayed E-D and D-R borders have a role in the most striking cycles through evasion and unfulfilled P-recall in this movement. The cycle which involves the E-D border begins with the blocked EEC (mm. 83–84) that initiates P insertion (mm. 86–93). P’s recollection here is unsatisfying, though. The two statements of $P^{BI}$ in B-flat major (V), the secondary key, which make up P insertion get interrupted unexpectedly by a third $P^{BI}$ statement,
although in E-flat major. This third statement of $P^{BI}$ sounds like the start of an expositional repeat in which $P$ seems on-track to closure. As Example 4.4 demonstrates, however, $P$’s higher-level consequent is interrupted by new, ominous material (mm. 105ff.) on V/ii so that evasion happens again, and the development (mm. 94–176) makes its presence known. One essentially realizes that the development feigns the start of an expositional repeat where $P$ still remains an ideal. Retrospectively, then, $P$ insertion serves postcadential function to m. 85 near the end of the exposition, where the EEC should have materialized, but did not. This sense of evaded EEC is heightened by $P$ insertion’s appearance: while mm. 89 and 93 seem to articulate V: IACs, these articulations reflect cadential content only at best, not cadential function. The segments which lead to these articulations both hold initiating function ($P^{BI}$ and its repeat) as well, and the energy wanes by the end of $P^{BI}$’s immediate repeat (note the ritardando). The development’s start on $P$ material in the tonic also clarifies the movement’s three-part structure, wherein the development prolongs the tonic $Stufe$, and is left to find its own path to the structural dominant.

7 One retrospectively realizes this material to be a new theme ($N$) of the development. After the pre-core (mm. 94–105) dissolves into the core (mm. 105–150), more specifically, $N$ (mm. 107ff.) is introduced by two measures of preparation (mm. 105–106; note that the V/ii chord reharmonizes the melodic ending of the lower-level antecedent within the larger consequent phrase). Not only is the texture reduced and played in pianissimo, the eighth-note stream amongst sustained notes collectively serves as backdrop to the pending theme entering a couple of measures later (mm. 107–122). The extension of the fourth hyperbeat (mm. 105–106) also helps to express the pre-core’s dissolution.

8 The distinction between content and function—that the formal function of an individual segment does not depend on its motivic content is a main tenet of Caplin’s theory. See Caplin (1998), 4; see also p. 14 for an example of incongruence between content and function in the main theme of the second movement of Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 1 in C major, Op. 15.

9 For more on three-part tonal structures of sonata form movements (i.e., the ternary sonata as exemplified by this movement), see Adrian (1990): 57–80.
Example 4.4: The E-D border; Op. 12, I, mm. 83–106

This structural dominant is never achieved, though, and the striking cycle which involves the D-R border makes this known. For this cycle, the development amplifies evasion through an A-minor passage (mm. 131–150) at a tritone away from the home key before recollection can occur. This passage of heightened tension features P’s return and breakdown in *fortissimo* mid-development, and culminates from the building tension of the ascending stepwise sequence and
chromatic ascent, which N (mm. 107–114) initiates (see Examples 4.5a and 4.5b).\(^{10}\) P’s breakdown here in A minor seems to suggest frustration at evasion, since the multiple entrances on P’s initial segment in all the voices (mm. 131–138) create a tension that is previously unmet. P’s head motive then returns again as culmination of the fragmentation immediately thereafter (mm. 139–142). This reiteration initiates an aggressive drive towards further evasion at the climax of the development (note the repeated, accented, *fortissimo* A-minor chord in *tutti*; mm. 149–150).

---

\(^{10}\) As the sequence progresses, the texture also thickens, and the music gradually crescendos towards the revelation of N’s connection to S (mm. 123–131). The violin lines also fragment (mm. 127–131) for further intensification towards the A minor passage mid-development.
Example 4.5a: N Builds Tension via an Ascending Sequence towards P’s Breakdown; Op. 12, I, mm. 107–130

N increases tension via fragmentation
Locally, this A-minor chord functions as ii which prepares S’s (mm. 151–156) expressive rendition in G minor (iii). Now transformed, S’s diminished-seventh descent creates an air of pathos before subsequent fragmentation (mm. 156–163) tries again to surpass evasion, albeit unsuccessfully; the music culminates in fortissimo, but amounts only to stillness (m. 163).
A strong sense of anticipation then ensues (mm. 163–176) which is marked by rising chromaticism as the search for P in its ideal state continues.\textsuperscript{11}

As mm. 171–176 make clear, this desire for P is hardly fulfilled when it arises unexpectedly at the start of the recapitulation due to the underplayed D-R border. In this passage, P in the home key is essentially unprepared, especially when, in the context of considerable stillness, the music more strongly suggests G minor.\textsuperscript{12} The sustained D-major chord (mm. 171–176) anticipates resolution to G minor (iii), the local tonic, which faintly appears in \textit{pianissimo} and \textit{ritardando} at the end of m. 176. There, the G-minor chord is downplayed by its brief appearance a few measures earlier (see the latter half of m. 172) as a subsidiary passing sonority within the broader context of the D-major prolongation (note that mm. 173–176 constitute an augmentation of mm. 171–172 with the inner voices flipped) rather than being heard as a prolonged harmony in and of itself. When \textit{a tempo} returns (m. 180) already midway through P, one retrospectively realizes the onset of the recapitulation (mm. 177–244) a couple of measures earlier; there, P had already begun, albeit rhetorically obscured with E-flat major’s lack of preparation. As it turns out, the D-major chord’s local function as V of G minor (iii) distracts from its larger role as VII\textsuperscript{♯} to I substituting for V at the background level. For P, this highly underplayed thematic and tonal return at the D-R border seems to

\textsuperscript{11} Note the sustained notes in \textit{piano} and the lethargically intoned versions of the three-note ascending motive from mm. 156–162, now in the second violin, namely.

\textsuperscript{12} The role that G minor (iii) has in amplifying evasion in the development is an outgrowth of its presence as a local vi chord blocking the MC (mm. 53–54) in the exposition (to be further discussed). The emphasis on V/iii at the close of this development also recalls the Classical fondness—as exemplified specifically by Mozart’s music (e.g., the first movements of his K. 332 and K. 333) and in the music of mid-Haydn—for V/vi near the end of a development (although V/vi is followed by an intervening dominant before the recapitulation’s onset on the tonic). For more on Mozart’s use of V/vi to close the development, see Beach (1983): 1–29. For more with regards to Haydn, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 221–228.
suggest further unfulfillment following the sense of evasion from several measures back (mm. 149–150; 158). For the development at large, the expectation for RT perpetuates anticipation until the recapitulation’s onset. In the latter half of the development, RT-prep occurs (mm. 152–162; 163–176) after P’s climactic breakdown mid-development. RT never arises, though, and the end of the development fuses to the start of the recapitulation (mm. 177–244).

The underplayed thematic and tonal return perpetuates the cycle of evasion and desire to reclaim P’s original state towards the movement’s end. In the recapitulation, this end is facilitated through TR’s excision, such that P (mm. 177–193) leads directly to S (mm. 194ff.). This setup drastically contrasts the evasion first triggered by TR (mm. 35–58) and S’s ultimately unsuccessful efforts to secure the EEC in the exposition at the movement’s start. There, beginning with the sequence in m. 45, the thickened texture, and dynamic build-up, the music intensifies only to be brought to a halt by the blocked MC (see the declamatory vi of B-flat major chords in fortissimo; mm. 53–54). This blocked MC initiates textural and dynamic thinning in a fill-like manner for a shadow of an MC (see the V6/5 arrival on the downbeat of m. 57)—and S’s (mm. 59–85) resigned start on the tonic of B-flat major (V)—to emerge. At first, S appears as a regular eight-measure sentence (mm. 59–67) en route to closure. Evasion persists, however, when S’s ending is evaded by the change to a tempo and the first violin’s shift to F5 in fortepiano (m. 67). When S tries again through its repeat (mm. 67–84), S’s original eight-measure model form is lengthened to eighteen and its continuation phrase is internally

---

13 For another example of a new-key vi-chord MC block, see the first movement of Mozart’s Symphony No. 38 in D major, K. 504 (“Prague”). For more on the blocked MC itself, see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 47–48.

14 The tonic-chord opening of S is suggested by the placement of local scale degree 1 on the downbeat of m. 59 (the lower bass note F, which may hint at a 6/4 opening is subsidiary; the bassline in mm. 45–59 completes a stepwise ascent from E♭2 to B♭2 in the cello).
expanded (mm. 75–84). The continuation phrase’s gradual intensification towards a *fortissimo* V\(^7\) arrival (mm. 83–84) brings the music to an abrupt halt, and results in a blocked EEC.\(^{15}\) This S layout and blocked EEC set the precedence for S in the recapitulation, which remains mostly the same and evades the ESC.\(^{16}\)

After S, the end of the recapitulation dissolves into the apparent coda. When the transition (mm. 225–244) to the coda evades the ESC, it is extended in comparison to its expositional statement (compare mm. 86ff.); given the way the two-note fragments descend in *diminuendo*, mm. 229–232 seem to dissolve away for the addition of mm. 233–244. This latter passage gradually approaches the Ger. 6/ii chord (mm. 243–244) in stepwise motion, where the music halts after fading in *pianissimo*. Evasion returns in the form of N pushing the ESC even further, but seems to disintegrate now towards the movement’s end.\(^{17}\) As **Example 4.6** demonstrates, the immediate repetition in the theme’s continuation phrase (mm. 253–258) temporarily weakens the hypermeter, as the third and fourth hypermetric beats are twice reiterated (i.e., 3–4–3–4) before the last of these is drawn out across three measures (mm. 256–258) and fades to *pianissimo*.

\(^{15}\) The EEC’s evasion almost seems to make up for the blocked MC, where *fortissimo* triple stops articulated vi rather than a V chord (see m. 53).

\(^{16}\) S keeps the eight-measure sentence form of its initial statement (mm. 194–201), while the sixteen-measure model of S’s repeat (mm. 202–224) is also expanded, although differently towards S’s end. In contrast to the exposition’s quasi-chromatic bass ascent in the continuation phrase in S’s latter half (mm. 75–79), the recapitulation features a descent (mm. 210–218), and evasion is extended to include not only a couple measures, but an additional hypermetric group of six (mm. 219–224).

\(^{17}\) Like its original statement, the reprisal of the development’s theme suggests F minor (ii). F minor also holds aesthetic weight in the opening movement of Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20, where it appears as “blockage” or an aspect to be overcome.
Example 4.6: N’s Return in the Apparent Coda; Op. 12, I, mm. 245–259

With evasion now removed, P’s return (mm. 259–274) is achieved. In its highest register thus far, P proposes a I: IAC/ESC (m. 266), and then mounts to the movement’s highest pitch in *forte* (mm. 269–270), after which the music diminuendos to two measures of cadential V harmony (mm. 272–273) for the I: PAC/ESC. Repetitions of P’s head motive descend gently towards a *pianissimo* ending above sustained notes in the lower strings (mm. 275–292). The metric displacement created by the shift of grouping structure to mid-bar position distorts the
sense of regular hypermeter (mm. 282–286), meanwhile. This occurs before the eighth-note
descent disintegrates the A↓–B↓–A↓–G figure (mm. 285–286) and initiates a textural reduction
towards the final three measures. These effects, in addition to the melodic use of ↓7 above the
tonic pedal sustained to the very end, suggest a sense of peace, rest, and fulfilment, which result
from P’s ultimate ability to overcome evasion in the end when it reclaims closure like its ideal
state at the start. The literal developmental reference subtype of DRT2—the return of the
development’s theme to delay the ESC into the apparent coda—is therefore artistically sensible
and crucial to the movement’s overall aesthetic; it allows for P to be reprised in a way that is all
the more meaningful to the journey as a whole.

ii) Feigned Developmental Reference

DRT2 developments do not always forward a literal reference, though. A feigned
reference plays a role in the ESC’s delay and transformation in the D-minor third movement
of String Quintet No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 87 (1845). Here, the P-based development (mm.
39–52) facilitates transformation as expressed by the recapitulation’s (mm. 53–102) more fluid
take on the expositional materials (mm. 1–39). The development facilitates this transformation
when its RTC-fill (mm. 51–52) figures continue through the D-R border and direct attention
towards the standing-on-the-V theme (mm. 64–70; compare mm. 24–30), which the MC
proposal (m. 64) initiates. This theme, in turn, leads directly to S (mm. 70ff.) and shortly to the

---

18 The RTC-fill material which carries over the D-R boundary is a textural, rather than thematic/melodic
element, and still contributes to the D-R boundary being sharply articulated (note specifically, the thin solo texture
preceding the recapitulation and the change to tutti along with a slight modification in the figuration, which
demarcate the recapitulation’s onset). As the discussion of developments in DRT5 will demonstrate, this instance of
solo texture continuing into the recapitulation while still maintaining the border distinction directly contrasts Op. 64
spot (m. 79) analogous to the start of the development. There, the ESC is evaded and P returns (mm. 79–88)—albeit transformed—as if to suggest an apparent coda whose thematic composition recalls the development’s. Ultimately, though, any implication of an apparent coda is feigned, since one realizes P’s role as insertion when S returns (mm. 87ff.) and achieves the ESC (m. 94) closer to the movement's end.

That the development’s RTC-fill figures extend past the D-R border and facilitate the flow and coherence between thematic materials by the movement’s end carries strong narrative implications. This discussion suggests that the shift from disunity (as expressed especially in the development) to unity (as alluded to beyond the development) articulates the movement’s quest for resolution and fulfillment from blockage via transformation, which the development strives for by reaching beyond its boundaries to P’s ultimate return (i.e., the feigned reference).

Disunity due to blockage—specifically via the intrusion of the diminished-seventh sonority—is the development’s central feature. It is also the main cause of the development’s brief and unsuccessful stint in aspiring to articulate P fully (for P’s full statement, see mm. 1–10). Even given the tendency for slow movements to have shorter developments than first movements or finales, the brevity of the current one stands out. Its contents also present

(III). There, the element continuing into the recapitulation is thematic/melodic and is accompanied by greater continuity throughout the texture so that, by contrast, a minimally articulated D-R boundary results, which, in addition to the Concerto’s lack of E-D border, maintains the categorical distinction between the two movements.

19 Note specifically how P’s return in the recapitulation arises at an analogous spot to where the development begins. Note also that at the development’s start, P material appears in the first violin above the rippling thirty-second-note texture in the inner parts. At the movement’s end, the first violin also features P’s return above a rippling thirty-second-note accompaniment, albeit more cohesively. As this discussion elaborates, this ultimate rendition’s tie to the development is also given by the rippling thirty-second-note stream of RTC-fill that transforms P at the recapitulation’s start.
discernible obstacles to musical unfolding. As Example 4.7 demonstrates, the development, begins immediately with its core, and consists of only a four-bar model (mm. 39–42) and its sequencing—just once—up a minor third (mm. 43–46) before the RT: vii\(^{7}\) proposal-turned V6/5 arrival RTC (mm. 48–50) initiates the development’s breakdown fairly early on. The sense of the development ending too soon via a vii\(^{7}\) RT proposal is but one aspect of blockage preventing the development from fully realizing P, however. Diminished-seventh and V,9/7 sonorities (mm. 41–42; 45–46) intrude upon P within the model itself and its subsequent sequential iteration.

Example 4.7: The Development; Op. 87, III, mm. 39–53

---

20 Among Mendelssohn’s four other slow movements in type-3 format (i.e., the second movements of Opp. 2, 4, and 11, and the third movement of Op. 44/3), this development is, in fact, the shortest, accounting for 15% of this present string-quintet movement’s length. This proportion is unusually low for Mendelssohn’s slow movements, it being more than doubled in Op. 2 (II) (31%) and nearly doubled in Opp. 4 (II) (26%) and 44/3 (III) (27%). Op. 11 (II) (18%) demonstrates a proportion closer to that of Op. 87 (III), but as the opening DRT1 discussion of Op. 11 (II) reveals in the previous chapter, the development there unfolds continuously without the obstacles encountered in the development of Op. 87 (III) which amplify the terseness explored here in this present discussion.
The development’s premature end is only the beginning, though. Together, the development’s failure to claim P because of blockage and the development’s resultant fragmented nature
inspire the search for greater continuity. This sense of continuity is represented by the change to stronger thematic coherence in the recapitulation. Through the extension of its RTC-fill figures past the D-R border, then, the development continues its influence. These figures transform the exposition’s materials, now in the recapitulation, to be more continuous such that the individual elements appear less stagnant and more unified than they did before. Most significantly, the majority of TR (mm. 10–30) (i.e., where the emphatic diminished-seventh chords originate) is excised. P=>TR (mm. 53–70) provides further emphasis on the standing-on-the-V theme to “compensate” for the development’s lack of pedal earlier in the RT (mm. 48–52), as such. S (mm. 70ff.), meanwhile, returns in the cello and alludes to the major mode of the tonic key. P’s return as insertion (now prominent in the upper register above the tremolos) also seems to signify the resolution and fulfillment that the development had aspired for. With the development’s essence residing in P insertion within the confines of the form (as opposed to coda material), integration seems also to be suggested as a resolution to the fact that the development is prevented earlier from reaching its potential. The development’s curtness (especially in comparison to the exposition) almost seems to convey the development’s near exclusion or, at least, that the development is stopped from expressing what it sets out to.

That the development rises above blockage/adversity and finds fulfillment is celebrated by the tutti texture here and the way the music crescendos into the fortissimo onset (the loudest dynamic thus far) of D major, again signalling transformation. Not only this, but the development’s fulfillment via P’s return also leads to S’s triumphant apotheosis (mm. 88–94; the theme now played in the upper register and sempre forte) as further representation of the far-

---

The thematic components of the exposition had appeared as discrete elements: P (mm. 1–10); TR (mm. 10–30); S (mm. 30–39) with V: IAC/EEC in m. 39.
reaching positivity resulting from the development’s quest to find fulfillment. As resolution, the development achieves even greater continuity by eliding the end of P’s return with S, an ultimate expression of unity as a symbol outshining the sense of separateness, fragmentation, and suppression caused earlier by blockage.

To this effect, unity is specifically expressed by the greater sense of continuous stepwise motion in P’s transformation which incites the stronger integration of P’s isolated upward leaps (i.e., its “sigh” gestures) into the overall melodic line leading to S’s apotheosis. As a comparison between P’s original form from the exposition’s start and P’s transformed version towards the movement’s end demonstrates (see Examples 4.8a and 4.8b), the motion through P’s transformed version is made continuous.\textsuperscript{22} The way P’s transformation ascends above the rest of the ensemble also stands as corrective to P’s representation in the development. There, in addition to being fragmented, the violin plays P solemnly in its lower register. P also remains grounded by the development’s chromatic bass descent which continues onwards throughout. This descent modulates from the movement’s dominant minor (A minor) to C major (,VII)—both which avoid the raised leading tone—before heading back to D minor.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} Note the more uniform use of register throughout and the change from PAC (as seen in m. 4) to the deceptive cadence in m. 82, such that P’s first four measures lead smoothly into its latter portion (mm. 83–88; compare mm. 5–10) before flowing onwards into S.

\textsuperscript{23} The change in register from mm. 43–44 constitutes an octave displacement so that the descent remains playable within the cello’s range.
Example 4.8a: Original P; Op. 87, III, mm. 1–10

Example 4.8b: Transformed P towards the Movement’s End; Op. 87, III, 79–88
Now, with the development’s fulfillment via the unity inspired by the figuration spanning the D-R border—and ultimately P’s transformation coupled with S’s apotheosis after the development’s earlier breakdown due to blockage—the I: PAC/ESC is achieved (m. 94). Everything is laid to rest; the codetta (mm. 94–102) resides on a tonic pedal as the first violin drifts upwards to a still point on the highest note (m. 98) of the movement, this before floating downwards in resolution. In this way, this DRT2 movement, with its feigned developmental reference and journey of transformation from blockage to resolution, draws to a peaceful and fulfilled close.

Conclusion

Through this chapter, I have demonstrated that DRT2 developments generate strong ties to the rest of the form when they forward literal or feigned developmental references. These references play a role in delaying ESCs when they expand recapitulatory S zones, and in so doing, facilitate the end-weighted structures of movements. The first movements of Op. 106 and Op. 12 have respectively shown how literal references further the ESC’s evasion, either as part of S expansion or when they initiate an apparent coda which clearly corresponds with the development. With its feigned reference, the third movement of Op. 87 seems like a mix of these two on the other hand. The reference initially appears to correspond with the development to initiate an apparent coda. As it turns out, however, the reference remains within recapitulatory space as P insertion expanding S. In each of these movements, the development plays an active role in furthering the action towards the end for a stronger aesthetic finish than would be proposed if the expositional end were to be preserved for the recapitulation’s close. To this effect, all three movements show substantial recomposition of the weak IAC/EECs they
respectively achieve or at least propose. Their developments soften the D-R border—or at least lessen the weight of the recapitulation’s start—to various degrees, and make the return of development material all the more satisfying when it participates in achieving structural resolution by temporarily delaying it. Put together, these aspects are important to the end-weighted trajectory of Op. 106 (I) and the end-directed narratives of transformation in Op. 12 (I) and Op. 87 (III). Such narratives and end-weighted structures continue to be facilitated by the DRT3 developments I explore in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5
Developmental Relationship Type 3 (DRT3): RT Calls for “Compensation” Towards the End of the Movement

As I have shown in Chapter 4, DRT2 developments strengthen ties to the rest of the form via literal and feigned developmental references (i.e., direct and initially implied thematic links, respectively). The reuse of developmental material later in movements is not exclusive to emphasizing such ties, however; as I demonstrate with DRT3 developments in this chapter, the RT can play a special role in reinforcing the development’s connection to the rest of the form. The craftsmanship of RTs, the processes that run through them, and the effectiveness of their paths to claim the recapitulation connect with their ability to direct attention towards the movement’s end. There, the music “compensates” for the RT’s earlier “deficiencies” in some way by either enacting events more typically associated with normative RTs and the strong sense of arrival they often achieve or by participating in the expansive processes that build anticipation for a strong ESC to occur closer to the end.¹

In this chapter, I explore the role of DRT3 developments through my analysis of eight movements, which belong each to one of four subcategories of DRT3: (1) the mostly sufficient RT; (2) the sufficient-insufficient RT; (3) the downplayed RT; and (4) the somewhat insufficient RT (special cases involving D-R overlaps). Each of these RT arises in place of a more normative V pedal, and in so doing, reaches a level of insufficiency in anticipating and

¹ I use the term “deficiency” to refer to atypical RTs that do not fulfill the normative tendency of preparing the tonal return via an extensive home-key V pedal. As I suggest in these cases, an aspect later in the movement seems to “compensate” for this earlier non-normative use, and in so doing, highlights the atypical RT as an integral part of the larger aesthetic strategy for the movement as a whole.
building up to the D-R border. As I demonstrate with the **finale of Piano Sonata No. 1 in E major, Op. 6 (1826)** and the **finale of Piano Sextet in D major, Op. 110 (1824)**, a characteristic of the mostly sufficient RT is the retransitional sequence leading up to the D-R border, which can detract from the sense of arrival at the recapitulation’s onset given the sense of the sequence’s tendency to continue forging onwards. The sufficient-insufficient RT in the **finale of Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (1842)**, on the other hand, begins normatively on a sufficient home-key V pedal, but becomes insufficient when it meets a tonal and dynamic block, which contributes to the recapitulation’s underplayed beginning. The downplayed RT in the **first movement of Symphony No. 4 in A major, Op. 90 (1833)** features a “wrong-key” RT up to the D-R border, meanwhile, and in the **third movement of Piano Trio No. 1 in D minor, Op. 49 (1839)**, the downplayed RT is only retrospectively realized as an RT shortly after the recapitulation’s onset. My analysis will demonstrate that in Op. 49 (III), this is due, in large part, to the retransitional sequence, which initially seems like an anticipatory RT-prep zone. I then close the chapter with three examples of the somewhat insufficient RT. In these movements, the RT is made less sufficient via a D-R overlap, which downplays the recapitulation’s launch in different ways. In the **overture to Heimkehr aus der Fremde, Op. 89 (1829)**, P-zero-P spans the border; in the **overture to Ruy Blas, Op. 95 (1839)**, the recapitulation’s thematic and deep-level tonal return misaligns; and in the **second movement of Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (1842)**, misalignment also occurs, but it involves a false recapitulation, which delays the RT

---

2 The downplayed RT in Op. 49 (III) differs from the mostly sufficient RTs in Op. 110 (IV) and Op. 6 (IV), since retransitional space is signaled ahead of the recapitulation’s launch in those movements as opposed to in retrospect in Op. 49 (III). As I demonstrate with Op. 110 (IV), a more normative V pedal is introduced before the onset of sequence. In Op. 6 (IV) in E major, meanwhile, the allusion to the home-key V is made when the music directs towards the fifth degree, B (albeit as C, supporting i of A, major; mm. 89 and 91), in the bass just slightly ahead of the recapitulation’s start.
from its more “regular” position leading up to the onset of recapitulatory space. In all eight of
the DRT3 movements I examine in this chapter, the “compensatory” tie between the RT to the
rest of the form plays a role in the end-weighted trajectories, which become important aspects of
the narrative threads through the form.

i) Mostly Sufficient RT

The finale of Piano Sextet in D major, Op. 110 (1824) features one such trajectory
when the “compensatory” relationship between the retransitional sequence of the mostly
sufficient RT (mm. 117–128) subtype of DRT3 and later V pedal (m. 193–209) directs
attention towards the movement’s end. There, the uncharacteristic recall of third-movement
(rather than first-movement) material appears as coda I (mm. 209–267) in the tonic minor and
pushes motion even further to the end via coda II (mm. 267–283). In turn, coda II ultimately
reinstates codetta(P) material (compare with mm. 79–86) and the tonic major for the
movement’s strong, fortissimo close. As this discussion suggests, the “compensatory”
relationship between the RT and later V pedal also facilitates a narrative of transformation
through the form. This narrative involves the growing prominence of the A–B♭–G♯–A motive
(mm. 111–112) from earlier in the development (mm. 98–128) and its role in facilitating the D-
major-to-minor transformation through its particular emphasis on B♭ for the recall of the third
movement in D minor.

The RT’s mostly sufficient nature stems from how the RT starts on a regular home-key
V pedal en route to the recapitulation (mm. 128–209), but is abandoned when a forward-driving
sequence takes over (mm. 125–128). With this ascending 5–6 sequence heading directly to the
recapitulation, the tonic-articulated onset seems in medias res (and therefore slightly
insufficient), being only retrospectively realized given one’s expectation for the sequence to forge onwards. As Example 5.1 demonstrates below, the stepwise ascent through ⅆ VI, ⅆ VII, and I pushes the motion forward. The effect is that even with the arrival of the D-major chord in m. 128, one realizes the recapitulation’s start only shortly after the downbeat where the static eighth-note accompaniment returns, and certainly around mid-measure where the piano’s right hand reintroduces P (compare with mm. 1–17). While the strings press on into each downbeat (and therefore each ascent) given their rising ornamental scalar runs, the sequence’s start midway through m. 125 also contributes to the initial sense that sequential motion persists past the downbeat of m. 128.

Example 5.1: Retransitional Sequence; Op. 110, IV, mm. 125–128

As it turns out, this ultimately forward-driving RT provides the culmination of both large-scale and more local aspirations within the development itself. The development’s large-scale progression through B-flat, C, and D major in the core (mm. 98–117) leads to the RT’s highly localized encapsulation of these same keys via its sequence through ⅆ VI and ⅆ VII to I. As
Example 5.2 demonstrates below, moreover, the core’s use of hypermetric reinterpretation throughout leads to the onset of regular four-bar hypermeter for the RT’s initial V pedal (mm. 117–125). This comparatively broader pacing for the RT’s start foils the RT’s forward-pressing sequence, which culminates with the hypermetric reinterpretation at the recapitulation’s launch—another aspect contributing to the recapitulation feeling somewhat undercut and underprepared.
Example 5.2: Hypermetric Reinterpretation throughout the Core; Op. 110, IV, mm. 98–117

The RT’s terminating sequence also derives from earlier in the core. As Example 5.3 demonstrates below, the sequence at the RT’s end forms a slightly modified version of the ascending 5–6 sequence from mm. 113–117. There, the sequence begins on the downbeat rather
than mid-bar, progresses through vi, VII, and i instead, and features a more chromatic bassline given the intermediary change to 6/3 position of each 5-phase chord.3

Example 5.3: Retransitional Sequence Originates from the Core; Op. 110, IV, mm. 113–117

As in the RT, this sequence also arises as motion away from an earlier arrival of the home-key V (mm. 111–113), which supports the melodic A–B♭–G♯–A motion in the strings above. Given this motive’s association with ending space (i.e., note the use of this motive on these exact

---

pitches in the RT/link to the development; mm. 86–98), its reappearance in this otherwise exclusively P-based development has the potential to signal and lead to the end as it did in the exposition. Here, however, the motive eschews this role when the music forges on sequentially. That this motive remains underplayed is important for the movement’s overall narrative, since it allows more room for the motive to gain prominence above the later V pedal and to facilitate the movement’s transformation to minor for the third movement’s recall closer towards the end of the form.

Following the recapitulation’s P=>TR (mm. 128–149), S (mm. 149–169), C(P) (mm. 169–185), and codetta (mm. 185–193) zones, this later V pedal (which serves as RT to the coda) “compensates” for the RT in a couple of ways and directs attention closer towards the movement’s end. Being much lengthier and uninterrupted (unlike the RT, which is prone to brief intermittent excursions off the RT: V in mm. 118 and 120 before the terminal sequence takes over), this later V pedal features A–B♭–G♯–A throughout and more pervasively than before. A steady and seamless crescendo from piano to fff in tutti texture builds anticipation for the covered PAC (m. 209) in the tonic minor, which initiates the recall of the D-minor menuetto in 6/8 time from the sextet’s third movement as coda I. Retrospectively, then, through its particular emphasis on B♭, the A–B♭–G♯–A motive and its increased prominence seems to anticipate the recall’s change to minor. At the same time, the recall’s departure from the movement’s 4/4 in allegro perpetuates the motion even further—especially with its sempre fortissimo dynamic and agitato character—to the i: PAC (m. 267) marking coda II’s onset. There, codetta(P) material reinforces the tonic back in the movement’s original tempo and time signature, while driving to fortissimo for the tonic pedal (mm. 278–283), which leads directly to the movement’s emphatic close.
Through the “compensatory” relationship between the ultimately forward-driving, mostly sufficient RT and the later, more extensive V pedal, then, the A–B♭–G♯–A motive from the RT/link to the DRT3 development becomes progressively more prominent towards the end of the movement’s overall narrative of transformation. There, the motive’s particular emphasis on B♭ achieves the movement’s D-major-to-minor transformation. This transformation ultimately facilitates the recall of the sextet’s menuetto, which perpetuates the motion even further to the return of codetta(P) material in coda II as emphasis for closure, eventually achieving a fortissimo tonic pedal for the end. With the D-major chords tonicizing iv6/4 on the downbeats, and the tierce de Picardie in the final measures, this pedal only so much as alludes to the memory of the original tonic major as a token, which exemplifies a reversal of the minor-mode allusion (as given by B♭ through the A–B♭–G♯–A motive) in D major from before. It is in this way that the strongly articulated pedal achieves the movement’s triumphant close as culmination for itself, and even more significantly, for the sextet as a whole.

Another mostly sufficient RT subtype of DRT3 that is involved in fulfilling more global aspirations occurs in the finale of Piano Sonata No. 1 in E major, Op. 6 (1826). In this movement, the “compensatory” relationship between the forward-driving RT (mm. 121–130) and later V pedal (mm. 206–230) directs the motion towards the movement’s end. As this discussion explores, a crucial aspect of the forward momentum generated by the RT is its use of the ascending 5–6 sequence and the infusion therein of the #5 element heard prominently in the movement’s opening measure. With these two components, the RT intensifies the motion generated throughout the development (mm. 77–130) to beyond the D-R border (despite the strong arrival there) and through the recapitulation (mm. 130–199). There in the recapitulation, the RT continues to inspire forward motion via the return of its featured components (i.e., the 5–6 sequence along with its #5 embellishment). These components expand S and evade the ESC
for the V pedal to achieve closure nearer to the movement’s end. When the V pedal ultimately dissolves, however, the movement’s most poignant moment—the recall of P from the first movement (P¹; see mm. 233–235)—emerges just before the very end to conclude the sonata as a cyclically unified whole. As this analysis eventually clarifies, the quickened pace instigated by the forward-driving RT through to P¹’s return expands on and provides stronger technical grounding for Benedict Taylor’s (2011) general thoughts on the finale as the impassioned homecoming to an idyllic state from the past (as discussed briefly in his book chapter devoted to the cyclic nature of Op. 6). First, however, the present analysis addresses how forward motion is generated in the RT and directed towards the later V pedal.⁴

The RT’s “compensatory” relationship with the later V pedal arises in how the forward-driving RT leads directly into the start of the recapitulation such that the sense of preparation and anticipation more commonly produced through a lengthy V pedal is foregone and saved for the movement’s later—albeit unsuccessful—attempt at securing the ESC. As Example 5.4 demonstrates, the P⁵-based RT generates its forward-driving motion by accelerating, in crescendo, through an ascending 5–#5–6 sequence (mm. 121–126) in two-measure segments that becomes compressed to one-measure lengths when it continues without its #5 elaboration (mm. 127–130).

When the tonic chord of the home key occurs (m. 130) as the next step in the stepwise ascent, the return feels minimally premature as if it were *in medias res*, especially given the sequence’s potential to forge onwards; one might specifically consider the sequence’s effect on carrying the motion forward into the second measure of the recapitulation. Especially with the return of the $5$ element in m. 130 (which had disappeared in the previous three measures), the continuation of the sequence would suggest a first-inversion C-sharp minor chord (i.e., the 6-phase chord above E in the 5–6 sequence) in m. 131. Notwithstanding the IV6/4 chord there, the sense of $vi^6$ seems possible. The rather prominent G$\flat$ in the upper line holds the potential to be a chord tone, although it is not. This possibility allows for a momentary hearing of the C-sharp minor chord potentially to be had if the sequence was in fact continuing onwards. As such, only after the downbeat, as more of P unfolds, is the recapitulation fully realized. The RT, then—despite its
overall sufficiency in building towards a strongly articulated, *fortissimo* return—lacks the level of anticipation often generated through an extended V pedal, such as the one heard over twenty-five measures in the apparent coda (mm. 199–249).

The forward-driving RT also contributes to the movement’s end-weighted aesthetic by fulfilling more local aspirations as the culmination of the development’s gradual path towards intensification (in terms of thematic layout) and as the fitting end (an ascent) balancing the descent into the development.

**Figure 5.1: Developmental Layout; Op. 6, IV, mm. 77–130**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Core^part1</th>
<th>Core^part2</th>
<th>Recap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>P (expanded)</td>
<td>P (interrupted)</td>
<td>Descending 8ths (2-mm. units →)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73–77</td>
<td>77–87</td>
<td>88–96</td>
<td>96–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73–87</td>
<td>96–100</td>
<td>101–106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.1 (continued): Recap**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1-mm. units)</th>
<th>P^head (imitative texture)</th>
<th>130ff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106–110</td>
<td>110–117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In A– (iv)</td>
<td>To G– (♭iii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RT: Ascending 5–6 seq.
I: PAC/RT-connect
As Figure 5.1 demonstrates above, the link (mm. 73–77) descends towards the onset of the beginning (mm. 77–96) of the core in C-sharp minor (vi), where an expanded version of P modulates further towards A-flat major (III±) (mm. 96–121) into the core’s latter portion. There, a sense of intensification is conveyed when another statement of P (mm. 96–100) is interrupted by the onset of the descending eighth notes (mm. 101ff.) in the bass—highly localized representations of the stepwise bass descent from the link—which modulate to A minor (iv) as two-measure units (mm. 101–106) accelerate to one (mm. 106–117). When \( P^{\text{head}} \) appears in m. 110, it marks the start of further intensification, first through the persistence of eighth-note motion, now in imitative texture between the hands (mm. 112–116), and then through the placement of the bass in the middle of the bar (mm. 117–120) in G minor (\( \text{iii} \)) which arises as this imitation accelerates to half-measure units. As discussed in the paragraph above, harmony, accompanied by the persistent forte dynamic and extended crescendo, then becomes a driving force in heightening the intensification towards the recapitulation in the RT.

Once in the recapitulation, the intensifying effects from the development and forward-driving RT help the motion along in directing attention towards the V pedal closer to the end. Compared to the exposition, the recapitulation is more fluid; whereas P (mm. 1–16) and TR (mm. 16–39) were discrete, P=>TR (mm. 130–155) now appears, and greater harmonic instability occurs sequentially (mm. 142–147) towards the i: HC/MC’s (m. 147) proposal. In addition, the actual MC articulation (m. 151) is slightly obscured by the left hand’s persistence in the caesura-fill (mm. 151–155) compared to the MC-complex in the exposition. There, the V: HC/MC (m. 35) was clearly distinguished by the onset of fill (mm. 35–39) (i.e., the right hand’s solo descending line). In the exposition, S (mm. 36–69) was also stated and repeated with its concluding PACs intact S (mm. 155–199); but now in the recapitulation, motion seems to flow through S’s looser structure. S’s closure is initially evaded by \( I^6 \) (m. 170) at the analogous point
to the EEC. S then continues to expand, first through the return of the RT’s ascending 5–#5–6 motion in sequence (mm. 170–174).

**Example 5.5a** demonstrates that this expansion exhibits an even stronger compression of each of the two models heard previously in the RT, since the 5–6 sequence occurs in one-measure segments, now even with the chromatic embellishment (i.e., the #5–6 motion) carrying over the barline, which enhances the sense of forward drive here in the recapitulation.

**Example 5.5a: Sequential Motion from RT Expands S in the Recapitulation; Op. 6, IV, mm. 170–174**

When mm. 174–181 immediately repeat and expand on this same sequence, the effect is of even greater intensification over a broader trajectory. As **Example 5.5b** shows, segments are expanded to two measures when each 5-phase chord in the sequence is preceded by an applied V6/5 held for the first measure of each segment until mm. 178–181, where the pace of the chromatic stepwise ascent on G♯ and A in the upper line slows to two measures each to anticipate possible closure in m. 186.
Example 5.5b: RT’s Sequential Motion Continues to Expand S; Op. 6, IV, mm. 174–190

The proposed I: PAC/ESC in m. 186 is undone, however, by the immediate repeat of mm. 182–186 (see mm. 186–190) and P insertion (mm. 190ff.), which initiates more sequential motion (mm. 190–195) before attempting closure twice (mm. 195–197; 197–199). When both attempts are evaded, first by the intervening vi chord (m. 197), and then by the reharmonization of the melodic close via V4/2 of IV6 (m. 199), the recapitulation dissolves; the launch of P’s full statement on this latter chord suggests the apparent coda’s onset, where the V pedal is left to come to terms with the burden of closure.
This PBL-based pedal, although strong at first, dissolves. When one-measure ideas (mm. 214–217) above the pedal begin to ascend, the melodic motion gained becomes blocked at the allegro con fuoco section (see Example 5.6). There, broken diminished-seventh chords appear and begin to descend (see mm. 217–224).

Example 5.6: “Compensatory” V pedal in the Apparent Coda; Op. 6, IV, mm. 214–232
Eventually, the pedal loses its energy (*sempre ritardando e diminuendo*); the motion becomes more or less static (mm. 225–232) and trails off for the return of P¹ material in the *allegretto con espressione* section. As it turns out, the low energy in this late stage robs the pedal of its initially presumed *raison d’être*, leaving P¹ to take on the burden of securing the ESC, but its efforts seem futile too. The I: IAC (m. 232) it reaches lacks the strength to serve as the structural close, since something of P¹’s original closing function is lost when it is recalled mid-phrase (i.e., from the second half of its antecedent) and is reinterpreted as an opening (i.e., of the start of the thematic recall). Attempts thereafter for closure then barely suffice when the I: PAC in m. 243 materializes as the next and final candidate for the ESC. The music diminuendos into the downbeat of m. 243, more specifically, only to have the *una corda* applied to the already delicate descent through diminished-seventh chords in the piano’s extreme high register. It is as if the ESC washes away, the extension of the tonic in the finale’s last measures (mm. 246–249) also returning to those in the opening movement (i.e., mm. 159–165), only now without the disruptive vi chord (m. 162), so that a stronger sense of settling on the tonic is possible here now for the very end.

Exploring the RT’s forward-pressing nature and how it inspires further motion through the movement’s later areas to ultimately reach P¹’s re-emergence relates well to Taylor’s thoughts on the finale’s expressive meaning within the context of Op. 6 as a cyclic whole. By drawing a parallel to “the search for lost time”, a prevailing theme in the aesthetic and intellectual climate in Germany during Mendelssohn’s era, Taylor suggests that the sonata—performed without pauses between its movements—follows a circular journey in which all four

---

5 Ibid., 103–125.
movements are linked by the sporadic return throughout, and at the finale’s very end, of the opening movement’s P and diminished-seventh-chord passages. As Taylor elaborates, the return of these components runs as a nostalgic thread throughout the piece in memory of home—a lost golden age (as represented by the pastoral mode evoked by P\textsuperscript{1} at the sonata’s very beginning)—which is only acquired at the very end, with the finale acting as the impassioned homecoming following the second and third movements’ departure away from the idyllic Arcadian landscape introduced in the beginning.

Within this overall framework, Taylor notes that the sense of homecoming, or journeying backwards, is suggested by the finale’s allusions to the first and second movements in reverse chronological order; Taylor specifically points out that mm. 5–6 allude to mm. 14–15 of the second movement before diminished-seventh chords, as in the opening movement, appear in the development.\textsuperscript{6} He also links his finale-as-homecoming interpretation to the sense of journeying home expressed in literary works of early German Romantics, such as the poet/intellectual Novalis, who characterizes homecoming as the quickening of time once the protagonist realizes the nearness of his goal (i.e., that it has been in the beginning all along). This, for Taylor, seems to be represented by the finale’s development, which, he notes, increases motion through its imitative sequential writing.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 120. More could be said of the relationship between the first movement and finale to further suggest the finale as a mirror of the opening in its portrayal of homecoming, since the expositions of both movements are quite comparable in their generally static nature (see the pedal tones in P and TR) and share melodic similarities between their respective thematic zones (i.e., in both, P features G\textsuperscript{2}–A–G\textsuperscript{2} motion to start, arpeggiated figures ascend above repeated bass motions on a tonic pedal in TR, and S begins with D\textsuperscript{7}–C\textsuperscript{7}–B–A\textsuperscript{7}).

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 120.
This present discussion therefore expands on Taylor’s interpretation of the finale by providing a more in-depth look at how forward motion is generated through the development and intensified by the RT’s use of the ascending 5–6 sequence and 55 element and how these RT components come back in S to evade the ESC in addition to drawing attention to the apparent coda for P’s re-emergence. In so doing, it has shown that the RT’s forward-driving effect becomes not only an important factor in the movement’s end-weightedness, but also in shaping the movement’s sense of quickened time to portray the homecoming in the sonata’s overall journey. As such, this discussion, like Taylor’s, maintains that the reclaiming of P should not be seen as an end in itself, but rather, something that paints the end of Op. 6’s return to the beginning as multifaceted. Taylor has demonstrated that on one plane, P in the finale rhetorically signals the circular path taken by protagonists in their search for an ideal past; but as this discussion will conclude by further suggesting, on yet another plane lies P’s recall as a representation of Mendelssohn’s return to Beethoven’s Op. 101, the seed of his initial inspiration.

As Example 5.7 demonstrates below, Mendelssohn alters the finale’s recall of P in mm. 233–234. This alteration appears more like the opening movement of Beethoven’s Op. 101. The upper line and bass now move in contrary motion to one another, and Mendelssohn’s use of IV6 to reharmonize the beginning alludes more strongly to A major, the key of Op. 101.

---

8 The brief score except from Beethoven’s Op. 101 in Example 5.7 is from *Ludwig van Beethovens Werke* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862–1865, 1888).
The C♯ (enharmonically B♭; m. 247) in the iv chord (which seems to suggest resolution here) in Op. 6’s last three measures provides a final emphasis on the prominent ♯5 component in the finale and Beethoven’s Op. 101, albeit enharmonically. For the finale, B♭’s appearance at the end generally emphasizes the importance of the ♯5 element with regards to the finale’s forward drive (as first introduced by the accented I♭5 chord in m. 1 and later via the RT’s 5–♭5–6 sequence). B♭’s ultimate appearance also ties into the keys of the development, C-sharp minor
(vi) and A-flat/G-sharp major (III\#), and how they are foreshadowed earlier on in the movement.\(^9\)

For the first movement of Beethoven’s Op. 101, similarly, the emphasis on Ⅱ5, C-sharp minor, and G-sharp major is apparent. Beethoven features deceptive motion built on the scale degrees, 5–Ⅱ5–6, in m. 6 (note how Mendelssohn also features deceptive motion in m. 6, the melodic inner motion that appears straightaway in mm. 1–2, and later in the RT). Beethoven also emphasizes a G-sharp-major chord (mm. 8–9; note the wide spacing between the hands) and C-sharp minor via deceptive motion (mm. 15–16) shortly after. These sonorities are featured in the development (mm. 35–57) via the stormy C-sharp-minor passage (mm. 50–53). Beethoven precedes this iii key by vi (mm. 41–43) and Ⅱ5–6 motion (see mm. 35, 38, and 40) before that. An ascending 5–6 appoggiatura sequence (mm. 53–54) and false recapitulation (mm. 55–57) also articulate a quasi-chromatic bass ascent up to the tonic-articulated opening of the true recapitulation in m. 58 like Mendelssohn’s RT.

Essentially, the way Mendelssohn’s forward-driving RT directs attention towards the movement’s end by reserving the prolonged V pedal for the apparent coda to increase anticipation for the pending ESC—but ultimately does not—is crucial to the movement’s end-weighted design. This design focuses on P\(^1\)’s return, and quite possibly highlights Beethoven’s underlying influence which seems to run as a current of inspiration throughout Mendelssohn’s Op. 6. This reference to the past retrospectively provides a context within which the

\(^9\) In the first part of the exposition, there is substantial tonicization of C-sharp minor and reference to G-sharp major via V/vi (see mm. 6; 14; 27–30) as there is similarly in the opening movement of Op. 6. There, C-sharp minor also appears as vi (m. 2) at the peak of its opening antecedent phrase, where it is lightly tonicized by the lower-neighbour tone, B\(^\sharp\) (Ⅱ5), before being tonicized briefly in mm. 26–30. As the next paragraph continues to discuss, however, it seems that the finale’s emphasis on C-sharp minor and G-sharp major alludes more strongly to Op. 101.
development can operate: the development’s descent-in-and-ascent-out structure might do well in suggesting the idea of the development as other—especially with the core’s failed attempts to represent P fully, as if the development were an alternate reality to the exposition—or a small-scale representation of homecoming as represented by the development’s journeying away from its initial key, C-sharp minor, and then leading back to that sonority, albeit as a transient vi in m. 128, on its way to the tonic for the recapitulation’s onset. Within either of these contexts, the use of C-sharp minor in the finale’s development would represent an intensification of C-sharp minor’s role in undercutting the tonic as first seen in the opening movement (e.g., in m. 2 where the first sounding of the tonic scale degree in the right hand becomes harmonized by vi, and in m. 162 where vi undercuts the settling on the tonic in the end) while also forming a part of the large-scale articulation of the 5→(45→)6 relationship between E major and the development’s C-sharp minor as first encapsulated in the finale in the inner voice of mm. 1–2, and later by B–B♭–C♯ in the tenor of mm. 73–77 of the link going into the start of the development on a C♯m6 chord.

However one might interpret the role of the DRT3 development in the finale and the sonata as a whole, the way the ESC ultimately washes away seems to suggest the fleeting nature of reminiscence and an open-ended reading of the sonata’s overall expressive meaning. In providing the push towards this ultimate ending, the “compensatory” relationship between the forward-driving, mostly sufficient RT and later V pedal is important in highlighting nostalgia’s role as a means to close the movement—and the sonata—as a cohesive whole.
ii) Sufficient-Insufficient RT

Like the mostly sufficient RT in Op. 6 (IV), the sufficient-insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 in the fourth movement of Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (1842) forges a tie to the rest of the form through its “compensatory” relationship with a later V pedal. In contrast to the mostly sufficient RT, however, the sufficient-insufficient RT begins on-track on a home-key V pedal but somehow relinquishes the pedal for a less anticipatory, less directed, and overall, less normative way of preparing the tonal return at the recapitulation’s onset.

In this particular finale movement, the sufficient-insufficient RT helps to direct attention towards the end where the crux of the movement’s aesthetic trajectory materializes as a token of this DRT3 development’s (mm. 147–245) importance to the music’s overall expressive meaning. Here, the S-based (mm. 67ff.) sufficient-insufficient RT (mm. 225–244) begins on-track on a V pedal, but reaches a tonal and dynamic block when it digresses and produces a backwards glance via F major (VI; m. 235) to D minor (iv; m. 237), the development’s principal key. The impact of this tutti, forte D-minor block on the downbeat temporarily disrupts the regular four-bar hypermeter by causing a hypermetric reinterpretation before the energy wanes. Thereafter in the rest of RT, a sense of expectancy is garnered through Phead’s use in sempre piano as the bass descends to the V6/5 arrival RTC (mm. 243–244) in the direction of the recapitulation’s (mm. 245–395) tonic opening, which, however, remains underplayed despite the sforzando onset. As it turns out, the “softness” instigated by the RT’s tonal and dynamic block persists through the D-R border and continues to build anticipation towards the apparent closing(P) (mm. 290–395), where a later V pedal (mm. 347–361) “compensates” for the RT’s earlier digression builds stronger anticipation for the ESC when it expands the form further by leading to S’s unexpected return (mm. 362–395) heading into the apparent coda (mm. 396–
S’s re-emergence results in the transformation of the movement’s prominent motive, F, to F♯—or more specifically, F–E to E–F♯ (as supported harmonically by the change from iv to IV in mm. 392 and 396)—for the apparent coda’s strong ESC (m. 480) and celebratory close in A major in contrast to the movement’s A minor.¹¹

Within the development itself, the S-based RT is highlighted, since it serves as the goal of dynamic build-up and thematic lead-up considering the development’s form-functional, thematic, and hypermetric layout (for an overview, see Figure 5.2). Essentially, the development recaptures the expositional layout by beginning straightaway with the core (mm. 147–218), whose P-TR progression culminates with the RT’s S material. Anticipation for S is also facilitated by the core’s organization into two parts and not only the dynamic intensification through them, but also the hypermetric intensification produced by the change from non-elided hypermetric units in core¹ to elided ones in core². This intensification is itself heightened internally within each section by the successive shortening of the initial length of the initiating units before RT-prep (mm. 218–225) stabilizes the return to regular four-bar groupings for the RT.

² An apparent closing zone also appears in the exposition, but achieves closure through the III: IAC/EEC (m. 147) that launches the development. For a comparison, see mm. 109–147. Here in the recapitulation, however, one might reinterpret the apparent closing’s onset as P insertion given S’s newfound brevity, and ultimately, considering S’s unexpected return. At the same time, the material from mm. 290ff. continues to be quite extensive and aims for closure as it does in the exposition. When S returns unexpectedly, it does so after the dominant pedal loosens the apparent closing’s efforts for the ESC. As I make clear by the end of this discussion, the reappearance of S material may be interpreted as anticipatory to the apparent coda’s theme, and as having a transitory role towards the movement’s higher aspirations for a global connection to the symphony’s introductory theme and for closure for the symphony as a whole.

¹¹ Despite the progression from the dominant pedal to the tonic pedal in m. 361, the ESC is withheld given the ppp dynamic and the lack of a strongly articulated tonic that is more characteristic of closure.
Figure 5.2: Development’s Form-Functional, Thematic, and Hypermetric Layout; Op 56, IV, mm. 147–244

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Zone</th>
<th>Core (Part 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Material</strong></td>
<td>P-zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypermetric Grouping</strong></td>
<td>8 + 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*= units with elision)</td>
<td>Acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td>147-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Structure</strong></td>
<td>[Brief tag]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>p; light texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td>C→E-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core (Part 2) builds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6*+6</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4* + 4</td>
<td>2 + 2 + 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + 4</td>
<td>4 + 4 + 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4* + 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acceleration Back to steady

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme treated contrapuntally in the strings only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR (2 mm.) + ↑ stepwise melodic sequence on TRb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same, but with chrom. seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same, but w/↑P4 melodic sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 8-mm. sentence based on TRb only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence expanded sequentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-measure iterations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pp</th>
<th>Intensification: building to tutti, cresc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D- (iv)</td>
<td>→F+ (VI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core\textsuperscript{part1} (mm. 147–182), based on P (mm. 1–37), begins softly, although actively (note the melodic interchange between the woodwinds and violins), in thin texture, and modulates to D minor (iv), arriving at a V6/5 arrival DG (m. 176) soon after with DG-fill (mm. 177–181) (see Example 5.8).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} The specific use of vii\textsuperscript{7}–V6/5 in m. 176 for the DG foreshadows the use of this same progression in the home key for the RTC (mm. 243–244). In both, the seventh of the diminished-seventh chord acts as an appoggiatura, but in the latter instance, the progression is drawn over two measures instead of one and is not followed by fill.
Example 5.8: DG-complex; Op. 56, IV, mm. 169–183

Hypermetrically, this section translates into discrete units throughout, beginning with two groups of eight measures (mm. 149–156; 157–164), which successively shorten to two groups of four (mm. 165–168; 169–172), and then two groups of two (mm. 173–174; 175–176) towards the DG. DG-fill then bridges the gap leading to greater intensification. Characterized by the textural reduction to the flute’s and oboe’s decorative scalar lines, the fill introduces eighth-note motion in anticipation of the TR (mm. 37–66) material featured in core^{part2} (mm. 182–225), while beginning to quicken the sense of pacing at the hypermetric level through the introduction of an elided six-bar hypermeasure (in contrast to the two eight-measure groupings initiating the development).

These elided six-bar hypermeasures persist and carry the motion through the start of core^{part2}, which presents a more intensified version of core^{part1}’s hypermetric trajectory (i.e., 6–4–2, including some hypermetric reinterpretation, vs. core^{part1}’s 8–4–2 without any...
reinterpretation)—to drive even further towards RT-prep in anticipation of the S-based RT.\textsuperscript{13}

There, discrete four-bar units return as part of a distinguishable eight-measure sentence, which steadies the motion through the repetition scheme and home-key iv prolongation of its presentation phrase to directly await the beginning on V of the S-based RT. Core\textsuperscript{nart2’s} intensification is also given by the dynamic and textural building from mm. 199ff., and especially since Mendelssohn successively elaborates the three ascending 5–6 sequences in mm. 199–218.

The first sequence (mm. 199–204), featuring applied diminished- and half-diminished-seventh chords, maintains the clearest ascent, since the rising bassline (F$\sharp$–G–A–B) is articulated on the downbeats of mm. 201–205 by the strings in their homogeneous \textit{tutti} texture. This passage also features the most breadth, since the pacing at the hypermetric level intensifies through the second (mm. 204–211) and third sequences (mm. 212–217) (i.e., hypermeasures reduce from 6- to 4- to 2-bar units). Further intensification happens with the latter two sequences into core\textsuperscript{nart2}. The second sequence intensifies given the chromaticized ascent in the first violins, the conflicting interaction between the sequence’s melodic and harmonic dimensions at the middleground level, and the dynamic and textural buildup as the dotted motive ascends through the wind section to eventually its strongest manifestation (m. 211; \textit{forte}).\textsuperscript{14} The third sequence (already in near-\textit{tutti} texture and \textit{forte}) then increases in intensity

\textsuperscript{13} Elided to the end of DG-fill, namely, core\textsuperscript{nart2} begins with a parallel set of elided six-measure statements (mm. 182–187; 187–192), followed by another pair of six, this time with the latter’s end, which simultaneously serves as the start of the first of two four-bar hypermeasures (mm. 204–207; 208–211). Three groups of two (mm. 212–217) then accelerate towards RT-prep.

\textsuperscript{14} Note specifically how the melodic line (E–F–F$\sharp$–G–G$\sharp$–A), aligned with consecutive downbeats, rises against the mid-bar emphasis in the lower strings, which is caused by the accent, through duration and articulation, of the applied dominant-seventh chords’ change to 4/2 position. This mid-bar emphasis overshadows the true ascending bass motion from C–D–E on what should be the downbeats of mm. 206, 208, 210; but given the use of
when the ascending 5–6 sequence becomes greater in expanse. Each 5–6 motion becomes related to the next through transposition up a fourth, and linked via the rising chromatic motion supplied by the intervening applied V6/5 chords. Conflicting forces add to the excitement, meanwhile; the strongly articulated descending semitones repeated mid-bar per measure by the winds are out-of-phase with the bassline and melody which express a clear ascent involving each hypermetric downbeat within the string of discrete two-bar hypermeasures in this passage.

Given the individual characteristics of each sequence and the changes between them, one can see how each successive passage builds in intensity. By the third sequence, the intensity is the greatest. The descending semitones in the winds are made the most prominent and most impactful against the version of 5–6 sequence which demonstrates the clearest and most directed forward ascending motion in both melody and harmony. This is in direct contrast to the second sequence, whose rising stepwise bassline is obscured by the same descending semitone motions appearing more latently in the bass. With the lowest intensity, meanwhile, the first sequence remains minimally impacted by these descending semitones, which generally serve to symbolize the movement’s prominent F–E motion as the antithesis to the movement’s ultimate E–F, represented here in the core through the ascent of the 5–6 sequences discussed in the paragraphs above.

The way these three sequences successively achieve greater intensification while each modulating respectively to F major (VI), E minor (v), and D minor (iv) also foreshadows the pending role that VI and iv have in preventing V from reaching its goal in the RT zone, with iv syncopation over the bar line, these bass notes are de-emphasized by their displacement to the (weak) second beat of these measures and their brevity as quarter notes.
being suggested as the most important through the core’s ultimate move to D minor. E’s function as a transitory key here in the core draws, furthermore, on E’s earlier use as S’s off-key beginning in the exposition (see Sa in mm. 67–82 in comparison to Sb, in mm. 83–90, in C major, the true secondary key). As the development makes certain, E’s ultimately transitory nature becomes prominently revealed in the S-based sufficient-insufficient RT—an important player in the movement’s overall aesthetic.

This sufficient-insufficient RT holds a multifaceted role in articulating the movement’s end-weighted trajectory towards transformation. From a rhetorical perspective—and as suggested in the opening paragraph—the RT’s activation of prolonged “softness” assists in directing attention towards the transformation. On a more significant level, however, the RT elevates S’s role in the movement by altering S to make it its own (it excises Sb completely and loosens Sa’s structure sequentially; compare mm. 226–237 with Sa in mm. 67–74) before attaching significance to S by meeting the block on iv through deceptive motion to VI. As discussed further below, RT’s version of S (inclusive of the deceptive motion to VI) forges a direct tie to the recapitulation by reappearing in its S zone (mm. 271–290). There, RT material resurfaces to evade the ESC potentially to be had in m. 290, and in so doing, facilitates the movement’s end-weighted trajectory towards metamorphosis in a more outwardly and structural manner.¹⁵ In addition, the RT deepens F’s pervasiveness as a motive when it initiates an inner-voice F pedal (mm. 237–244) with its D-minor block via VI—both sonorities of which intone F.

¹⁵ The precedence for the evasion of the ESC here is set by the EEC’s in m. 109, which initiates the apparent closing (mm. 109–147). As it turns out, the III: EEC (m. 147)—albeit an IAC—is pushed all the way to the end of the exposition for the development’s onset, much as the I: PAC/ESC (m. 480) is delayed until just a handful of measures prior to the movement’s end. The delayed EEC therefore works in tandem with the RT and its role in evading the ESC to direct attention towards the movement’s end where transformation takes place.
With F’s emphasis through these sonorities, the RT’s role in highlighting F’s significance in the movement’s journey therefore also more broadly amplifies the importance of the development’s earlier tonal ventures to not only D minor (see its establishment fairly early on as the key of the development in mm. 160–202, and how it continues its presence in mm. 216–222 before reinstating itself amidst the RT), but F major (see mm. 204–211) as well.

Given the RT’s emphasis on S and the tone F via iv and VI (i.e., the main components of transformation in this movement), and through this emphasis, the RT’s tie to the rest of the form (specifically, S’s subsequent reappearances), the discussion below traces F’s path to transformation. Gradual changes which bring out this note in the RT, the recapitulatory S zone, and finally, S’s more exceptional re-emergence heading into the apparent coda articulate a cohesive thread which one traces through the movement. This thread articulates an underlying narrative that moves from: (1) recomposition (in reference to RT/S’s recycling throughout and the changes made to each subsequent reappearance to either emphasize F/F→E or F♯/E→F♯ in allusion to F’s pending metamorphosis); (2) transformation (the specific change from F to F♯ heading into the apparent coda via S’s return); and ultimately, (3) reconciliation of the past with the present (as represented by the resulting apparent coda’s A-major theme and its motivic tie to S—a more immediate past—and the introductory theme to the symphony as a whole—a more distant past).¹⁶

¹⁶ The idea of reconciliation with the past works in tandem with existing perspectives on the coda. In his discussion of cyclic form in Op. 56, Richard Longyear (1979), comments on the coda’s dual function as a coda not only to the movement in its own right, but also to the symphony as a whole through the coda’s tie to the symphony’s introductory theme, while Peter Mercer-Taylor (1995) interprets the coda as Mendelssohn’s coming to terms with the past when composing symphonies in the post-Beethovenian era. By tracing the coda’s thematic kinship with Vaterland in deinen Gauen from Mendelssohn’s earlier Festgesang (originally composed for the 1840 festival commemorating the 400th anniversary of Gutenberg’s invention of the printing press—a historical moment), Mercer-Taylor specifically interprets the coda as symbolic reverence for Germany’s musical past—what Mercer-Taylor believes to have been the goal of the era’s new symphonic teleology. See Richard Longyear, “Cyclic
Recomposition is first expressed by the RT’s take on S (mm. 67–109) which serves to truly bring out F as an important character in the movement’s aesthetic. As Example 5.9a and Example 5.9b demonstrate, the RT is selective in recalling the theme’s Sa (mm. 67–74) segment solely and loosens its structure via a descending sequence, such that VI is tonicized (see the thematic B♭ in m. 234) as a means to emphasize F. This, in addition to the inner-voice F pedal following RT’s tonal diversion back to D minor via VI, seems to intensify the expositional S zone’s earlier emphasis on F. There, F is juxtaposed against F♯.¹⁷

---

¹⁷ S specifically juxtaposes E–F♯ against F–E motion when S alternates between its off-key segments in E minor (i.e., Sa: mm. 67–74; 75–82; 91–98) and its C-major segments (i.e., Sb: mm. 83–90; 99–105). When on its way to closure (i.e., Sc: mm. 105–109), S also ascends chromatically through F–F♯ (mm. 107–108) in the uppermost voices in contrast to the F–E motion (mm. 108–109) in the bass for the EEC’s initial evasion via I° in C major, which initiates the apparent closing.
Example 5.9a: Expositional S; Op. 56, IV, mm. 67–111
Example 5.9b: RT recalls S; Op. 56, IV, mm. 225–246

RT recalls Sa (now expanded)
Example 5.9c: Recapitulatory S; Op. 56, IV, mm. 271–290

(S and Sc excised)

Sa
E G♯

Sa' (expanded)
E F♯ G♯

RT's thematic sequence

Apparent
C(P)

290
a tempo

VI
(EC)
No ESC
Example 5.9d: S arises before the Apparent Coda; Op. 56, IV, mm. 362–395
Example 5.9e: Apparent Coda Theme; Op. 56, IV, mm. 396–399

With F’s role more clearly defined by RT, S returns to juxtaposing F and F♯ in the recapitulation, but in a more cohesive manner than in the exposition, particularly now given Sb’s and Sc’s excision. As Example 5.9c conveys, any importance given to F♯ here serves less to foil, but rather, to allude to F’s pending change into F♯, especially with the way the heads of Sa (mm. 271–278) and Sa’ (mm. 279–290) proceed directly from one to another to articulate the gradual introduction of E–F♯ motion (compare the second flute in mm. 271–272 and 279–280) in Sa’ above F♯–E in the upper strings. F♯ melts away soon after for F to be further emphasized, though. When RT’s thematic sequence on S-based material returns to evade the ESC, it does not proceed as far as iv; instead, the material exits on the earlier VI chord (m. 290) which initiates the apparent closing, the introduction of B♯ (mm. 289 and 290) tonicizing VI further, and the use
of VI marking a more extreme version of evasion than met previously with C\(^6\)’s aversion (see m. 109) of the EEC in the exposition.\(^{18}\)

As the music advances towards the V pedal, and ultimately, S, F continues to be emphasized harmonically through the extensive use of Ger. 6 (mm. 331–338; 339–342). Despite helping to propose a i: PAC/ESC in m. 338 (which is undone by the Ger. 6’s return in mm. 339–342 on the same thematic material), the Ger. 6 eventually reaches the V pedal (albeit via \(\text{III}^6\)). Above this pedal, descending thematic material leads to F–E’s emphasis (as opposed to the ascent through F\(^\flat\) in mm. 312–330 prior), the *diminuendo*, and the loosening of the regular four-bar hypermeter (i.e., via the immediate repeat of mm. 353–354 in mm. 355–356 and again in mm. 357–358), which collectively lead to the pedal’s dissolution, the avoidance yet again of the ESC, and S’s ultimate rendition in preparation for the broadly melodic and stately apparent coda in the tonic major, where the ESC is finally achieved.

S’s final re-emergence towards the apparent coda features Sa above a tonic pedal in A minor (see Example 5.9d above). In contrast to the recapitulation, however, Sa is expanded to include greater melodic emphasis on F through its E–F–E and A–B\(^\flat\)–A motions on the musical surface. These motions loosen the regular four-bar hypermeter: the third and fourth beats of the hypermeasure in mm. 374–379 are immediately repeated before the hypermetric reinterpretation in m. 379. In this measure, the oboe slightly alters the melodic figure as the bassoon initiates another paired interchange of the figure on A and F with the oboe over another four measures (mm. 379–382). Regular four-bar groupings are then reinstated as F–E appears solely in the

\(^{18}\) The enhancement of F major’s earlier role in RT’s collapse to evade closure here in the recapitulation is also coupled with D minor’s stronger emphasis—its tonicization (mm. 261–260)—in P=>TR (mm. 245–270) to prepare the V\(^7\) arrival MC (m. 270) for S’s opening.
violins and eventually above the VI–ii6/5–V progression (mm. 384–395), which ends with the fermata extending the fourth hyperbeat in anticipation of the apparent coda’s change in key and time signature. The isolation of VI, ii6/5 as a substitution for iv, and F–E provides the components for transformation to take place (and retrospectively seems to affirm the importance of these entities as initially suggested by the RT), while the clarinet’s brief and subtle chromatic musings beginning on E–F–F♯ (mm. 384–387) seem to imply a glimmer of, and perhaps incite, F’s ultimate metamorphosis. Indeed, when the apparent coda opens with its A-major theme beginning on E–F♯, the movement fulfills its transformation not only of F/F–E to F♯/E–F♯, iv to IV, minor to major, but also the harmonic lingering on F–E—as expressed by VI–ii6/5–V within the final measures of the recapitulation—to E–F♯—as is conveyed above the I–IV motion at the start of the apparent coda (see Example 5.9e above).

As this discussion alludes to earlier, this ultimate transformation seems to reconcile the past with the present; the apparent coda’s “new” A-major theme derives from the symphony’s introductory tune (mm. 1–16; opening movement) in a full-circle path which binds the symphony as a unified whole. From a more local standpoint that specifically considers the finale in question, moreover, it seems that the apparent coda’s theme also has its origins in S (see Example 5.10).
Example 5.10: The Apparent Coda Theme Derives Earlier from S and O\textsuperscript{1}; Op. 56, IV

In this way, F’s pathway to $\text{F}_\sharp$—via (1) the RT’s recomposition of S, (2) RT’s return in S, and (3) S’s reawakening to enact now S’s transformation into the apparent coda’s theme—seems to suggest a teleological narrative that runs as a truly cohesive thread through the movement. The sufficient-insufficient RT strongly facilitates this trajectory; it furthers the motion generated from the delayed (and albeit weak) III: IAC/EEC through the D-R border via the dynamic recession it activates and continues to direct attention (via its thematic return to evade the ESC) towards the later V pedal. There, S ultimately resurfaces to achieve transformation. That the sufficient-insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 plays this strong role in furthering the motion to transformation on so many levels—from $\text{F/F–E}$ to $\text{F}_\sharp/\text{E–F}_\sharp$, iv to IV, S to the apparent coda’s theme, the symphony’s introductory tune to the apparent coda’s theme—speaks to the RT’s importance in facilitating the movement’s end-weighted trajectory towards transformation, and indeed, the symphony’s, claim to reconciliation in the end.
iii) Downplayed RT

The development (mm. 210–369) in the *first movement of Symphony No. 4 in A major, Op. 90 (1833)* features the downplayed RT of subtype DRT3 when a “wrong-key” V pedal in vi (F-sharp minor) leads up to the D-R border and displaces the RT: V6/4 pedal so that the thematic and tonal returns misalign.\(^\text{19}\) This displaced RT: V6/4 pedal persists from the thematic return at the recapitulation’s (mm. 369–456) start to the I: IAC/RT-connect in m. 376 (simultaneously the end of P\(_{\text{antecedent}}\)).\(^\text{20}\) Together, the development’s lack of tonal preparation for the thematic reprise and subsequent incongruence at the D-R border direct attention towards the movement’s end. There, the development’s theme (N; as first seen from mm. 225ff.) returns and contributes to the ESC’s delay into the apparent coda (mm. 456–586), where the home-key V pedal appears more than once to emphasize the sense of homecoming.

At closer look, the RT in F-sharp minor gradually becomes realized in a few stages (see *Example 5.11* below). When F-sharp minor arises already well into the development (mm. 313ff.), the sense of forward motion begins to draw to a standstill as if to indicate the development’s pending end. Compared to the rest of the development thus far, mm. 313–328 relinquish the use of contrapuntal texture and sequence, and instead, feature four-measure thematic units which articulate the local dominant in their latter half. Midway through the fourth

\(^{19}\) Note that the intensifying effects *en route* to the recapitulation’s start in the tonic key help one to retrospectively realize the RT towards the development’s end, despite the “wrong-key” reference to F-sharp minor. Note also that the tendency to reach V at the end of the development via III\(_4\) is reflected in Mozart’s music.

\(^{20}\) Despite the weak root-position tonic in m. 373, one can easily hear the retransitional dominant extending further to m. 376. In addition, while the exposition begins on V6/4 just as the recapitulation does, the sense of tonal return at the D-R border is overshadowed by the “wrong-key” RT. Rapoport (2004) also views that the tonal and thematic return are in conflict at the recapitulation’s start. See Rapoport (2004), 144–146.
unit, the music proposes a vi: HC/DG (m. 327) and initiates a vi: V pedal to the actual DG articulation (mm. 331–332). Immediately thereafter, the sudden drop to piano and onset of sparser texture suggest DG-fill (mm. 333–355). This fill passage comes to reflect the anticipatory nature of an RT, however, since it grows to strongly foreshadow P’s return at the recapitulation with its increasing textural richness, crescendo, and the rise of ascending Phead fragments.
Example 5.11: RT is Gradually Realized in Stages; Op. 90, I, mm. 313–362

Development (continued)

Core\textsuperscript{part 1} continues \Rightarrow retrospectively becomes RT-prep

4-mm segment

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{313} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
F_{\#}-(vi): i^6 \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{repeated} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{321} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
DG \text{ proposed} \\
\end{array} \]
DG-fill? No. The passage becomes a "wrong-key" RT: V pedal

329    DG articulation

337    anticipation continues to build

346    digresses to D major (IV of A+)?
Retrospectively, then, what is initially thought to have been a vi: HC/DG (mm. 331–332) becomes recognized as the acceptance of the “wrong-key” RT: V pedal at the end of the N-based F-sharp-minor passage which becomes RT-prep (mm. 313–332). What once seemed like intensifying DG-fill therefore becomes RT1 (mm. 333–355). RT1 digresses into D-major territory—possibly as IV of A major (the home key)—for the onset of RT2 (mm. 355–369).²¹ There, in RT2, a chromatically ascending bass and P^head’s more emphatic use in the winds and brass arise. As the ascent back to vi: V6/4 (mm. 359–363) demonstrates, though, F-sharp minor persists into RT2’s latter measures (mm. 363–369). The music only procures a very subtle motion to the key of A major when the cello (doubled by the oboe above) ascends chromatically from C⁰ to E as an inner voice (mm. 367–369) below the static upper voices. As it turns out, this chromatic motion leads the RT to achieve the recapitulation’s onset on V6/4 (see Example 5.12; the horns reinforce this E as the bass note from mm. 369ff.). In the upper voices above this ascent, the RT also simultaneously reinforces the development’s role in amplifying the exposition’s F-sharp-minor allusions via the static C⁰–A third (mm. 367–370), a verticalized

²¹ That D major arises via ascending 5–6 motion from III⁰ raises the expectation that the ascending 5–6 sequence continues as the direct path to the home-key dominant. In this ascending sequence—i.e., III⁰ (5–6) IV (5–6) V—D major, as IV, seems directly on its way to V. This makes the RT’s move backwards to F-sharp minor all the more striking and significant as an event of aesthetic weight in the interpretation of this movement.
manifestation of the melodic $p_{\text{head}}$ motive. This third, which is unique to both the tonic triads of F-sharp minor and A major, points to F-sharp minor’s emphasis here in this A-major movement.

Example 5.12: “Wrong-key” RT’s Subtle Motion to V6/4 of the Home Key for the Recapitulation’s Start; Op. 90, I, mm. 363–370

The development’s tie to F-sharp minor via the RT demonstrates an amplification of three earlier F-sharp-minor allusions in the exposition. First, Pb (mm. 23–51) harmonizes the melodic $C_\sharp$–A third with vi (mm. 27–30) for the first time, and directly after its more typical
harmonization by the tonic in mm. 23–26.\textsuperscript{22} Second, localized neighbour motions, which
involve vi to V, occur at the start of TR (mm. 59ff.; note mm. 60–61 and 64–65, specifically).
Third, when the potential for an EEC dissolves in S (mm. 90ff.), a passage (mm. 159–167) of
p\textsuperscript{head} (see clarinet) on a vi: V pedal in the secondary key intervenes for the apparent C(P) zone
(mm. 167–183) to achieve the V: PAC/EEC (mm. 183–187). The RT furthers this third
expositional aspect most directly, since the RT similarly involves p\textsuperscript{head} above a vi: V pedal,
albeit in relation to the home key. The material at the EEC (i.e., mm. 183–187) also recalls the
thematic material of the MC area (mm. 86–90), which the development subsequently furthers
via its initial DG area (i.e., mm. 327–332; note how the material descends now).

The development’s amplification of F-sharp-minor material and the incongruence at the
D-R border then provides greater weight to the V pedals heard later in the movement as a means
to “compensate” for the weak sense of tonal preparation for the recapitulation’s launch in the
home key. These pedals direct attention towards N’s reprise in the apparent coda, namely, and
subsequently, to resolution via closure and congruence closer to the movement’s end. When
Mendelssohn transposes the V4/2 pedal (see mm. 132–140; 427–434) from S to the home key in
the recapitulatory S zone (mm. 405ff.), more specifically, the pedal builds anticipation towards
the ESC, even though the ESC’s potential dissolves. The pedal ultimately reaches an ECP (mm.
435–442), which achieves a I: IAC at first, but this cadence is undone.\textsuperscript{23} The ECP’s immediate
repeat fades (see mm. 443–456) for N’s return over a V6/4 pedal at the apparent coda’s launch.
N’s return is integral, since it now appears over V pedals in the home key and replaces P at the

\hspace{1cm}

\textsuperscript{22} This move occurs at a point when it is unclear whether or not TR is starting or if the P zone is
continuing with Pb. P turns out to be in small ternary form (for Pa, see mm. 3–23).

\textsuperscript{23} Following Caplin (1998), I use the abbreviation, ECP, to refer to expanded cadential progressions.
head of the apparent coda’s recall of the expositional layout. This recall seems to offer a chance
to “correct” the incongruence at the D-R border via congruence at the ESC (m. 554), which
Mendelssohn ultimately achieves via a lyrical “S-like” theme (mm. 514–554).

A couple of other events on the way to the ESC suggest resolution in the apparent coda
as well. The submediant arises in the apparent coda, but does not evade the home key as it did in
the development; it instead appears as \( \text{VI} \) (mm. 472–475) on its way to another V6/4 pedal
(mm. 476–483). The emphasis on IV (mm. 494–501) also recalls the D-major diversion, which
decorates the vi: V pedal heard previously in the RT. Now, though, the D-major sonority helps
to secure a caesura-like complex—a V6/5 arrival caesura (m. 510) and fill (mm. 510–514)—
which opens the way for the apparent coda’s “S-like” theme.\(^{24}\) After a series of phrase
expansions, this theme ultimately secures the I: PAC/ESC in a clear manner, such that
congruence is achieved unlike before at the D-R border. Mendelssohn emphasizes this
congruence via cadential reinforcement and by changing the thematic material upon the ESC’s
attainment.

In this way, the downplayed RT subtype of DRT3 development plays a crucial role in
the sense of narrative—the progression from conflict to resolution—through the form when it
furthers the emphasis on F-sharp minor by tying it to incongruence. The development amplifies
F-sharp minor via its “wrong-key” RT, more specifically, through which F-sharp minor persists
to the recapitulation’s onset on V6/4. This persistence suppresses anticipation for the tonic key’s
return, while the incongruence between the thematic and tonal return at the D-R border directs

\(^{24}\) Recall that in the development, there initially seemed to be a vi: HC/DG (mm. 331–332), which turned
out to be the acceptance of a “wrong-key” RT: V pedal.
the search for resolution further into the rest of the form. There, home-key V pedals work to achieve the ESC in the recapitulation, but ultimately direct attention towards N at the apparent coda’s start. With N heading the apparent coda’s recall of the expositional layout, Mendelssohn achieves congruence and strong tonal closure at the moment of ESC now closer to the movement’s end as “compensation” for the earlier incongruence at the D-R border, this as resolution to the narrative thread through the form.

The D-major **third movement of Piano Trio No. 1 in D minor, Op. 49 (1839)** also features the **downplayed RT subtype of DRT3**, although in a slightly different way. Here, the downplayed RT gives the impression of a recapitulation that is barely prepared, since the RT is only retrospectively realized. The recapitulation (mm. 118–188) seems barely prepared since it starts mid-sequence and interrupts the RT-prep zone (mm. 100ff.) *in medias res*. That the RT-prep zone seems to be interrupted pertains to the way the music foregoes adequate preparation for the recapitulation’s underplayed onset. The *sempre piano* dynamic and more-or-less consistent texture through the D-R border contribute to this underplayed boundary. This boundary is underplayed even more so by the way the music leading up to the border abstains from stabilizing D major enough for one to anticipate the tonal recapitulation, let alone propose a preparatory home-key V pedal. Only retrospectively does one consider that RT-prep=>RT at some point, such that a downplayed RT forwards the motion from the end of the development (mm. 47–118), through the underplayed D-R border, and into the recapitulation. The motion contributes to the recapitulation’s more fluid beginning and directs towards two specific areas, which reinforce the development’s tie to the rest of the form. The first is the newly extended four-bar V pedal (mm. 137–141) to the I: PAC/ESC (m. 141). This pedal works in “compensatory” relationship with the development’s lack of preparatory V pedal and
downplayed RT.\textsuperscript{25} The second area is the C zone’s (mm. 141–172; compare mm. 28–38) expansion via mm. 149–156. This passage recaptures the sequential lead-up to the D-R border, although slightly altered, as this discussion will later show in the context of the movement’s narrative of transformation and emerging end-weighted structure. The paragraphs below will first explore how the RT-prep zone seems to persist to the recapitulation’s onset, downplaying the sense of RT.

As \textbf{Example 5.13} demonstrates below, the RT-prep zone is signalled by a climactic Ger. 6 chord (mm. 98–99) in F-sharp minor (iii). This RT-prep zone is marked by $P_{\text{head}}$’s stronger prominence (perhaps in anticipation of the recapitulation) and an intensification characterized by the increasing pace at which two consecutive ascending sequences achieve their 5–6 phases. For a broader sense of pace at the RT-prep’s start, more specifically, the first sequence (mm. 100ff.) presents each 5–6 phase as a four-measure unit. This sequence conveys a gradual increase in motion by repeating its initial phase (mm. 100–104; 104–108) on a C-sharp-major sonority (V of F-sharp minor) before transposing it up by step to the subsequent D-major (mm. 108–112) and then E-major chords (downbeat of m. 112). This arrival on E quickly reveals itself as V of A minor (v), however, and launches the second ascending 5–6 sequence on the hypermetric reinterpretation in m. 114 (3=1), which intensifies the forward-pressing motion. From here on, this second sequence (mm. 114–118) expresses an acceleration since it achieves each of its 5–6 phases in two-measure units and sets out to lead through the bass notes, A–(F#)–B–B–(G#)–C#–C#–(A)–D. As \textbf{Example 5.13} demonstrates, though, the recapitulation cuts the sequence short. The recapitulation’s beginning on D interjects on the expected C# at what would

\textsuperscript{25} Although not discussed in detail here, see also Op. 49 (I), which also suggests DRT3 with a downplayed RT.
be the start of the third 5–6 phase (note how the second sequential phase in mm. 116–117 substitutes the forecasted dominant-to-tonic motion in C♯ with IV–V6/5 in the home key).
Example 5.13: Ascending 5–6 Sequences in the Downplayed RT; Op. 49, III, mm. 100–119

RT-prep=>RT (note Pedal's stronger prominence)

ascending 5–6 sequence no. 1

mm. 98–99
F提示 (iii): Ger. 6
hypermeter:

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1

ascending 5–6 sequence no. 2 continues? No. Recapitulation (retrospectively realized)

(reinforces V arrival) A (F) B B (G) C#

of A- (i)

2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 etc...

motion presses forward

*Note: Both sequences are variants of the ascending 5–6 sequence. No. 1 resembles the 5–6 sequence through ascending stepwise motion via voice-leading 5/3 chords. No. 2 demonstrates root-position variants of the 6/3 chords.
The acceleration of forward motion through the RT-prep zone to the D-R border represents the culmination of the development’s own intensification. This intensification begins with the development’s pre-core (mm. 47–54) and extends through core\(^{\text{part1}}\) (mm. 54–82) to the V arrival sealed DG (m. 82) in B minor (vi), which launches core\(^{\text{part2}}\) (mm. 82–100). As Figure 5.3 demonstrates, the pre-core and core\(^{\text{part1}}\) intensify in pacing, especially at the hypermetric level, to the subsequent zone. Given the pre-core’s use of P’s full hybrid-3 statement (as in mm. 1–8), a hypermetric reinterpretation (4=1 in m. 50; compare m. 4) appears midway through the pre-core, and this intensifies the motion to the core’s start.\(^{26}\) Delineated into three phases, core\(^{\text{part1}}\) then demonstrates its own intensification. Phase 1 (mm. 54–63) picks up the pace with a couple of hypermetric reinterpretations (4=1 in m. 57 and 3=1 in m. 59). Phase 2 (mm. 63–72) subsequently features \(^{\text{Phead}}\)’s stronger use and begins with a regular four-bar hypermeasure before ensuing reinterpretations lead to phase 3 (mm. 72–82). There, model-sequence technique drives the motion onwards through a chromaticized variant of the ascending 5–6 pattern (perhaps foreshadowing the ultimate 5–6 sequence to the D-R border). This sequence moves through CM (m. 72)—Dm (m. 75)—Em\(^6\) (m. 78) and finally to F\#M (m. 82) for the sealed DG. Hypermetric reinterpretations at the start and end of each four-bar unit generate the strongest forward-driving effect thus far, meanwhile, which Mendelssohn strengthens via phase 3’s overall dynamic build-up to fortissimo.\(^{27}\)

\(^{26}\) This intensification coincides with the continual characteristics of the pre-core’s hybrid 3 layout. Although mm. 54ff. recapture P=>TR (mm. 8ff.), moreover, it seems pre-core=>core by m. 54 due to the modulation to E minor (ii) by that point.

\(^{27}\) The successive hypermetric reinterpretations here form an outgrowth of the thematic irregularity characterized by the initial reinterpretation within P (i.e., m. 4).
Figure 5.3: Intensification in the Development’s Thematic, Hypermetric, and Tonal Layout; Op. 49, III, mm. 47–118

As Figure 5.3 continues to show, the sealed DG initiates a marked—and fitting—change in the thematic, hypermetric, and tonal layout for core\textsuperscript{part2} in two phases. Phase 1 (mm. 82–92) seems anticipatory given the static harmony, juxtaposition between fortissimo and pianissimo, and the refuge from hypermetric reinterpretation via the hypermetric stabilization of regular four-measure units headed by P\textsuperscript{CBI} (the stabilization coincides with the remote tonal area of B minor, vi). Eventually, a hypermetric reinterpretation (m. 92; 3=1) instigates further intensification in phase 2 (mm. 92–100). There, a discernible theme, sentential in proportion,
expresses yet another ascending stepwise sequence. In addition to being more chromatic, this sequence features 6–5 phases extended over the bar line, such that the resulting mid-bar effect and *sempre forte* dynamic create yet stronger intensification in this final phase of the core. Although this sequence ends in m. 96, P’s thematic liquidation in mm. 96–100 also carries the motion onwards to RT-prep’s start. RT-prep then intensifies the motion further (discussed above) as the culmination of the development’s build-up towards the underplayed D-R border.

That the development generates the forward motion channeled via the downplayed RT through the underplayed D-R border and into the recapitulation is important to the narrative of transformation through the form. Here, transformation is represented by the recapitulation’s recomposition of expositional elements.²⁸ The first change is conveyed by the forward-pressing motion, which instigates stronger fluidity up to m. 135, the corresponding measure to the V: PAC/EEC (m. 28). P=>TR (mm. 125ff.; compare mm. 8ff.) appears more concise, and channels the forward motion more efficiently up to this point. When Mendelssohn omits mm. 13–20, more specifically—and therefore the secondary key’s (A major’s) viiº6/5 of V material (this interrupts the emphasis on A major’s dominant)—the forward motion directs more readily to the ascending pull (mm. 128ff.; compare mm. 21ff.) towards the ESC. The omission of viiº6/5 of V material also signifies an important aspect of transformation in the recapitulation, since this same sonority (albeit in root position) maintains its interruptive role when it returns to evade the expected moment of ESC in mm. 135–136. This moment opens the space for the extended V pedal (mm. 137–141) to ensue, and is highlighted by the addition of the piano’s fluid sixteenth-note stream, which carries motion directly to it from the D-R border.

²⁸ The exposition (mm. 1–47) is continuous.
The recapitulation’s newfound fluidity up to m. 135 then initiates further transformation: the recapitulation expands in ways that reinforce the development’s tie to the rest of the form and the development’s role in the movement’s emerging end-weighted structure. After the evaded ESC, the forward-driving motion forges onwards to the newly extended compensatory V pedal (mentioned above), and builds climactically to the ESC. The piano’s sixteenth-note motion also highlights the transformed C zone’s newly expanded structure. In mm. 149–156, this structure recaptures the sequential lead-up (mm. 114–118) to the D-R border, but in a slightly modified way. As Example 5.14 demonstrates, these measures articulate the same ascent through chords built on A, B, and what should be C♯, and then D; but here, an ascending 6–5 sequence features applied V6/5 chords to AM and Bm before motion to DM prematurely enters. This motion to DM breaks the rising pattern, but still achieves the home-key tonic as endpoint. The recollection of this developmental component leads to further expansion through the addition of more strongly P-based material (mm. 156–172), which pushes the motion even closer to the movement’s end. Once the C zone achieves the ESC’s further reinforcement via its final I: PAC (m. 172), moreover, the codetta’s (mm. 172–188; compare mm. 39–47) newfound extensiveness emphasizes closure more strongly and convincingly than in the exposition as a fitting conclusion to the movement’s narrative of transformation.

29 Although from a tonal standpoint the move to D major preserves the use of diatonic triads (since one cannot tonicize viiº), D major feels premature in a temporal sense in its immediate context and given its reference back to the retransitional sequence.
Example 5.14: Recapitulatory C Zone Recalls the Retransitional Sequence; Op. 49, III, 149–156

Recapitulatory C zone continues (now expanded)
Ascending 6–5 sequence recalls the retransitional sequence

As such, the downplayed RT subtype of DRT3—the culmination of the development’s forward-driving motion, which channels through the underplayed D-R border—transforms the recapitulation’s take on expositional elements. The ascending 5–6 sequences so important throughout the development and leading up to the D-R border play a role in the recapitulation’s fluidity towards the ESC’s evasion. Expansion as transformation in the recapitulation then
follows: an extended V pedal (lacking earlier in the development) arises and achieves the ESC; the C zone recaptures similar ascending sequential motion from the development’s lead-up to the D-R border; and newly added P-based material expands the C zone further before it gives way to the lengthier codetta, which facilitates the movement’s more convincing end. These components express the recapitulation’s ultimate expansion and seem to convey transformation in the movement’s end-weighted design.

iv) Somewhat Insufficient RT (Special Cases involving D-R Overlaps)

In contrast to Op. 49 (III), the A-major overture to *Heimkehr aus der Fremde*, Op. 89 (1829) features the somewhat insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 that downplays the D-R border, in this case via thematic D-R overlap and a “wrong-key” RT. As Example 5.15 demonstrates below, this D-R overlap specifically features P-zero-P across the border, and extends from P-zero’s (compare mm. 32–42) persistence throughout a very brief development (mm. 185–207) directly ahead of the recapitulation’s (mm. 207–345) start on P (mm. 207ff.; compare mm. 43ff.).

**Example 5.15: D-R Overlap; Op. 89, mm. 185–216**
Although the development ends with fragmentation and acceleration (note the eighth-note figures and prominent dotted *sforzando* punctuations in shorter intervals), which may seem to anticipate the recapitulation’s onset, the tonal return lacks the level of preparation that a dominant pedal typically produces. The development ultimately alludes to iii via a “wrong-key” RT-complex (mm. 199–206) notwithstanding the static, pedal-like melodic emphasis on E (the home-key dominant) near the development’s end.\(^{30}\)

While this ending on iii features a descending bass arpeggiation through V–iii–I, recalling the V–III–I layout found in some Classical developments, iii’s emphasis here eschews more obvious and typical signals of pending tonal return, and therefore detracts from the recapitulation’s tonic-articulated onset. Given the development’s brevity, furthermore, one accepts the RT-complex gradually and in retrospect. The overlap involving P-zero might lead one to eventually understand the complex as part of a broader retransitional process that spans from the development’s start on V with its core, such that the entire development retrospectively expresses core=>RT. As part of this gradual process, the development activates the rhetorical/thematic signals (i.e., P-zero) ahead of the pedal devices typically associated with RTs (here, the melodic E pedal and sustained harmony, albeit on iii). This beginning on V also reaches iii via ascending fifths, which produces a stepwise ascending bassline through the short development from E, the dominant, to A, the tonic at the recapitulation’s start (refer back to **Example 5.15** at the start of this discussion).

\(^{30}\) This RT-complex is complete with proposals, iii-arrival RTC (m. 205), and RTC-fill (mm. 206–207; note the bass 5–6 motion with root-position substitution of the 6-phase chord above C to the tonic initiating the recapitulation).
This gradual realization of the somewhat insufficient RT downplays the tonal return—
despite some effects that might anticipate the recapitulation’s onset—and plays an important
role in the overture’s narrative trajectory. In this narrative, the somewhat insufficient RT
amplifies the exposition’s (mm. 32–185) overall avoidance of strong tonic articulations at
boundaries, which perpetuates the overture’s quest for resolution into the rest of the form. This
avoidance is sometimes expressed by cadential evasion, but primarily, the mostly sustained
emphasis on IACs throughout the exposition at junctures and/or moments of rest. These
moments are also made less impactful through different types of overlaps, albeit none as
complex or overt as the D-R overlap. **Figure 5.4** summarizes these moments below.

**Figure 5.4: The Exposition Avoids Strong Tonic Articulations at Boundaries; Op. 89**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juncture or Point of Rest</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Articulation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro-P-zero</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>tonic reharmonization; phrase overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-zero-Pa</td>
<td>42-43</td>
<td>I arrives ahead of Pa’s onset; phrase overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa: antecedent end</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>IAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa: consequent end</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>covered PAC; accompanimental overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb cadential reinforcement</td>
<td>66; 70</td>
<td>IAC; accompanimental overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb-Pa*</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Phrase overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-fill (5-4-3-2-1)-1S</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Phrase overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S-repeat</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>IAC; elision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S-2S</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>IAC; elision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S-repeat</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>evaded cadence; elision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S-Apparent C(P)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>evaded cadence; elision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent C(P)-Codetta</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>IAC/EEC; elision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By amplifying the exposition’s avoidance of strong tonic articulations at boundaries, the
development acts as the turning point in the overture’s end-weighted narrative; it boosts the
search for resolution—i.e., the I: PAC/ESC—in the recapitulation by instigating a
transformation via recomposition of expositional materials. The recomposition of the MC-S
juncture is particularly telling of this transformation and the development’s tie to the rest of the
form. As **Example 5.16** demonstrates below, the MC-S juncture now incorporates thematic overlap like the development.

**Example 5.16: Thematic Overlap at the Recapitulatory MC-S Juncture; Op. 89, mm. 219–236**

Here, however, the thematic overlap (as opposed to a “wrong-key” allusion) downplays the tonic at S’s onset (mm. 231ff.; compare mm. 119ff.). When S material enters prematurely as MC-fill (mm. 226–230), namely, the effect is of a false beginning, which detracts from S’s true tonic-articulated start. This transformation contributes to the narrative’s quest for resolution, since it expresses a progression from the D-R overlap: S’s premature thematic entrance continues to downplay the tonic without diverting away from the tonic tonally. This transformation is also highlighted by the recapitulation’s more direct path to the expanded S
zone, which draws sharper focus on S’s delay of the ESC closer to the overture’s end.\textsuperscript{31} When the I: PAC/ESC (not covered) finally arises in m. 345, it delivers the strong tonic arrival that has been withheld throughout the overture, and especially by the somewhat insufficient RT that downplays the tonic at the recapitulation’s onset.

This tutti, fortissimo ESC that is neither an IAC, a covered PAC, nor an articulation with overlap or elision (note the use now of separate, consecutive hyperdownbeats in mm. 345–346) truly functions as the triumphant resolution to the narrative thread across the form. In addition to the drawn-out build-up that anticipates this momentous event, Mendelssohn reinforces the ESC via several IACs in codas I (mm. 346–365; see, specifically, mm. 349 and 343) and II (mm. 366–369; note that the final IAC returns to material from the introduction—compare mm. 1–32). As a concluding thought, the returns to IACs highlight the I: PAC/ESC by virtue of its uniqueness. They also provide commentary on the persistence of IACs throughout as the unifying thread across the overture’s narrative, in which the development plays an important role. The somewhat insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 strengthens the sense of end-weightedness through the form when it downplays the tonic at the recapitulation’s onset. This act instigates a transformation via recomposition of expositional materials in the recapitulation, which furthers the narrative’s quest for resolution to the overture’s very end.

\textsuperscript{31} Note that P\(_n\)=>TR (mm. 207–230; compare mm. 43–119) replaces P’s small ternary structure. Note also how P insertion arises as the apparent C(P) zone (mm. 259ff.; compare mm. 151ff.) to evade closure before subsequent events further delay, and ultimately strengthen, the ESC. These events are: the apparent C(P) zone’s repeat, which undoes the proposed covered I: PAC/ESC (m. 293); the passage in A minor (mm. 301–320); and ultimately, the reharmonization of the tonic via the fortissimo V\(^7\)/IV chord (mm. 337–338) several measures before the true I: PAC/ESC.
The somewhat insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 in the C-minor overture to *Ruy Blas*, Op. 95 (1839) similarly involves a D-R overlap with misalignment between the recapitulation’s thematic (mm. 246ff.) and deep-level tonal return (m. 269). The RT-complex (mm. 250–268) begins past the start of recapitulatory space, as such, and culminates with a V⁷ arrival RTC (mm. 261–268) just before S’s onset (mm. 269ff.; compare mm. 101ff.). This V⁷ arrival RTC is also itself expanded; the articulation of the tonic in m. 265 appears only on the surface and is subsumed within this larger dominant. The RT relinquishes its anticipatory function, making it somewhat insufficient. Given the way the somewhat insufficient RT pushes the RTC just before S’s onset, the RT helps to instigate the overture’s increasingly end-weighted design. The I: PAC/ESC (m. 388) gets pushed progressively towards the end, more specifically, when recapitulatory S space expands to balance the distance from the RTC. The RT also becomes important to the overture’s aesthetic by channeling the forward motion from the development (mm. 172ff.) to the return of the introduction’s (mm. 1–31) four-measure *Lento* material given by the horns (O; compare mm. 1–4; 13–16; 28–31) just before S. The RT highlights the overture’s unique integration of the O material into the body of the sonata in this way—both here in the recapitulation and before S in the exposition—and in so doing, contributes to the narrative of transformation across the form. This narrative seeks to resolve the blurred D-R boundary via the PAC/ESC at the overture’s end, and is expressed by the ultimate change from C minor to C major.

A contributing factor to the RT’s forward-channeling nature is the development’s role in generating continuity into and through the thematic recapitulation. Especially significant is S’s

---

32 In my interpretation of the ESC, I prioritize the tonic arrival in the winds at m. 388 over the strings’s articulation in m. 400.
use later into part 2 (mm. 188ff.) of the core (mm. 172ff.) to downplay the thematic recapitulation as if it were additional core material. As Figure 5.5 demonstrates, S (mm. 214ff.) emerges from the energetic apparent C material (compare mm. 140–172) in corepart2. Initially timid and withdrawn (note the sparse, static, and pianissimo texture), S seems like a parenthetical interpolation or momentary digression away from the development’s otherwise energetic atmosphere (note the earlier use of TR and P; compare mm. 64–97 and 32–64, respectively). When this S material begins to build on iv (mm. 236ff.) and gain momentum to the fortissimo viiº4/3-turned-V4/2 in mm. 242–245, the sense of anticipation seems geared towards resuming the apparent C—or possibly TR or P—material from before it. As such, P’s onset from mm. 246ff. feels, at least momentarily, more like a localized return, still within the core following a brief digression, rather than a thematic return at the large-scale level. This feeling is reinforced by the tutti texture that continues through P. The deep middleground prolongation of the subdominant also downplays the thematic return by channeling the motion through to Panteecedent’s HC (m. 250)—simultaneously the RT: V proposal. From this point onward, moreover, RT: V is proposed per measure (mm. 251–254) and expanded (mm. 255–261) up to the RTC. The RTC, which does double function as the RTC and recapitulatory MC, is also itself expanded by mm. 261–268, which includes O’s return. In this way, the RT fuses with P=>TR (mm. 246–265) at the recapitulation’s start and participates in channeling the motion from the development to the RTC and its inclusion of O.

---

33 P, TR, and apparent C do seem alike given their shared energetic eighth-note countenance.

34 The thematic return on i6 (bass E♭) passing to V7/V (bass D) prolongs iv in this broader motion to V.
Figure 5.5: Development’s Thematic and Form-functional Layout; Op. 95, mm. 172–269

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Thematic Recap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core&lt;sup&gt;part1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Core&lt;sup&gt;part2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>forte</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-: i&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt; arr. sealed DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thematic Recap

| | | Tonal Recap |
|----------------|----------------|
| RT-complex | O | S |
| P=&gt;TR | | |
| **ff + tutti** | | |
| Motion | RT: V prop. (expansion) | V’s arrival RTC (expanded) | C+(I): I |

That the development channels motion straight to O in the recapitulation highlights O’s presence in sonata space as a key aspect in the overture’s narrative of transformation.

Highlighted at this point in the recapitulation, O serves multiple purposes. From a practical standpoint, O announces S as it does earlier in the exposition (mm. 32–172) as MC expansion (mm. 93–100). O also acts as a buffer here in the process of transformation, which ultimately sees to the overture’s change from minor to major. Strong, stately in its character, and pronounced slowly as if to show importance, O’s expansion of the RTC grounds and stabilizes the eighth-note scalar descent in C minor by allowing the motion to settle more firmly on V (m. 268; note the fermata) before C major takes over from S onwards. The rest of the overture then seeks to solidify this transformation through closure. As in the exposition, however, this is not achieved straightaway. S (mm. 269ff.) and the apparent C zone (mm. 304ff.) reappear intact from the exposition and attempt for the ESC; but whereas the expositional apparent C zone does obtain the III: PAC/EEC (m. 172), the recapitulatory S becomes even more expanded. P returns
and reverts to the minor mode to initiate an apparent coda (mm. 340ff.), which evades the apparent C zone’s build-up to closure, delaying the ESC even further. Before too long, though, P achieves another build-up that reinitiates apparent C material (mm. 366ff.) for yet another try. This material in *fortissimo, tutti* texture now achieves the long-awaited I: PAC/ESC (m. 388) successfully in C major as a reaffirmation of the transformation to the major mode and the overture’s triumphant end.

That the somewhat insufficient RT due to D-R overlap channels the motion towards S speaks to how the DRT3 development “compensates” for S’s somewhat less ostentatious presence in the development itself. By channeling motion towards O before S, furthermore, the development highlights O’s use throughout the form as goal posts or markers, each of which apportions lengths of sonata space for motion to forge through. Figure 5.6 demonstrates that motion channels through three resulting spaces: (1) P-MC in the exposition (note also the elision at P’s PAC ending), (2) S in the exposition to the MC in the recapitulation, and (3) S in the recapitulation to the end of the movement. This trajectory reinforces the path to minor-major transformation, since the change to C major occurs in the third space; notwithstanding the development’s launch from E-flat major (III), the exposition’s secondary key, the development lies principally in minor keys. The transformation summarized as: elision (at the EEC) $\rightarrow$ blurred D-R boundary $\rightarrow$ resolution (at the ESC)—is also realized through the trajectory in Figure 5.6, and shows the amplification of forward-driving motion in the progression to the blurred D-R boundary before resolution can be achieved.
Figure 5.6: Transformation in Op. 95, mm. 1–414

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Thematic Recap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Space 1</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>RTC-complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–31</td>
<td>32–64</td>
<td>64–93</td>
<td>93–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80–92</td>
<td></td>
<td>101–140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C MINOR (i)</td>
<td>i: PAC (elided)</td>
<td>III: PAC/EEC (elided)</td>
<td>amplified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tonal Recap | Apparent Coda | Cadential Reinforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space 3</th>
<th>App. C</th>
<th>[P]</th>
<th>[C]</th>
<th>[C]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td><em>4+4+4+4+3</em>+4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C+ (I) | C- (i) | C MAJOR (I): PAC/ESC

Resolution
= Transformation

* = hypermetric reinterpretation between adjacent hypermeasures
By channeling motion from the development to O’s interpolation ahead of the recapitulatory S, therefore, the somewhat insufficient RT due to D-R overlap inspires the overture’s increasingly end-weighted design via the ESC’s delay and plays a significant role in the aesthetic of transformation from minor to major—and towards resolution—which binds the overture into a unified whole.

Another somewhat insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 that involves D-R overlap occurs in the second movement of Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (1842) in F major and serves as a closing example for this chapter. Here, the somewhat insufficient RT occurs when the development (mm. 105–183) overlaps thematically and tonally with recapitulatory space (mm. 183–242). As Example 5.17 demonstrates, the thematic overlap caused by $\text{P}^{\text{CBI}}$’s (mm. 176–183; compare mm. 9–12) premature entry functions as a false recapitulation, which delays the RT: V6/4 pedal (mm. 183ff.) from its more “regular” position leading up to recapitulatory space. Misaligned, the RT: V6/4 pedal fuses with the true thematic recapitulation’s onset. This misalignment blurs the D-R boundary and allows the RT to channel the motion forward, through the border, and into the latter regions of the movement. There, the increasingly delayed ESC materializes closer towards the movement’s end as “compensation”—as a way of balancing the distance from the strong arrival produced earlier by the RT-connect (m. 193) past the start of recapitulatory space.
Example 5.17: D-R Overlap; Op. 56, II, mm. 172–194 (continued on next page)

F+ (I): V4/2  I6  [ V4/3 ] ii6  \( \text{vii}^9/\text{V}^7 \) = \( \text{vii}^9/4/2-\text{V}^7 \)  E\( \flat \) pedal  

mm. 163–167  168 ff.

False Recap
\( \text{pCBI} \)

Thematic Recap
\( \text{pconsequent}\rightarrow\text{TR} \)

motion forges through
Prevented from fulfilling its anticipatory role leading up to the recapitulation, the RT becomes somewhat insufficient, as such, but essential to the movement’s end-weighted design and the narrative of transformation towards unity and reconciliation that transpires across the form. This discussion pursues transformation as narrative in two layers: (1) from the internal vantage point or first-person perspective of an observer “at the scene” (i.e., of one following the individual events of “the story” in close proximity to or of being within the “action zone” without partaking in the “action” itself); and (2) from an external vantage point or aerial view as facilitated by an orator (i.e., narrative in terms of shifts in spatial distance from the perspective of an outsider looking in on and being drawn to and away from “the story” as a whole). As this discussion contends, transformation is relevant to both narrative layers, since specific changes across the form seem to suggest a progression of events that is applicable to both. By exploring narrative via these two streams, the present discussion also seeks to enrich existing perspectives on the movement and its extramusical affiliations within Mendelssohn’s well-known “Scottish” Symphony.

Especially pertinent are Thomas Grey’s (1997) ideas on the visual imagery evoked by the symphony.35 Grey believes that Mendelssohn himself visualized the inspiration for his “Scottish” symphony in terms of a picturesque historical landscape scene, and that in his composing of Op. 56, Mendelssohn treats the symphonic genre as a canvas to the type of landscape painting that depicts historical ruins.36 As such, Grey maintains that the historic


36 Sentiments of Mendelssohn’s inspiration at Holyrood Palace read from his famous and oft-quoted letter from Edinburgh of July 30, 1829: “In the depths of twilight we visited today the palace where Queen Mary lived
scenes which might be attached to each movement of the symphony “stimulat[e] reflection[s] on past times and historical events… [and] invite the viewer [or listener] to people them with spectral figures, historical or invented…” just as the historic ruins conveyed in landscape painting do.\textsuperscript{37} For Grey, these scenes or movements can be gleaned from Mendelssohn’s own specifications in the preface to the 1843 published score of Op. 56. Grey quite rightly notes that notwithstanding the \textit{vivace non troppo} tempo indication heading the second movement in the score itself, Mendelssohn specifies the rather suggestive indication, \textit{Scherzo assai vivace}, for the second movement (along with others for the remaining movements) in the concert program for the symphony. Given the Scherzo indication, Grey likens the second movement to a “country dances” tableau—“a Highland landscape with figures”\textsuperscript{38}. Continuing this vein of thought, this discussion imagines the second movement as a scenic representation of country dances.\textsuperscript{39} This scene serves as the contextual backdrop for the transformation towards unity and reconciliation—an innate theme pertaining to dance as a social event—which occurs in the first narrative layer. The second narrative layer pertaining to the act of storytelling also seems plausible for the second movement following on the heels of the first given the presence of an imaginary orator opening the symphony already in the first movement, which Grey interprets as

\begin{center}
\textquote{\ldots I think that there, today, I’ve found the beginning of my Scottish symphony.” Quoted in Grey (1997), 56.}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 56.

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 61.

\textsuperscript{39} The idea of the second movement evoking a social scene involving country dances also seems possible given specific musical cues. The opening melodic fourths suggest a call or beckoning to action for all to convene, the piping in the woodwinds and F-major key suggest a pastoral setting, and the scalar and triadic tune in a narrow range and lively 2/4 is appropriately simple for the informal dance scene, whose spritely atmosphere is also conveyed by the generally light articulation and texture.
a “scene of narration” or “balladic invocation”.\textsuperscript{40} To begin, though, the following paragraph elaborates on how the RT becomes downplayed through its delay in the first place.

The RT’s downplaying is facilitated by the measures leading up to the false recapitulation. When the viiºº/V arrival (mm. 168–176) in F major arises, more specifically, it is prolonged by a sententially proportional unit, which focuses solely on P\textsuperscript{head} material in the lower strings. This unit seems to suggest an RT-prep zone given the reduction in thematic material and change to slower harmonic rhythm in anticipation of V. Through a chromatic shift in the bass, however, the viiºº/V sonority ultimately becomes an applied V\textsuperscript{7} to the arrival on the subsequent E-flat-major chord (m. 176), which initiates P\textsuperscript{CBI}\textsuperscript{'}s entrance (mentioned above) in the flute alone. P\textsuperscript{CBI}\textsuperscript{'}s appearance here seems like the thematic return at first; but it alludes to E-flat major, revealing itself as a false recapitulation in hindsight. Ultimately, the subsequent bass adjustment (mm. 180–183) descends away from the E-flat-major chord to the V6/4 arrival accompanying P\textsuperscript{consequent} (mm. 183ff.)—retrospectively, P\textsuperscript{consequent}=>TR (mm. 183–193)—in near-tutti texture. This onset on V6/4 (mentioned above) simultaneously initiates the RT and true recapitulatory space. Beginning on V6/4 in piano then, the RT directs motion through the D-R border and into the recapitulation. Via a stepwise bass ascent and drawn-out crescendo through P\textsuperscript{consequent}=>TR, more specifically, the RT builds and forges onward to the strong tonic arrival RT-connect (m. 193) in fortissimo, tutti texture, which marks the tonal return and already initiates S (mm. 193ff.; compare mm. 72ff.).

\textsuperscript{40} Grey’s balladic invocation notion for the first movement is also gleaned from the preface on the score, where Mendelssohn specifies the Introduction and Allegro agitato indication for the first movement in the concert program for the symphony. The Introduction indication specifically serves as another suggestive deviation from the tempo indications (i.e., Andante con moto and Allegro un poco agitato) directly on the score of the first movement. Ibid., 61.
By forging through a fairly brief P => TR passage and channeling the motion directly to S, the RT highlights and becomes an essential aspect of S’s ultimate transformation, which also happens to be the development’s most overt tie to the rest of the form. In the development’s core (mm. 105–183), S only begins to mingle with P\textsuperscript{head} as if warming to the party atmosphere (note the “soft” dynamics and relatively sparse texture). As Example 5.18a demonstrates, S occurs simultaneously with sporadic statements of P\textsuperscript{head}'s sixteenth-note fragments, although S and P remain separate entities given their orchestration. This newfound mingling, which the development incites as an expression of S’s transformation, constitutes a crucial step in the narrative thread running through the form. On the one hand, the development’s mingling of S with P marks a significant departure from the neat distinctness maintained between the two themes in the exposition (for S in the exposition, see Example 5.18b).\textsuperscript{41} On the other hand, the development’s rendition of S acts as the predecessor to S’s stronger integration with P in the recapitulation.

\textsuperscript{41} The exposition demonstrates a clear delineation of its thematic components. The layout appears as follows: P-zero (mm. 1–8); Pa-a-b-a (mm. 9–24, 25–33, 33–40, 41–49); TR(P) (mm. 49–72) including a V\textsuperscript{7} arrival MC (m. 67) and CF (mm. 67–72); S (mm. 72ff.); apparent C (mm. 93ff.); and I: PAC/EEC (m. 104).
Example 5.18a: Development’s Rendition of S; Op. 56, II, mm. 152–168
This rendition is carried forward as a direct tie to the development, but undergoes further transformation in the recapitulation, where the mingling is intensified as an ultimate expression of unity and intermixing in the celebratory excitement amidst what seems like the height of this social scene. Achieved through \( P \rightarrow TR \) forging onwards, \( S \) becomes more strongly and seamlessly integrated with \( P \), namely, when \( h^{head} \) becomes a part of \( S \)'s thematic line itself above \( P \)'s now continuous sixteenth-note texture in the lower strings and bassoon (see Example 5.18c below). In \textit{tutti, fortissimo} texture as though infused with the spirit of the dance, the recapitulatory \( S \) theme also appears more outward-facing in contrast to \( S \)'s previous, more reticent manifestations where the revelry only just begins in the exposition and development.
The development plays an important role in S’s transformation across the form. This transformation itself holds the dual function of representing the two narrative layers mentioned near the start of this discussion. The gradual progression of events produced by tracing S’s appearances across the form demonstrates the first narrative layer, which chronicles the observer’s account of the “action” within “the story”. The second narrative layer, meanwhile, follows the transformation in terms of the changes in distance as mediated by a hypothetical orator. The orator draws the observer progressively closer to and into “the story”. This zooming in is then balanced by the orator zooming out and leading the observer away, leaving “the story” and its contents far off in the distance. Where closing distance is associated with immersion,
these changes are mostly sonically conveyed by textural and dynamic alterations, such that loudness and notions of propinquity generally align. The closer one draws to the heart of the “action”, the louder the surroundings become. Still, the sense of being drawn to and into the “action zone” of “the story” remains deeply motivated by the actual changes in theme discussed above that generate S’s transformation and which convey a sense of progress across the form in the first place. As such, the gradual “crescendo” that one traces with each subsequent expression of S across the movement towards S’s ultimate tutti, fortissimo setting and integration with P, not only seems to suggest advancement with regards to “action” (i.e., to the height of the festivities conveyed), but also immersion into the heart of “the story”.

The forward-driving effect channeled by the somewhat insufficient RT is therefore crucial to the final length taken in closing the distance for the observer’s full immersion into the heart of “the story” where the height of the “action” resides. As Figure 5.7 demonstrates, this forward-driving effect is generated by the development as a whole. The two parts of the core (mm. 105–124; 124–183), as defined by the V arrival sealed DG (m. 124) in D minor (vi), each undergo a similar acceleration with respect to P’s use and fragmentation. The progressive shortening of P\textsuperscript{CBI}’s initial four-measure unit to two- and then consecutive one-measure units ultimately produces a stream of sixteenth notes. This shortening articulates an acceleration that is enhanced by a drawn-out textural and dynamic crescendo across both core\textsuperscript{part1} and core\textsuperscript{part2}. For core\textsuperscript{part2}, however, the acceleration culminates with S mixing with P, such that closing distance is expressed not only by the intensification across each part of the core through P\textsuperscript{CBI}’s progressive shortening, but also by S and P being physically united.
Figure 5.7: Developmental Layout; Op. 56, II, mm. 105–193

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part1}</th>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration 1</td>
<td>Acceleration 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p \rightarrow \text{cresc. to tutti, fortissimo})</td>
<td>(pp \rightarrow \text{cresc. to tutti, forte})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-mm.</td>
<td>4-mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-mm.</td>
<td>2-mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mm.</td>
<td>1-mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–112</td>
<td>124–131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113–118</td>
<td>132–135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119–124</td>
<td>136–151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi: V arr. sealed DG</td>
<td>152–168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168 ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That motion generated by the development directs through the D-R border via the somewhat insufficient RT and allows for a more direct path to S’s ultimate union with P before the ESC’s delay closer to the movement’s end. When P-TR reappears transformed in the recapitulation with newfound concision and fluidity, the motion goes straight to S. S’s \textit{tutti, fortissimo} texture continues onwards into the rest of the recapitulation as if to suggest the continued whirlwind of the country dance. As such, S maintains its expansion outwards via an apparent C (mm. 214–242) zone just like in the exposition. Instead of claiming the ESC as it did the V: PAC/EEC after several measures, though, the apparent C zone now becomes increasingly drawn out.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{42} Note how the apparent C zone proposes the ESC twice (mm. 221; 234) ahead of the actual I: PAC/ESC (m. 242).
This loosening of the apparent C zone seems to suggest an increasing distance following the height of the “action” and now nearing the movement’s and “the story’s” end. Gradually fading from its *tutti, fortissimo* onset to a sparser, lighter texture in *piano*, the apparent C zone undoes each of its ESC proposals by repeating its thematic material. Notwithstanding the dotted figures in the winds, this material also pairs down to P’s characteristic sixteenth-note texture, which now eschews P’s melodious figuration for a more static rendition. The excitement seems to fade away further as the apparent C zone loosens by alluding to the developmental key of D minor (vi), perhaps as a final commentary on the development’s role in driving the motion to the movement’s end and in generating the evocations of transformation and distance that are so pertinent to the narrative interpretation of this movement.

When the I: PAC/ESC does materialize, it is not outwardly gregarious, but rather, more in tune with the sense of action fading and of one being led away from “the story” scene. With this sentiment, the coda (mm. 242ff.) commences, and as a reversal of the exposition’s P-zero and P zones gradually drawing the observer in at the start of “the story” (note the “quiet”, sparse texture which grows with each segment of P heading to TR(P)’s *tutti, fortissimo* onset as if getting closer), $P_{\text{head}}$ now occurs in a delicate *piano* texture that diminuendos as if to suggest an increasing distance. Eventually, $P_{\text{head}}$ (mm. 257ff.) appears in *pianissimo*, ascending in ripples through the tonic triad of the F-major (“pastoral”) key. These ripples become more delicate still as if to suggest yet further distancing when they ultimately disperse and descend to the movement’s final *pizzicato* chords and dissolved scenic ending.

The somewhat insufficient RT subtype of DRT3 due to D-R overlap therefore demonstrates a tie to the rest of the form. Via the motion it channels, the RT instigates the recapitulation’s concision and fluidity, so that the motion presses onwards, delaying the ESC for
the movement’s end-weighted design. From the development, which generates an acceleration through each part of its core, the motion forges directly to S’s more outgoing and integrative state near the recapitulation’s start. S’s transformation—dynamically and texturally amplifies the development’s earlier, more inward-facing integration of S with P in its core. S’s ultimate manifestation seems representative of the climax for both the internal and external narrative layers spanning the movement, meanwhile. These layers respectively convey changes in “the action” and the evocation of spatial distance associated with the act of narration itself. For the former, climax seems suggested by the strong expression of unity between S and P, which might be interpreted as social mingling at the height of the dance. For the latter, climax seems suggested by immersion into “the story” given the reconciliation or closing in of physical distance between S and P in addition to the physical nearness conveyed by S’s sonic “loudness”. The development partakes in the sense of acceleration across the form as expressed by the increasing fluidity and integration between P and S that one can trace from the exposition to the development and finally, the recapitulation. In these ways, the DRT3 development plays an important role in the narrative of transformation towards unity and reconciliation, which elides the movement’s formal sections into a cohesive whole.

**Conclusion**

As I have shown through the eight analyses in this chapter, DRT3 developments call for “compensation” towards the ends of movements via the mostly sufficient RT, sufficient-insufficient RT, downplayed RT, and somewhat insufficient RT (special cases involving D-R overlaps). These RTs underplay the D-R border in some way, and in so doing, facilitate the end-weighted trajectories which become important to the sense of narratives across movements. With the mostly sufficient RT in Op. 6 (IV) and Op. 110 (IV), the retransitional sequence
(ascending 5–6) directs its forward-driving motion through the D-R border. The **sufficient-insufficient RT** in Op. 56 (IV), on the other hand, begins as an RT: V pedal but meets a tonal and dynamic block, which causes the energy to wane towards the recapitulation’s start. The **downplayed RT** via “wrong-key” RT underplays the D-R border in Op. 90 (I), meanwhile, and in Op. 49 (III)—as with the mostly sufficient RT—the retransitional sequence (ascending 5–6) downplays the D-R border too, but the sense of retransitional space is only retrospectively realized. In each of these five movements, the RT directs attention towards the movement’s end, where a “compensatory” V pedal sets out to either achieve a strong ESC (as in Op. 6, IV; Op. 56, IV; Op. 90, I; and Op. 49, III) or reinforce closure (Op. 110, IV) closer towards the movement’s end. With the exception of Op. 49 (III), these goals are further delayed, however, when N returns as in Op. 90 (I), or when material from a previous movement returns and not only adds to the sense of narrative through the form, but also, the sense of unity across the piece as a whole. For Op. 110 (IV), the return plays a role in the transformation narrative from D-major-to-minor, and is itself facilitated by the growing prominence of the A–B♭–G♯–A motive from the RT. For Op. 6 (IV) and Op. 56 (IV), meanwhile, the return, as facilitated by the “compensatory” relationship between the RT and later V pedal, works to invoke nostalgia in the end.

Other narratives of transformation were suggested in Op. 89, Op. 95, and Op. 56 (II) as closing examples for this chapter. The **somewhat insufficient RTs** in these three movements involve D-R overlap in different ways and direct attention towards a strong ESC as “compensation” for the downplayed D-R border. In Op. 89, thematic overlap via the premature entry of beginning material occurs when P-zero-P spans the D-R border just as a “wrong-key” RT approaches the recapitulation’s tonic-articulated onset. In Op. 95, on the other hand, the RT-complex fuses with the thematic recapitulation, such that the tonal and thematic returns misalign. Op. 56 (II) demonstrates elements of both Op. 89 and Op. 95, meanwhile, since it
involves the premature entry of beginning material (i.e., $\text{P}^{\text{CBI}}$ as false recapitulation) and misalignment of the thematic and tonal returns. In all three of these movements, the overlap channels the motion through the border and incites the recomposition of expositional elements in the recapitulation. This recomposition paves a more direct path towards the expanded S zone, which delays the ESC for a stronger, more fulfilling close. By facilitating such end-weighted trajectories, RTs of DRT3 developments play a strong role in narratives which express transformation towards resolution (i.e., the change to congruence at the ESC in Op. 89, Op. 95), as well as unity and reconciliation (i.e., P’s integration with S and the change to S’s outward state in Op. 56, II) across the form.
Chapter 6
Developmental Relationship Type (DRT4): The Development Comments on an Aspect from the Exposition and/or Introduction and Furthers the Action into the Recapitulation and/or Coda

DRT4 developments, like DRT3, exhibit strong ties across whole movements, since they expand on an aspect from the exposition and further it into the rest of the form. Over the course of eight examples, I demonstrate three subcategories of DRT4 developments in this chapter—those which further a (1) thematic; (2) motivic; or (3) harmonic/tonal aspect.

As in Chapters 3 to 5, I begin this chapter with the most straightforward discussions on DRT4 developments. I then present more complex interpretations with examples of DRT4 developments with the most pervasive ties across entire movements. The development of the third movement of Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 transforms TR material as an intermediary stage in the movement’s progression from conflict to resolution. The overture to Die Hochzeit des Camacho, Op. 10 (1825) features a rather tame development that perpetuates the desire for S’s further treatment into the recapitulation. DRT4 developments in the “Trumpet” Overture, Op. 101 (1825; revised 1826, 1833) and the first movement of String Quartet No. 2 in A minor, Op. 13 (1827) then ensue. Both further P’s expositional layout, and in so doing, channel narratives that achieve reconciliation in the end via the reunification of P’s components following thematic overlap at the D-R border. Such coherence across the form is

---

1 Other DRT4 developments not featured in this chapter, but which further a thematic aspect, occur in Symphony No. 5 (“Reformation”) in D major, Op. 107 (IV) and the overture to Die schöne Melusine, Op. 32. In Op. 107 (IV), Mendelssohn integrates chorale prelude practice with sonata form, and in so doing, features section B of the chorale “Ein’ feste Burg” in the development. In this way, the development represents progress from section A’s role in both the introduction and expositional TR. The development also prepares section A’s subsequent return
similarly facilitated by the DRT4 developments in the **first movement of Piano Quartet No. 3 in B minor, Op. 3 (1825)** and the overture to the cantata, **Die erste Walpurgisnacht, Op. 60 (1832; 1842–1843)**, which further a motivic aspect. In Op. 3 (I), the development facilitates a progression from conflict to resolution when it furthers the interplay between two motives. In Op. 60, meanwhile, the development projects F as a motivic-harmonic element onto a progressively larger-scale level, first as a new theme (2N), which goes on to facilitate the overture’s minor-to-major transformation.

The closing DRT4 developments for this chapter further a harmonic/tonal aspect, and in so doing, create a tonal diversion towards the D-R border. The DRT4 development in the **first movement of String Quartet No. 3 in D major, Op. 44, No. 1 (1838)** similarly amplifies F’s tie to tonal misdirection via another “wrong-key” RT in a narrative which gradually stabilizes F via its more common D-major harmonization towards the movement’s end. As culmination, the chapter closes with the **finale of String Quartet No. 6 in F minor, Op. 80 (1847)**, whose DRT4 development furthers the destabilizing role of VI when it becomes a tonal diversion within RT. This diversion—as with the “wrong-key” RT in Op. 44, No. 1 (I), as well as the D-R overlaps in Op. 101 and Op. 13 (I)—downplays the D-R border and directs attention into the rest of the form where resolution is finally achieved.

---

2 Other DRT4 developments not featured in this chapter, but which further a harmonic/tonal aspect include Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20 (III); Piano Sonata in E major, Op. 6 (I); **Meeresstille und glückliche Fahrt overture, Op. 27**; and Cello Sonata No. 1 in B-flat major, Op. 45 (I). In Op. 20 (III), the development highlights VI when E♭ (6) persists in the bass to the recapitulation’s underplayed launch on D (V6/4). In Op. 6 (I), the development furthers the role of the diminished-seventh chord and metric displacement via the way it underplays the D-R border. In Op. 27, the D-R overlap underplays the tonal return, and in so doing, furthers the de-emphasis of the tonic into
i) The Development Furthers a Thematic Aspect

The thematic subtype of DRT4 development in the third movement of Piano Sonata No. 2 in G minor, Op. 105 (1821) plays a role in the transformation narrative that pursues reconciliation across the form. The development’s (mm. 90–120) role in altering TR (mm. 24–50) at the start of its core (mm. 90–100) allows for reconciliation to transpire in two ways. In the first, TR’s transformation holds the immediate function of facilitating the development’s gradual path to reconciling P (mm. 1–24) in its original form for the recapitulation’s launch. In the second, the use of TR’s newly acquired state in the recapitulation (mm. 120–220) retrospectively clarifies S’s (mm. 50–74) start in the exposition (mm. 1–90). This start is made less distinct by the premature introduction of thematic S material with the cadential 6/4 at TR’s end which achieves the III: PAC/MC (m. 50). This latter path to reconciliation of this initial disparity between content and function at the expositional TR’s end articulates a large-scale narrative from conflict to resolution. I trace this narrative in my analysis by comparing the ends of TR’s subsequent appearances throughout the movement.

As Examples 6.1a and 6.1b demonstrate, the development alters TR significantly. The development interlaces TR’s two main thoughts with an intermediary passage (mm. 100–108, taken from the P-based codetta, mm. 74–82), on an E-flat pedal that seems to tonicize the flattened supertonic of the home key.3

---

3 These two main thoughts consist of TR’s compound basic idea (mm. 90–100) and cadential (i.e., leading-to-MC) material (mm. 108–111) derived from the earlier evasion within P’s own consequent phrase (see mm. 16–20; 20–24). While the E-flat pedal tonicizes iII, moreover, it ultimately functions as Ger.6 of the home key after the pedal point (V7/iII is enharmonically Ger. 6 of the home key).
Example 6.1a: Expositional TR; Op. 105, III, mm. 24–50

TR compound basic idea "fragment

24

i: PAC " cadential (failed) cadential (expanded)

34

V6/4-V7 VI iv6 V6/4 [vii07] (EC)

New idea = S? No. S

Premature S material

42

Example 6.1b: The Development Transforms TR; Op. 105, III, mm. 90–121

This pedal, though, connects to the VI chord (m. 108) which initiates TR’s cadential segment. TR’s cadential segment gives rise to a version of P (mm. 112–120) that more strongly resembles its original form and ultimately achieves the i: PAC/RT-connect (m. 120). Essentially, the incorporation of P-based codetta initiates RT-prep (mm. 100–120), since it allows for the inclusion of the E-flat pedal to expand VI as part of the cadential motion (mm. 108–111) that aims for the RT-connect. Although the cadential segment fails to achieve this articulation, first via the reprisal of VI in m. 110, and then the 6/4 chord in m. 112, the pedal initiates anticipation for the sentential P unit that ultimately achieves the RT-connect.
Example 6.1c: The Development Forwards its Version of TR to the Recapitulation; Op. 105, III, mm. 138–163

When TR (mm. 138–162) occurs in the recapitulation (see Example 6.1c above), it appears as it did in the development, now transposed from the development’s key of C minor (iv) to the tonic, G minor. The B-flat pedal (mm. 148–157) arises in place of the one on E-flat heard previously, as such, and thereby tonicizes VI of the home key instead of ,II. This change due to transposition incites the continuation of P-based codetta material (mm. 156–162) in place
of TR’s cadential idea (recall mm. 108–111), since the B♭7 chord (m. 156) becomes chromatically altered as B♭7 which tonicizes iv (mm. 157–158) to initiate a chromatic bass ascent to the i: PAC/MC (m. 162) for S’s (mm. 162–186) launch. This alteration—the extended use of the development’s infusion of P-based codetta material into TR to motivate a more direct path to the MC—retrospectively clarifies S’s start in the exposition. There, TR’s cadential idea (mm. 38–45) leads to a new thought (mm. 46–50) on the cadential dominant which secures the III: PAC/MC (m. 50) for S’s initiation. This new thought, as mentioned at the start of this discussion, however, turns out to be S’s thematic material as well, and so, renders the MC to be less effective and S’s onset less distinct.

As such, the inclusion of the development’s take on the recapitulatory TR rectifies the friction caused earlier by the juxtaposition between content and function (i.e., the mismatching of a cadential 6/4 with a new thematic idea that is recycled immediately as S) in claiming the MC in the exposition. Though on a local level, the development pursues its own path to clarifying P in its original form for the recapitulation’s onset, its own take on TR fits within this more global narrative that works towards resolution of this initial conflict caused by the way the 6/4 chord type and thematic content are mismatched. As Figure 6.1 demonstrates, the articulation of the 6/4 in m. 112 with thematic content that signals beginning function in the analogous place in the development provides an intermediary step in the movement’s move from incongruence to congruence. Here, incongruence is represented by the terminal cadential 6/4 (mm. 46–47) paired with the start of a new thematic idea in the exposition. Congruence, on the other hand, is expressed by the cadential 6/4 (mm. 160–161) matched with a typical closing gesture in the right hand at the corresponding moment in the recapitulation.
Figure 6.1: The Development as Intermediary Step in Facilitating the Movement’s Narrative from Conflict to Resolution as Represented by Subsequent Appearances of TR in Op. 105, III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of 6/4 chord</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cadential (End)</td>
<td>Intermediary</td>
<td>Cadential (End)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Narrative</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incongruence</th>
<th>Lessening of Content-Function Disparity</th>
<th>Congruence</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Within this context—and in correspondence with the development as an intermediary step in the movement’s narrative from conflict to resolution—the 6/4 in m. 112 might itself be referred to as an intermediary 6/4 chord, since it weakens the sense of content-function disparity at TR’s end in the exposition in either one of two ways. In the first, the 6/4 chord proposes V harmony at P’s (mm. 112–119) onset only to have its dominant function temporarily abandoned and then reclaimed at the end of the passage in m. 119. There, the cadential V6/4 coincides clearly with the thematic close of P’s eight-measure sentential statement. In the second, the 6/4 chord in m. 112 articulates the beginning of a four-measure unit yet is in the midst of descending stepwise bass motion (thus the P6/4 label on Example 6.1b above). Interpreted in either of these two ways, the harshness of the juxtaposition between the terminal cadential 6/4 and the premature onset of new thematic material earlier at the expositional TR’s end is certainly softened by the development in this transitory step within the movement’s journey towards resolution.

---

4 This motion stems from the E-flat (m. 108 at the start of the previous four measures) to the C of the predominant (m. 116 at the start of the segment succeeding it directly).
Through its role in transforming TR for the recapitulation, then, the thematic subtype of DRT4 development plays an active part in the movement’s two processes towards reconciliation. In the first process, the development attains P’s original form for the recapitulation’s onset. In the second, the development facilitates the large-scale narrative from conflict to resolution as expressed by the gradual alignment of cadential 6/4 with thematic ending material.

One also finds a **thematic subtype of DRT4** development that furthers a thematic aspect into the rest of the form in the **overture to Die Hochzeit des Camacho, Op. 10 (1825)**. In contrast to Op. 105 (III), however, the development fulfills a “compensatory” relationship to the exposition and furthers the action into the recapitulation when it leaves more to be desired with S and its treatment. S (mm. 58–72) feels relatively limited in the exposition (mm. 1–136), more specifically. S’s fifteen-measure length is largely eclipsed by the emphasis P receives. P’s antecedent phrase alone spans eight measures (mm. 9–16). When P’s consequent dissolves, first through an immediate repeat of its cadential fragment (mm. 25–26), and then through a melodic sequence to a new idea based on P (mm. 32–40), P material’s use also becomes quite extensive within the exposition’s first half. Even throughout mm. 40–52 where the V: HC/MC is proposed and articulated (mm. 40; 44; and 52), P’s energetic character carries on.

---

5 Op. 10 also seeks to “correct” an earlier thematic situation as Op. 105 (III) does, but through the development’s even stronger integration into the rest of the form. As this discussion demonstrates, developmental activity infuses into the recapitulation in Op. 10, but in Op. 105 (III), the development forwards specific thematic material into the recapitulation.

6 The overall construction of mm. 9–58 is P=>TR.
When S enters, it feels far from substantive by comparison, largely due to its construction. The S zone consists of one statement (mm. 58–65) and its repeat (mm. 65–72), but the theme alone—a hybrid 1—though comprised of eight measures, seems shortened. Not only does the end of the theme elide with the start of its repeat, the antecedent of this theme ends on $V^7$ (a nineteenth-century half cadence) and overlaps with the start of its continuation phrase midway through its fourth measure (m. 61) which results in the continuation phrase being out-of-phase from the hypermeter. S also feels insufficient due to the lack of a cadential segment and the use, instead, of a prolonged dominant in place of any increased harmonic activity within its continuation phrase towards the final cadence. When reached, moreover, the cadence is the imperfect authentic type, and is elided with the start of the S theme’s repeat (m. 65). The overall sense of S’s insufficiency is perpetuated by the fact that the theme’s repetition is exact; there is no adjustment for a V: PAC. As a result, the V: IAC ending is preserved, and as it happens, remains elided with the launch of the next zone, so that the EEC proposed is weak and deferred to a later point.  

---

7 The hybrid 1 interpretation of S is suggested by the shorter two-note fragments in mm. 61–65 which indicate continuation function and the arrival on V in m. 61 (although with the presence of a seventh) which seems still to function as a HC to the antecedent phrase in mm. 58–61. The HC’s presence is specifically hinted at by the orchestration: the antecedent is given by the woodwinds only, its ending articulated solely by the flute which completes the melody to imply V (i.e., the bassoon does not even sound the bass note), the seventh only being supplied by the brass section, when it enters simultaneously on the start of the continuation phrase to produce the phrase overlap midway through the bar.

8 The pianissimo dynamic in m. 72 and the fact that tutti texture is avoided (i.e., the focus remains on the strings) also suggest that an EEC is not likely at this point.
Example 6.2: Expository S (first statement only); Op. 10, mm. 58–65
The way one might expect an antecedent-consequent relationship between both S statements, but essentially is left without one brings about the sense that the ensuing P-based zone (mm. 72–100) might, at least initially, be P insertion. Given the insufficient EEC proposal in m. 72, this interpretation is perpetuated by the desire for a more convincing articulation to be achieved. As it happens, mm. 72–100 build in dynamic towards tutti texture and a fortissimo statement of more P material beginning on the downbeat of m. 100, where the true V: PAC/EEC occurs. The fact that P continues beyond this cadence suggests C(P) in mm. 100–120, which is directly preceded by an apparent C(P) zone (mm. 72–100) that retrospectively alludes to S’s completion. A codetta (mm. 120–136) which perpetuates the eighth-note motion also ensues so that the exposition’s second part feels heavily P-based, while S seems significantly outweighed thus far.

As such, the development (mm. 136–199) is left to appease the imbalance created by the rather limited S zone in the exposition. The softened E-D border facilitates this when it leads seamlessly and directly into S material. In the development, S (mm. 136–166) is treated rather tamely. S is initially presented as it was in the exposition, more specifically. As seen in the pre-core (mm. 136–150), S is immediately repeated and maintains the overlap between its compound basic idea and continuation phrases for S’s exact rendition, but in G major. Even

---

9 The lack of a stronger sense of closure at the end of S’s repeat precludes an antecedent-consequent relationship. According to Caplin (1998), “The consequent repeats and alters the antecedent so as to achieve greater closure by means of a stronger cadence. With few exceptions, a consequent ends with a perfect authentic cadence, thus fully completing the harmonic and melodic processes of the theme…” See Caplin (1998), 53.

10 The cadence here is a covered PAC, because B5 in the second violins articulates the tonic and main melody note, which is “covered” by the D♯6 entry in the flutes.

11 The codetta dissolves into the link by turning to the minor mode in mm. 132–133, and subsequently modulating to G major—V of the secondary key in mm. 134–136—so that the exposition “becomes” the development.
when one retrospectively realizes that the continuation phrase (mm. 146–150) functions as a model for the stepwise ascending sequence in mm. 150–158, the overall tone is of modesty and control. When the music begins to pick up the pace and modulates to B minor to present a series of shorter two-measure fragments (i.e., S’s basic idea) in a backwards fifths sequence (mm. 158–166), the action peters out rather prematurely and begins immediate preparations for the RT zone (mm. 166–199).

In comparison to the S material in the development thus far, the RT area exclusively uses P so that S and P are treated separately and almost equally represented within the development (thirty-one and thirty-four measures respectively). The efforts to strengthen S’s presence at the start of the development are thus neutralized. With respect to the development itself, furthermore, the effect is of an insufficient S-based core that does not manage to get fully underway. The relatively stable demeanor of the RT given by its prolonged pedal points and use of theme-like units also makes for a rather tame development which leaves much to be desired in terms of “developmental” activity. An eight-measure unit of a four-measure $P_{CBI}$-based segment and its immediate repeat is featured twice in the RT zone, first in RT1 (mm. 167–178), and then in RT2 (mm. 178–186). In the former, the theme-like unit is presented on a $V^7/IV$ pedal, which modulates via its Ger. 6 to the $V^7$ pedal of the tonic for RT2. RT1 therefore functions as a preparatory zone to RT2, where the RT: V is first proposed (m. 178). When RT3 (mm. 187–194) arrives on the downbeat of m. 187, another RT: V articulation occurs and initiates a theme-like unit that more closely resembles the original $P_{CBI}$ segment from the exposition in stronger anticipation of the recapitulation. The unit increases in dynamic throughout and culminates with the true RTC on the downbeat of m. 194. This arrival initiates RT4 (mm. 194–199), which functions as the exit. After the RTC, this final segment constitutes high-energy RTC-fill, in which the energy used to secure the RTC continues right up to and
through the D-R border (i.e., in the recapitulation, P is stated in full force in \textit{tutti} and \textit{fortissimo} dynamic). In this case, characteristics of this high-energy RTC-fill include: the near-\textit{tutti} texture, the use of accent and \textit{crescendo to fortissimo}, the theme-like unit’s fragmentation to just the head motive of P only, and the intensification produced by the ascending chromatic line in high register.\footnote{This rising chromatic line anticipating the beginning of the recapitulation recalls the chromatic ascent leading up to the MC area (mm. 37–40) and the moment of EEC (mm. 93–100).}

Thus far, S’s limited use in the exposition inspires an initially S-based development which ultimately feels insufficient due to the brief and rather reserved treatment of thematic materials. In this way, the development not only responds to the situation introduced by the exposition, but also furthers the action into the recapitulation by leaving something more to be fulfilled. In its reprise, P’s consequent phrase dissolves quickly into TR space; the basic idea (mm. 207–208) becomes the model for a descending fifths sequence into mm. 211–212. There, the basic idea goes on to complete a full CBI statement (mm. 211–214). Hereafter, the contrasting idea becomes fragmented (mm. 215–222), and the passage builds in intensity towards the vi chord in m. 223. At this point, the music begins to recapture material from the development—S$^{B1}$ sequenced in fifths (mm. 223–230)—which receives fuller treatment. This material becomes subsequently fragmented in a process of acceleration towards m. 237, where $\flat$VI is reached to prepare for P material’s return in m. 239 (see mm. 231–238).

“Developmental” activity does not cease here, though. The $\flat$VI chord reminds one of G major’s role in opening the development ($\flat$VI of the secondary key). Not only this, but the chromatic ascent in the woodwinds (mm. 237–239) also anticipates more action to come when it...
leads to the first MC proposal (m. 239) which initiates the MC area (mm. 239–263). Here, the “developmental” activity and the fortissimo dynamic continues; PBI in the upper strings intermixes with SBI and SCl in the mid-string range and woodwinds respectively proposes the MC along the way (mm. 243 and 247) until its actual articulation (m. 251). To close the P=>TR zone, caesura-fill ensues (mm. 251–263) to the start of S which appears as it did in the exposition. An apparent C(P), true C(P), and codetta then ensue. The thematic subtype of DRT4 development in the overture to Op. 10 therefore furthers the action proposed in the exposition by trying, unsuccessfully, to compensate for S’s limited use there, and inspiring, instead, TR’s rise as true “secondary development” in the recapitulation. There, S is featured more extensively and in a manner more likely to be attributed to the conventional notion of “development.”

Like the overture to Op. 10, the “Trumpet” Overture, Op. 101 (1825; revised 1826, 1833) in C major features a thematic subtype of DRT4 development (mm. 137–286) that facilitates a transformation narrative towards resolution across the form. This development furthers a thematic aspect from the exposition (mm. 1–137): P’s layout, specifically, 1P (mm. 1–28) followed by Pclosing (mm. 28–44) (see Example 6.3). By furthering P’s layout, the development also highlights and provides commentary on 1P’s quasi-introductory nature, as the

---

13 Recall the prior roles of chromatic ascent as a lead-up to the MC complex (mm. 37–40), the EEC (mm. 93–100), and the recapitulation (mm. 195–199).

14 Here, codetta=>link=>coda, just as codetta=>link=>development earlier.

15 pclosing—as opposed to the label, 2P—seems to more appropriately acknowledge the somewhat “after-the-fact” feeling of mm. 28–44, this especially given this passage’s brevity and static nature following upon the expansiveness of 1P and the strength of the I: PAC (m. 28) that 1P achieves.
end of this discussion later clarifies.\textsuperscript{16} As a whole, this discussion suggests the development’s crucial role in the overture’s aesthetic of transformation. The development facilitates a conflict with this thematic aspect, and then urges its resolution via transformation towards the overture’s end. This transformation narrative from conflict to resolution transpires across the form and is inspired by the development and its continued role in the recapitulation (mm. 286–396). There, material from the development helps to push the motion forward to the coda (mm. 396ff.).

\textsuperscript{16} Rhetorically, 1P shows characteristics of a slow introduction (note the long melodic notes paired with dotted figures and slow harmonic rhythm). With these traits, one may likely hear the start of a slow introduction for at least the first few measures. The effect renders a hypothetical P zone from mm. 28ff. rather short and unfulfilled, such that one retrospectively realizes the 1P-P\textsuperscript{closing} construction of the primary theme zone.
With its iterations of the dotted $P^{\text{head}}$ figure which persists from mm. 221ff. and again from mm. 268ff., more specifically, the development thematically segues into the recapitulation’s start straightaway with $P^{\text{closing}}$, such that $P$ spans and softens the D-R border.\footnote{Note how $P^{\text{head}}$ incites an anticipatory effect when it thickens the texture through its introduction from each of these points in the development. From mm. 221ff., more specifically, $P^{\text{head}}$ announces the onset of \textit{tutti}, \textit{fortissimo} texture before it facilitates the gradual build-up from mm. 268ff. towards the D-R border. The lack of $1P$ at the recapitulation’s launch, to which the development builds up, highlights and makes reference to $1P$’s quasi-introductory nature.}

The incongruence of this thematic overlap fuels the development’s commentary on $P$’s layout into the recapitulation. There, the \textit{divisi} material accompanying the dotted $P^{\text{head}}$ figure from the otherwise TR-based development (for TR, see mm. 44–71) returns (mm. 350–380) and interrupts S (mm. 315ff.; compare mm. 71–110).\footnote{That the development features TR material so strongly also demonstrates the development’s role in “compensating” for TR’s less elaborate presence in the exposition, where TR seems barely to come into fruition given its contrapuntal fugue-like design.} Originally from mm. 145–175 and 250ff., this TR-based \textit{divisi} material acts as a framing device which marks the start and end of the development (note that mm. 250ff. also feature $P^{\text{head}}$). Amidst the recapitulatory S zone, then, this return seems initially to evade the ESC and suggests the onset of an apparent coda that recalls the development’s start. $S$ does resume (mm. 380–396), though. $S$ claims the I: PAC/ESC (m. 396) and retrospectively renders the return of developmental material to be insertion expanding $S$.

Still, this developmental \textit{divisi} texture continues to accompany and therefore transform S when S resumes, now above a home-key V pedal that leads directly to the ESC. The added fluidity of this, S’’s transformation via the incorporation of material from the development—along with the fusion expressed by $P^{\text{closing}}$\textless$>$TR (mm. 286–315) and the excision of both the
C(P) (mm. 110–129) and codetta zones (mm. 129–137) in the recapitulation—drives the music onwards to the ESC’s launch of the coda straightaway with 1P in tutti, fortissimo texture. As such, p\textsuperscript{head} in the divisi’s return stands to “correct” the development’s earlier build-up to the recapitulation. There, p\textsuperscript{head} ultimately functions as part of the thematic overlap across the D-R border; but here, in the lead-up to the coda, p\textsuperscript{head} anticipates P’s return at the coda’s start.

The onwards drive to 1P at the coda’s launch therefore constitutes an important aspect in the narrative thread across the form, since the newfound thematic and form-functional congruence achieved at the coda’s onset acts as a counterweight to, and resolves, the incongruence of the thematic overlap expressed earlier at the D-R border. This resolution is itself highlighted by the divisi material which continues above the V pedal through S to the I: PAC/ESC—a setup which recalls the RT’s (mm. 278–286) claim of the I: PAC/RT-connect (m. 286) that initiates the recapitulation and exposes the thematic incongruence there.\(^{19}\) The parallelism drawn between these two areas in this way is further reinforced by the return of developmental divisi material in the recapitulation. The development’s framing structure carries on into the recapitulation (i.e., the S material flanks the insertional divisi texture) as continuation of the narrative, namely, and the developmental material’s return plays a role in the ESC’s delay closer to the overture’s end.

1P’s reinstatement for the coda’s start may also be seen to act as resolution to an additional thread which traces the development’s involvement in highlighting 1P’s quasi-introductory nature. When the development thematically segues into the recapitulation’s start

\(^{19}\) Note specifically the exact reprise of the material in the strings from m. 285 in m. 395. These measures immediately precede the RT-connect and ESC respectively.
straightaway with $P^{\text{closing}}$ such that $P$ spans and softens the D-R border, more specifically, 1P’s excision at the recapitulation’s start not only harks to the sense of slow introduction regarding this material from the piece’s onset, but also makes clear that a hypothetical P zone from mm. 28ff. is very brief indeed. The uncertainty about the scope of $P$ and that $P$’s wholeness is robbed—feelings that perhaps arise as one considers the possibility of a slow introduction at the very beginning of the piece—are therefore given attention to by the development. It is the development, furthermore, which moves towards strengthening the sense of $P$’s 1P-$P^{\text{closing}}$ layout by the coda’s onset. This ultimate resolution is then celebrated by the continued drive towards the overture’s triumphant close in *tutti*, *fortissimo* texture.

The thematic subtype of DRT4 development therefore furthers a thematic aspect in Op. 101 when it reinterprets $P$’s layout by facilitating a thematic overlap across the D-R border. The incongruence of this overlap incites a conflict, which material from the development then helps to resolve. When the development’s *divisi* material returns as insertion—and as $S$ expansion in the recapitulation, namely—the ESC is delayed to coincide with the coda’s onset. There, $P$’s return articulates a newfound congruence as resolution of the earlier conflict at the D-R border. In this way, the development plays a crucial role in the rise of a cohesive narrative that journeys from conflict to resolution through the form.

As with Op. 101, the thematic subtype of DRT4 development (mm. 93–151) in the first movement of String Quartet No. 2 in A minor, Op. 13 (1827) furthers $P$’s components, specifically its $P$-zero (mm. 19–27)-$P_1$ (mm. 27ff.) layout from the exposition (mm. 19–92) into
the rest of the form. From a large-scale perspective, the mostly P-zero-based development
anticipates the P1-based coda (mm. 226–251); but this relationship only constitutes part of a
much more intricate path through the form. This D-C relationship acts as a framework to two
narratives that the development supports. The first, discussed below, traces the development’s
forwarding of RT material into the recapitulation and coda and each successive appearance’s
increasing resemblance to P1. The second pursues the amplification of thematic overlap at the
boundaries of progressively larger levels through the form—most notably at the D-R border, and
subsequently, heading into the coda. Both are integral for transformation to be achieved, as P-
zero’s reconciliation with P1 expresses by the movement’s end.

As Example 6.4 demonstrates, the first narrative thread arises through the movement
when the RT (mm. 148ff.) furthers the P-zero-derived material (mm. 42–46) reappearing from
within P1 => TR (mm. 38–67) into the recapitulation (mm. 151–226; note specifically
mm. 191ff.) and then the coda (note mm. 244ff.). The chain of slight changes to the thematic
material played by the first violin in each of these three stages gradually achieves transformation
towards the theme’s closer resemblance to P1, more specifically. This closer resemblance
ultimately leads to P-zero’s (as given by the accompanimental sixteenth-note figures below) and

---

20 Following the eighteen-measure introduction, P-zero extends to m. 27. Although one might interpret
mm. 19–26 as the final portion of a multi-tempo introduction, a couple of factors suggest P-zero.

The first factor is that mm. 19–26 seem to belong together, and that these measures should be interpreted
as being in close relation to P1’s onset in m. 27. Note, specifically, how the V7 arrival (m. 23) initiates a four-bar
hypermeasure (mm. 23–26) that includes P1-based material (mm. 24–26) ahead of P1’s actual onset. This P1-based
material conveys ending instead of beginning function, since it extends the terminal V7 harmony from the
hyperdownbeat in m. 23. For this same reason, P1 begins in m. 27 and not sooner. This interpretation is also
reinforced by P1’s distinctness given the way the first violin announces P1 in its upper register above a rather static
accompaniment that sets P1 apart from the P1-based material of the preceding measures.

The second factor that suggests P-zero in mm. 19–26 and not introduction space is that the development
begins with and features the material from mm. 19–26 quite extensively. It would be highly unusual for the
development to be based on material from the introduction.
P1’s stronger integration with one another (note their simultaneous manifestation towards the movement’s end). Summarized in Example 6.4, this process demonstrates: (1) the RT infusing the first violin line with P1’s descent and triadic framework; (2) the introduction of stepwise motion in the RT’s return to expand S (mm. 172ff.) in a way that brings the apparent C(P) (mm. 198–206) zone to mind; and finally, (3) the additional changes in directional contour which make the thematic line most closely resemble P1 above P-zero by the movement’s end.
Example 6.4: Transformation towards P1’s Closer Resemblance and P1’s Integration with P-zero; Op. 13, I

Exposition (continued)

Development (continued)
triadic descent from P1 now featured

Recapitulation (continued)
S continues—passage recalls RT, but tune now brings Apparent C(P) to mind (see * below)

Coda (continued)
triadic outline now most closely resembles P1

* Apparent C(P)
This final transformed utterance expresses P-zero’s reconciliation with P1; their simultaneous appearance together here acts as the culmination of an additional path that expresses transformation. As Example 6.5 demonstrates below, this path traces the amplification of thematic overlap at successively larger levels through the form. One should note the following four events. First, small-scale intra-thematic overlap occurs between P-zero and P1 (note specifically mm. 23–27), as well as between P1\textsuperscript{antecedent} (mm. 27–38; i.e., mm. 35–38) and P1\textsuperscript{consequent} => TR.\textsuperscript{21} Second, the overlap becomes inter-thematic when S\textsuperscript{head} appears prematurely (mm. 51, 55, 58) before the S (mm. 59ff.) zone begins. Third, thematic overlap then becomes inter-sectional when exposition => development via the link’s (mm. 85–92) introduction of rippling sixteenths (m. 92) heading into the P-zero-based development. Fourth, both thematic and tonal overlap ensue at the D-R border when P-zero precedes the recapitulation’s immediate start with P1, still above the RT’s V6/4 pedal. All four of these events happen before the thematic overlap between the recapitulation and coda transforms to be much more extensive than at the E-D border. This overlap occurs when the oscillating eighth-note figures continue from the codetta (mm. 206–226) into the coda and become increasingly intense.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21} In Example 6.5, and elsewhere in this discussion, I use the word “premature” when thematic material belonging to the upcoming thematic zone appears directly ahead of it, before the end of the previous function, and in a way that suggests a disparity between content and function.

\textsuperscript{22} Note specifically the \textit{poco a poco crescendo} and eventual diminution to arpeggiated sixteenths, and finally to P-zero’s sixteenth-note figures by the RT’s return just short of the movement’s end.
Example 6.5: Overlap at Successively Larger Levels Through the Form; Op. 13, I

Exposition

P-zero

P1 antecedent

P1 material prematurely enters

19 Allegro vivace.

A- (i): V6/5

P1 antecedent continues

P1 material prematurely enters

33 etc...

VI iv 6 V6/4-5/3 i

i: HC

P => TR continues

S premature

S material

54 etc...

v: IAC/MC ...
That this path culminates with this final, more extensive overlap supports the transformation traced above: the RT’s first violin line gradually appears more and more like P1, such that P1’s simultaneous utterance above P-zero also expresses a convergence of the two transformation narratives across the form. This convergence seems to suggest reconciliation between P-zero and P1 as two otherwise distinct ideas. Throughout the form, P-zero and P1 alternate: within P=>TR of the exposition, within the development, and as the P-zero-based development anticipating the P1-based coda suggests. At the same time, the path towards more extensive overlap seems to express resolution as transformation in and of itself. For one thing, the coda thematically completes P with reference to the P-zero-based development. The coda, however, seems also to resolve the development’s limited use of P1 and P1’s somewhat stilted occurrence there.\textsuperscript{23} P1 appears transformed given the oscillating figures which continue through the R-C border and throughout the coda, namely. P1 seems livelier, more specifically; it appears more fluid and melodious, as well as more elaborately featured here by the movement’s end.

In this way, the thematic subtype of DRT4 development facilitates two transformation narratives across the movement when it furthers P’s components from the exposition and into the rest of the form. The first narrative discussed above articulates the return of RT material’s progressively stronger allusion to P1 above P-zero in a way as to suggest P-zero’s reconciliation with P1 by the movement’s end. The second narrative, meanwhile, seems to express the progressive amplification of thematic overlap at boundaries. In this narrative, the D-R overlap helps to direct towards the RT’s reappearance as recapitulatory S expansion. Ultimately, the narrative culminates with the most extensive overlap at the R-C border. This overlap, via the

\textsuperscript{23} Note how P1 breaks down from mm. 119ff. to the short, static fragments heading into the RT.
stream of oscillating eighths which grows to resemble P-zero over the course of the coda, demonstrates transformation most ostentatiously thus far. The fluidity brought by this stream amplifies the motion encountered earlier through the D-R border and directs attention towards the RT’s final manifestation in coda space. In this final manifestation, P-zero and P1 reconcile following their juxtaposition throughout the movement (recall the thematic overlap between P-zero and P1 at their first introduction, as well as by the contrast between the mostly P-zero-based development and P1-based coda). It is this separation of P-zero and P1 between the development and coda, however, which suggests that the coda thematically completes P with reference to the P-zero-based development in the first place. This resolution is supported further by the oscillating stream that transforms P1 to be more fluid and complete in the coda, such that here, P1 contrasts its earlier appearance in the development. The RT’s ultimate expression in the coda therefore acts as a point of convergence where the two narratives meet. P-zero and P1 sound simultaneously as a local representation of the large-scale resolution offered by the coda’s completion of P via P1’s more fulfilling presentation there. This transformation is expressed both locally and in a more large-scale manner that makes the movement all the more satisfying and aesthetically intricate as a whole.

ii) The Development Furthers a Motivic Aspect

Developments in the **motivic subtype of DRT4** also have strong ties to the rest of the form. One such example occurs in the **opening movement of Piano Quartet No. 3 in B minor, Op. 3 (1825)**. Here, the development (mm. 247–392) advances the exposition’s (mm. 1–247) interplay between two motives—neighbour (mm. 1–3) and stepwise motion from the first half of
Pa’s consequent phrase (mm. 9–13) (see Example 6.6)—towards resolution in the coda (mm. 559–627).²⁴

Example 6.6: Pa; Op. 3, I, mm. 1–25

---

²⁴ The stepwise ascent is also anticipated by the ascending line articulated in half notes (i.e., F₂–G–A–B in the right hand’s uppermost voice of the piano; see mm. 4–7) in the latter half of the antecedent phrase, which, however, appears strictly on the musical surface, embedded within the structural line that involves both G and A resolving down a step to F₂ and G respectively.
These motives alternate in prominence as they vie for dominance throughout the movement. The development, in particular, plays a vital role in this alternation, since it provides the stage on which the interaction between these motives intensifies. There in the development, stepwise motion emerges as a distinct thematic idea of its own to contrast the neighbour, which pervades more deeply: the development’s C-major (ⅱ/I) onset articulates a Neapolitan inflection and large-scale projection of P’s head motive against the B-minor (tonic-key) backdrop of the movement as a whole.

ⅱ/I’s emergence as a main entity is but one aspect of the development’s tonal landscape which furthers the motivic narrative by illuminating the neighbour’s hold on deeper levels of the music. The way D minor (ii of C minor—note C minor’s onset from mm. 297ff.) modulates back to B minor by transforming the D major chord (m. 319) into V⁹/7 of Ger. 6 (mm. 320–322) to prepare the home-key RT: V (mm. 323–392) retrospectively activates recognition of a web of relations that link the primary and secondary keys (B minor and D major respectively) more closely through ⅱ/I and ⅴ/I. These Neapolitan-complex sonorities serve as tonal and harmonic projections of the neighbour and its melodic emphasis on ⅱ/2 and ⅴ/6 in particular.²⁵

As the discussion below illustrates, the neighbour seems more pervasive from the start. P’s head motive (B–C–B) articulates 1–ⅱ/2–1 while G–F♯ (or incomplete neighbour 6–5) motions

²⁵ Christopher Wintle coins the term “Neapolitan-complex” (or N-complex) to refer to the relationships between Neapolitan and Neapolitan-related chords in Brahms’ instrumental music. ⅴ/I links the tonic and Neapolitan keys since it is enharmonically V⁷/Ger. 6, for example. N-complexes are also emphasized motivically, often through melodic chromatic-neighbour tone motion involving ⅱ/2 and ⅴ/6. For more on Neapolitan procedures, see Peter Smith, “Brahms and the Neapolitan Complex: ⅴ/I, ⅱ/I, and their Multiple Functions in the First Movement of the F-minor Clarinet Sonata,” in Brahms Studies 2, ed. David Brodbeck (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 169–208. See also Christopher Wintle, “The ‘Sceptred Pall’: Brahms’ Progressive Harmony,” in Brahms 2: Biographical, Documentary, and Analytical Studies, ed. Michael Musgrave (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 197–222.
are prominently heard throughout the rest of Pa (mm. 1–24), Pb (mm. 24–48), and Pa’=>TR (mm. 48–110). These motions persist in S (1→2–1 and especially 5→6→5 continue to appear transposed, and the pitch motive F♯–G–F♯ recontextualized in the secondary key) and alternate with more stepwise-based materials, which emerge more strongly towards the exposition’s end and at the development’s start. By challenging its opponent further, however, the neighbour does reinstate itself for the recapitulation (mm. 393–440) and from there on, loosens its hold gradually for the coda’s return of the development’s stepwise theme which persists above another large-scale, albeit more latent, manifestation of B–C–B (for the C major passage within the otherwise B minor coda, see mm. 573–581). As the coda concludes, stepwise motion ultimately claims its victory as resolution by the end of this motivic narrative. In this way, the sense of conflict characterized by the motives’ interplay for dominance throughout the movement dissolves.

A strong sense of this motivic interplay is especially encapsulated in the development. There, the development’s theme—an eight-measure presentation-like unit based on stepwise motion (i.e., four measures and their repeat; see mm. 247–255)—comes head-to-head with the neighbour (P^{head}) before the neighbour dominates in the RT to anticipate the recapitulation. In particular, the neighbour rises to supremacy by intervening on this new theme at the development’s start—always on the hypermetric downbeat—in the strings, first as a two-measure statement (mm. 255–257), and then four (mm. 265–269), until finally, it takes hold, for a full twelve measures (mm. 277–289). When the presentation-like unit tries to reinstate itself thereafter, the neighbour continues to enter on the third hyperbeat of the resulting four-measure fragments (mm. 289–293; 293–297). The neighbour eventually becomes so pervasive that it reinstates its start on the hypermetric downbeat (mm. 297–300) and articulates three fortissimo proclamations (mm. 305–306; 307–308; 309–310) shortly after, the last neighbour being the
most climactic by far. Although the stepwise presentation-like theme (mm. 311–317) does return, the neighbour (mm. 317–321) intrudes after six measures—two bars earlier than it did at the development’s start—and leads directly to the sustained G⁷ chord (mm. 321–322), still in fortissimo, which serves as a critical harmonic point as the pivot home, and specifically, the Ger. 6 directly ahead of the RT’s onset.

The RT gradually reinstates the neighbour in three stages to anticipate P’s return at the recapitulation’s start, despite the ascending idea’s initial comeback. RT1 (mm. 323–334) proposes and secures the RT: V pedal, while now completing a full melodic statement—without the neighbour’s intervention (the denial of closure being assured by the dominant pedal in the bass)—of the presentation-like unit above (mm. 323–331). When the music tries for a repeat immediately after (mm. 331–334), it only succeeds in capturing four of the original eight measures. These measures dissolve in favour of the neighbour in RT2 (mm. 335–369), where it occurs prominently on three consecutive hypermetric downbeats (mm. 335, 339, and 343) over a descending fifths sequence towards ∪II (m. 348)—another tonal projection of the neighbour on its original pitches (B–C–B), its arrival highlighted by the theme in the strings (mm. 347–361) and the bassline, which circles around it.

By m. 361, the digression to ∪II ends in favour of resuming the RT: V pedal and neighbour motion in mm. 361–369 (specifically, RT: V is proposed and re-articulated in mm. 361 and 365). When the RTC (m. 369) occurs, RT3, or in this case, RTC-fill (mm. 369–393), initiates a full statement of the presentation-like theme (mm. 369–377) which, however, becomes fragmented in diminuendo and rallentando. The lessened pace, texture, and dynamics suggest the kind of RTC-fill where a theme-like unit breaks down and only echoes of the RTC
are heard. With this breakdown, the neighbour emerges in the final measures (mm. 385–392) to anticipate the recapitulation’s start.

In this way, the development presents a clear sense of the two conflicting motives and conveys its intensifying role in their struggle for dominance, which is first suggested in the exposition. There, the interplay persists throughout, beginning first with the motives’ large-scale alternation in P’s small ternary design, wherein the Pa sections headed by the neighbour contrast the stepwise motions on the musical surface embedding iterations of F♯–G–F♯ (see the violin and viola) in Pb. When Pa’ returns, the neighbour appears stronger; the latter of its two fortissimo statements (mm. 48–50; 56–58) replaces stepwise motion as the head of the consequent (see Example 6.7 below and compare with Example 6.6 from earlier in this discussion), which dissolves into TR via the sequencing of yet another neighbour (mm. 60–61).

---

26 These stepwise motions elaborate the initial F♯ of this neighbour figure within Pb, which seems at first to propose a new theme in the tonic after the i: PAC (m. 24), more specifically. Only with the V pedal initiated by the i: HC (m. 40), is Pb’s status retrospectively realized.

27 This latter neighbour, now with its C-natural harmonically emphasized by viiº⁷/v, is sequenced down a fourth in mm. 62–63, more specifically.
Example 6.7: Neighbour Motive Now Heads the Consequent in Pa’=>TR; Op. 3, I,

mm. 48–68
G–F♯ then usurps the stepwise motions in the musical surface (i.e., the three-note fragments and bass ascent) by arising in the uppermost voice at a slightly deeper level (see the downbeats of mm. 65–66 and 69–70) on the way (mm. 64–86) to the III: HC/MC (m. 106), despite a couple of initial MC proposals via stepwise motion. This neighbour motion continues into S (mm. 110–134) and its repeat (mm. 134–164) as TR insertion (mm. 116–125; 140–149) which interrupts the antecedent’s end and delays the consequent’s start. While the neighbour also serves as the antecedent’s melodic backbone (see F♯–G–F♯ in the piano’s uppermost register), the consequent—like that of Pa—features a contrasting start with a stepwise melodic line instead (see D–C♯–B–A in the violin; mm. 128–130). This stepwise melodic line provides the precedence for the ascent (mm. 156–164) to the III: PAC/EEC (m. 164) and C (mm. 164–211). There, the motives struggle above a tonic pedal (mm. 164–180). The tetrachord from S emerges first as the piano’s main element (i.e., D–C♯–B–A which descends from the last beat of each bar; see mm. 164–167 and 172–175) against the string backdrop of neighbour tones. Then, the neighbour becomes rhythmically augmented and harmonically emphasized by the piano’s change to prolonged diminished-seventh chords (mm. 168–172; 176–180). These stepwise- and neighbour-dominated passages alternate twice before an ascending (mm. 180–189) and descending (mm. 193–197) 5–6 sequence carry stepwise motion to the forefront, especially given the extensiveness of these sequences. The link (mm. 227–247) to the development also

---

28 An ascending stepwise sequence (mm. 80–86) leads towards the first III: HC/MC proposal (m. 86), while quasi-chromatic lines over the activated V pedal (mm. 86–93) culminate in the second (m. 94).

29 The first statement of the consequent phrase (mm. 126–133) fails to achieve the III: PAC/EEC, and instead, dissolves for the repeat of S to try again.

30 Not only does the bass ascend through an entire octave (from D2 to D3), but also the descending sequence continues far past IV♭, exiting at ii♭ instead. This extension allows for the large-scale articulation of the tetrachord originally heard in S (albeit chromatically altered as D–C–B–A; see violin in mm. 193–196) and expands the phrase structure to incorporate more stepwise motion on the surface (mm. 197–199). For a more typical
reinforces this motion after the neighbour’s return (mm. 219–227) within the otherwise stepwise codetta (mm. 211–227) for further interplay, which the development intensifies, as explored in the paragraphs above.

The recapitulation mostly corresponds to the exposition, but presents typical changes for more compact thematic zones. These changes, though, facilitate the neighbour’s lessened hold—especially after the development’s ultimate emphasis on this motive—for stepwise motion to arise as the coda’s main entity in the end. The omission of Pa’ for Pb=>TR in the recapitulation avoids reiterations of the neighbour to lead more directly to a briefer S zone (mm. 440–470), where the neighbour’s intrusive role is weakened. C (mm. 470–511) remains relatively unchanged except for transposition, moreover, and while this allows for a brief interplay between the two motives, the codetta (mm. 511–558), now lengthened, becomes more heavily based on stepwise motion, this despite the neighbour appearing on its original pitches in the piano’s left hand (mm. 519–527).

The coda recalls the development’s start with the ascending stepwise presentation-like idea (see piano), now determinedly in the tonic (mm. 559–567), without the neighbour’s intervention, and directed towards a sequential passage that modulates up to C major (mm. 567–573) for the theme’s repeat (mm. 573–581). Thereafter, this sequential passage (mm. 581–587) returns to modulate back down to B minor. The coda, as such, presents a latent reference to

example of a descending 5–6 sequence with earlier exit at IV⁶, see the opening of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 21 in C major, Op. 53 ("Waldstein").

By Mendelssohn’s time, the on-tonic start to the coda must not be taken for granted. As Hepokoski and Darcy mention in their discussion on discursive codas, Beethoven was especially fond of slipping away from the tonic key secured at the ESC by going to a nontonic key(s) before regaining the home key at the end. The “Waldstein” sonata provides a classic example, with its coda beginning on II. See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 284.
the upper neighbour on its original pitches just as in the retransition, and similar to the way the development opened in C major, a semitone above the tonic key. Despite this reference and the G–F♯ motions which appear a couple of times in the piano’s uppermost voice (mm. 595 and 597), stepwise motion prevails. The theme is stated again (mm. 587–595) along with its cadential iteration (mm. 595–603), and fortissimo persists (mm. 603–627) as stepwise motions pervade over a widely spanned final cadential progression. This happens first in octaves in both hands of the piano (mm. 603–607) before the violin ultimately achieves a climactic ascent (mm. 607–615) to A♯–B (mm. 618–619; 622–623) as a counterweight to the downward pull of C–B once felt through the neighbour’s presence, now relinquished.

In this way, the motivic subtype of DRT4 development specifically intensifies the narrative of conflict conveyed in the movement by doing two things. First, the development provides stepwise motion with its own distinguishable identity as a theme in its own right to challenge the neighbour more adamantly. Second, the development amplifies P’s B–C–B head motive on the large-scale tonal level through its start in the Neapolitan key. The way the development acts as a channel for the emergence of the ♯II key and ♯VI sonority towards RT conveys the depth to which the neighbour—and its melodic emphasis on ♯2 and ♯6—pervade the musical fabric of the movement. It also prepares the sense of resolution in the coda. There, the large-scale projection of B-C-B is re-enacted, but in a more latent manner suggesting the dissolution of the neighbour’s grasp. The head of the coda begins in B minor, namely, rather than the development’s C major, which is pushed to a more subordinate location. The dolce G♯7 chord (m. 572) also relinquishes its Ger. 6 function as an upper neighbour to V, and instead, eases into the Neapolitan key as V♯/♯II, as stepwise motion persists on the thematic surface above in triumph to the movement’s very end.
The **motivic subtype of DRT4** in the monothematic **overture to the cantata, Die erste Walpurgisnacht, Op. 60 (1832; 1842–1843)** in A minor also plays a strong role in the transformation narrative across the form. Here, the development (mm. 114–228) carries the action through the form by generating a new theme (2N; mm. 188–206) towards its end in F major (see **Example 6.8** below).  

Example 6.8: Arrival in F Major and of 2N (first statement only) towards the Development’s End; Op. 60, mm. 180–191

---

32 The 2N designation for this theme accounts for the first new theme (1N), which occurs in the woodwinds at the development’s onset.
F major plays an important role in the overture’s overall aesthetic. F major sharply juxtaposes the strong character and minor-mode affect of P (mm. 5ff.) and S(P) (mm. 50ff.) in the key of the minor dominant. Aside from F major, the emphasis on minor keys is essential to supporting Mendelssohn’s programmatic title “Das schlechte Wetter” for the overture’s first part in sonata form.

This F-major theme returns at the end of the coda (mm. 284ff.) in mm. 304ff. to create a direct connection to the development. Already in the development, though, this new theme seems to reach outwards, as it arises as an outgrowth of the exposition’s (mm. 1–113) emphasis on the Neapolitan as a melodic-harmonic motivic element (i.e., F as a melodic tone, and harmonically, F major as VI in the tonic and then, more significantly, II in E minor, the secondary key). That the development furthers this motivic aspect by conjuring a distinct theme intimately attached to F major—which then goes on to facilitate the overture’s turn to A major and a more relaxed lyricism for the overture’s second part (“Der Uebergang zum Frühling”; mm. 350ff., which functions as a transition to the cantata’s first vocal number)—articulates a narrative of transformation towards the change in ambiance proposed by the overture’s two programmatic headings. Essentially, what begins in the exposition as a localized and unsuspecting, albeit prevalent, sonority retrospectively becomes increasingly important as it is fleshed out on a larger-scale level by the development into an overt thematic-tonal entity. This entity ultimately facilitates the change in modality through its major-key attachment, represents a shining contrast to the principal and secondary areas in minor from earlier in the exposition, and becomes a fitting segue to the overture’s more lyrical second part when it reappears in the
coda. At the largest and lattermost stage, then, the theme functions on a dramatic level, enacting the change in aural depiction to spring (see Example 6.9 below).³³

Example 6.9: 2N’s Role in Facilitating Transformation through the Form; Op. 60

³³ *Walpurgisnacht* is the spring festival on the night before the first of May, which is celebrated to ward off winter and welcome spring.
In the development alone, 2N’s germination serves as the main goal. This theme appears towards the development’s end in the RT-prep zone (mm. 181–218), which rather seamlessly leads into the RT-complex (mm. 219–228). At the same time, 2N only functions here to foreshadow the pending minor-to-major-mode change, and so, ultimately gives in to P for the recapitulation’s (mm. 229–283) onset. As Figure 6.2 demonstrates, the development builds up to F major’s arrival where RT-prep begins. In so doing, the development achieves greater intensity with each successive phase, especially from the V/B minor arrival sealed DG (m. 139; without fill) onwards. Prior to this, corepart1 (mm. 114–139) at the development’s launch is the thinnest in texture, and gradually reinstates PBI briefly before carrying on with greater activity. This first part features a four-measure idea (1N) that is sequentially repeated once before a subsequent unit of likewise length—which represents 1N’s breakdown and headed by Phead—becomes a new model for further sequencing until PBI (mm. 134–139) appears. PBI then proposes the sealed DG at its onset and occurs as a six-measure group, such that the temporary broadening of regular four-bar hypermeter directly anticipates the true sealed DG at its end. Stated strongly in near-tutti texture and fortissimo, the sealed DG causes a hypermetric reinterpretation (6=1) and simultaneously initiates the core’s latter part (mm. 139–181). This, corepart2, distinguishes from corepart1 through its texturally- (as opposed to thematically-) driven start.

34 Note how the theme alternates with PBI in the strings below before it disintegrates beginning in mm. 206ff. going into the recapitulation.
**Figure 6.2: The Development Builds up to F Major’s Arrival where RT-prep Begins; Op. 60, mm. 114–229**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part1}</th>
<th>DG-complex</th>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part2}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1N→ repeated sequentially</td>
<td>1N’s breakdown</td>
<td>P\textsuperscript{Bl} appears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+4</td>
<td>4+4+4</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture thickens</td>
<td>near-\textit{tutti}, ff texture</td>
<td>Texturally-driven material returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114–122</td>
<td>122–133</td>
<td>134–139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/B- arr. sealed DG</td>
<td>139–155</td>
<td>155–169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>169–181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* = hypermetric reinterpretation between adjacent hypermeasures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RT-prep</th>
<th>RT-complex</th>
<th>Recap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2N enters</td>
<td>P\textsuperscript{Bl}, 2N</td>
<td>Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+4*</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>RTC-fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Sparser texture ensues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-major arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6/5 arr. RTC (home-key)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite this difference, core\textsuperscript{part2} resembles core\textsuperscript{part1}, since it more or less traces the same events, often maintaining, but sometimes expanding on, the sentential proportions set forth by core\textsuperscript{part1}.\textsuperscript{35} As **Figure 6.2** demonstrates above, the similarities begin with core\textsuperscript{part2}’s opening phase (mm. 139–155), which leads to a P\textsuperscript{Bl}-derived passage (mm. 155–169). Unlike the analogous excerpt in core\textsuperscript{part1}, though, this passage continues in sentence structure, but again achieves a hypermetric reinterpretation (3=1) at its end. This reinterpretation also

\textsuperscript{35} Core\textsuperscript{part1} can be considered “sententially” given its “presentation” (consisting of a four-measure idea and its sequential repeat) and expanded “continuation” (consisting of a four-measure unit derived from the first, and then its subsequent sequencing towards the DG-complex, which is instigated by P\textsuperscript{Bl}).
simultaneously initiates the same texturally-driven material (mm. 169–181) from the start of core\textsuperscript{pan2}, now on V/E minor. In contrast to before, this texturally-driven material functions as an expansion of the previous phrase, and essentially completes the motion to F major’s (\textsuperscript{ii} of E minor) emphatic arrival via the bass’ quasi-chromatic ascent for RT-prep’s onset and 2N’s introduction shortly after.

F major’s prominence here in the development is prepared for considerably by the exposition, which, like the development, culminates with F’s strongest manifestation closer to its end. As Example 6.10 demonstrates below, the overture begins with Pa (mm. 45–24). Pa at first highlights F as a strong melodic and harmonic entity before it places particular attention on F–E melodically.

Example 6.10: Emphasis on F/F–E in Pa and Pb; Op. 60, mm. 5–32
This dyad gains further emphasis, first in Pb (mm. 24–31) at pitch level and then in Pa’=>TR (mm. 32–49). There, it appears as B↓–A and becomes B–A, as if to foreshadow the pending change from minor to major. This pending change is represented by the eventual transformation of the overture’s initial F–E to ultimately F♯–E motion. Whereas F acts as a non-chord tone in these initial F–E occurrences, F gains further strength when it becomes harmonized by the Neapolitan in the secondary key within S(P)’s continuation phrase (mm. 58–66; 66–82).

In the recapitulation, F/F–E continues to be emphasized in the same ways, but to a lesser extent given the increased motion throughout: Pa=>TR (mm. 229–249) now leads directly to S(P) (mm. 250–284) and the i: PAC/ESC (m. 283), followed by the coda (mm. 284–350). Such forward motion is complemented by the inclusion of the texturally-driven material from the development (from mm. 241ff.), which forges onwards and continues into the coda. There, the motion eventually simmers towards 2N’s reprise. That this textural material from the development continues through a more compressed version of the exposition’s events in the recapitulation—and now gives into 2N in the coda—represents progress in the overture’s narrative of transformation.

When 2N reappears in the coda for the first time, it does so in a stately manner on the tonic of A minor as a beckoning call against a sparse textural backdrop (note the textural reduction to nearly just the horns and bassoons). The fermata (m. 305), meanwhile, anticipates more change to come. As the succeeding measures soon demonstrate, this change is expressed

---

36 See F♯–E’s entrance on the first violins’ descending material just measures before the end in m. 397; the overture’s second part builds up to it through successive entries on this same material.

37 Recall, as comparison, 2N’s disintegration for P to take over at the development’s end leading into the recapitulation.
through further growth and richness. Two iterations of 2N (mm. 311–318) appear dovetailed between the horn-and-bassoon pairing and clarinet, more specifically, and modulate to F major (VI). The texture, which gradually thickens in the winds, along with the added warmth of F major, also seem to signify the transition towards spring coming into fuller bloom. With 2N’s final entrance on (C#4/2-turned-to-)A7 (mm. 333ff.), the warmth and richness become stronger and ultimately lead to the moment of peripeteia at the onset of the overture’s second part. There, the tension once built up through P’s ascent—and the texturally-derived material from the development—melts away (note the descending figures in the strings). The F#7 harmony (V7 of V/V) also outshines the previous A7 in a harmonic pathway (Am–FM–A7–F#7) that facilitates increased warmth through the introduction of more sharps. The melodic use of triadic motion heard all along as the aggressive P turned to the gently calling 2N, finally becomes the lulling theme introduced by the clarinet (mm. 354ff.), as well.

In this way, transformation is achieved via the DRT4 development’s ability to project F as a motivic-harmonic element—as introduced in the exposition—onto a progressively larger-scale level. This projection happens first as an overt thematic-tonal entity, 2N, which foreshadows the pending change from A minor to A major when it initially materializes towards the development’s end. This theme then ultimately incites the change in modality when it arises again at the end of the coda. There, 2N functions at the largest level—the dramatic level—to produce increasingly warmer sonorities for spring’s advent. At this largest level, 2N also attributes a gentler calm to the triadic motion of the overture’s thematic material and a stronger lyricism to the descending texturally-derived idea first introduced in the development.
iii) The Development Furthers a Harmonic/Tonal Aspect

In addition to the motivic subtype of DRT, those DRT4 developments of the harmonic/tonal subtype play a role in the narrative trajectories that pursue resolution, such as in the opening movement of String Quartet No. 3 in D major, Op. 44, No. 1 (1838). The development (mm. 120b–230) furthers F♯’s emphasis from the exposition (mm. 1–120b), where F♯ is destabilized harmonically from its more common D-major harmonization. F♯’s destabilization plays a role in tonal misdirection and occurs at the movement’s outset. Within Pa (mm. 2–13) of P=>TR’s (mm. 1–56) a-b-a’ structure, the F-sharp-minor (iii; mm. 6–7) reharmonization acts as an antithesis to F♯’s more common D-major support (Example 6.11). F♯’s tie to tonal misdirection also arises through the F-sharp-major sonority (mm. 31–32) in Pb (mm. 13–37), which distracts from D major’s return in Pa’ (mm. 38ff.) when it continues to suggest B minor (vi) until the last chance for the home-key V7 to arise.
Example 6.11: F♯’s Destabilization in P⇒TR; Op. 44, No.3, I, mm. 1–56

D+ (I): [V7] iii

vi6
i6 of B- (vi)

B- (vi): V ... V ... V [V7] V vii07 vii07 of D+ (I)
Example 6.11 (continued)

Pa’ => TR

38


48

V: HC/MC
By wielding this a-b-a’ structure for its own thematic organization, the development amplifies F♯’s destabilization by setting the stage for tonal misdirection—such as that seen within P—to be projected at a larger-scale level. This amplification occurs explicitly through the F-sharp-major (V of B minor; mm. 200–201; 204–205) harmonization of P^{head} material descending from F♯, as well as through V6/4 of F-sharp minor’s (mm. 214–215) appearance towards the development’s end as part of a temporary divergence from the pathway to the true recapitulation (mm. 230–331) (see Figure 6.3 below).

**Figure 6.3: Development Amplifies P’s Thematic Layout and F♯’s Role in Tonal Misdirection; Op. 44, No 1, I, mm. 120–230**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pa-based</th>
<th>Pb-based</th>
<th>Pa’-based</th>
<th>Recap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core\textsuperscript{part1}</td>
<td>DG-complex</td>
<td>False Recap.</td>
<td>230ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120–130</td>
<td>130–158</td>
<td>166ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I arr.</td>
<td>200–214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sealed DG (,VII)</td>
<td>V/B-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214–230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6/4 (F♯-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=&gt;home-key</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V6/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I arr. RT-connect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>Pa’ =&gt;TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2–13</td>
<td>13–31</td>
<td>31–37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+ (I)</td>
<td>V arr./B-...home-key V\textsuperscript{7}-I---etc..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of tonal misdirection is also projected generally through the false recapitulation (mm. 166 ff). F♯’s emphasis diminishes towards the movement’s end; the coupling of F♯’s destabilization with tonal misdirection and its amplification in the development eventually find resolution in the recapitulation and apparent coda (mm. 331–374). There, F♯ returns to its more
common D-major support, and therefore, stabilization. This progression towards resolution runs through the movement as a unifying narrative that gradually emerges as the movement unfolds.

In addition to the instances of tonal misdirection near the development’s end, the development expresses F♯’s destabilization throughout in ways that are governed by the development’s a-b-a’ layout. In the opening Pa-based (mm. 120–130) section, the development destabilizes the initial melodic tone, F♯, by replacing the original D-major harmony with D♯⁷ or vii⁷⁴/² in the key of G major (IV). This diminished-seventh chord changes to root position on F♯ and then V6/⁵ thereafter. As such, F♯’s prolongation (mm. 124–130) to the start of Pb material (mm. 130–165) highlights F♯’s role as the leading tone of G major, and therefore, its destabilization. F♯ similarly becomes reinterpreted as the dominant of B minor (vi) (note the V⁷ chord in mm. 140–141) in the development’s Pb-based passage. F♯ also continues to be emphasized through its subsequent appearances in the cello as the bass note of a neighbouring- and then passing-six-four chord (mm. 142–145). This passing-six-four chord facilitates the modulation now to E minor (ii), wherein F♯ continues to be highlighted through F-sharp minor’s (mm. 146–148) tonicization. As E minor continues onwards, however, a temporary break from F♯’s emphasis occurs when the DG-complex (mm. 158–166), which leads to Pa’ (mm. 166ff.) in C major (VII), arises to initiate core². This DG-complex followed by Pa’ seems to suggest a retransition to the recapitulation’s onset at first. The sequencing of Pa’ material, fragmentation, and then further sequencing thereafter—in addition to the lack of home key—render the initial sense of recapitulation false, however.

From here on, core² continues to destabilize F♯, even with the additional statement of P’s opening segment (mm. 174–181), now at pitch level over a D-major chord, suggesting the true recapitulation. This thematic, coupled with what appears to be a tonal, return results from
the upwards sequencing of mm. 166–173 by step, however, such that the sense of D major remains transitory, especially since the passing D4/2 chord afterwards maintains F♯’s destabilization. Subsequent references to B minor (mm. 182–183) and G major (mm. 188–189) then arise—as in core\textsuperscript{part1} (mm. 120–166)—which destabilize F♯ further and eventually build up to F♯’s strongest destabilization thus far: the return of P’s opening segment (albeit slightly varied) at pitch level with F♯ now harmonically emphasized by an F-sharp-major chord.

This \textit{forte} statement initiates a steadier passage (note the more unified texture and slower harmonic rhythm compared to previous measures) that retrospectively becomes RT-prep (mm. 200–214), notwithstanding the sequencing on diminished-sevenths (mm. 206–214). This sequencing ultimately leads through D♯\textsuperscript{º7} (enharmonically B♯\textsuperscript{º7})—the same diminished-seventh chord at the development’s start—to F♯’s further destabilization on F-sharp-minor-6/4 (mm. 214–222). That the motion seems to direct towards and rest on this 6/4 sonority supporting P\textsuperscript{head} material in anticipation of something more to come—along with the chord’s expansion via applied diminished-sevenths—collectively suggest the RT’s (mm. 214–230) onset in preparation for F-sharp minor. This wrong-key RT proposal soon becomes rectified through the 6/4’s resolution to V6/5 (mm. 222–226) of the home key, at which point, the music builds texturally, dynamically, and in range. At the same time, the home-key RT: V6/5 is proposed again (mm. 226–230) ahead of the tonic-arrival RT-connect (m. 230) at the recapitulation’s onset.

The development’s emphasis on F-sharp minor and its role in tonally misdirecting the recapitulation’s onset is significant, because it points to F♯’s destabilization and expands on F♯’s prominence from other areas in the exposition aside from P, like C (mm. 72–120b) which
follows S (mm. 59–71). By tonicizing F-sharp minor, the C theme (mm. 72–89) temporarily deflects A major (V), the secondary key. This tonal deflection points to the importance of tonal misdirection in the movement’s overall aesthetic, and is furthered by Pa’s interruptive return as expansion (mm. 90ff.; beginning on the original melodic tone, F♯, destabilized here by D♯7) which evades the C theme’s closure.

The recapitulation, in comparison, only slightly modifies the exposition, and so, gradually resolves F♯’s destabilization by returning to and restoring F♯’s more common D-major harmonization as the music gets progressively closer to the movement’s end. While Pa (mm. 230–241) returns and tonicizes iii, namely, Pa’ is excised, so that Pb=>TR (mm. 241–257), now in the home key, surpasses the tonal misdirection in Pb from the exposition. Pb=>TR also leads directly to S (mm. 257–269) and the C theme (mm. 270–287) at the start of the C zone (mm. 270–342). The C theme’s transposition maintains a remnant of F♯’s destabilization; what originally appears in the theme as an overt reference to F-sharp minor now recurs as a nod to B minor (F♯ identifies with V6/5 of this key). These remnants of F♯’s destabilization seem to correspond with the idea that resolution is achieved gradually towards the movement’s end, that while C no longer overtly references F-sharp minor here as it does in the exposition, things are still in the process of being rectified. Given the C theme’s cadential evasion via Pa insertion (mm. 288ff.), the quest for resolution does continue closer towards the movement’s end. F♯ gains stronger stabilization through its harmonization within D major, albeit as a lengthy V4/3

---

38 Although the theme (mm. 72–89) at the start of C continues rhetorically in the lyrical manner of S, it is markedly different. Recall that Hepokoski and Darcy treat the “non-S-ness of C” as a strong norm: “as a general principle S is not finished until its thematic material is relinquished” such that “C will customarily contain material that provides an immediate contrast with the preceding S”). See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 181.
of IV (mm. 310–314) in Pa which heads into Pb material (mm. 314–330). When Pa’ (mm. 331–354) expands C even more, furthermore, its melodic descent from $F_\#$ becomes supported by $I^6$.

C’s expansion in the form of P’s a-b-a’ structure—like the development before it—overlaps with the coda’s (mm. 343–374) a-b-a’ layout (the Pa’ section of the latter specifically overlaps with Pa of the former). As such, the $I^6$ harmonization occurs again in support of Pa (mm. 343–354) which initiates the coda. There, resolution becomes increasingly obvious. Pa’s start on $F_\#$ avoids harmonization by the root-position tonic, and seems to suggest $F_\#$’s increasing stabilization, which can only be made more resolute with D in the bass. This sense that something slightly more needs to be achieved is perpetuated by the following outburst on $vii^6/IV$ (mm. 349–351), which presents D$9/7$ with suppressed root. When Pb material (mm. 354–366) claims the I: PAC (m. 366) and initiates P-zero (mm. 366–370), however, the movement finally reaches its long-awaited resolution with $F_\#$, the initiating tone of Pa’. Here, $F_\#$ is stabilized harmonically by the root-position D-major chord.

In this way, the DRT4 development furthers a harmonic/tonal aspect—$F_\#$’s destabilization and its tie to tonal misdirection—from the exposition by amplifying P’s a-b-a’ structure as the framework for its own thematic organization, and paving the way for tonal misdirection to occur at the larger level as a false recapitulation and wrong-key RT in F-sharp minor. As such, the development pushes the resolution into the recapitulation and coda, whereby $F_\#$—and especially, $F_\#$ initiating Pa material—is gradually stabilized by its more common D-major harmonization. Ultimately, the coda, modelled thematically after P’s a-b-a’ layout, builds

39 Note also, how P-zero is now extended to build climactically towards Pa’ (mm. 370–374) in fortissimo.
climactically towards one last rendition of Pa’. There, the root-position D-major chord finally realigns harmonically with the initiating melodic tone, F♯, in the final measures prior to the movement’s end. This realignment draws the narrative of F♯’s journey from destabilization to stabilization triumphantly to its close.

The concluding example for this chapter from the finale of String Quartet No. 6 in F minor, Op. 80 (1847) also features the harmonic/tonal subtype of DRT4, which facilitates another narrative towards stabilization into the rest of the form. Here, the development (mm. 125–268) amplifies and furthers the role of blockage first introduced in the exposition (mm. 1–124).40 Through the increasingly destabilizing role of the stagnant sixteenth-note (“blockage”) figures (mm. 10–17) from P=>TR (mm. 1–48), and of the local submediant harmony that launches S (mm. 49ff.), blockage becomes more prevalent in the development. There, VI becomes a key in its own right, albeit as a tonal diversion in the RT (mm. 181–268). As this discussion illustrates, this tonal diversion, coupled with the growing concentration of “blockage” figures, detracts significantly from the lead-up to, and the actual onset of, the recapitulation (mm. 269–375). That Mendelssohn downplays the D-R border directs attention to the recapitulatory S zone’s launch on VI. Doing so serves two purposes. The first is to intensify the focus on the submediant as a destabilizing entity. The second is to forward attention closer to the movement’s end. There, resolution from blockage is finally achieved as a fitting conclusion to the narrative through the form. This narrative intensifies blockage and destabilization throughout the movement.

40 Once again, I use the term “blockage” to imply a temporary lapse in the motion with regards to surface features like melody and texture. This loose definition contrasts a more literal definition, which may suggest a cease in further motion or continuation altogether.
When a D-flat-major (VI) inflection (mm. 213ff.) featuring S-like material (see
Example 6.12) in pianissimo instigates a diversion from the lengthy home-key RT: V pedal
(mm. 181–212) within the otherwise exclusively P-based development, the rest of the RT barely
recovers.

80, IV, mm. 205–220
In addition to being a tonal and dynamic digression, D-flat major initiates a departure from regular four-bar hypermeter, which broadens the sense of pacing at first before an intensification achieves the V6/5 arrival RTC (m. 265) (see Figure 6.4). The progression from broader S-like units to the re-introduction of “blockage” figures in progressively shorter intervals across increasingly shorter spans also contributes to the sense of intensification. Stronger instability is further attributed, meanwhile, to the deceptive motions (i.e., mm. 209–213; 223–229; 237–245), which facilitate the diversion to the VI key in the first place and lead from key to key thereafter.

Figure 6.4: Hypermetric Layout of RT; Op. 80, IV, mm. 181–268

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Material</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>“blockage” figures (P)</th>
<th>RTC-fill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypermeter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 + 4(−3−4); 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bass notes fall on the hyper-downbeat; arrows indicate deceptive motions

Even with this intensification, however, the recapitulation’s tonic-articulated onset remains downplayed and weakly anticipated. The RT: V pedal is never reclaimed, and the passage only begins to crescendo just measures prior to the fortissimo-articulated RTC. Even with the RTC’s strong dynamic, moreover, the RTC-fill (mm. 265–268) remains stagnant with its concentration of “blockage” figures and reversion from two-bar hypermeter to four. This broadening of pace in the RTC-fill is extended by the extra hypermetric downbeat of P’s “bar zero” (m. 269), which detracts from the intensification towards the D-R border and causes a
dynamic block through its sudden *piano* onset in sparse texture. As such, P’s start on the tonic barely amounts to a whisper following on the heels of the *fortissimo* RTC-fill. P’s onset of the recapitulation is also relegated to the second violin with sparse support from the viola as the first violin launches a new line in rising scalar triplets above. This line, infused with the forward-driving energy consistent with the hypermetric intensification up to the RTC features prominently and masks the thematic recapitulation, further downplaying the D-R border. The rising scalar motion in triplets from the pitch, C5, at the recapitulation’s start suggests an intensification via diminution of the first violin’s preceding path to the RTC, more specifically. That path goes through a stepwise ascent in two-bar units through G–A–B♭–B♮ to the same C5 (mm. 257–265), from which the triplets continue to rise.

This scalar intensification, which spans the already softly sounded D-R border, downplays the border further and leads to the recapitulation’s retrospectively realized onset. The first violin seems to extend the motion beyond the border, first to C6’s (m. 277) strong, *sforzando* arrival in longer duration on a home-key V chord, which draws the triplets to a halt. This V chord turns out to propose the MC before the actual MC articulation (m. 281) and caesura-fill (mm. 281–288); but this MC-complex is only realized once S (mm. 289ff.) enters, albeit timidly, on VI of the home key.

The way the recapitulation’s tonic-articulated onset slips by directs attention beyond the D-R border to S’s opening, and speaks to the development’s role in amplifying VI as a destabilizing entity in the movement—especially since VI’s diversion from the RT: V pedal detracts from the path to the D-R border in the first place. The “blockage” figures also become increasingly prevalent towards the RTC and for RTC-fill. These figures contribute to the downplayed border, since they seem perpetually to fulfill some intermediary rather than
terminal function in the movement thus far (as the paragraphs below will discuss). This conditioning seems to allow the listener to perceive these RTC-fill figures as transitory sonorities which anticipate more development space to come—perhaps a return to the RT: V pedal to better prepare the recapitulation.

Given the way attention directs beyond the D-R border to the home-key V chord in m. 277 (and the way P=>TR is drastically reduced to P\textsubscript{antecedent} which functions simultaneously and retrospectively as P and TR; see mm. 269–288), one might initially perceive the recapitulation’s MC-complex as a “correction” of the abandoned RT: V. As one discovers by the time of S’s onset, however, this is not the case. The development essentially amplifies VI as a diversion away from the RT: V pedal, from which the RT never quite recovers. Ultimately, the diversion diminishes the strength of the recapitulation’s onset and directs attention beyond the D-R border to S’s beginning on VI. Through this diversion, then, the development intensifies focus on blockage and VI as a destabilizing entity fairly straightaway in the recapitulation.

The heightened sense of the tonic’s destabilization—as produced by the recapitulatory P’s shorter length and the downplayed tonic-articulated D-R border for stronger direction towards VI—constitutes the chief difference between the exposition and recapitulation such that the rest of the recapitulation remains mostly the same. In both of these formal regions, P insertion (mm. 81ff. and 325ff.), which features the tremolo “blockage” figures on VI, interrupts S and evades the EEC/ESC.\textsuperscript{41} In the exposition, however, this evasion only weakens S’s path to the EEC. While the dynamic softens to pianissimo, namely, the “blockage” figures attain the III: IAC/EEC (m. 117). The recapitulation, on the contrary, eschews the ESC and maintains a strong

\textsuperscript{41} In the exposition, this submediant appears as \,VI in A-flat major or III, the secondary key.
forward drive into the coda (mm. 375–461). After P insertion’s start, the music crescendos to the
sforzando-articulated viio7 arrival (mm. 369–374). The crescendo also reaches the onset of a
soloistic con fuoco passage that revives the lively triplet motion first introduced at the
recapitulation’s launch to usher in the coda in sempre fortissimo throughout.

In the search for resolution now closer to the movement’s end, this increased motion on
the musical surface exhibits a forward momentum that contrasts the exposition’s weakened path
to the EEC and dissolution into the development. After P insertion starts in the exposition,
namely, the music ultimately wanes via textural and dynamic reduction (note the use of sempre
diminuendo to pianissimo) as the harmonic and melodic motion draws to a standstill. As
Example 6.13 demonstrates below, the thematic repetitions of two-bar units (mm. 113–114;
119–120) closer to the exposition’s end weaken the sense of four-bar hypermeter before a thin
stream of “blockage” figures dissipates the texture further. The abrupt, tutti, fortissimo F-major
chord which announces the development’s immediate onset of the core (mm. 125–181; which
begins with its own rendition of P being overtaken by “blockage” figures) also disrupts the
texture further.
Example 6.13: E-D Border Dissolves; Op. 80, IV, mm. 109–130

That the exposition succumbs to the blockage and destabilization instigated by P insertion constitutes a culmination of the progressively larger role that the “blockage” figures and the submediant accumulate in the exposition, which the development later amplifies. As the exposition demonstrates, the submediant begins as \( \frac{6}{5} \) in the “blockage” figures over the V pedal at P\^{\text{anteecedent}}’s (mm. 1–9) end. These figures function as insertion and separate the antecedent from the consequent (mm. 18ff.) before the figures reappear more prominently over VI (mm. 29ff.). More significant, though, is how these figures appear as further insertion such that the consequent dissolves and foregoes closure. Still, P\^{\text{consequent}} \rightarrow TR becomes more prominent and
instigates the “blockage” figures more strongly throughout TR for P’s breakdown. These figures lead to a dynamically blocked or suppressed V6/4–7 arrival MC (mm. 47–48) which prepares A-flat major, the secondary key. The submediant then assumes an even stronger role as a harmonic entity, since it now destabilizes the secondary key. S starts on vi, while the rest of S avoids the tonic. An even stronger expression of the submediant occurs when the exposition culminates with the local VI’s tonicization, this which initiates P insertion. The “blockage” figures also weaken the path to the EEC as mentioned above.

In the recapitulation, this growth in the submediant’s role as a destabilizing entity remains, and seems to draw sharper focus given the new sense of directedness towards S as the development proceeds to recapitulatory space. At the same time, this directedness demonstrates progress in the narrative’s journey from blockage and destabilization to resolution. With P=>TR reduced, the “blockage” figures have less of an intrusive role so that motion through the recapitulation seems more forward-driven. With the MC-complex (mm. 281–288) no longer suppressed (note the use of sforzando and forte) and clearly emphasizing the home-key V chord (note how the complex is more extensive) the recapitulation begins to move towards resolution via increased stabilization within the tonic key and stronger forward direction towards the end.

In the lively coda, this forward drive becomes prevalent given the triplets featured throughout and the lack of the “blockage” figures, which now cease to hinder the motion. Still, the path to resolution is gradual. When a strong passage in tutti unison texture in triplets appears in fortissimo emphasizing VI (mm. 395–403), resolution is temporarily threatened, especially

---

42 Note how the diminuendo to piano diminishes the MC’s effect, which also downplays the sense of preparation for the secondary key. In addition, S’s avoidance of the tonic occurs with the exception of the PAC (m. 65) at the end of the first and start of the second statements of S.
with the declamatory half notes in sforzando (mm. 400 and 402) which appear to hinder the motion as a reminder of blockage. As mm. 404–422 demonstrate, however, the half notes ultimately lead to VI’s suppression when VI is placed in service of the home key expanding the tonic’s path to the V6/4 chord (mm. 411–414) at the highest melodic peak in all of the movement.

This ostentatiously highlighted V6/4 chord (m. 413) speaks to the home key’s increased stabilization towards the movement’s end, notwithstanding VI’s presence a handful of measures before.\textsuperscript{43} Stronger stabilization is also conveyed when the V\textsuperscript{7} arrival (m. 422) in sforzando reaffirms the home key by initiating a fill-like passage (mm. 422–426) towards the fortissimo, tonic-articulated return of the thematic material (mm. 427ff.) from the coda’s start. That the V\textsuperscript{7} arrival is now used to anticipate this same material foils the earlier vii\textsuperscript{º7} arrival ahead of the coda’s start, and demonstrates a preference for stability over the diminished-seventh chord’s potential to venture elsewhere. This V\textsuperscript{7}-arrival moment, whose allusion to caesura-and-fill foils the movement’s earlier MC- and RT-complexes, also represents a poignant milestone in the quest for stability and resolution in the home key. As it does turn out, the rest of the coda fortifies the tonic. A V\textsuperscript{7} pedal (mm. 449–454) also leads to a i: IAC (m. 455) and subsequent tonic-dominant reiterations, which finally achieve the strong and long-awaited i: PAC/ESC in the very last measure, despite a fleeting passage that tonicizes VI (mm. 443–446).

This movement’s strong close is fitting given the lack of the “blockage” figures in the coda and the neutralization of VI’s destabilizing role. That the harmonic/tonal subtype of DRT4

\textsuperscript{43} Note also the tutti texture and \textit{sempre fortissimo} dynamic as the music swells outwards to produce the widest range across the ensemble thus far.
development amplifies VI’s role to the tonal level from VI’s more localized expressions in the exposition creates fodder for further continuation of the movement’s narrative, which journeys towards stabilization and resolving blockage. When the development’s destabilization of the RT via VI contributes to the downplayed D-R border, and thus, the attention directed towards S’s onset also on vi, the development helps the recapitulation to bypass the “blockage” figures of P=>TR, to “correct” the blocked MC from the exposition, and to intensify the focus on VI as a destabilizing entity. These aspects facilitate the recapitulation’s stronger forward-directedness and progression towards resolution, as is ultimately claimed by the coda, and indeed, the movement’s very end.

Conclusion

As I have demonstrated through this chapter, DRT4 developments play a strong role in the sense of narrative across the form when they further a thematic, motivic, or harmonic/tonal aspect from earlier in the movement. By furthering these aspects, DRT4 developments direct attention towards the movement’s end, where resolution of some earlier conflict is achieved. Those examples that furthered a thematic aspect did so in a way that either expressed a distinct progression from an earlier state as a step towards resolution (Op. 105, III; Op. 10) or in a way that underplayed the D-R border via a thematic overlap involving P’s components (Op. 13, I; Op. 101). Other DRT4 developments furthered a motivic aspect (Op. 3, I; Op. 60) and amplified the motive to the harmonic/tonal level in a way that seemed to represent a progression from an earlier state. When DRT4 developments furthered a harmonic/tonal aspect, moreover, they did so via a “wrong-key” RT (Op. 44, No. 1, I) or tonal diversion (Op. 80, IV), both of which downplayed the D-R border and directed attention
towards the end of the form. In so doing, DRT4 developments contribute to the end-weighted trajectories across movements and the narratives of transformation that pursue resolution as an end.
Chapter 7
Developmental Relationship Type 5 (DRT5): Underplayed D-R Border Channels Motion and Contributes to the Movement’s End-weighted, Single-sweep Design

DRT5 developments, like DRT4, exhibit a strong role across the entire form, but contribute, in particular, to the way in which movements unfold in a single sweep. Forward-driving motion generated through the development underplays the D-R border. This motion channels into the rest of the form for the ESC’s delay and the increasingly end-weighted design of movements. These movements demonstrate that DRT5 developments work in conjunction with blurred E-D boundaries which either attain an EEC—as in the first movement of Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 (1844) and the finale of Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 (1844); or those which do not—as in the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25 (1831) and the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 2 in D minor, Op. 40 (1837). I explore these movements in this order and demonstrate that DRT5 developments expose a particular trend with respect to genre, since DRT5 developments appear in all four of Mendelssohn’s concerto movements in sonata form.

The DRT5 development in the first movement of Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 (1844) plays a strong role in the movement’s end-weighted trajectory and the way the movement unfolds in a single sweep. As Example 7.1 demonstrates, the soloist’s rippling sixteenth-note figures, which extend from the development’s (mm. 226–335) end, persist beyond the recapitulation’s (mm. 336–473) onset. The D-R border is underplayed, as such, and
channels the forward motion, which the development intensifies from its lack of E-D border, this despite the EEC in m. 168.¹

**Example 7.1: Underplayed D-R Border; Op. 64, I, mm. 333–339**

![Example 7.1: Underplayed D-R Border; Op. 64, I, mm. 333–339](image)

The development’s lack of E-D border occurs when C(P) (mm. 168ff.) dissolves after S (mm. 131–168) closes in G major (III). Ultimately, C(P) is multiply expanded and arrives at V6/4 in mm. 206–209. This chord loses its initial cadential function from mm. 210ff., however, when the bassline continues to forge onwards (see **Example 7.2**); the bass ascends chromatically from the local dominant D, so that the harmonies allude increasingly to A minor (ii of G major). Before too long, the music changes in texture from mm. 226ff. and renews its energy when it launches into TR material. The music also continues to dissolve notions of G

---

¹ Although P’s return is clear, the violin downplays the D-R border with its continuous sixteenth-note stream. The stream softens the border distinction when it adds fluidity by carrying the motion through the D-R border.
major’s pending close through A minor’s tonicization and subsequent destabilization (mm. 230–233). Together, these effects play a role in the retrospective onset of the development, which begins directly with the core (mm. 226–328).
Example 7.2: Lack of E-D Border; Op. 64, I, 205–234 (continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C(P) continues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hypermeter: 4</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development intensifies and directs the motion from its lack of E-D border towards its underplayed D-R border, this especially with $P^{\text{head}}$ in the woodwinds already anticipating the recapitulation against the soloist’s running eighth-note figures (mm. 239ff.; these figures offer a loose diminution of TR). $P^{\text{head}}$ becomes increasingly prevalent throughout mm. 239–262; it grows more frequent and is strengthened by the violins and eventual tutti texture. From there on, $P^{\text{head}}$ is drawn into clearer focus in greater anticipation of the recapitulation’s onset. The soloist features $P^{\text{head}}$ alone over a stepwise descending bassline, which temporarily destabilizes the sense of E as tonic before securing the home-key V pedal (mm. 282–298). Mendelssohn reiterates fragments of $P^{\text{head}}$ to build up this pedal passage thematically before it culminates with the $V^7$ arrival (m. 298) in fortissimo for the soloist’s launch into the cadenza (mm. 299–335). There, the soloist’s lines ascend only to linger in anticipation before additional $P^{\text{head}}$ fragments segue into the rippling figures (mm. 323ff.), which progressively quicken via rhythmic diminution. These figures crescendo to the start of the soloist’s arpeggiated rendition of the dominant (mm. 328ff.), meanwhile, and then soften to pianissimo for the ultimate V articulation (m. 335). The sixteenth-note stream and soft dynamic through the D-R border minimize the strength of the recapitulation’s tonic-articulated onset and help to further the momentum into the rest of the form.

In the recapitulation, this forward motion can be sensed through P’s (mm. 336–351) revitalization via the continuation of the soloist’s sixteenth-note stream, in addition to the more direct route through P and TR (mm. 351–377). Both are more succinct than in the exposition (for P, compare mm. 3–72; for TR, compare mm. 72–131). TR also obtains greater energy, as conveyed by its strong tutti texture and the way it reaches the i: HC/MC (m. 363) shortly after its onset. TR now also includes caesura-fill (mm. 363–377) given by the soloist’s meandering line, which maintains the motion while preparing S’s (mm. 377–414) launch in the tonic’s major
mode. Although S remains relatively unchanged, its immersion in the brighter E major as opposed to E minor contributes to the sense of revitalization in the recapitulation thus far, and assists with channeling the motion forward. When S makes obvious preparations for the ESC (note the use of the fermata and the six-measure group in mm. 409–414), more specifically, E major sharply juxtaposes, and therefore heightens the drama caused by iv\(^6\)'s evasion of the ESC in m. 414, which perpetuates the need for resolution deeper into the movement, now back in E minor. With this evasion, the apparent C(P) (mm. 414–473) zone opens with an air of urgency. Mendelssohn reiterates and overlaps S\(^{\text{head}}\) fragments (in contrast to the exposition) against the more prominent ones from P, namely, as the soloist forges onwards in mostly triplets. Eventually, C(P) builds to V\(^7\) (m. 459–462) in fortissimo, but the impact of this chord and its function as the cadential dominant for the structural close diminishes; the bass continues to ascend chromatically as it did in the exposition, the music shifts the rhetorical emphasis to the passing 6/4 chord on C\(^{\sharp}\) (mm. 467–468), and the diminuendo thereafter accompanies the change to V6/5 leading to the tonic, which initiates the apparent coda (mm. 473–528) and delays the ESC even farther.

Like the development, the apparent coda opens with TR’s energetic material, now reinvigorated by the change to più presto so that the music continues to forge onwards to the i: PAC in m. 481. With the thematic repeat of the measures leading up to this articulation and the evaded cadence in m. 489, however, the i: PAC/ESC is delayed until m. 493, whereby the music, now in presto over a tonic pedal, drives to the movement’s fortissimo ending. The DRT5 development’s underplayed D-R border channels the forward momentum from its earlier lack of E-D border despite EEC, and contributes to the ESC’s progressive delay for Op. 64 (I)’s end-weighted, single-sweep design.
The DRT5 development in the finale of Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 (1844) similarly plays a strong role in the end-weighted trajectory through the form. When the development’s new lyrical theme (N, mm. 121–131; see Example 7.4 further in the discussion) continues past the recapitulation’s start (mm. 147ff.), it softens the D-R border and carries the motion later into the form. There, the music recaptures events from the development, which delay the ESC for the movement’s increasingly end-weighted design. This thematic overlap at the D-R border functions in two ways. First, it opens the gateway for the development’s later infusion in the recapitulation. Second, it intensifies the efforts undertaken by the development as a whole in channelling the forward motion from the E-D border’s earlier—albeit retrospective—dissolution. In particular, the development continues to weaken the regular four-bar hypermeter instigated by the shift of S material to mid-bar placement in the winds beginning in m. 95, which affirms development space in hindsight by dissolving the initial notion of C’s onset from the downbeat of this same measure where the EEC also materializes. The development essentially takes on this mid-bar effect as the seed of its narrative, the sense of hypermetric conflict in core\textsuperscript{part1} and RT perpetuating the need for resolution throughout the development—and beyond—which N’s continuation at the recapitulation’s onset provides.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{2} The pairing of an underplayed D-R border with dissolved E-D border (caused by the retrospective beginning of the development), along with the return of material from the development to delay the ESC for the movement’s end-weighted design, seems somewhat reminiscent of the DRT2 development in Op. 12 (I) from Chapter 4 (recall, though, that the EEC is not actually attained there; rather, the minimal potential for the authentic cadence in question to function as the EEC is retrospectively undone).

What distinguishes Op. 12 (I) specifically from Op. 64 (III) in categorization is the different prerogative each distinctly seems to pursue. Whereas in Op. 64 (III), the return of development material to delay the ESC seems to fulfill the general preoccupation with carrying motion through the movement for an end-weighted design, in Op. 12 (I), the development’s tie to the rest of the form seems to centre on N’s return to delay the ESC. There, N’s return is critical, especially considering its role as a symbol of blockage in the movement’s overall narrative; essentially, N’s return facilitates the successful end to the conflict conveyed throughout.
Through its core\(^{1}\) (mm. 95–114), the development intensifies the subtle way in which the E-D border dissolves following this E-major movement’s straightforward beginning consisting of an introduction (mm. 1–14), P-zero (mm. 15–22), P’s small ternary form (mm. 23–55), TR (mm. 55–68), and MC-complex (mm. 63–68), with S (mm. 69–95) achieving a V: PAC/EEC (m. 95). This EEC articulation elides with what seems to be the launch of C given by the soloist’s scalar ascent; but this notion of C is quickly vanquished with the return of S\(^{BI}\) material already being developed in the winds. The way Mendelssohn obscures regular hypermeter via S’s mid-bar placement (mentioned in the paragraph above)—along with the use of mixture (note the minor-mode implications in m. 98) and the subsequent modulation to G major (mm. 106ff.) via E minor (mm. 101–106)—work with the textural change created by the soloist’s light sixteenth-note passagework above minimal string support to retrospectively clarify the development’s start on the downbeat of m. 95 by dissolving any initial notions had of C.\(^{3}\) Collectively, these factors contribute to the retrospective dissolution of the E-D border and the sense of continuity which the development amplifies.

The sense of forward motion through the dissolved E-D border is pushed onwards by the mid-bar effect, which the development intensifies as the music continues to tonicize VI—now in

\(^{3}\) From a strictly Hepokoski-and-Darcian point of view, one might consider that the EEC in m. 95 is retrospectively undone by the reappearance of S material thereafter. Recall that for Hepokoski and Darcy “in order for a PAC to ‘stick’ as the EEC, S-material must normally be relinquished at the moment of the cadence, moving on to a differing thematic idea… [and that] when contrasting S-ideas persist past the first PAC, the implication is that the impulses that generated or sustained S are not yet finished, even though neither the S-theme nor its cadence is literally repeated.” For Hepokoski and Darcy, this same principle applies to situations where the EEC is deferred via the revitalization of some S material after a new module begins: “[this module,] initially [assumed] to mark the onset of C… fall[s] a few measures later into a perhaps slightly varied repetition of the music that had led to the earlier, presumed-EEC cadence.” See Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), 151–152. Applying this rather strict notion of S’s recycling to the present movement misses the insight gleaned from a more nuanced listening, though, which perceives C’s suggestion, however briefly, and takes into account the contextual effects of mid-bar placement working in tandem with mixture and modulation to develop S straightforward.
E minor (mm. 105–106)—to reach G major (III of the home key) from mm. 106ff. As

**Example 7.3** demonstrates, the development intensifies the conflict by proposing a V6/5 arrival in G major (mm. 107–109) midway through this measure until the metrical emphasis on the G-major chord returns to the downbeat to compete with these proposals (mm. 110–111). A clear V7 arrival DG (m. 112) followed by DG-fill (mm. 112–114) is achieved despite this conflict, and G major is established as the key of the development with P’s onset in m. 115.⁴

---

⁴ The V7 arrival in m. 112 falls on a strong measure (the hypermetric downbeat), following a hypermetric group of five in mm. 107–111.
Example 7.3: DG-complex; Op. 64, III, mm. 107–115

Core\textsuperscript{part1} (cont'd)  

DG-complex

S material continues

mid-bar emphasis

\textsuperscript{V}\textsuperscript{6/5} arr.
DG proposed

Core\textsuperscript{part2}

DG-fill

P material returns

\textsuperscript{I} \textsuperscript{V}\textsuperscript{6/5}''  
\textsuperscript{V}\textsuperscript{7} arr. DG
The way that mm. 95–114 retrospectively dissolve into the development and work towards this DG-complex in preparation for P in G major not only identifies its core\textsuperscript{part1} function, but also clarifies the role of the development’s subsequent sections right up to the recapitulation. Measures 115–131 suggest core\textsuperscript{part2}, since there is a change in the development’s activity. Core\textsuperscript{part2} reintroduces P’s full statement (mm. 115–118), followed by its breakdown (mm. 119–121), and the simultaneous iteration of its parts in thickened texture against N—all in G major. The loosening of N’s latter half (i.e., how it continues to ascend chromatically instead of securing an ending for itself in mm. 127–130) then facilitates the motion back to the home key for RT (mm. 131–146). There, P\textsuperscript{B1} material returns and the music proposes RT: V several times (see odd measures from mm. 131ff.). As Example 7.4 demonstrates, these articulations become obscured by the hypermetric conflict created by N in the cello, since N eventually proposes its own set of competing RT: V articulations (mm. 138, 140). This conflict pushes the motion onwards and perpetuates the desire for resolution. Once the conflict lessens through the transition back to regular hypermeter, an additional RT: V proposal (m. 143) prepares for the $V^7$ arrival RTC (m. 145) and RTC-fill (mm. 145–146), which lead to the recapitulation’s onset.
Example 7.4: RT-complex; Op. 64, III, mm. 121–147

Corepart2 (cont'd)

hypermeter: 1 2 3 4 1 2
The obscured regular four-bar hypermeter not only helps to clarify zones in the development, as such, but also pushes the motion forward through the development and beyond. The placement of S material mid-bar characterizes core\textsuperscript{part1}, just as the RT becomes marked by two competing hypermeters (i.e., between the soloist’s P and the cello’s N material). Core\textsuperscript{part2}, on the other hand, shows greater hypermetric clarity by far, although adjustments to regular hypermeter assist with the forward motion which claims the RT (see Figure 7.1).
In this way, the development’s initial dissolution of hypermeter, which clarifies development space, and so, retrospectively revokes C’s onset and dissolves the E-D border, becomes a marker of the development’s entry and exit zones. It also introduces the sense of hypermetric conflict which necessitates resolution. Given that the RT ultimately intensifies this conflict through N and P being at odds with one another, the D-R border’s softening via N’s simultaneous—and synchronized—restatement with P to initiate the recapitulation strongly conveys the reconciliation of conflicting forces.

Not only this, but with N carrying the motion through the D-R border, the development also manages to direct attention towards the movement’s end. There, material from the development returns to undo and further delay the ESC. At first, S (mm. 164–182) articulates a I: PAC/ESC (m. 182) in likewise fashion and at an analogous position to the V: PAC/EEC for C to follow. Whereas after the EEC, one retrospectively realizes that C is the onset of the development—this given the coupling of mid-bar emphasis with mixture and modulation—the music from mm. 182ff. remains stable, such that S’s recycling soon after the downbeat remains more homogenous with the recapitulatory S zone so as to undo the ESC. Notwithstanding its mid-bar placement, $S^{BI}$ is simply restated in the same register within the first few measures beyond m. 182, while the lack of mixture and modulation stabilizes the material here unlike
before, as does the more unified, rather than heterogeneous, texture. These factors which accompany \( S^{Bl} \)'s reuse following in close proximity to \( S \) in the recapitulation undo the ESC and perpetuate the continuation of recapitulatory space. As it turns out, this material from mm. 182ff. recaptures the events of the development—but functions as an apparent \( C(S) \) zone here—so that the development’s intensification of hypermetric conflict to channel the motion through the softened D-R border from the retrospective lack of E-D border continues to play a role near to the movement’s end.

The pairing of this apparent \( C \) zone with the development is summarized by Figure 7.2 and Example 7.5a/b. As the example shows, the apparent \( C \) zone revisits core\(^\text{part1} \) material (mm. 182–195), and even reclaims a proposal and articulation on a V6/4 arrival (mm. 195 and 197 respectively) for a fill-like passage (mm. 197–204) to achieve \( P \) (mm. 204–212) like the onset of the core\(^\text{part2} \). Soon after, though, \( P \)'s return begins to appear more like RT; the music proposes a V6/4 arrival (mm. 208 and 210) which is re-articulated (m. 212) to initiate a V pedal (mm. 212–218) supporting the return of \( S \) material. This V pedal finally achieves the I: PAC/ESC in m. 218 so that the true \( C \) (mm. 218–236) zone and codetta (mm. 236–248) bring the movement to a triumphant close.  

\(^5\) Note the same hypermetric group of five measures in mm. 190–194 paralleling mm. 107–111 earlier in the development. Also, the presence of a fill-like passage in this latter area of the form is supported by the manipulation of hypermeter in mm. 197–200 (i.e., –3–4–3–4), which creates a floating quality.

\(^6\) An alternative interpretation might consider this ESC in m. 218 to be undone by \( S \)'s additional repeat from mm. 218ff., so that the true ESC falls in m. 236. This repeat, however, is already quite different from the \( S \) material preceding it, especially given its chromatic bassline in mm. 218–219, which contrasts both the use of \( S \) above the dominant pedal (mm. 212–218) leading up to the ESC in m. 218, and the onset of \( S \)'s recycling from mm. 182ff., which begins over a tonic pedal.

That \( S \) material also persists beyond m. 236—the final option for where one might place an even later ESC—demonstrates this movement as a viable critique of Hepokoski and Darcy’s stringent view on the role of \( S \)’s recycling in deferring EECs and ESCs. Hypothetically applying their black-and-white approach to this movement poses the dilemma that even though all the I: PAC/ESC candidates in mm. 182, 218, and 236 are followed by \( S \)'s
Figure 7.2: The Development Influences the Apparent C Zone; Op. 64, III, mm. 182–248

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part1}-like</th>
<th>DG-like complex</th>
<th>Core\textsuperscript{part2}-like</th>
<th>RT-like complex</th>
<th>True C 218–236</th>
<th>Codetta 236–248</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182–195</td>
<td>195–204</td>
<td>204–208</td>
<td>208–218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 + 4 + 5</td>
<td>4(-3-4) + 4*</td>
<td>*4</td>
<td>4 + 4 + 3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S mid-bar</td>
<td>S + P fragments</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P + S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* = hypermetric reinterpretation between adjacent hypermeasures

Example 7.5a: DG-like Complex in the Apparent C Zone; Op. 64, III, mm. 195–204

repeat, it probably is not the case that all are insufficient taking into account other contextual factors; rather, it remains more than likely that one of these articulations is strong enough to be perceived as the movement’s structural close notwithstanding S’s extended presence around these measures.
Example 7.5b: RT-like Complex in the Apparent C Zone; Op. 64, III, mm. 208–219

RT-like Complex

V6/4 proposed

V6/4 pedal secured

Closing (S)

[V7] V7

I: PAC/ESC etc...
In this way, the DRT5 development’s progression from conflict to resolution articulates a narrative which grows out of the development’s retrospective dissolution of the E-D border, the RT’s intensification of the obscured hypermeter found there, and N’s synchronized use with P at the recapitulation’s onset to not only suggest resolution, but also soften the D-R border to direct the motion towards the ESC’s further delay, this via the development’s return for the increasingly end-weighted, single-sweep design of Op. 64 (III) as a whole.

Other DRT5 developments in Mendelssohn’s two remaining sonata-form concerto movements follow Op. 64 (I) and Op. 64 (III) in playing a strong role in the sense of narrative and end-weighted trajectories through the form, but these developments work with the development’s lack of E-D border without EEC. Such is the case in the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25 (1831). Here, the development (mm. 157–179) plays a large part in the way the movement unfolds in a single sweep. The development intensifies the motion from the lack of EEC and channels the forward motion through its own brief structure and through the D-R border into the recapitulation (mm. 179–234). Through its blurred E-D and D-R boundaries which involve V pedals, the development channels the forward momentum and in so doing, instigates a transformation of the exposition’s lengthier thematic zones. The recapitulation thereby appears more fluid and concise. Motion continues more directly towards the i: PAC/ESC (m. 234) for stronger closure nearer to the movement’s end—this despite the coda’s (mm. 234–270) “soft” ending modulation to E major which segues into the following Andante movement.

The development’s blurred boundaries also play essential roles in the narrative trajectory across the form. This narrative articulates a gradual progression towards resolution of the conflict expressed by the misalignment of formal functions at the large-scale level, which the
overlapping of end and beginning zones at the E-D and D-R borders creates. Via the transformation mentioned above, this resolution comprises the strong i: PAC/ESC, which serves to “correct” the earlier lack of EEC. As resolution, moreover, the ESC articulates a defined border between recapitulatory and coda space as well as the alignment of formal sections previously denied by the overlap at each of the development’s two borders. This narrative also draws attention to the MC-S juncture and S’s onset on V in the exposition and recapitulation. The former expresses an initial state of minimal overlap in “the story”, which becomes amplified by the development’s borders. The latter, by contrast, now recomposed, demonstrates a transitional state (i.e., still showing a strong sense of fluidity through the border, but minimizing the use of overlap significantly) on the gradual path to the ESC as resolution.

As Examples 7.6a and 7.6b demonstrate, both of the development’s overlaps involve a dominant pedal through the border, but differ in how other musical factors contribute to the blurred effects that play a role in the development’s and the recapitulation’s retrospectively realized onsets. Example 7.6a shows the blurred E-D border. S (mm. 77ff.) in B-flat major (III, the secondary key) continues as if en route to the EEC. This impression is given by the piano’s anticipatory sixteenth-note trill on the cadential V7 (mm. 156ff.) in fortissimo, which is dramatically preceded by the viiº7/V chord (mm. 154–155). S overlaps with P-zero’s entrances from mm. 157ff. (compare mm. 1–19), however. These entrances eventually help clarify the hypermetric reinterpretation (4=1) which marks the development’s start in m. 157, this despite the continuity through the E-D border via the continued sixteenth-note texture. This clarification

---

7 P-zero encompasses mm. 1–19 in the exposition (mm. 1–157). Despite how mm. 1–7 might seem to contrast mm. 8–19, both passages feature ascending scalar material, such that the latter appears as a loose diminution of the former.
only occurs retrospectively in m. 159 rather than when P-zero first appears, however, since
closure continues to be anticipated strongly by the trill. Continuing *con forza* to m. 166, this trill
first extends *V* through mm. 157–158, so that P-zero’s beginning function within the
development remains temporarily hidden. When P-zero becomes more prominent from mm.
159ff. (note how P-zero now appears in the upper woodwinds, as opposed to the bassoon’s less
perceptible lower register), the sense of the development’s core becomes strengthened. The trill
proceeds off of *V* in the same measure to tonicize C minor (locally, ii of B-flat major) before
moving on towards G minor, which ultimately evades the EEC and channels the motion
forward. In this way, the development’s onset in m. 157 becomes retrospectively realized, while
the role of the hypermetric reinterpretation there becomes retrospectively clarified.\(^8\)

\(^8\) An alternate interpretation might take m. 156 as the start of the development. In this case, the trills’ *fortissimo* onset in m. 156—as dramatically preceded by the vii\(^*\)/V chord (mm. 154–155)—exudes a strong sense of arrival, which reinterprets the third hyperbeat as a downbeat. The role of this reinterpretation would be retrospectively realized too. Initially, the reinterpretation in m. 156 would contribute to the continuity through the E-D border (i.e., by functioning as the beginning of the very end); but the hypermetric downbeat there would also support the development’s start in retrospect. The hypermetric reinterpretation (4=1) resulting from P-zero’s increased prominence in m. 159 would essentially help to clarify the start already of the development’s core in m. 156.
Example 7.6a: E-D Overlap; Op. 25, I, mm. 154–161

Development (retrospectively realized)

P-zero entrance

S continues...

154

16ths continue

as if to anticipate the EBC

B₃⁺ (III): [vii⁷]

V⁷

[iii/5]  V⁷  ...

of ii

hypermeter: 1  2  3  4 = 1  2  3  4  1

[iv of G- (i)]
Example 7.6b: D-R Overlap; Op. 25, I, mm. 171–186 (continued on next page)
Example 7.6b (continued)
The D-R overlap similarly involves a V pedal (mm. 179ff.) that initially appears on its way to fulfilling ending function within the development before subsequent events retrospectively clarify its use in launching the recapitulation. As Example 7.6b demonstrates—and as given by the gradual rise in energy from mm. 179ff.—this V pedal seems to occur as part of an expanded continuation within a sentence-like passage (mm. 173–184) that turns out to be the RT-complex.\(^9\) Secured in m. 179 after several proposals, namely, this home-key RT: V pedal features P-zero, a crescendo from “soft” dynamic, and the onset of tutti texture, while the outer voices expand outwards in contrary motion from the note, D, to the V arrival RTC in m. 184. Continuity through m. 179 is further supported, meanwhile, by the “soft” dynamic and additional P-zero material heading into m. 179 (certainly beginning from the RT-complex, but also slightly before in the lower strings in mm. 171–173). Notwithstanding this continuity and the RTC in m. 184, one soon realizes the recapitulation’s start back in m. 179 once P enters in (mm. 185ff.; compare mm. 20–37).

When P’s fortissimo entrance signals the onset already of recapitulatory space, it simultaneously reveals the excision of much of the rather lengthy P-zero material at the very start of the exposition. This excision comes as somewhat of a surprise, since the memory of the past shapes expectations for a repeat of similar events at the recapitulation’s launch. When this expectation is thwarted, the function of the P-zero material in mm. 179–184 becomes

\(^9\) Given the much lengthier exposition, one might anticipate a more elaborate development than Mendelssohn ultimately fashions here. The development, however, still seems well-structured (perhaps just tightly composed), such that the RT-complex seems viable even “in the moment”. Based primarily on P-zero, this development, although short, still seems to suggest a V arrival sealed DG (m. 169) in G minor (note the build in energy towards this point involving the piano’s crescendo to forte, agitato playing and ultimately, declamatory sforzando chords). This DG initiates the contrasting S material, which distinguishes core\(^{\text{mm.2}}\) before the piano returns to P-zero material (note the syncopated entrances on the note, D from mm. 173ff.) for the onset of the RT-complex.
reinterpreted. Initially masked by the sense of continuity through m. 179, P-zero above the RT: V pedal ultimately becomes retrospectively understood as the thematic start of the recapitulation.

The brevity of the development channels the forward motion from the lack of EEC at the blurred E-D boundary through its similarly blurred D-R border into the recapitulation. As the recapitulation will soon demonstrate, the development’s blurred boundaries are essential to not only the end-weighted trajectory and forward motion forging through this movement, but also the narrative thread that coheres across the form. The forward motion into the recapitulation essentially instigates a transformation via the concision of the expositional materials in the recapitulation for stronger directedness and fluidity towards the movement’s end. This concision begins straightaway, as the D-R overlap already demonstrates, and with P=>TR’s fairly brief passage (mm. 185–195; for a comparison with TR, see mm. 37–76) leading fluidly into S (mm. 195–234). In providing a step towards resolution, the MC-S juncture here (see Example 7.7a), although defined thematically by S’s onset, seems downplayed, appearing slightly blurred. As with the expositional S and the start of the development and recapitulation, the recapitulatory S’s beginning on the prolonged dominant avoids the tonic, and once again perpetuates the search for resolution until closer to the movement’s end. Recomposed to start now on V6/5 of V, S in the recapitulation withholds any sense of tonic that would have been given by a direct transposition of the exposition’s V6/4 opening of S in B-flat major. The preceding fortissimo articulations on the same V6/5 of V chord also contribute to the continuity into S and S’s retrospectively realized onset only after the downbeat of m. 195.10 S also occurs where one

---

10 One also retrospectively accepts the V6/5 of V articulation as the MC (m. 195) following S’s thematic onset, although Hepokoski and Darcy would seem to view this chord as an MC deformation based on their
might expect the ending segment in the sentence-like structure beginning from mm. 189ff. (note how the start of S’s theme reinterprets the third hyperbeat).

Example 7.7a: Downplayed and Slightly Blurred Recapitulatory MC-S Juncture; Op. 25, I, 189–197

*The strings are doubled by the brass and winds above (not shown here).
Example 7.7b: Clearly Defined Expositional MC-S Juncture; Op. 25, I, 69–78

While the recapitulation demonstrates a stronger thematic distinctness at the MC-S juncture than at the E-D and D-R borders, this distinctness does not quite match the clarity at the MC-S juncture in the exposition, notwithstanding S’s opening on V6/4 of the secondary key there (see Example 7.7b). The narrative, as such, propels further into S, where the music builds in strong anticipation of the ESC—and much more dramatically than at S’s end in the exposition, which eschews the EEC altogether (compare mm. 219–234 with mm. 146ff.). Here, Mendelssohn’s recomposition allows the elements from the analogous area in the exposition to become fleshed out as a “correction” to the earlier situation at the E-D border. In so doing, the
recomposition ultimately compensates for the lack of a strong articulative beginning at the recapitulation’s retrospectively realized onset. The most important change to avoid overlap here is the sooner and more extensive use of trills (mm. 225ff.), which dominate despite the P-zero figures in the piano’s left hand. Building to fortissimo, this passage culminates with the covered i: PAC/ESC in tutti texture, marking a distinct border previously denied for P’s now clear initiation of coda space (mm. 234ff.).

The DRT5 development’s blurred E-D and D-R boundaries therefore play an important role in the broad narrative trajectory across the form. They heighten the complexity and represent an amplification of the much milder overlap involving the V pedal through the expositional MC-S juncture. They also collectively represent the main conflict—the turning point in “the story”—which initiates the shift towards resolution. This shift, as instigated by the forward-channeling motion through these borders (and as facilitated by the development’s own brevity), represents a transformation of the exposition’s materials. The recapitulation becomes more concise as a result, as well as more directed towards resolution closer to the movement’s end, such that the recomposition of the MC-S juncture and the remainder of S in the recapitulation demonstrate gradual steps towards resolution. Ultimately, the forward-driving motion intensified by the development and furthered into the recapitulation culminates in a strong i: PAC/ESC. This long-awaited arrival expresses the alignment of tonal and thematic forces in launching the coda, which draws the movement to its very end.

Although literally a i: IAC given P’s entrance on B♭, the melodic resolution of the cadence occurs in the piano in solo to G, the tonic, which articulates a i: PAC/ESC in m. 234.
The **DRT5 development** in the **first movement of Piano Concerto No. 2 in D minor, Op. 40 (1837)**, like that in Op. 25 (I), facilitates an even stronger sense of fluidity through the form. In this closing example for this chapter, the D-R border, despite its re-articulation of tonic harmony, is underplayed, and hardly disrupts the overall sweep of the movement’s strongly end-weighted design. The D-R border plays a critical role; it channels the forward-driving momentum from the unattained EEC, to beyond the development, and onwards to the ESC—this despite the opening movement’s smooth connection to the *Adagio* which follows.

The sense of momentum through the D-R border is upheld through the premature onset of the recapitulation *in medias res* (mm. 230ff.), both in terms of the form-functional layout and the development’s tonal pathway to return. From a form-functional standpoint, the entirely P-based development begins in a rather straightforward manner. The pre-core (mm. 183–190) exudes a strong sense of its preparatory function by stating recognizable PCI units (mm. 183–186; 187–190), while the change to PB1 marks the subsequent start of the core (mm. 191–233). In this latter zone, units are shortened in a core-like manner; the initial group of six measures (i.e., four measures of PB1 and two of the PB1-based eighth-note figures; see mm. 191–196) shortens to four (mm. 197–200) at the onset of the eighth-note fugato in the strings, and the group of six measures (mm. 201–207), which this fugato initiates, turns into shorter, four-measure units (mm. 207–222) after the piano’s entry in m. 207.

From mm. 207ff., the piano, supported by harmonies given separately by the strings and the winds, articulates a rising stepwise sequence tonicizing E-flat major, F minor, and then G minor (see **Example 7.8**). This type of forward-driving motion continues with the onset of the piano’s octave rendition of the eighth-note material in *solo* (mm. 222–224), whereby the four-measure grouping disintegrates to initiate another six-measure unit (mm. 224–230). In this latter
passage, the way the piano continues to drive onwards in *forte* and just begins to develop the large-scale stepwise ascending motive stemming from the start of the sequence from mm. 207ff. suggests more action to follow. This notion is called into question, however, when the winds and brass intervene, announcing P-zero (mm. 230–233) in *fortissimo* as the eighth-note core material continues simultaneously in the piano. As the strings soon confirm through their \( p^{B1} \) statement immediately after, this strong re-entrance on P-zero marks the start of the recapitulation, resulting in a lack of preparation for the recapitulation itself (i.e., there is no RT), and an overlap at the D-R border despite the re-articulation of tonic harmony there.

**Example 7.8: Forward-driving Sequence Leads to D-R Overlap; Op. 40, I, mm. 207–234**
tonicizes G minor (iv)

1  2  3  4  1  2  3  4=1
Recapitulation

P-zero

P

figures continue through

sequence continues? No.

[V4/2] iv6 V ...

vi VI ...

VII ...

i i pedal

2 3=1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4=1 etc...
When considered within the overall context of the movement, it becomes apparent that the development’s channeling of forward-driving momentum through the D-R border stems earlier from the unattained EEC. As it turns out, complications with the EEC have much to do with S’s extensive use, and seem to be foreshadowed by earlier difficulties encountered towards TR’s end in opening S in the exposition’s true secondary key of F major (III). A look at the exposition’s start reveals an annunciatory descent of the tonic chord in the winds and brass (which forms part of the fairly extensive P-zero material; see mm. 1–33), and P, whose antecedent phrase (mm. 33–52) leads to a dissolving consequent (beginning in m. 53) into TR, where A minor is strongly referenced. A V7 arrival MC is proposed in this key in m. 75—and several times more—before an actual V arrival MC is reached (m. 89), and caesura-fill (mm. 89–90) leads to the onset of the S theme (m. 91). As Example 7.9 demonstrates, this theme soon modulates to C major before it seems to have its presentation phrase expanded (mm. 95–102). With the retry of S in F major at the onset of m. 103, however, III becomes realized as the true secondary key, S’s off-key beginning becomes apparent, and the material heard initially as internal expansion (i.e., mm. 99–102) becomes retrospectively reinterpreted as the true MC-complex complete with a V6 arrival MC proposal (m. 99), MC articulation (m. 101), and caesura-fill (mm. 101–102) to prepare S in III.
Example 7.9: S’s Onset in the Exposition; Op. 40, I, mm. 91–106

Despite this initial situation, F major does not find recompense through S’s closure as the pending situation with the EEC soon demonstrates. S’s first F-major statement (mm. 103–117) has its cadential segment interrupted by S’s repeat (mm. 117–132), and when this latter statement achieves a seemingly good candidate for a III: PAC/EEC (m. 132), it is eventually
undone: the S theme returns beginning in m. 151.\textsuperscript{12} As such, another chance arises for the EEC to be reclaimed when the theme arrives at a V6/4 pedal in m. 163 and dominant harmony is prolonged for some twenty measures. This time, in the aftermath of the adversity faced through the EEC’s undoing, a stronger sense of striving for closure is suggested. The temporary break in the pedal (mm. 166–169), the pedal’s decoration via chromatic neighbour motion (mm. 169–175), and the sustained trills (mm. 175–183) build the tension towards, and the anticipation for, a strong cadence. Such preparation is executed in vain, however; in m. 183, the moment of resolution is evaded by a vii\(^{6}/5\) of V chord and the return of four measures of P\textsuperscript{Cl} (mm. 183–186).

Preoccupied with the expectation of securing the EEC, one initially interprets P\textsuperscript{Cl}’s reinstatement in the piano solo as a continuation of the exposition’s action space, but this notion soon dissipates. When the vii\(^{6}/5\) of V chord mentioned above becomes enharmonically reinterpreted as vii\(^{4}/3\) of V in D minor (i), the orchestra’s rendition of the same, relatively undeveloped P\textsuperscript{Cl} material (mm. 187–201) in this key suggests pre-core material. In this way, the development’s onset in m. 183—where P\textsuperscript{Cl} was stated in the piano solo four measures earlier—becomes retrospectively realized, as does the overlap between the exposition’s end and the development’s beginning. As such, one is forced to accept the EEC’s unattainment from here onwards (in Hepokoski and Darcy’s terms, a “failed” exposition), and the motion continues to push forward into the development.

\textsuperscript{12} The EEC’s undoing is actually hinted at within the same measure that it is sounded (i.e., m. 132); the dotted-quarter figure (although P-based) heard initially in the winds (mm. 132–133 and 135–136) echoes its earlier appearance (m. 127) from within S territory just a few measures before.
In addition to the way the DRT5 development channels the forward momentum from the lack of EEC thereafter, the fusion at the D-R border amplifies the sense of pressing onwards and directs the motion through the recapitulation. As changes made to the material first presented in the exposition demonstrate, the music of the recapitulation seems to flow through a more direct path geared towards the end. In the recapitulation, P’s consequent is excised, its antecedent is fused with TR (mm. 233–244), the correct V6/5 arrival MC is more readily achieved (i.e., on the third beat of m. 244), and a much more straightforward rendition to the start of S (mm. 245ff.) eschews earlier complications with S’s off-key beginning in the exposition. From here on, S continues to propel the motion towards the end, its multiple expansions surpassing any proposition of an ESC paralleling the weak EEC from m. 132. As Example 7.10 demonstrates, S’s forward-driving nature continues to be upheld when its continuation phrase (mm. 253–259) is shortened by the entrance of S’s reiteration (mm. 259ff.). The presentation of this restatement then carries the momentum further when it becomes expanded through a quasi-chromatic ascent in the bass (mm. 263–270). In the cadential segment (mm. 271–274) and its repeat (mm. 275–278), Mendelssohn also evades closure both times, such that the music presses forward—beyond the analogous spot where the weak EEC was proposed—and expands S even further.
Example 7.10: S Expands in the Recapitulation; Op. 40, I, mm. 245–278
What ensues is a $P^{\text{head}}$-based passage (mm. 278–285) which leads to the onset of $P^{\text{CI}}$ (mm. 286–289), the material of the pre-core. Here, though, the excerpt initiated by $P^{\text{CI}}$ functions as additional $P$ insertion within $S$, and it propels the motion towards closure at a point even closer to the movement’s end. $P^{\text{CI}}$ sparks the onset of a presentation phrase and a forward-driving stepwise bass ascent which flows into the continuation (i.e., collectively, a sentence in
mm. 286–293), past the evaded cadence (m. 293), and through further expansion (mm. 294ff.). From here, the ascent in the right hand (mm. 294–298) carries the momentum, as it produces an accelerative drive relative to the bass ascent heard previously (i.e., mm. 286–293). The shortening of units thereafter (mm. 299–306) also pushes onwards, as two-measure thematic segments (mm. 299–300; 301–302) become one-measure (m. 303), and then half-measure ideas (mm. 304–306). By m. 306, the music intensifies and reaches a climax through the ascending sixteenth-note chromatic lines which not only build to fortissimo, but also stretch out the predominant harmony in preparation for the lengthy V6/4–7 pedal (mm. 310–321). Finally, after the addition of the anticipatory trill (mm. 313–321), the music achieves the long-awaited i: PAC/ESC (m. 321) in fortissimo, tutti texture.

Given the strong sense of forward motion which persists through the D-R border and pushes the ESC increasingly towards the end, the ESC in m. 321 barely suffices as recompense for the EEC’s earlier undoing in the exposition; the strength of the propulsive forward motion generated over the course of the entire movement is such that the music bypasses any subsequent reinforcement for the i: PAC, and instead, initiates a modulatory coda. In this way, the forward-pressing motion continues as aftermath past the ESC, so that by m. 341, the tonic major is already reinterpreted as III$$\flat$$ in B-flat major, and the music drifts off to anticipate the subsequent Adagio movement in this very key. Over the course of the opening movement, then, the D-R border becomes instrumental in channeling the forward-motion from the unattained EEC, through the recapitulation, and to the ESC’s ultimate realization at a point closer to the end. As such, the D-R border becomes not only critical for the movement’s increasingly end-

13 This eleven-measure pedal compensates in some way for the recapitulation’s seemingly premature beginning.
weighted design, but also critical as a matter of aesthetic, as a contributor to the sense of the movement’s overall sweep and forward-pressing nature.

**Conclusion**

Through my analyses of Op. 64 (I), Op. 64 (III), Op. 25 (I), and Op. 40 (I) in this chapter, I have demonstrated the strong role that **DRT5 developments** play in the end-weighted trajectories of movements and the way movements unfold in a single sweep. I have also identified a specific trend in genre for Mendelssohn’s compositional aesthetic, since DRT5 developments played a role in all four of his concerto movements in sonata form. These movements demonstrate that DRT5 developments work in conjunction with blurred E-D boundaries which either attain an EEC (Op. 64, I; Op. 64, III) or do not (Op. 25, I; Op. 40, I). In all four of these movements, the development carries the motion forward and underplays the D-R border in some way. Op. 64 (I) and Op. 64 (III) both have thematic material from the development that persists through the D-R border, while a retransitional sequence and V pedal carry motion through the D-R border in Op. 40 (I) and Op. 25 (I), respectively. As my analyses have also demonstrated, the forward momentum instigates a transformation of the exposition’s lengthier thematic zones so that the recapitulation appears more fluid and concise on a more direct path to the ESC—or the ESC’s delay—closer to the movement’s end. The underplayed D-R border plays an important part in the sense of transformation, as such, and specifically for Op. 64 (III) and Op. 25 (I), the rise of narrative which pursues the gradual change from conflict to resolution through the form.
As I have shown with these narratives, the softened D-R border suggests conflict, but in two different ways between Op. 64 (III) and Op. 25 (I). Conflict grows out of the development’s retrospective dissolution of the E-D border and the RT’s intensification of obscured hypermeter in Op. 64 (III). The V pedals through the development’s borders in Op. 25 (I), meanwhile, amplify the smaller-scale misalignment at the MC-S juncture and S’s onset on V. Both movements then pursue resolution gradually. In Op. 64 (III), N synchronizes with P at the recapitulation’s onset as reversion back to regular hypermeter, and carries the motion through the D-R border towards the movement’s end. In Op. 25 (I), the D-R border channels forward motion into the recapitulation for a more direct path to the ESC. This arrival defines the R-C border and the alignment of formal sections previously denied at the development’s boundaries. The DRT5 developments in this chapter therefore play a strong role in the way that Mendelssohn’s concerto movements unfold in a single sweep and the sense of narrative and transformation which arise through the form.
Chapter 8
Conclusions and Considerations for Further Study

This study on the role of the development in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms has led me to propose a theory of development that outlines five different ways in which developments have a connection to the rest of the form. I call these connections developmental relationship types (DRTs). As my analyses have shown, DRTs offer an effective way to investigate and communicate the importance of development sections to both the aesthetic interpretation of movements and the structural trajectory across entire forms. DRTs also constitute a lens through which to explore developments systematically and to elucidate trends with regards to developments across a large body of music. At the same time, DRTs provide a sufficiently flexible framework to group entire developments together productively, despite each development’s unique traits. While the focus in my analyses has been on the development and its relationship to the rest of the form, the narratives that arise also demonstrate that the idiosyncratic traits of developments still can, and do, play a strong role in the aesthetic interpretations of movements. As my in-depth analyses show, my pursuit of DRTs has led me to see the relevance of musical narrative as a large-scale musical process to many, if not all, of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms.

This closing chapter first presents a summary of the new concepts I offer in this dissertation. I then reflect on trends in the distribution of movements across DRTs, the associations between traits of Mendelssohn’s development sections and specific DRTs, as well as the implications DRTs have with respect to large-scale formal process and the intersection
between narrative and form. I close by discussing the contribution of my work and avenues for further study.

I. Summary of New Concepts

DRTs comprise only part of my theory given my application of what I call an inner-outer perspective in my study of Mendelssohn’s developments. This perspective has enabled me to provide stronger delineations of developmental space, both locally and globally, rather than approaching the development solely as a discrete formal entity. DRTs arise from the global perspective I take of viewing the development in the context of large-scale form. As I have demonstrated over the course of this dissertation, the five DRTs I outline express how: (1) the development forwards material to the coda (D-C pairings or development-coda pairings) in DRT1; (2) the development forwards material, which helps to defer the essential structural close (ESC) in DRT2; (3) the RT calls for “compensation” towards the movement’s end in DRT3; (4) the development furthers an aspect from the exposition or introduction into the recapitulation and/or coda in DRT4; and (5) the underplayed D-R border channels motion and contributes to the movement’s single-sweep design in DRT5.

DRTs complement the stronger delineation of developmental space which was facilitated by the inner perspective I applied on developments. I provided this delineation in Chapter 2 through a few new terms and concepts on the development section and its distinct components. I proposed the terms D-R border (development-recapitulation border) and D-R overlap (development-recapitulation overlap) and introduced the RT- and DG-complexes with each of their components—RT-connect (retransition-connect), RTC (re transitional caesura).
RTC-fill (retransitional-caesura-fill), sealed DG (sealed developmental gap), DG (developmental gap), and DG-fill (developmental-gap-fill). I also explained the two-part core, which consists of \text{core}^\text{part1} and \text{core}^\text{part2}, and other devices that can appear in relation to the RT (retransition), such as the RT-prep zone (a zone which prepares the RT) and retransitional sequence (the use of sequence—for Mendelssohn, ascending 5–6 sequence—in place of the more normative V pedal leading up to the D-R border).

The stronger delineation of the RT is especially important in my theory, since my theory views the kind of articulation achieved by the development at the D-R border as a key consideration in my method for classifying developments. My method can be used to organize any number of developments—and can theoretically be applied across the music of various composers—since I base my method on two criteria, which are specific and yet broad enough to relate to any development in question. These two criteria are: (1) what I proposed as the border class—either a tonic- or a non-tonic-articulated D-R border, which the development achieves, and (2) whether or not the development has a strong tie to the rest of the form. I proposed this method in Chapter 2 by combining these two criteria to devise development classes I, II, III, and IV. Those fifty of Mendelssohn’s developments that I identify for in-depth study in Chapters 3 to 7 centre on those Class-I and -II developments which have a strong tie to the rest of the form. I also distinguished between border classes “a” and “b” for tonic-articulated borders to account for instances of non-overlap and overlap, respectively. As Table 2.7 demonstrated, instances of overlap—including by non-tonic-articulated borders—almost equaled those of non-overlap, such that non-overlap occurred more often by only a slight margin. My analyses showed that regardless of border class, D-R overlap and the way developments negotiate the D-R border play an important role in how the rest of the form unfolds. This was especially the case for DRTs 3, 4, and 5. For DRT5, furthermore, overlap prevailed despite the prevalence of tonic-
articulated borders (refer back to Table 2.7). Taken collectively, the terms and concepts that arise from the inner-outer perspective of my theory have enabled the more detailed discussion of developments in the in-depth analyses of entire movements that I have presented for each DRT in each chapter.

II. Trends in Distribution Across DRTs

The five DRTs I identify represent Mendelssohn’s compositional tendencies with respect to his approach to the development and its role within the context of entire movements. The subcategories I propose within each, meanwhile, demonstrate how Mendelssohn expresses each of these DRTs in slightly different ways. Table 8.1 summarizes the distribution of Mendelssohn’s fifty sonata movements across all five DRTs and their subcategories (for a list of the movements/works and their DRT classifications, see Appendix 1). DRT1 developments were the most common; their strong presence represents the degree to which development-coda pairings prevail. As I have demonstrated through my analyses, this prevalence indicates that developments are likeliest to forge a connection through thematic ties, and that these ties are specifically made to the coda. DRT2 developments were the least common, by contrast, and although the developmental tie is also thematic in these movements, the relationship is not with the coda. Instead, the relationship is with the recapitulatory S zone; the development forwards material which expands S and delays the ESC.
### Table 8.1: Ranked Distribution of Mendelssohn’s Sonata-form Movements Across DRTs and their Subtypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRT</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>DRT</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>DRT</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>DRT</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRT1</td>
<td>(20) Thematic D-C Pairing (19)</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
<td>(14) Harmonic/Tonal (6) Thematic (6) Motivic (2) ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Insufficient RT (3) Downplayed RT (3) Mostly Sufficient RT (2) Sufficient-Insufficient RT (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of E-D Border Despite EEC (2) Lack of E-D Border Without EEC (2) --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Literal Reference (2) Feigned Reference (1) --- ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution across DRT4, DRT3, and DRT5 demonstrates that developments still continued to forge ties to the rest of the form, but differently than in DRT1 and DRT2. The strong presence of DRT4 developments among these three DRTs shows that it was far more common for developments to highlight and further an aspect from earlier in the movement and into the rest of the form. Of the three aspects which distinguish the subcategories of DRT4, moreover, harmonic/tonal and thematic components were highlighted equally and much more than motivic aspects.

That Mendelssohn preferred to highlight harmonic/tonal and thematic ideas indicates the attention he placed on underplaying the D-R border as a way to achieve the end-weighted trajectories of narratives through his movements. As my analyses of DRT4 developments demonstrate, thematic overlap often played an important step in how Mendelssohn furthered a thematic aspect in the form. This was similarly the case when the DRT4 development pertained to a harmonic/tonal aspect. In these analyses, the aspect was projected to a larger-scale level as a “wrong-key” RT or tonal diversion on the way to the recapitulation.
By contrast, when Mendelssohn did use a DRT4 development to highlight a motivic aspect a couple of times (i.e., in the overture to *die erste Walpurgisnacht*, Op. 60 and Piano Quartet No. 3 in B minor, Op. 3, I, more specifically), the aesthetic was markedly different. The attention seemed more geared towards projecting a motive to the harmonic/tonal level as a way to represent a progression from an earlier state rather than on underplaying the D-R border per se. Perhaps Mendelssohn was experimenting with, or wanted to try, a particular way of composing when he dealt with motive. It is also possible that he had a very specific aesthetic or concept in mind with regards to how the movement or piece should unfold in these cases. The latter might seem likelier given the programmatic tie which Op. 60 has as an overture to a larger dramatic work; the transition to spring is forward-looking and implies gradual change. For Op. 3 (I), furthermore, the alternation of two different motives and of the amplification of one over the other to the harmonic/tonal level seems to be a very distinct way of composing for that particular piano quartet. It is also worth noting Mendelssohn’s use of the N-complex which is referenced later in the literature with regards to Brahms.

By contrast, both DRT3 and DRT5 were less common than DRT4. Still, DRT3, which featured an RT and its connection to a later V pedal, demonstrated Mendelssohn’s preoccupation with underplayed D-R borders. DRT5 developments were similar in this same respect. Occurring even less frequently than DRT3, DRT5 might be considered somewhat special, though, since these developments play a large role in how movements unfold in a single-sweep.

Other trends in the distribution of DRTs turned out to be genre-, movement-, and piece-specific. DRT5 was, most notably, the only group to show exclusivity with concerto
movements. DRTs 1–4, on the other hand, were more eclectic in composition, but showed a strong preoccupation with certain types of movements and genres. Almost all the overtures were found in DRT4, for example, with the remainder in DRT3, which otherwise demonstrated an orientation towards finale movements, albeit non-exclusively. The three scherzo movements were more evenly distributed (DRT1, DRT3, and DRT4), meanwhile, as were the movements from Mendelssohn’s piano sonatas (DRT1, DRT2, DRT3, and DRT4). In addition, the majority of symphonic movements occurred in DRT1, and although less frequented, DRT2 was largely characterized by chamber movements. Last but not least, specific pieces—Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (DRT1), String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44/2 (DRT1), Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (DRT3), Piano Trio No. 1 in D minor (DRT3), and Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64 (DRT5)—shared the same DRT across multiple movements. These trends suggest that Mendelssohn composed with a specific aesthetic framework in mind for particular pieces and genres, and occasionally, with regards to finales. These trends did not correlate with composition date, however. The strong preoccupation with a specific DRT demonstrated this observation. On the other hand, the more even distribution of scherzo and piano-sonata

1 Those concerto movements are: Piano Concerto No. 1 in G minor, Op. 25, I; Piano Concerto No. 2 in D minor, Op. 40, I; and Violin Concerto in E minor, Op. 64, I and III.


3 Those scherzo movements I refer to are String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44/2, II (DRT1), Piano Trio No. in D minor, Op. 49, III (DRT3), and Octet in E-flat major, Op. 20, III (DRT4). Those piano-sonata movements I refer to are: Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105, I (DRT1); Piano Sonata Op. 106, I (DRT2); Piano Sonata in E major, IV (DRT3); and for DRT4, Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 (III) and Piano Sonata in E major, Op. 6, (I).

4 Those symphonic movements in DRT1 are: Symphony No. 1 in C minor, Op. 11 (I, II, and IV); Symphony No. 5 in D minor, Op. 107 (I); Symphony No. 2 in B-flat major, Op. 52 (I); Symphony No. 3 in A minor, Op. 56 (I).
movements across the DRTs indicated that Mendelssohn may have thought of these movements as unique components within a set, each of which showcases a different DRT as an aesthetic approach.

III. Associations Between Specific Traits of Development with Particular DRTs

My analyses also demonstrate the correspondence of specific traits of development with particular DRTs. While DRT1 exhibited many examples of clearly defined thematic components in their layout, many of these traits had to do with the RT and the development’s end. In my theoretical chapter (Chapter 2), I recognized the use of what I term retransitional sequences, or sequences leading up to the D-R border. This device occurred in DRT3 developments in particular. The ascending 5–6 sequence is a favourite retransitional device of Mendelssohn’s as an alternative to the more normative extended V pedal. As my analyses have further shown, retransitional sequences hold aesthetic implications for the development’s importance, since they underplay the D-R border and carry motion through the rest of the form.

Thematic D-R overlaps also downplayed and channeled motion through the border. These overlaps were common to DRT3 as well, and were achieved in different ways. Methods involved: fusing the RT: V pedal with the thematic recapitulation’s onset, continuing N or thematic material from the development through the border, or extending the motion to the deep-level tonal return past the thematic recapitulation’s start, this despite surface motion to the home-key tonic there.

I also encountered downplayed D-R borders in DRT2 and DRT4; but these were especially a defining feature in the single-sweep movements of DRT5, which particularly
included instances of overlap and retransitional sequence. DRT5 developments were able to
dissolve the E-D border in some way, moreover, whether an EEC was achieved or not. Some
analyses also showed forward-driving energy built up by some two-part cores, first through
core\textsuperscript{part1} and again through core\textsuperscript{part2}, such that the development generates motion and channels it
beyond the D-R border. In these cases, which happened mostly in DRT3, the development holds
strong implications for the end-weighted designs of movements.

IV. Trends with Narrative and Form

The systematic organization of developments into various groups through DRTs has also
provided a channel by which to pursue musical narrative, and to see the strong relationship
between narrative and form arise in Mendelssohn’s music. Transformation arose as a rather
consistent framework in which to view the development’s role in how form unfolds. These
transformation narratives could often be seen to achieve resolution by the ends of movements in
a handful of ways. Resolution was expressed, more specifically, via the gradual resolution of an
initial conflict (e.g., the change from incongruence to congruence at or near the ESC), a change
to a “higher” state (e.g., through the change from minor to major or a motive’s newfound
prominence), the reconciliation between two specific components (e.g., through P’s integration
with S) or unity with past (e.g., via the cyclic recall of material at a poignant moment, for
example, where one expects the ESC).

Specific compositional tendencies in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms also acted as
accessories to the development’s role in the end-weighted designs which became so important to
the transformation narratives across movements. My analyses demonstrate Mendelssohn’s
tendency to recompose expositional elements in the recapitulation and that recomposition was
important to the sense of transformation through the form. Often, expositional elements were compressed for P-TR fusion to direct motion towards S’s frequent expansion. As such, delayed ESCs became a trait of many of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms and of the narratives explored throughout my thesis. When ESCs were not delayed, meanwhile, they often appeared strongly articulated as recomposition of the weak IAC/EECs encountered previously in the exposition. In this way, recomposition via P-TR fusion, expanded S zones, and strongly articulated and delayed ESCs contributed to the end-weighted designs that characterize Mendelssohn’s narratives. More importantly, Mendelssohn often downplays the D-R border, and in so doing, channels the forward motion into the rest of the form. This forward motion incites the more direct path to S in the first place, and is facilitated by RTs which are made insufficient in some way, as well as the use of devices like retransitional sequences and thematic D-R overlap which detract from the sense of border heading into the recapitulation. With some developments, furthermore, the forward-driving RT and underplayed D-R border form the culmination of forward-driving processes which are intensified through core\textsuperscript{part1} and core\textsuperscript{part2}.

These compositional elements in Mendelssohn’s formal process tie into how each of the five DRTs relate, in their own ways, to the sense of narrative and transformation through the form. DRT1 developments facilitate narrative via D-C pairings in which the development highlights and then furthers some aspect to the coda where it appears differently—usually stronger in some way as an expression of resolution or apotheosis. DRT2 developments play a strong role in resolution as well, since material from the development returns as S expansion and pushes the ESC closer to the end. In these cases, the return of material highlights some component which takes new meaning as an expression of transformation. DRT3 developments were also heavily involved in the end-weighted trajectories that were so important to transformation. RTs underplay the D-R border. In so doing, forward motion towards the end of
the form where “compensation” occurs, also as precursor to a stronger, more fulfilling close. The motion channeled by these RTs incites the recomposition of expositional elements in the recapitulation as an expression of transformation as well. That the motion leads more directly to the expanded S zone delays the ESC and highlights an aspect that is transformed. DRT4 developments act as an intermediate step towards an end state when they highlight, further, and give meaning to an aspect from earlier in the form, moreover, while the single-sweep designs facilitated by DRT5 developments channel motion towards a final transformed state to cap off movements. In these ways, all five DRTs provide appropriate lenses through which to see the rise of transformation as narrative and aesthetic in Mendelssohn’s music.

V. Contributions and Implications for Further Study

As this concluding chapter suggests, the delineation and application of DRTs delve into several avenues of study and reach beyond the analysis of the development itself. DRTs have enabled me to explore and answer—more adequately—why developments warrant fuller attention and more extensive in-depth study. The analyses I presented in Chapters 3 to 7 suggest that DRTs hold strong implications for the sense of narrative and end-weighted trajectories through Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. As a methodological approach, DRTs also represent a reorientation in how we think about developments, since they advocate for a contextualized approach that contrasts treating the development as a discrete entity to be dissected for its parts.

Given their contextualized approach, DRTs stand as a critique of established approaches to form—as in the handful of Schenkerian studies surveyed in Chapter 2—and the recent treatises on form by Caplin (1998) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), which mainly focus on the inner workings of individual formal sections rather than on their inter-relationships.
The perspective that the development is intimately connected to the rest of the form has been both liberating in my treatment of the development in analysis and essential to the outcome of my project; it has led me to devise DRTs as a music theoretical concept and to propose DRTs as a viable theory of developments across an extensive body of works like Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. That DRTs allow one to organize whole developments into a small handful of groups in a purposeful and meaningful way is a significant contribution to the development as an area of study, especially given the differences between developments. A more traditional preoccupation with finding similarities by dissecting developments for their parts might previously have shied away from such differences. As a more holistic approach, DRTs allow one to not only group developments by some similarity, but also, to embrace the traits unique to a particular development when writing analysis and exploring the development’s importance in large-scale form.

DRTs have ample implications for further study. As Chapters 3 to 7 have shown, DRTs are flexible enough to assist with the discovery of broader implications, like the relationship between narrative and form when considering the development’s role. DRTs remain focused enough, meanwhile, to facilitate the stronger delineation of development space. In addition to the applicability of DRTs across a large body of music, my analyses have demonstrated the applicability of RT-prep zones, the two-part core, retransitional sequences, the DG-complex, and the RT-complex with either RTC or RT-connect that I propose in Mendelssohn’s developments. One can test whether or not and how well these concepts apply to other early nineteenth-century composers and if these concepts prevail for developments going further into the Romantic era.
Overall, the shift in perspective away from the rigid thematic and structural approaches of traditional music analysis to the development has been transforming. It has opened my mind to seeing the development as a whole and to treating it as a contextualized entity within the context of the entire form. It has also offered me the flexible frame of mind required to deviate from the existing approaches to developments in order to devise DRTs as a broader theory of the development in the first place. The transformation narratives that are suggested through the application of DRTs—the narratives from dissonance to consonance, unity, and harmony—also speak to the sense that a unifying thread runs through Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. These insights into the possibility of extramusical meanings have only been possible through my choice to treat each development for its own contributions to the music itself.
**Glossary of Terms**

**Border class**  The kind of articulation—either tonic or non-tonic—that the development achieves for the recapitulation’s onset. Distinguishing between border classes is important to the study of developments, because the way in which developments negotiate the treatment of the D-R border plays a crucial role in how the rest of the form unfolds. The non-tonic border class implies overlap at the border. Classes “a” and “b” refer to instances of non-overlap and overlap, respectively, when there is a tonic-articulated border.

**Continued textural/accompanimental RTC-fill**  RTC-fill that is either brief or extended. Brief fill of this kind involves the continuation—over one measure—of an accompanimental figure or developmental texture to the D-R border. Extended fill of this kind involves accompanimental material or a theme from the development that continues through the D-R border and into recapitulatory space.

**CorePart1**  The first part of the core that is markedly different and distinguished from the second part through the articulation called the DG.

**CorePart2**  The second part of the core that is markedly different and distinguished from the first part through the articulation called the DG.

**D-C pairing**  Development-coda pairing. In a thematic D-C pairing, the development and coda correspond thematically via the development’s shared layout and/or theme. An abstract D-C pairing, by contrast, captures only the essence of the development in the coda through distinctive characteristics.

**Development class**  There are four kinds of developments or development classes. Development class organizes developments by combining a development’s border class (i.e., tonic or non-tonic) and developmental tie (i.e., strong or minimal). Development classes I and II represent those developments with a strong tie. Development classes III and IV represent those with a minimal tie.
**Developmental reference**  A specific theme, passage, or material from the development that reappears later in the form and participates in deferring the ESC. The reference can be literal or feigned. In the latter case, the material in question gives the impression of a literal reference at first, but turns out not to be.

**Developmental tie**  The kind of tie—either strong or minimal—that developments have with the rest of the form. Developments with a minimal tie are usually characterized by strong correspondence between the exposition and recapitulation, a lack of development material returning later in the form, and the development maintaining the D-R border distinction or negotiating the border in such a way that does not play a strong role in how the rest of the form unfolds. Developments with a strong tie show the opposite traits, including significant recomposition of expositional elements in the recapitulation, and D-R overlap. More specific ways of how developments hold a strong tie to the rest of the form are represented by the five DRTs I outline in this study.

**DG**  Developmental gap. The articulation—either a half cadence, an authentic cadence, or an arrival on a position of $V^7$ or the tonic—that opens a gap in the texture between core$_{part1}$ and core$_{part2}$. This articulation (or, alternatively, the sealed DG) is the culmination of the DG-complex and is required for the complex to take place.

**DG-complex**  Developmental-gap-complex. The set of events that lead up to and include the DG or sealed DG that separate core$_{part1}$ and core$_{part2}$. The DG-complex requires the DG or sealed DG to be present.

**DG-fill**  Developmental-gap-fill. An optional passage of nonstructural melodic or textural material at the end of core$_{part1}$ that bridges over the gap opened by the DG in the core.

**D-R border**  Development-recapitulation border. The border between the development and recapitulation.

**D-R overlap**  Development-recapitulation overlap. The term used to refer to instances of overlap between the end of the development and the onset of recapitulatory space.

**DRT**  Developmental relationship type. The kind of relationship the development has with the rest of the form. DRTs provide a way to organize developments by considering the
development within the broader context of the form. DRTs can be outlined for all developments regardless of a strong or minimal tie. DRT1 (D-C pairings), DRT2 (developmental references), DRT3 (RT calls for “compensation” towards the movement’s end), DRT4 (the development furthers an introductory and/or expositional aspect into the recapitulation and/or coda), and DRT5 (the underplayed D-R border channels motion and contributes to the movement’s single-sweep design) represent the strong ties that Mendelssohn’s developments have with the rest of the form.

**Inner-outer perspective** The method used to generate stronger delineations of development space by combining the inner (or local) perspective that focuses on the development’s inner structure and layout (i.e., two-part core and RT-complex) and the outer (or global) perspective that focuses on the development’s tie to the rest of the form (i.e., DRTs). This approach contributes to a more holistic, comprehensive theory of the development.

**Retransitional sequence** A sequence used in place of the more normative extended V pedal for the retransition leading up to the recapitulation’s onset. Mendelssohn specifically uses the ascending 5–6 sequence.

**RTC** Retransitional caesura. The terminal articulation—a half-cadence or arrival on a position of V or V\(^7\)—at the end of the RT-complex that opens a gap in the texture before the recapitulation’s onset. This articulation (or, alternatively, the RT-connect) is the culmination of the RT-complex and is required for the complex to take place.

**RTC-fill** Retransitional-caesura-fill. A passage of nonstructural melodic or textural material that bridges the textural gap between the RTC and the recapitulation’s onset on the tonic.

**RTC-fill on a V pedal secured by the RTC** This kind of RTC-fill, either high-energy or gentle, occurs over a pedal secured by the RTC and can occur over several measures. This RTC-fill can be thought of as an expansion of the RTC articulation that fills the gap at the D-R junction. High-energy fill builds in *tutti* or near-*tutti* texture, features a melodic—sometimes chromatic—ascent in the uppermost voice, and pushes to the D-R border without surpassing it. Gentle fill, on the other hand, features sparse texture and ‘soft’ dynamics, and echoes the RTC as reinforcement.
**RT-complex** Retransition-complex. The set of events that begins with the onset of the extended V pedal at the end of the development and that culminates with the RTC or RT-connect.

**RT-connect** Retransition-connect. The terminal articulation at the end of the RT-complex that is either an authentic cadence or arrival on a position of the tonic. This tonic articulation simultaneously initiates the recapitulation, such that the RT-connect is the point at which the retransition connects to the recapitulation. This articulation (or, alternatively, the RTC) is the culmination of the RT-complex and is required for the complex to take place.

**RT-prep zone** Retransition-prep zone. The optional zone found at the end of core\textsuperscript{part2} that lessens the foregoing activity to prepare for the RT-complex. Features like emphasis on the predominant of the home key, pedal point, and recession often define this zone. Slower harmonic rhythm, thematic material that the RT will soon feature, or material associated with ending function like material from the expositional closing or codetta zones can also help to anticipate the RT.

**RT proposal** Retransition proposal. The stresses on the extended V pedal of the RT that propose the pedal at its onset and periodically thereafter until the pedal is either secured or culminates with the RTC or RT-connect. Stresses are more specifically produced by repeated phrase lengths in the upper voice.

**RT secured** Retransition secured. The point at which the extended V pedal of the RT is secured by a change in the phrase length and/or content in the upper voice that typically suggests broader motion than the repeated units in the RT’s proposal stage. The pedal’s secured stage usually consists of one phrase length and culminates with the RTC or RT-connect.

**Sealed DG** Sealed developmental gap. The articulation—either a half cadence, an authentic cadence, or an arrival on a position of V\textsuperscript{(7)} or the tonic—at the end of the DG-complex that marks the change in activity between core\textsuperscript{part1} and core\textsuperscript{part2}. Unlike the DG, the sealed DG simultaneously initiates core\textsuperscript{part2}. This articulation (or, alternatively, the DG) is the culmination of the DG-complex and is required for the complex to take place.
**Solo-line RTC-fill**  RTC-fill that consists of a single melodic or descending bass line that extends from the RTC to the recapitulation’s onset. The line can be contrapuntally or texturally reinforced by other voices (e.g., doubled at the octave) and is more extensive than brief continued textural/accompanimental RTC-fill. This kind of fill can feature a melodic or bass descent through $5-4-3-2-1$.

**Two-part core**  Developmental core in two parts that are separated by the DG-complex. Both parts are markedly different from one another and comprise the main bulk of the development where the activity takes place.
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## Appendix 1: List of Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms and DRT Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opus</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>DRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Symphonies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Symphony No. 1</td>
<td>1824-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Symphony No. 5</td>
<td>1829-30, revised 1832</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Reformation&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Symphony No. 4 (&quot;Italian&quot;)</td>
<td>1833; revised 1834 (Movements 2-4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Symphony No. 2 (&quot;Lobgesang&quot;)</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Symphony No. 3 (&quot;Scottish&quot;)</td>
<td>1829-1842</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Concert Overtures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>&quot;Trumpet&quot; Overture</td>
<td>1825; revised 1833</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><em>Meeresstille und glückliche Fahrt</em></td>
<td>1828; revised 1834</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><em>Ouverture zum Märchen von der schönen Melusine</em></td>
<td>1833; revised 1835</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Overture to <em>Ruy Blas</em></td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overtures to Large Vocal Works</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Die Hochzeit des Camacho</em></td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td><em>Heimkehr aus der Fremde</em></td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td><em>Die erste Walpurgisnacht</em></td>
<td>1832; revised 1842-1843</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Solo Instrument &amp; Piano</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cello Sonata No. 1</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Cello Sonata No. 2</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>String Quartets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 2</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 1</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44/1</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 3</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44/2</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 4</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44/3</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 5</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 6</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Quartets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 2</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 3</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Trios</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Piano Trio No. 1</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Piano Trio No. 2</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>String Quintets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>String Quintet No. 2</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Chamber Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Sextet</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Octet</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Piano Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Piano Sonata</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Piano Sonata</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DRT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Piano Sonata</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Concertos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No. 1</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Piano Concerto No. 2</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Violin Concerto</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>DRT5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DRT5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>