January 2018

Felix Mendelssohn and Sonata Form in the Nineteenth Century

Katharine G. Walshaw
The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor
Dr. John Cuciurean
The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in Music

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Doctor of Philosophy

© Katharine G. Walshaw 2017

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd

Part of the Music Theory Commons

Recommended Citation
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/5085

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact tadam@uwo.ca.
Abstract

Mendelssohn’s music is consistently measured by a Beethovenian yardstick and, more often than not, his music is found to be unfit to live up to this aesthetic model. The purpose of this dissertation is to ask: is the model of Beethoven’s music the only appropriate choice for guiding analysis and research of Mendelssohn’s compositional style? I argue that the answer is an emphatic no. This dissertation attempts to open other avenues of research into Mendelssohn’s compositional style by training the focus directly on Mendelssohn’s works themselves. Using an inductive approach, this dissertation summarizes the results of the analysis of a cross-section of works in sonata form that span Mendelssohn’s compositional career.

This dissertation attempts to demonstrate that Mendelssohn was following a decidedly different path than Beethoven. First, I examine Mendelssohn’s musical education and upbringing, drawing strong connections to the Classical style. Next, I demonstrate the need for a flexible analytical model of sonata form in order to capture the unique blend of Classical and Romantic aspects within Mendelssohn’s music in sonata form and argue that Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form is the best choice to analyze these works. The conclusions drawn from an examination of twenty-four first movements in sonata form from Mendelssohn’s oeuvre are then presented, suggesting that there are four main aspects that define Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style. Aesthetic issues of the early-nineteenth century are explored with a focus on the concept of lyricism and its effect on sonata form as a whole and Mendelssohn’s approach in particular. Finally, four analytical case studies are presented which span Mendelssohn’s compositional career. Two piano sonatas, the Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105 (1821) and the Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 (1825) are presented as a demonstration of
Mendelssohn’s early conception of sonata form; the Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (1838) and the Piano Trio in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845) are presented in order to demonstrate Mendelssohn’s continued use and transformation of sonata form over the course of his compositional career.
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List of Abbreviations

The following is a list of terms and their abbreviations that are used throughout this dissertation.

Abbreviations from Hepokoski and Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory*¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Primary-Theme Zone (whose modules may include $P^1$ or $P^{1.1}$, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Medial Caesura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Secondary-Theme Zone (whose modules may include $S^1$ or $S^{1.1}$, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Closing Zone (whose modules may include $C^1$ or $C^{1.1}$, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>Essential Expositional Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Essential Sonata Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>caesura fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td><em>Fortspinnung</em> module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMB</td>
<td>Tri-Modular Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT⇒TR</td>
<td>Continuation “becomes” Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_A$</td>
<td>the active dominant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations from Caplin’s *Analyzing Classical Form*²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bi</td>
<td>basic idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ci</td>
<td>contrasting idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont</td>
<td>continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frag</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cad</td>
<td>Cadential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant</td>
<td>Antecedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>Consequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont</td>
<td>Continuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Full definitions of these terms can be found in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006), xxv–xxviii.

². Full definitions of these terms can be found in Caplin, *Analyzing Classical Form* (2013) 703—715.
Chapter 1

1 Introduction

For generations, music critics have marginalized much of Felix Mendelssohn’s musical oeuvre to the edges of the western art-music canon. While not dismissed entirely, Mendelssohn’s works are trapped in the looming shadow of Beethoven; his works are often categorized as failed attempts at capturing or emulating Beethoven’s late style. This is especially true of Mendelssohn’s string quartets, but is an attitude that permeates critical views of his large-form works in general. Through the course of my research for this dissertation, it has become abundantly clear that Mendelssohn’s music is consistently measured by a Beethovenian yardstick and, more often than not, his music is found to be unfit to live up to this aesthetic model. One is forced to ask: is the model of Beethoven’s music the only appropriate choice for guiding analysis and research of Mendelssohn’s compositional style? I will argue that the answer is an emphatic no. This dissertation attempts to open other avenues of research into Mendelssohn’s compositional style by training the focus directly on Mendelssohn’s works themselves. Using an inductive approach, this dissertation presents the results of a thorough analysis of the first movements of twenty-four works in sonata form that span Mendelssohn’s compositional career. This chapter serves as an introduction to this project by examining the current state of research into Mendelssohn’s compositional style with specific focus on the sonata forms. I will briefly explore Mendelssohn’s musical education, drawing direct connections to the Classical practice. I will introduce the methodology used for this study and briefly address the so-called “Mendelssohn Problem.” Finally, this chapter will explore the scope and limitations of this project.
1.1 Mendelssohn and Sonata Form: A Review of Current Literature

At the time of publication of this dissertation, there is little published work that directly deals with Mendelssohn’s music and sonata form. Greg Vitercik’s *The Early Works of Felix Mendelssohn: A Study in the Romantic Sonata Style* provides an excellent starting point for delving into the issue of Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form in the Romantic style.¹ However, Vitercik’s consistent comparison of Mendelssohn’s works to Beethoven’s style and works interferes with a prudent examination of Mendelssohn’s works as they stand on their own. Vitercik inevitably finds Mendelssohn’s works to be inferior to their Beethovenian model, and is unduly critical of Mendelssohn’s works that may in fact not be trying to achieve the formal and structural goals he is presuming they are. Nevertheless, Vitercik’s work presents valuable conclusions on aspects of Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form. These will be addressed throughout this dissertation.

In examining Mendelssohn’s String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13, Uri Golomb takes issue with several critics of Mendelssohn’s work. In particular, Golomb is critical of Vitercik, who deems that Mendelssohn’s attempts at cyclic procedures in the String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13 and other works are failed attempts to achieve a large, processive flow that Beethoven was able to execute in his late works. Golomb argues that the “…Beethovenian yardstick is not the only one available, and should not be allowed to

monopolise our reception of Mendelssohn’s works.”

Golomb implores us to view Mendelssohn’s works for their own sake, suggesting that “it might also be argued that [Mendelssohn] used the devices from Beethoven’s work [specifically Opus 132 in Mendelssohn’s Opus 13] to tackle expressive and structural issues of his own…in coming to terms with what he himself was up to.”

Golomb implores researchers to further examine Mendelssohn’s oeuvre, both before and after his so-called late-Beethovenian phase in order to “place these works within the development of Mendelssohn’s own style, while not losing sight of their Beethovenian inspiration.”

This dissertation serves as a response to Golomb’s directive by studying Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works across his compositional output.

To this end, this dissertation will endeavor to determine, as Golomb argues above, what Mendelssohn himself was up to through an inductive analysis and exploration of a cross-section of Mendelssohn’s works in sonata-form. Twenty-four works from across Mendelssohn’s compositional output were selected as the basis of this study, ranging from solo instrumental works to full orchestral symphonies. In order to guide my research, and with the aspiration to remove the Beethovenian yardstick as the only source of analytical comparison, a more neutral theoretical model of sonata form was selected. In particular, the theoretical and analytical model developed by James Hepokoski and


3. Ibid., 102 (emphasis added).

4. Ibid., 119.

5. The details on the scope and the process of the selection of these works will be addressed in Chapter Two.
Warren Darcy, as expressed most completely in their book *Elements of Sonata Theory*. The application of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theoretical and analytical approach to Mendelssohn’s music grants a starting point for determining the key internalized features of Mendelssohn’s sonata style.

As such, two questions emerged that guided my research: 1) What are the stylistically appropriate choices available for Mendelssohn’s specific conception of sonata form? 2) What are the key internalized features that exist for each action zone in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms? Since Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory is based on the foundation that any work written in sonata form is in a dialogic relationship with all works that share that form, their theory provides the lens through which I will investigate these questions.

This not only affords one the ability to understand what Mendelssohn himself was attempting to do by allowing his music and his compositional strategies to speak for themselves, but it also endeavors to re-align these works with their more contemporaneous influences, such as the sonata-form works of Schumann, Chopin, Berlioz, Liszt, and Rossini. While some works are undeniably influenced by Beethoven—the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 is an example of Mendelssohn mirroring

---


7. This is a cornerstone statement for the purpose of this dissertation. A foundational tenet for Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory is the dialogic concept of sonata form: “Sonata Theory starts from the premise that an individual composition is a musical utterance that is set (by the composer) into a dialogue with implied norms. This is an understanding of formal procedures as dynamic, dialogic. Our conception of the sonata as an instance of dialogic form...is not the obligation of a sonata to “conform” to a fixed background pattern...Rather, the composer generates a sonata—which we regard as a process, a linear series of compositional choices—to enter into a dialogue with an intricate web of interrelated norms as an ongoing action in time.” (*Sonata Theory*, 10). This concept will be discussed at length in Chapter Two of this dissertation.
Beethoven’s style—is his works should not form the only aesthetic yardstick we use to judge Mendelssohn’s music.

Aside from Vitercik’s work mentioned above, there is very little published research into Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form and there is even less published work that specifically uses Hepokoski and Darcy’s analytical methodology as a guide for research and analysis. One instance is Paul Wingfield and Julian Horton’s article “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms,” which addresses the issue of sonata form and Mendelssohn specifically through the analytical lens of Hepokoski and Darcy’s model. The main focus in this article is on the concept of deformation theory and how it

---

8. The notion of developing a theory of Mendelssohn’s compositional strategies in sonata form that focuses on the influence of Beethoven or other composers is tenuous at best. For how can one definitively prove influence? It is true that several of Mendelssohn’s works are clearly modeled after Beethoven—going so far as to even directly quote passages from Beethoven’s works. This shouldn’t, however, lead one instantly to the conclusion that Mendelssohn was influenced by Beethoven, to the point that only Beethoven’s works are used as the aesthetic model for judging the success, or, more often in the literature, the failure, of Mendelssohn’s works (see Greg Vitercik’s writings, especially in The Early Works of Felix Mendelssohn.) It is certainly not uncommon for composers to learn their craft by modeling, studying, analyzing, and copying out the works of their predecessors; therefore, it shouldn’t surprise us that Mendelssohn’s compositional education wasn’t any different. It is far too simplistic to state that, since Mendelssohn quotes and alludes to phrases from Beethoven’s work, he is de facto merely trying to pick up Beethoven’s torch. And if we do admit Beethoven’s influence, how do we unpack this influence from the countless others, including his teacher Carl Friedrich Zelter, whose distaste for Beethoven’s late-style works he would likely have imparted to the young Mendelssohn. Proving influence is well beyond the scope of this study. Simply put, Mendelssohn, like many composers before and after, is undeniably steeped in a tradition of musical composition, which he studied carefully and intently, and which was then incorporated into a style all his own.

9. Albeit, recent studies have been coming to the fore, the latest of which were presented at the national AMS/SMT conference in Vancouver, 2016 including: Benedict Taylor (University of Edinburgh), “Mendelssohn and Sonata Form: The Case of op. 44 no. 2”; Julian Horton (Durham University), “Mendelssohn’s Piano Trio Op. 66 and the Analysis of Romantic Form”; Steven Vande Moortele (University of Toronto), “Expansion and Recomposition in Mendelssohn’s Symphonic Sonata Forms”; Thomas Grey (Stanford University), “Deformed Beauty? Form and Narrative in the Overture to the Tale of the Fair Melusine, Op. 32,” and Catarina Kim (Eastman), “Mendelssohn’s Formal Frames: Multi-Stage and Recurring Introductions.” However, at the time of writing, these papers have yet to be published.

applies or does not apply to Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form. This article will be considered at length in Chapter Two.

One other author that deals directly with sonata form in Mendelssohn’s music is Rohan H. Stewart-MacDonald in his article “‘Developmental Recession’ and Large-Scale Teleology in the Sonata-Type Movements of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy.”11 His work and the implications of the concept of developmental recession in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works will also be addressed further in Chapter Two.

1.2 Mendelssohn’s Musical Education and Connections to Classical Sonata Form

R. Larry Todd provides a thorough and in-depth account of Mendelssohn’s life and education in both Mendelssohn: A Life in Music and Mendelssohn’s Musical Education.12 Todd investigates Mendelssohn’s musical education through the analysis of a volume of Mendelssohn’s composition exercises with Carl Friedrich Zelter.13 In particular, it includes exercises in thoroughbass, chorale, invertible counterpoint, and canon and fugue in two and three parts, as well as previously unknown works for solo instruments and piano-violin duets.14 Todd argues that


13. The folio can be found in the Margaret Deneke Mendelssohn Collection at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (shelfmark C. 43). Todd writes “comprising some seventy folios, the volume can be dated roughly from September, 1819, to January, 1821…” (Mendelssohn’s Musical Education, 2).

Zelter’s course of instruction…reflects a conservative theoretical tradition extending back to J. S. Bach. Zelter himself had been trained by Carl Friedrich Chrisitan Fasch and Johann Philipp Kirnberger, two eighteenth-century Berlin musicians who were contemporaries of C. P. E. Bach. Kirnberger and C. P. E. Bach were both taught, of course, by Johann Sebastian.\textsuperscript{15}

Mendelssohn was decidedly steeped in the conservative traditions of the eighteenth-century compositional style. Todd argues that Mendelssohn likely started studying composition with Zelter as early as 1817 or 1818, but the only firm confirmation of his tutelage with Zelter comes from a letter dated July 14, 1819, written by Mendelssohn’s mother.\textsuperscript{16} Mendelssohn studied with Zelter for at least seven years, until 1826, an important year in the development of Mendelssohn’s musical style, which will be discussed further below. His student compositions are scattered throughout the exercise books and include “chiefly variations and movements in binary-sonata form for solo piano or piano and violin.”\textsuperscript{17}

Todd argues that Mendelssohn’s early education in the traditional, conservative style of the eighteenth century provides him with a solid foundation from which his own compositional style will spring. This traditional training coupled with the emerging aesthetic trends of the early-nineteenth century Romantic style prompts Todd to claim that Mendelssohn “was a versatile, craftsmanlike composer whose work effortlessly mediated between the poles of classicism and romanticism…”\textsuperscript{18} Todd goes on to say that Mendelssohn “by and large…adhered to classical blueprints and traditional, academic

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{17} Todd, \textit{Mendelssohn: A Life in Music}, 45.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., xix.
\end{flushleft}
counterpoint, and was by nature a ‘dry’ formalist.” While mainly true, the chapters that follow will demonstrate that Mendelssohn was in fact innovative with the Classical model of sonata form, most especially his treatment of the medial caesura and the recapitulation.

Todd also touches on the problem of imposing both the Beethovenian, and in his case, Wagnerian, yardstick as a measure for the success, or lack thereof, of Mendelssohn’s compositions. He writes,

…we may yet realize that imposing a Beethovenian or Wagnerian yardstick on Mendelssohn does an injustice to [Mendelssohn’s] music. The essentially dramatic model of the Fifth Symphony and Wagner’s revolutionary theories about music drama do not fit Mendelssohn’s music, but not because of its intrinsic inferiority. It is not that Mendelssohn could not write dramatic music…Rather, Mendelssohn’s aesthetic was broad enough to admit other models as viable avenues of exploration. Several of his scores—the Hebrides and Calm Sea and Prosperous Voyage Overtures, the Italian and Scottish Symphonies, for example—seem inspired more by a synaesthetic blending of the visual and musical, and by highlighting the painterly attributes of music than by elucidating a dramatic narrative.\footnote{Ibid., xxvii.}

In the quote above, Todd suggests that Mendelssohn was using various models beyond the model of Beethoven’s dramatic music, a position that will be developed throughout this dissertation.

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to address the issue of influence at length. Nevertheless, it seems clear that Mendelssohn was well trained and steeped in the Classical models of composition, which would undoubtedly have included a study of

\footnote{19. Ibid., xx.}
\footnote{20. Ibid., xxvii.}
works in sonata form by Haydn, Mozart, as well as Beethoven.\textsuperscript{21} Thus it can be concluded that Mendelssohn’s compositional style was indeed influenced or, at the very least, impacted to some degree by the style of his Classical predecessors. It is critical for a study of Mendelssohn’s music to admit these other influences, rather than continuously looking at Beethoven’s mid- and late-style as a model for the young composer. It is also critical to analyze Mendelssohn’s music in its own regard, in an attempt to allow his own compositional style to speak for itself. It would be careless of any study to make the argument that influence does not exist or matter. Rather, an approach that inductively analyzes Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form, compared and contrasted, at this stage, to and with themselves is a critical first step in developing a theory of Mendelssohn’s own personal compositional style in sonata form.

1.3 Methodology

In order to replace the Beethovenian yardstick as an aesthetic measure of Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form, an inductive approach to analysis was selected for this project. Much of the primary literature on Mendelssohn’s music that present analyses of his works in sonata form rely on comparisons with Beethoven’s ‘models’, whether actual or perceived. As noted above, Vitercik is particularly susceptible to this line of analysis. He is fond of finding connections with Beethoven’s works for nearly every Mendelssohn work he analyzes which, in turn, become the benchmarks for characterizing Mendelssohn’s success with each of these analyzed works. This is an unfortunate blemish.

\textsuperscript{21} In fact, Todd argues that the works of Haydn (and Mozart) were often imitated and used as models by Mendelssohn during his tutelage with Zelter. See \textit{Mendelssohn’s Musical Education}, 69 and 71, among other places throughout this book.
on the analyses that Vitercik presents, which, overall, are often nuanced and insightful. However, he consistently blames Mendelssohn for “missing the point” of Beethoven’s works for any number of reasons.22 One has to step back and question whether or not Mendelssohn was in fact even trying to re-create the point of Beethoven’s approach to these works. My research and analysis takes a different focus, choosing to analyze Mendelssohn’s works as they stand on their own. I compare and contrast his works with each other, searching to answer the two research questions laid out at the beginning of this chapter. In sum, I seek to determine what Mendelssohn’s works themselves can tell us about Mendelssohn’s approach to composition in sonata form.

A wide range of first movement works in sonata form spanning Mendelssohn’s compositional career are analyzed and studied. The student works are omitted, although the early string symphonies were briefly analyzed as a stepping stone into Mendelssohn’s compositional style.23 From this initial analysis, a cross-section of twenty-four works was selected for deeper analysis and this sample includes works that span Mendelssohn’s entire compositional career. The earliest work, the Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7, was composed in 1820, when Mendelssohn was just eleven years old, and the latest work, the String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80, was composed in the year of his death, 1847. The works analyzed range from solo instrumental works, to chamber works, to full

22. See for example the numerous analyses presented in Vitercik’s *The Early Works of Felix Mendelssohn* throughout the entire book.

23. Once it was determined that the focus would be on sonata forms in dialogue with the Type 3 “Textbook” sonata, the string symphonies were no longer viable, as many are Type 1 or Type 2 sonatas.
orchestral symphonies.²⁴ It was deemed important to include a variety of works across Mendelssohn’s repertoire and works that represented various instrumentations in order to develop the most general sense of Mendelssohn’s compositional style in sonata form. The twenty-four works that form the analytical sample for this study are neatly split between pre- and post-1825 works. The year 1825 is commonly referred to as an important one in the development of Mendelssohn’s style as it is the year in which Mendelssohn composed his first unquestionable masterpieces: the concert overture *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Op. 21, the Octet in Eb Major, Op. 20, and two String Quartets Op. 12 and Op. 13. Todd argues that the B Minor Piano Quartet, Op. 3 “heralds Felix’s mature style; indeed, the leap from the Quartet to the high plateau of the Octet…is not great.”²⁵ Mendelssohn’s stylistic growth does not demonstrate a clear-cut, teleologically-based trajectory over time; in fact, some authors even argue that Mendelssohn’s style regressed over his compositional career.²⁶ However, there does seem to be a clear division between pre- and post-1825 works. As will be discussed at length below, one of Mendelssohn’s most innovative features of his sonata forms is his treatment of the articulation of the *medial caesura*. It is worth noting that all of the MCs in the post-1825 works analyzed

---

²⁴. The concerti were omitted from this dissertation in an effort to focus on sonata-form works that would be in direct dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form. Concerto form, known as a Type 5 sonata in Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory, certainly reflects the background structure of sonata form; but it also introduces other formal concerns that are beyond the scope of this dissertation. See Hepokoski and Darcy, *Sonata Theory*, Chapter Nineteen, especially pp. 430–446.


and discussed in this dissertation are obscured to some degree. This is discussed at length in Chapter Four.

1.4 The “Mendelssohn Problem”

One curious aspect of Mendelssohn studies is the so-called “Mendelssohn Problem,” which first appears in an edited volume by Carl Dahlhaus entitled “Das Problem Mendelssohn.”²⁷ Michael P. Steinberg argues that the “Mendelssohn Problem” immediately conjures “a rhetorical, ideological, and political parallel: the Mendelssohn problem, ‘the Jewish problem.’”²⁸ The issue of Mendelssohn’s Jewishness is not a central focus of this dissertation. However, in addressing Mendelssohn’s reception history, it is an important, if not unfortunate, topic to address. Mendelssohn’s reception history is plagued by anti-Semitic attacks, both veiled and overt. He also suffers from being a child prodigy from a wealthy family, a state that certainly does not fit the ‘starving’ or ‘tragic’ artist narrative.²⁹ The primary sources considered for this study address to an extent, the issue of the “Mendelssohn Problem,” most especially Vitercik—his first chapter is even titled “The Mendelssohn Problem.”³⁰ But for Vitercik, Mendelssohn’s problem is an issue of chronology; specifically, he argues that it is difficult to appreciate or understand Mendelssohn’s earlier works due to the apparent weakness of his later works.³¹

---


²⁹. The ‘Jewish issue’ is something I have attempted to avoid, since, in my opinion, it is not relevant to the issue at hand which is a study of Mendelssohn’s use of sonata form.


³¹. Ibid., 2.
Mendelssohn does not seem to fit the chronological mould that Vitercik expects; this serves as a premonition of his consistent comparisons of Mendelssohn to Beethoven. Mendelssohn’s compositional career does not follow a seemingly teleological path of stylistic growth. Other authors have noticed this apparent trend in Mendelssohn’s compositional output to the point where Tovey and Shaw discover what they call “pseudo-Mendelssohn”\textsuperscript{32}: they speak of two Mendelssohns; 1) the immensely talented, vigorously original Mendelssohn of the Octet, Hebrides, and Midsummer Overtures and 2) pseudo-Mendelssohn of the Lobgesang, St. Paul, and Elijah, these “platitudinous monuments to early Victorian seriousness.”\textsuperscript{33}

Another conception of the ‘Mendelssohn Problem’ is developed by Peter Mercer-Taylor in the introduction to the Cambridge Companion to Mendelssohn, titled “Mendelssohn as Border-Dweller.”\textsuperscript{34} Mercer-Taylor argues that the ‘Mendelssohn Problem’ for Dahlhaus is ‘classicism’ in Mendelssohn’s music. These differing opinions on what the ‘Mendelssohn Problem’ actually is is symptomatic of the evasive place that Mendelssohn holds within the scholarship and historical traditions of Western art music:

…what has become increasingly clear in the scholarship of the last thirty years is the peculiarly slippery position of Mendelssohn’s music along not one but many axes, which either overlap or intertwine so thoroughly as to be distinguishable more in principle than in practice: the conservative and the progressive; the Biedermeier and the Romantic; the comprehensible and the palpably inward; the

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 2–3 citing Donald Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis, 6 vols. (London, 1935–44), 4:90 (on The Hebrides) and George Bernard Shaw, “A Dismal Saturday,” World, November 19, 1890.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid. See Donald Francis Tovey, Symphonies & Other Orchestral Works: Selections from Essays in Musical Analysis, (1981; reprint, Mineola, NY: Dover Publications Inc., 2015), 398.

\textsuperscript{34} Mercer-Taylor, “Mendelssohn as Border-Dweller.” The notion of Mendelssohn as a ‘border-dweller’ is a perfect description of his tendency to blend aspects of both the Classical and Romantic style within his sonata-form works. This idea will be developed throughout this dissertation.
music of the past and the music of the future; the popular and the elevated; the feminine and the masculine; the superficial and the profound.\textsuperscript{35}

Furthermore, Mercer-Taylor argues that “the anxiety Mendelssohn inspires is rooted largely in the peculiar tendency of his life, his career, and his music to make us aware of crucial borders at the same time that he crosses and re-crosses them.”\textsuperscript{36}

What is critical for this present study is the lack of attention that has been paid to much of Mendelssohn’s compositional oeuvre from a strictly analytical sense. If his music is not being dismissed for anti-Semitic reasons, it is being dismissed for being too Classical. According to Vitercik, the issue lies with sonata form itself: “…neither the elements of the romantic musical language—the harmonic vocabulary and sense of phrase-structure, texture, and rhythm—nor the articulative processes in which these elements are unfolded are particularly suited to sonata style.”\textsuperscript{37} Vitercik sees Mendelssohn’s use of sonata form as a problem, since Vitercik’s conception of the Romantic musical language appears at odds with the form itself. He argues that “…in approaching the romantic sonata it often seems appropriate—in many cases absolutely essential—to consider form and content as unrelated aspects of the musical design.”\textsuperscript{38} Vitercik goes on to argue that Mendelssohn’s most successful works are indeed all in sonata form and suggests that “it is precisely in the coordination of surface detail and formal process that the most remarkable elements of [Mendelssohn’s achievement] shall be found.”\textsuperscript{39} Vitercik’s work aims to redeem

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 6.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 1.
\textsuperscript{37} Vitercik, \textit{The Early Works of Felix Mendelssohn}, 5.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 6.
Mendelssohn’s ‘early’ works (those composed between 1825 to ca.1834) by studying these works and identifying “the events of the musical surface as functional elements within a coherent structural process.” This approach unfortunately creates a preconceived notion of what might be found within Mendelssohn’s works, resulting in an often overly-critical dismissal of some of the aspects of the ‘early’ works because they do not live up to the ‘brilliance’ of Beethoven’s models.

This pre-conceived notion of what must be found in order to provide “a truly accurate description” of these works leads us no closer to unveiling what Mendelssohn might have been up to; rather, it results in a report of how Mendelssohn has failed to achieve what Beethoven did. It is my belief that Vitercik’s approach is inverted. He looks for aspects of what he defines as the Romantic style within the framework of the sonata form, rather than looking at the sonata form and finding aspects of Mendelssohn’s style. Vitercik’s main problem that influences his approach is the effort to impose a style on Mendelssohn’s works, rather than allowing the works to speak for themselves, through a more neutral analytical tool. It is the intent of this dissertation to do just that. Rather than looking for comparisons and aspects of Beethoven’s style in Mendelssohn’s works

40. Ibid.
42. The neutrality of Hepokoski and Darcy’s analytical model can be challenged, given that they developed their theory by looking at the literature itself. However, I would argue that Vitercik is imposing a style onto Mendelssohn’s music, rather than a set of expectations that do no necessarily have to be met. Vitercik’s compare and contrast style of analysis doesn’t allow Mendelssohn’s music to speak for itself in that he assumes many times that Mendelssohn is trying to copy or recreate what Beethoven did. I refer to Hepokoski and Darcy’s analytical model as ‘neutral’ because it does not come with an aesthetic judgement attached: “sonata x did not achieve the first level default for action zone 1, therefore it is deemed of lesser value than this comparable sonata that did achieve the first level default.”
as a justification for analysis, I look at Mendelssohn’s works, in and of themselves, from
the perspective of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory.

1.5 Scope and Limitations

This project was born out of the need for an examination that studies Mendelssohn’s
works in sonata form for their own sake. This study, while remaining sensitive to
Mendelssohn’s musical education and historical influences in general, seeks to analyze
Mendelssohn’s works as they stand on their own, jettisoning the compare-and-contrast
model preferred by much of the primary literature on this topic. Providing an answer to
Golomb’s argument above, this study examines works from across Mendelssohn’s oeuvre
in order to develop preliminary conclusions regarding Mendelssohn’s own compositional
style in sonata form. Chapter Two will develop a case for, and defend the selection of,
Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form and analytic methodology. The present
study is limited to first movements and works that exhibit sonata form in dialogue with
Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form. Through a critique of existing
examples of analysis of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works, specifically the approach of
Vitercik and Wingfield and Horton, I will demonstrate that a flexible model of sonata
form is required in order to allow Mendelssohn’s works to speak for themselves. Rather
than searching for form-functional moments, Hepokoski and Darcy’s analytical model
allows the analyst the freedom to explore works in sonata form by following a set of
expectations, and analyzing whether or not these expectations are met, blocked, obscured, or thrown out all-together.\footnote{‘Form-functional moments’ refers to William Caplin’s theory of Classical Form, which will be addressed in further detail in Chapter Two.}

Chapter Three serves as an introduction to my conception of Mendelssohn’s sonata form based on the analysis of the cross section of twenty-four works used as the analytical sample for my research. There, I will introduce the four main aspects of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style gleaned from the analysis of the representative sample which include: 1) a preference for large-scale Primary themes (henceforth, P-themes); 2) issues of formal continuity through the transition (henceforth, TR) and medial caesura (henceforth, MC) zones; 3) proportional issues with the secondary-zone-closing-zone (henceforth, S and C respectively) block of the exposition; and 4) the effects of compression and re-composition, most especially in the recapitulation. Chapter Four builds upon these issues, exploring the transforming role of the MC and recapitulatory issues in further detail. Chapter Four also examines the evolving nineteenth-century aesthetic and Mendelssohn’s place within that transformation. Mendelssohn’s works do not appear to demonstrate a clear early- middle- and late-style like Beethoven; he nevertheless shows significant stylistic growth and transformation over his compositional output in sonata form, which he was still utilizing in his final year, 1847. This dissertation will attempt to demonstrate that Mendelssohn expertly blends aspects of both the Classical style (sonata form) with the emerging Romantic aesthetic (thematic structure, form generators, etc.) to create a sonata-form style that is uniquely his own.
Chapter Five presents four analytical case studies that span Mendelssohn’s compositional career: the Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105 (1821), the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 (1825), the Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (1838), and the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845). These works were selected for deeper analytical consideration for three reasons: 1) they provide a reflection of Mendelssohn’s use of sonata form and the evolution of the style over the course of his compositional career; 2) they reflect the genres that make up the analytical sample; and 3) they all contain the four main aspects of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style discussed in Chapters Three and Four. The two early works provide a glimpse of Mendelssohn’s insight and skill with the Classical model of sonata form, while the two later works provide a perspective on Mendelssohn’s evolution of the form. Finally, Chapter Six will summarize the conclusions drawn throughout the dissertation and provide prospective avenues for future research and analysis.

---
46. It is worth stating again that Mendelssohn does not ever jettison the “Classical” model of the sonata nor does he abandon the new and emerging Romantic aesthetic ideals. He expertly combines aspects of both the Classical form and the Romantic aesthetic, evidence of which is even discernable in the Piano Sonata in G Major, Op. 105 (1821).
Chapter 2

2 The Case for Using Sonata Theory

Mendelssohn’s music emerges across a unique time in the history of western music. He began composing while Beethoven was still alive; several of Mendelssohn’s early mature works reflect that Beethoven’s works were used as models, especially during the period between 1823 and 1827.\(^1\) Beethoven’s shadow loomed as the epitome of eighteenth-century music; and yet, changing aesthetic preferences were beginning to emerge in these young nineteenth-century composers. Capturing this shift, R. Larry Todd argues that Mendelssohn’s music “[seems] inspired more by a synaesthetic blending of the visual and musical, and by highlighting the painterly attributes of music…” rather than elucidating a dramatic narrative more generally associated with Beethoven’s music.\(^2\) In the present study I will employ an analytical methodology developed by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy as presented in their article “The Medial Caesura” and their book *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata.*\(^3\)

In this chapter, I will explore the foundational principles of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form, and argue that the analytical model developed within *Elements of___

---

1. From the twenty-four works surveyed in this study, there are at least six works that directly quote, indirectly quote, or otherwise embrace aspects of Beethoven works. Mendelssohn’s works that appear to be influenced by Beethoven’s include the Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4; the Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op.2; the Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14; the String Quartet in A Major, Op.13; the Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op.106; and the String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op.12. These connections have been noted by other authors including R. Larry Todd and Greg Vitercik.


Sonata Theory is the model best suited to the evolving Romantic conceptions of sonata form. To this end, I will explore three of the fundamental concepts of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theoretical framework which are critical to understanding Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form. After an exploration of the foundational principles of Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata form, I will discuss the concept of rotation as it pertains to Mendelssohn’s sonata forms, broadly considering issues of formal closure and motivic development and their effects on the rotational-principle of Sonata Theory as well as the overall sonata narrative. A discussion of dynamic-dialogic issues follows, which compares and contrasts Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works with their Classical predecessors, and develops a large-scale teleological trajectory to illustrate Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style as a whole. Finally, the concept of deformation is examined as it is developed by Hepokoski and Darcy and addressed in the work of Paul Wingfield and Julian Horton on norms and deformations in Mendelssohn’s music, which affords one of the only applications and challenges to Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of deformation as it applies to Mendelssohn.

2.1 Foundational Principles of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory

A critical factor in defining a sense of form in mid- and late-eighteenth century works is the concept of rhetorical articulation. Emphasized by Koch in his Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition (1787), hierarchically ordered pauses, breaks, and cadences
are operative on both the local and structural level and are critical for defining form. Analysis of major structural and rhetorical punctuations is the central premise of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form. They maintain that genre is heuristic and that it does not literally exist but rather acts like a regulative principle that remains flexible while still maintaining a set of guidelines, capturing the implicit social and ideological content of the musical style. Sonata form is considered a constellation of normative and optional procedures. Hepokoski and Darcy’s intent is not to lay down a set of binding rules regarding sonata form, but rather to sketch an outline of the generic norms and common options available to the composer of the Classical sonata. Of particular importance is Hepokoski and Darcy’s view of sonata form as a dynamic-dialogic process: a composer generates a sonata, which is regarded as a process, and the sonata enters into dialogue with an intricate web of interrelated norms as an ongoing action.

Hepokoski and Darcy emphasize the expectation that certain audible goals be achieved and secured regardless of how they are manifested on the surface level of any work in sonata form. The authors redirect sonata form analysis toward the caesuras, both medial and final, and the obligatory cadences associated with these caesuras, recognizing and


6. Ibid., 10. It is important to note that this is an ahistoric concept. They write: “Given the history of the term and its self-consciously ahistorical application to eighteenth-century works, what one chooses to call a sonata type or a sonata form depends on the interpretive purposes one has in mind for doing so. There is no reality question at stake here. Once one takes a more sophisticated view of a genre (or a form) not as a concrete thing to be found in the music proper but as a regulative idea guiding analytical interpretation, many of the problems associated with this terminological concern become less pressing.” (*Sonata Theory*, 343).
defining an expressive and dramatic trajectory that drives toward these caesuras and cadences. A central motivation for their theory is to uncover and understand the background structure of sonata form that contains a set of normative procedures and generic choices applicable for each action-zone of the form. Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory aims to uncover and interpret the dialogue between an individual piece and the background set of norms. Their ‘generic layout of the sonata form’ is presented below as Figure 2-1.

**Figure 2-1: Hepokoski and Darcy’s “Essential Sonata Trajectory,” from Elements of Sonata Theory, 17, Figure 2.1b.**
Hepokoski and Darcy’s model of sonata form is based on an extensive survey of
“hundreds of sonata-form movements by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and many
surrounding composers of the time (as well as later composers).” They argue that,
in addition to furnishing a new mode of analysis for the late-eighteenth-century
instrumental repertory, the Elements also provides a foundation for considering
works from the decades to come—late Beethoven, Schubert, Weber,
Mendelssohn, Schumann, Liszt, Brahms, Bruckner, Strauss, Mahler, the
“nationalist composers,” and so on. As we point out from time to time, most of
these sonata norms remained in place as regulative ideas throughout the
nineteenth century, even as the whole sonata-form genre, with its various options,
was continuously updated, altered, and further personalized with unforeseen
accretions, startling innovations, and more radical deformations.

Even a cursory scan of the available scholarship on Mendelssohn’s music indicates that
he studied the works of his predecessors intensely, including the music of Bach, Handel,
Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Therefore, it is reasonable to presume that Classical
sonata form had an impact on Mendelssohn’s ultimate conception of his own sonata
form. As the analyses presented in Chapters Three and Five will demonstrate,
Mendelssohn’s early sonata-form works are in line with the traditional Classical model.
In particular, the Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 (1821) is a locus classicus Type 3
“Textbook” sonata.

8. Ibid., vii.
9. Todd, Mendelssohn's Musical Education; Todd, Mendelssohn: A Life in Music; Todd,
Mendelssohn Essays; Vitercik, The Early Works of Felix Mendelssohn; and Seaton, ed.,
The Mendelssohn Companion.
10. As will be discussed at length below in section 2.4, Horton and Wingfield argue that
Mendelssohn’s oeuvre scarcely includes an example of sonata form that does not deviate in some way from
the generic “Textbook” model. Op. 105 is just one example that indicates this is not accurate. Other early
works that can generally be classified as a traditional, Type 3 “Textbook” sonata include: Overture for
Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24 (1824); Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110 (1824); and the String
Quartet in A Major, Op. 18 (1827).
Mendelssohn’s sonata form works display a clear interest in motivic unity and elements of continuation; firm articulation of cadential goals is relinquished, with a strong sense of continuation taking precedence. The forward-driven, teleologically-oriented Classical sonata, which is consistently driving toward the articulation of structural cadential goals (i.e.: MC, Essential Expositional Closure (henceforth, EEC)/Essential Sonata Closure (henceforth, ESC)) is overlaid with contrapuntal expansions that are more typical of the Baroque era. Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works maintain the underlying structure of the Classical sonata trajectory and consistently reach the structural goals identified by Hepokoski and Darcy as form-defining. This mixture of Classical and Baroque techniques is one of the defining features of Mendelssohn’s compositional style in sonata form.

2.2 The Concept of Rotation and the Principle of Form as Dynamic-DIALOGIC

Two central concepts of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory which are pertinent to this study are the rotation principle, and the authors’ conception of sonata form as a dynamic-dialogic principle. Hepokoski and Darcy’s overall structure of sonata form features a specified, large-scale trajectory of event or action zones, the surface details of which can be realized in a myriad of style-appropriate ways. They lay out a set of generic possibilities for each zone, which they refer to as default levels: “each event-zone within the sonata-genre is describable as a family of hierarchically ordered standard options available to the composer, analogous to a menu of formatting options within a computer
program.”\textsuperscript{11} Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, and the analytical model it espouses, was selected as the basis for this study for two primary reasons. First, Mendelssohn’s sonata forms do not fit neatly into any Classical model of sonata form. A flexible system that allows for Mendelssohn’s works to enter into dialogue with sonata form, while still allowing for deviations, transformations, and other such evolutions of the form is required. Second, thematic textures play a critical role in defining the onset of rhetorical action spaces for Hepokoski and Darcy.\textsuperscript{12} Analysis of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works indicates that formal closure plays a decreasingly important role as a form-defining characteristic. In its place, thematic content takes on an increasingly more important role in defining the formal structures of Mendelssohn’s works. Therefore, models of \textit{Formenlehre} that rely on formal closure as form-defining are unsustainable as a model of analysis for Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works. For instance, William Caplin’s theory of Classical sonata form would be ill-fitting for Mendelssohn’s music due to several factors, including the diminishing role of localized cadences as form-defining as well as the increasing importance of thematic content in the nineteenth century. Caplin’s model relies heavily on localized cadences to define formal units. As will be demonstrated by the analyses presented in Chapters Three and Five of this dissertation, Mendelssohn’s

\textsuperscript{11} Hepokoski and Darcy, “The Medial Caesura”: 116.  
\textsuperscript{12} Hepokoski and Darcy argue that many of the action spaces within the sonata open with characteristic textures in place of closed and self-contained melodies. For example, the dynamic drop to \textit{piano} is a strong rhetorical signal of the onset of an S-theme that is coupled with, but separate from, any tight-knit theme that may exist as the secondary theme (Sonata Theory, 65n1).
sonata-form works tend to downplay or override these local cadences altogether, preferring an increasing level of continuation function throughout the entire movement.\textsuperscript{13}

The principle of rotation is a critical factor in Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory. It acts as the main generator of dynamic motivation for the form and allows for the form to be opened to progressive hermeneutic analysis. Rotation is the main rhetorical principle of the form and is not necessarily associated with the harmonic structure of the work. The rotation principle is rooted in the Platonic dialectic of perpetual loss and a cyclical re-beginning or renewal.\textsuperscript{14} The rotation is set into motion by the exposition, whose rhetorical task is to provide a layout of themes and textures against which the events of the development and the recapitulation are to be measured and understood. The authors argue that the development and the recapitulation are additional rotations of the initial expositional layout. Thus, for example, many development sections open with primary-theme based material, initiating a development that will trace through the rhetorical

\textsuperscript{13} Thus, Caplin’s formal functions of “beginning,” “being-in-the-middle,” and “ending” become increasingly difficult to sustain in a musical style that seeks to prioritize continuation above anything else. Caplin’s tight-knit themes remain a useful tool for the analysis of many of Mendelssohn’s primary themes, and I often use them as type of pseudo-background ‘theme structure’ in order to guide analysis of P- and S-themes. Continuation function is also borrowed from Caplin and used throughout this dissertation. However, the reliance on ending function and localized cadences to demarcate theme zones within a sonata becomes increasingly difficult to maintain over the course of the entire movement. See William Caplin, \textit{Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven}, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

\textsuperscript{14} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Sonata Theory}, 611. The authors go on to say that “within a sonata, tonality is irrelevant to the task of identifying the rotational principle. The central thing is an implied or actualized thematic modules, along with the assumption that the most ‘natural’ or expected continuation of the layout’s last module will be to lead to a relaunching of the initial module of the next, thus producing the characteristic spiral or circular effect. Rotation is what we call a rhetorical principle rather than a tonal one: it is governed by the expectation of a temporal presentation-sequence of thematic-modular elements, not by harmonic procedures, even though, on another plane of analysis, those harmonic features have their own structures to articulate.” (\textit{Sonata Theory}, 612).
layout presented by the exposition.\textsuperscript{15} The rotational principle of sonata form becomes critical for the overall dynamic trajectory and narrative, especially when a problem exists within the exposition’s rhetorical layout. A problem with the unfolding of the exposition’s rhetorical strategy places the burden on the recapitulation rotation (or, as is sometimes the case with Beethoven’s late sonatas, on the coda) to generate a resolution to the problem.

As stated above, Hepokoski and Darcy’s structure of sonata form features a large-scale trajectory of action zones, and each zone has a set of generic possibilities or default levels for their realization. They argue that several ‘internalized’ features exist for each action zone which do not claim superiority for one default choice over another, but simply refer to the frequency of use in the repertoire of the mid-eighteenth century style. These features fall into the following categories: generically appropriate types of themes and textures, reasonable lengths of individual passages, dynamics, degrees of contrast, standard ‘topics’ and thematic formulas, properly placed cadences and cadential delay/frustration, handling of major- and minor-mode colouration, and the boundaries of taste and the limits of eccentricity.\textsuperscript{16}

Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory allows for a dynamic and large-scale analysis of the overall trajectory of a work in sonata form. Furthermore, it opens the form to a wide range of additional analytical possibilities, most critically to the possibility of

\textsuperscript{15} According to Hepokoski and Darcy, the developmental rotation generally leaves out references to the subordinate and closing themes, since they play a special rhetorical role in the recapitulation, resolving the structural dissonance between tonic and dominant keys (Sonata Theory, 205–6).

\textsuperscript{16} Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 9.
hermeneutic and narrative interpretations. Their large-scale dramatic trajectory and rotational conception of sonata form allows the analyst to consider long-range connections throughout the sonata while dramatizing the rhetorical effects of each section from primary theme, to the exposition, and so on. Joel Galand writes that “for H&D [sic], in short, ‘sonata form’ is not primarily a form but a genre, a constellation of socially mediated traditions and heuristic norms that they conceive as a Weberian ideal type, or a game (in Wittgenstein’s sense), or a Kantian regulative idea that guides our reason but is not given to us directly.”17 Their dialogic principle of sonata form is, however, not without criticism.18 Wingfield and Horton are critical of Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of the fundamental background structure of sonata form, and they question the value or reducing sonata form to a generic model for analysis. Their criticisms are considered in section 2.4.

The approach employed in this study accepts the foundational principle of sonata-form as a dialogic process. The analyses offered in chapters Three and Five demonstrate this, as they are presented in dialogue with the expectations generated by the normative, background structure of sonata form. They also allow for Mendelssohn’s music to speak for itself, a critical tenet in the development of Elements of Sonata Theory: “Our


18. The fundamental differences between William Caplin’s formal function approach and Hepokoski and Darcy’s dialogical approach have been well documented by the author’s themselves, particularly in Musical Form, Forms, and Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections, edited by Pieter Bergé. (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010). Caplin’s and Hepokoski and Darcy’s approaches differ in the fundamental overall treatment of cadences: whereas Caplin’s approach prioritizes localized cadential achievement, Hepokoski and Darcy’s approach concentrates on larger-scale cadence and caesura articulation. Other criticisms of Hepokoski and Darcy’s approach focus on the concept of deformation, in particular, Wingfield and Horton’s “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms,” which will be discussed and critiqued at length in section 2.4.
preference...was to let the composers themselves teach us how sonatas work. Our method of understanding sonatas (‘Sonata Theory’) strikes a balance between inductively inferred norms and the unpredictability that one finds in these pieces.”

2.3 Sonata Theory and Mendelssohn’s Sonata-Form Works

Published literature on Mendelssohn’s conception and use of sonata form is scant. Wingfield and Horton attempt to address these issues in their essay “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms.” The authors use Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form as a springboard for their approach to Mendelssohn’s music. They suggest that the aim of the essay is twofold: “first, to evaluate sonata theory and its specific relevance for Mendelssohn’s music; second, to establish, through an analytical survey of sonata-type movements, precisely what can be considered normative in Mendelssohn’s sonata practice, and whether this has any correlation with the acceptance or deformation of a Formenlehre model or generic scheme.” These are bold claims and, since this essay represents the largest contribution that directly deals with both Mendelssohn and Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, it merits substantial review here.

Wingfield and Horton are largely focused on two central concepts of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory: the background sonata structure and the theory of sonata


20. As discussed in Chapter One, several recent studies have appeared including an entire session at the AMS/SMT conference in Vancouver in 2016. Unfortunately, at the time of submission of this dissertation, none of these articles have been published.

deformation. The two issues are intertwined: in order to define a deformation of a structure, one must first address the expected, generic form of said structure. On both issues, Wingfield and Horton are critical of Hepokoski and Darcy’s approach. In general, they take issue with the background structure of the sonata form as developed by Hepokoski and Darcy, which they deem a “reified normative model,” repeatedly describe as an “ideal type,” and question “whether sonata form can be reduced to a Platonic model that simultaneously stands apart from and yet informs the repertoire.”

The author’s criticisms are misguided by a flawed understanding of Hepokoski and Darcy’s premise of the background sonata-form structure, which will be demonstrated below. They argue that one cannot prove that Mendelssohn was influenced by any one theory of form, which “begs the essential question ‘what, precisely is Mendelssohn deforming?’ It is not simply the Classical ‘genre’; but neither is it any version of the Formenlehre model.”

This argument is a moot point for Hepokoski and Darcy’s analytical model—by the simple act of writing a sonata or engaging sonata form, Mendelssohn’s work enters into a dialogue with the generic background structure of the anticipated sonata form. It is true that we cannot prove without a doubt that Mendelssohn was influenced by any one theory of form over another; but neither can this be disproven, especially considering Mendelssohn’s education and influential friendship with A.B. Marx. Furthermore, Wingfield and Horton disprove their own assertion when they state that “before 1825 Mendelssohn produced some 80 sonata-form movements modelled mainly on the works

22. Ibid., 87–93.

23. Ibid. 91.
of Mozart and Haydn.” This is more than half of the total sonata-form movements (154) credited to Mendelssohn by the authors and suggests a clear early model for the young Mendelssohn. To deny that Classical sonata practice had any impact on Mendelssohn’s compositional practice whatsoever is problematic and historically insensitive.²⁵

Wingfield and Horton appear to misunderstand the intent behind the model of the generic background structure of sonata form proposed by Hepokoski and Darcy and become too embroiled with the philosophical ‘chicken-and-egg’ scenario regarding sonata form— which came first? The model or the practice? The spirit behind Hepokoski and Darcy’s model, which was presented above in Figure 2-1, rests in the long-range cadential trajectories of sonata form: the achievement (or lack-thereof) of the EEC and ESC.

Hepokoski and Darcy describe the exposition as a structure of promise and the recapitulation as a structure of accomplishment. This is the critical defining factor of sonata form: the expectation that both the EEC and the ESC can, and will, be achieved.

What this does not mean is that a work cannot be classified as a ‘sonata form’ if the EEC and/or ESC are not achieved. Hepokoski and Darcy write that “failure to attain the EEC

²⁴ Ibid., 98, emphasis added.
²⁵ It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to fully explore the issue of influence, which would require a very close study of Mendelssohn’s education, training, and correspondence. The nature of this study does not rest upon Mendelssohn’s influences, but rather, the analyses conducted herein are intended to illuminate Mendelssohn’s music through the specific lens of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form. Whether or not Mendelssohn composed his sonata-form works with any particular theory of sonata form in mind is a moot point; this current study is intended to develop a theory of Mendelssohn’s own compositional style, using Hepokoski and Darcy’s model as a neutral starting point for analysis and comparison. As noted above, even a quick glance at the literature concerning Mendelssohn’s education indicates that the composer closely studied the works of Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Influence to some degree can be inferred, inasmuch as the Classical model for sonata form was at the very least known to Mendelssohn.
within the exposition suggests that the entire sonata is threatened with nonclosure in the recapitulation (sonata failure). To undermine S’s raison d’être in this way suggests that something has gone amiss, that the whole point of undertaking a sonata (as a metaphor for human action) has proven futile.”26 What they clearly do not say is that, based on the inability of the music to secure a proper ESC, the analyst must jettison the sonata-form framework altogether. A work can be comfortably ‘in sonata form’ while, at the same time, failing to achieve the ESC. As noted above, what is critical to the form is the expectation of this eventuality, not its actual materialization. Wingfield and Horton go on to argue that Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of sonata form is a response to the ‘modernist’ notion of a binary polarity of form, that suggests that “forms either reinforce known structural categories, or else spring unmediated from their primary material.”27 The authors argue that Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of form as a dialogic process attempts to forge a path through the middleground between this binary polarity of form. Wingfield and Horton argue that the theory of form as a dialogic process falls short, citing Hepokoski and Darcy’s hierarchy of default choices as nothing more than another instance of form as conformational.28 If this were the case for Hepokoski and Darcy’s model, then the analyst would be forced to jettison any work that did not conform to the hierarchy of defaults from the canon of works in sonata form. As mentioned above, the critical feature of Sonata Theory is the expectation, rather than the manifestation, of form-critical goals along the trajectory of the sonata as a whole.

28. Ibid., 88.
This line of criticism is tenuous for it begs the question: why else would a composer choose to compose a sonata if s/he did not wish to enter the realm of sonata practice? The entire purpose of this study agrees wholeheartedly with Wingfield and Horton’s assertion that advocates for “an inductive, empirical strategy grounded in the analysis of an entire corpus of works.”29 However, their attempt to liberate Mendelssohn’s music from the Formenlehre tradition is not without fault. Hepokoski and Darcy’s study is the result of meticulous scrutiny of the repertoire they endeavor to analyze in much the same way as Wingfield and Horton’s study of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms results in generic norms for Mendelssohn’s music. Hepokoski and Darcy’s default level choices do not come with an additional attachment of aesthetic value. A first-level-default choice is not first-level because it is the best choice for a particular moment in the unfolding of the sonata; rather, the defaults are simply a matter of statistical frequency in the repertoire on which Hepokoski and Darcy base their model of sonata form. This is precisely the inductive model Wingfield and Horton advocate, and yet they criticize the hierarchical categories as a vestige of a conformational inclination latent in Hepokoski and Darcy’s conception of sonata form. Wingfield and Horton state that they do not intend their approach to be ahistorical, even appealing to a study of Mendelssohn’s pedagogical experience in order to maintain a sense of historical focus.30 Nevertheless, their preferred approach of seeking to “establish what might be regarded as normative for Mendelssohn’s sonata-form music” through “an inductive, empirical strategy grounded in the analysis of an entire corpus of works” while maintaining significant distance from any type of Formenlehre model has

29. Ibid., 93.
30. Ibid., 91.
the danger of resulting in just such an ahistorical outcome. After spending such a significant portion of the introductory part of their essay criticizing Hepokoski and Darcy’s use of a conformationist model, and the pitfalls of this approach when it comes to deformation theory, they nevertheless reluctantly use the Formenlehre deformations as defined by Hepokoski and Darcy to analyze Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works. Their caveat indicates that the “strategy at this stage has been to assess [the deformational categories] critically against Mendelssohn’s practice, with the aim of establishing the relative prevalence of normal and deformational devices under the broad terms of the concept,” which seems quite consistent with Hepokoski and Darcy’s research approach.31

2.4 Deformation Theory and Mendelssohn’s Sonata-Form Works
A second problem with Wingfield and Horton’s argument stems from a potential misreading of the theory of deformation. In general, they classify any deviation from the Type 3 “Textbook” sonata as a deformation. But this is not consistent with Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition. In their system, deformation is “a technical term referring to a striking way of stretching or overriding a norm.”32 Wingfield and Horton argue that Mendelssohn’s oeuvre scarcely includes an example of a sonata form that does not deviate from Hepokoski and Darcy’s generic norms; my analyses will show that this is not necessarily the case.33 Wingfield and Horton’s definition of deformation is too rigid. As stated earlier, they argue that any deviation from the norm constitutes a deformation

31. Ibid., 93.
32. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 615.
33. The analyses that support this conclusion will be presented in Chapters Three and Five of this study.
of the form. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of deformation is more nuanced, requiring a narrower stance for defining a formal deviation as a deformation. Noteworthy deformations completely alter the form, and stretch the “normative procedure to its maximally expected limits or even beyond them—or the overriding of that norm altogether in order to produce a calculated expressive effect.” Furthermore, Hepokoski and Darcy write that,

Extreme formal deformation can suggest an undermining of confidence in the form itself. The demonstration of “sonata failure” became an increasingly attractive option in the hands of nineteenth-century composers who, for one reason or another, wished to suggest the inadequacy of the Enlightenment-grounded solutions provided by generic sonata practice. Deformation of form became identical with deformation of expressive content.

Wingfield and Horton endeavor to expand the categories of deformation laid out by Hepokoski and Darcy. However, their approach to deformation is too broad, and many of their categories can more accurately be described as deviations from the expected norm, rather than full-fledged deformations. Their list of deformation categories is presented below in Table 1.

34. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 614, emphasis added.
35. Ibid., 254.
**Table 2-1: Reproduction of Wingfield and Horton’s Table 5.2 “Some existing and some additional categories of ‘sonata deformation’” (2012, 99).**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction-coda frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Three-key expositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tonal regions outside the I–V and i–III/i–v tonal opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Theme groups presented as harmonic fields rather than prolongations of a single key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Second groups occurring substantially over dominant pedals or first-inversion triads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elisions of exposition and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The appearance in development space of ostensibly new non-tonic (often fugal) material that is often resolved in coda space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Elisions of development and recapitulation, including themes returning over dominant pedals, or harmonic progressions, or first-inversion tonic triads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Truncated recapitulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reversed or partly reversed recapitulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Non-resolving recapitulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The return of themes from earlier movements in finales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *Denotes categories previously identified as ‘deformations’ by Hepokoski and Darcy (2006)*.

As demonstrated in Table 1, the starred categories are deformations included by Hepokoski and Darcy in *Elements of Sonata Theory*. It is important to note that the examples of deformation included by Hepokoski and Darcy have significant and drastic effects on the sonata procedure as a whole, calling the entire sonata narrative process into question. The rest of the concepts included on Wingfield and Horton’s list, while certainly notable expressive devices, fail to meet the criteria of deformation. The ‘three-key’ exposition is dealt with briefly by Hepokoski and Darcy. They acknowledge that, “in some cases, these provide deformational complications associated with apparent
double medial caesuras…” However, the deformation is linked to the often-complicated effect of the tri-modular block (henceforth, TMB) and apparent double MC rather than merely the existence of three key-areas in the exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy note that Beethoven and Haydn are particularly fond of the TMB effect in their minor-mode sonata works: the first-level default i–III harmonic trajectory is undermined, and instead the exposition produces the EEC in v, creating an overall harmonic trajectory i–III–v. The effect is a narrative effect: the “heroic major-mode promise is turned into something grimmer—something forecasting the ultimate demise of the hero.” Nevertheless, the exposition still accomplishes what it set out to do: produce the EEC, and thus the so-called three key exposition, while useful for dramatic and narrative effect, ultimately does not deform the sonata structure.

Exploration of tonal regions beyond the I–V, and i–III/i–v oppositions are listed above as a deformation by Wingfield and Horton. Hepokoski and Darcy concede that a move to a key other than the dominant in major-mode sonatas before 1800 is considered deformational. However, their stance broadens when it comes to sonatas produced after 1800, and they provide numerous examples from Beethoven’s oeuvre where he explores the possibility of moving to III for the second part of the exposition. They go on to argue that as the nineteenth century progressed, “other tonal choices were also acceptable (especially various shades of mediants and submediants) as lower-level defaults for

36. Ibid., 120.
37. Ibid., 316.
38. Ibid., 119–120.
idiosyncratic structural implications—among which the unwillingness or staged
‘inability’ to move to the traditionally normative V was by no means the least telling.”

The description of Wingfield and Horton’s fourth category of deformation, that of theme
groups presented as harmonic fields, rather than prolongations of a single key, is sparse.
As will be shown, Mendelssohn has a proclivity for undermining cadential closure, and
often fails to satisfactorily close themes before initiating the next section. However,
analysis of a cross-section of the twenty-four Mendelssohn works for this study reveals a
far more normative sonata practice than Wingfield and Horton exhibit. Chapter Three of
this dissertation will explore this point in more detail. However, it is true that
Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works tend to be harmonically freer in the second half of the
exposition; nevertheless, they frequently produce the expected EEC in the expected
key.

Returning to Wingfield and Horton’s list of deformations, categories 5, 6 and 8 are
interconnected: second groups occurring substantially over dominant pedals or first-
inversion triads, elisions of exposition and development, and recapitulations over
dominant pedals. Hepokoski and Darcy generally refer to the occurrence of S over a
prolonged pedal-point as a deformation. Wingfield and Horton argue that
given the crucial role that the collaboration of bass progression and chord
inversion plays in eliding formal-functional divisions in Mendelssohn’s music,

39. Ibid. 120.

40. Or, at the very least, they produce an EEC in an unexpected key, like the major dominant
instead of the minor dominant in a minor-mode sonata. At times, Wingfield and Horton’s essay gives the
sense that Mendelssohn deviates far off the expected harmonic path, but this is simply not the case, at least
in the cross-section of works analyzed here for this study.

41. See Hepokoski and Darcy’s discussion in Sonata Theory, 129.
and especially bearing in mind the rarity of clearly articulated medial caesurae in his mature sonata forms [a claim that will be refuted later in this study], it seems appropriate to consider this issue as challenging significantly the distinction between the ‘launch’ of P and the ‘relaunch’ of S as it is conceived in the generic layout, and therefore as a ‘deformation’ impinging on ‘rhetorical form’ under the terms of sonata theory.\textsuperscript{42}

At issue here is the stability of P and/or S; both sets of authors agree that an unstable S is to be considered a structural deformation. A non-tonic opening of the recapitulatory rotation is also considered deformational by Hepokoski and Darcy. The passage from \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory} to which Wingfield and Horton are referring in the above quotation is related to a discussion of Schenkerian implications for the S-zone.\textsuperscript{43} It is relevant to note that Hepokoski and Darcy’s focus is not on the fundamental bass line of the S-zone, but rather on identifying a clear linear descent in the new key. They do, however, provide that \(\hat{2}\) and \(\hat{1}\) of the new key should be supported by root-position dominant and tonic chords respectively. Mendelssohn’s consistent use of inverted chords at key cadential moments therefore needs to be addressed as a potential deformation to the generic layout of the sonata structure. Hepokoski and Darcy do not discuss the elision of the exposition and development as a deformation; however, one could imagine that a deformation could occur should there be a problem with the articulation of the EEC (assuming that there is no closing zone). In any other case, one would be hard pressed to identify the elision of these two larger spaces as a deformation of sonata structure.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42} Wingfield and Horton, “Norm and Deformation,” 101n51.

\textsuperscript{43} See Hepokoski and Darcy discussion in \textit{Sonata Theory}, found under the subtitle “Structure” on pp. 124–131.

\textsuperscript{44} Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works retain the large-scale divisions of exposition, development, and recapitulation. However, these formal sections are often not clearly demarcated, especially the division between the development and the recapitulation. This feature of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three of this dissertation.
Wingfield and Horton’s category 7 deals with new non-tonic material in development space. Hepokoski and Darcy address this issue as “episodic interpolations or substitutes in the center of developmental space.” This situation often occurs either with an interpolation wedged between two parts of the developmental rotation \{P, episode, TR, C\} or as a writing-over of an action zone in the rotation \{P, episode, S\}. Again, under the strict definition of deformation preferred in this study, these episodes and interpolations do not necessarily have an impact on the overall sonata structure, and should not be considered deformations. Caplin argues that an interpolation “can be defined as musical material that is inserted between two logically succeeding formal functions, yet seeming not to belong to either function…an interpolation can easily be eliminated in order to restore a more normative grouping structure.” The development, while performing an important role within the sonata structure, does not have a form-defining role inasmuch as the exposition and recapitulation do. The development contains no form-defining cadence or structural goal on par with the EEC/ESC. Interpolations within the development do not deform the overall sonata narrative and thus should not be considered a deformation as defined within the scope of this study.

Wingfield and Horton’s categories 9 and 10 deal with recapitulation issues: truncated recapitulations and reversed or partly reversed recapitulations. Hepokoski and Darcy employ a strict definition for use of the term ‘truncated recapitulation’: this term is used

47. That being said, I acknowledge that the general goal of the development is to achieve a dominant lock of the home key, preparing for the launch of the recapitulation.
to define recapitulations that suppress the S-C block, thus suppressing any chance of ESC articulation, a clear deformation:

the sonata thus falls short of its generic mission to provide the requisite tonal resolution with the only action-space, S, that is capable of providing it…within Allegro compositions these compositions are extreme deformations, registering some catastrophe or act of violence that has befallen the structure as a whole.  

Hepokoski and Darcy are reticent to employ the term ‘reversed’ or ‘partly-reversed recapitulation.’ Wingfield and Horton acknowledge this, but include this category in any case, arguing that “in Mendelssohn’s practice, and many other nineteenth-century examples, we see no reason to give primacy to a larger rotation over a reversal of formal-functional [sic] order.” Hepokoski and Darcy, however, argue that,

…the term “recapitulation”…was devised to describe the normative situation in the postexpositional spaces of what we call Types 1, 3, 4, and 5 sonatas, namely, that space usually begun by the simultaneous arrival of P and the tonic key and proceeding onward to include S and C…a crucial component of the recapitulation-concept as it emerged historically in the music-theoretical literature was the initiating function of P…One of P’s central functions in all of the sonata-form types is to signal the onset of a structural rotation…but the same cannot be said of S. On the contrary, S’s role—above all in the expositional and recapitulatory rotations—is within an ongoing rotation to proceed from the medial caesura to drive toward and secure the EEC or ESC.

A Type 2 sonata features a double rotation: the exposition proceeds normatively, and closes in the appropriate key. The second rotation launches with P, but in a non-tonic key, and it often gives way to clearer developmental activity. Only with the return of the S-C

49. Wingfield and Horton, “Norm and Deformation,” 101n52. They go on to argue that they cannot address this issue fully within the context of the current chapter, which is unfortunate, as this is a sweeping claim that merits elaboration.
block does the tonic return. Hepokoski and Darcy go on to argue that the continued application of the term 'recapitulation’ to the S-C block of a Type 2 sonata is problematic and a vestige of the practice that preferred to define sonata form in terms of tonal structure, “pushing to the side important considerations of thematic function and arrangement.”

Late appearances of P material in a Type 2 sonata are referred to as either a coda to the second rotation or an interpolation within the C-space of the second rotation. The clear trend in Mendelssohn’s compositional style that emphasizes thematic development suggests that Hepokoski and Darcy’s approach is preferred, since they argue that thematic function and arrangement are of critical importance in the definition of formal structures.

Finally, Wingfield and Horton’s category 12 deals with the return of themes from earlier movements in finales. Since the present study only deals with first movements, this category is of little consequence to my analyses. However, it is worth noting again that one would be hard pressed to define this rather common practice (after Beethoven) as a deformation of sonata form. While it is true that recycling of thematic material from earlier movements can and often does have narrative implications on the finale, it certainly does not necessarily imply a deformation. Wingfield and Horton link this practice to the introduction-coda frame deformation, arguing that “the sonata activity is subordinated and/or disrupted by elements from beyond its confines.” In this sense, the

51. Ibid., 354.
52. Ibid., 369.
reappearance of thematic material from earlier movements certainly could act as an agent of deformation, if the material appears in the specific way of disrupting the normative sonata activity of the finale as mentioned above. But the generalization of category 12, that any return of thematic material in the finale is to be considered a deformation, is problematic. It is beyond the scope of this study to deal with final movements, but their category 12 offers another example of Wingfield and Horton’s potential misreading of the concept of deformation.

In general, Wingfield and Horton argue that seemingly any deviation from the normal Type 3 “Textbook” sonata should be considered a deformation. But this is not the spirit of Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition of the term. Hepokoski and Darcy write that,

we use the term “deformation” to mean the stretching of a normative procedure to its maximally expected limits or even beyond them—or the overriding of that norm altogether in order to produce a calculated expressive effect. It is precisely the strain, the distortion of the norm…for which the composer strives at the deformational moment. The expressive or narrative point lies in the tension between the limits of a competent listener’s field of generic expectations and what is made to occur—or not occur—in actual sound at the moment. Within any individual exemplar (such as a single musical composition) operating under the shaping influence of a community-shared genre-system, any exceptional occurrence along these lines calls attention to itself as a strong expressive effect. As such it marks an important event of the composition at hand.

54 As has been argued above, Hepokoski and Darcy’s conception of sonata form is based largely on the implicit understanding that a set of audible goals is expected to be achieved over the course of a sonata by a competent listener well versed in sonata form. It is precisely these expectations that a composer manipulates in order to stretch the generic

54. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 614.
expectations of the form, potentially leading to a true deformation of the structure. Nevertheless, the deformation can only exist if one expects something different to occur at that particular moment in the form.

2.5 An Overview of Mendelssohn’s Sonata-Form Practice

The details of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form practice will be developed at length in Chapter Three of this dissertation. Overall, even though Mendelssohn’s sonata forms tend to retain a sense of formal division at all levels of structure, generally, the sections are not clearly demarcated, tending instead to flow one into the other. As noted, Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory defines an expressive and dramatic trajectory that drives toward medial and final caesuras and obligatory cadences of the form. Analysis of Mendelssohn’s works suggests a blurring of these boundaries. This requires a reconceptualization of formal closure as form-defining and the effect of this change on the sonata narrative of nineteenth-century works. Vitercik argues that,

\[\text{[t]he problems the composers of the early romantic generation faced center in large part on the difficulty of coordinating the large-scale symmetries inherent in a clearly articulated tonal dynamic of tension and resolution with the romantic idea of a thematic process controlled by the progressive development of material over the entire course of a movement—a development that was organic and unidirectional. The establishment of thematic processes as the primary generating principle of sonata form necessarily introduces a disjunction of form and process that threatens the fundamental coherence of the style…}^{56}\]

This tension is discernable in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works and is most noticeable in his treatment of the medial caesura (MC) and the opening of the S-theme zone, where he

---

55. Ibid., 13.
tends to extensively blur the division between P–TR and S–C sub-rotations. Furthermore, the emphasis on thematic development routinely results in a sense of monothematicism in Mendelssohn’s works, juxtaposed with a clear sense of S-zone rhetoric. This sense of monothematicism removes a common source of conflict from the overall structure: that of the conflict between P- and S-themes. This results in a sense that the exposition is cast as a cycle of variations, a concept developed by Carl Dahlhaus in his analysis of Schubert’s String Quartet in G Major, D. 887. He argues that,

[t]he functional differentiation of parts, which obeys the rule of sonata form, nevertheless alters little in the basic design of successive variations, which form a cycle insofar as they draw circles, ever expanding circles, around the theme. The variation principle as such is not goal-oriented, but rather resembles a commentary “meandering” about the theme, illuminating it from all sides.  

Dahlhaus goes on to argue that Schubert’s thematic structures embrace “a multitude of elements, whose linkage and separation create a thematic process—one that evades the simple notions of statement and elaboration.” Dahlhaus links this change in thematic structure to the evolving Romantic aesthetic, which tends to look backward in remembrance, rather than pushing ahead toward each goal. These aesthetic concerns will be addressed in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

Mendelssohn’s penchant for composing in the minor mode allows for greater narrative flexibility. Of the twenty-four works studied for this project, ten are in the minor mode,

58. Ibid., 4. I will return to a discussion of Dahlhaus’s essay in Chapter Four of this dissertation.
and all ten handle the burden of the emancipation of the minor mode in a different fashion. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that,

in addition to articulating the rhetorical shape familiar from a major-mode sonata form, a minor-mode sonata bears an additional burden. This is that of the minor mode itself, generally interpretable within the sonata tradition as a sign of a troubled condition seeking transformation (emancipation) into the parallel major mode…what matters…is not whether the initial tonic minor is converted into a stable tonic major at or around the ESC but rather that minor-mode sonatas, unlike major-mode ones, are uniquely capable of effecting this modal transformation. This is the extra burden under which minor-mode sonatas are placed, regardless of the results of the minor-major musical drama engaged.\(^{59}\)

Mendelssohn routinely avoids the emancipation of the minor mode in the first-movements studied for this project, preferring to save the transformation for the final movement. This creates the need for cyclical works, the study of which must be saved for another project. Nevertheless, the use of the minor mode by Mendelssohn is compelling, and will be discussed further in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

Finally, a well-documented characteristic of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style is the use of developmental recession.\(^{60}\) In the typical Classical sonata, one expects an increase in tension and harmonic drive at the moment of retransition to prepare for the launch of the recapitulation. The tension generally culminates with the achievement of the dominant lock (\(V_A\)) that signals the expected return of the tonic. Mendelssohn’s use of developmental recession, which suppresses energy via lowered dynamic levels, reduced rhythmic activity, etc., is in clear contrast to the Classical norm. Stewart-MacDonald

\(^{59}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Sonata Theory*, 306.

writes that Mendelssohn’s “developmental recession[s] coalesce to form a progressive facet of Mendelssohn’s style, not only because they replace the eighteenth-century tendency to build to a climax towards the end of the development, but also because of their likely relationship with large-scale teleology.” Steward-MacDonald goes on to argue that other characteristics, such as the expansion of the coda, the truncation of the recapitulation rotation, and the introduction of new themes in the development, all play a role in generating teleology in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works. Stewart-MacDonald argues that the use of developmental recessions is an example of Mendelssohn’s ability to juxtapose nineteenth-century aesthetic ideals with eighteenth-century formal structures, an idea that will be more closely considered in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

2.6 Conclusion

Wingfield and Horton argue that Mendelssohn’s oeuvre of sonata-form works scarcely includes an example that doesn’t contravene Hepokoski and Darcy’s generic norms. As will be shown, the analyses completed for this project will demonstrate that this is not necessarily the case. In fact, if one looks closely enough, many of Mendelssohn’s works across his compositional career fit well within the expected norms presented in Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, provided the analyst is willing to approach the background structure flexibly and as a guide, rather than a set of strict rules and requirements. As stated above, Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, and the analytical model it implies, was selected as the basis for this study for two primary reasons. First,

61. Ibid., 96.
62. Ibid., 96.
Mendelssohn’s sonata forms do not fit neatly into any Classical model of sonata form. A flexible system that allows Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works to enter into dialogue with sonata form, while still allowing for deviations, transformations, and other such evolutions of the form is required.

Second, my analyses below will reveal how thematic textures play a critical role in defining the onset of rhetorical action spaces, an important and sometimes overlooked feature of Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory. As mentioned above, Mendelssohn’s works demonstrate the decline of the role of formal closure and the increasing importance of the role of thematic content in defining the formal structures in his compositions in sonata form. The remainder of this study aims to inductively analyze Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works to trace the development of his own conception of the form. Placing Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works within the dynamic-dialogic framework of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory allows one to more clearly illuminate the areas of significant stylistic growth and change within Mendelssohn’s own style, and to determine what stylistically appropriate choices were available for Mendelssohn’s specific conception of sonata form. Remaining historically sensitive to the compositional influences of his predecessors, this study aims to shine a light directly on Mendelssohn’s own works, replacing the Beethovenian yardstick with the more neutral model offered by Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory.
Chapter 3

3 An Introduction to Mendelssohn’s Sonata Form

This chapter will explore in detail a subset of twenty-four of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works, aiming to illuminate the areas of significant stylistic growth and change within Mendelssohn’s own style, and to determine what stylistically appropriate choices constitute Mendelssohn’s specific conception of the sonata style. The conclusions drawn in this chapter are largely based on an analysis of a cross-section of Mendelssohn’s sonata form movements from 1820, when the composer was just eleven years old, to 1847, the year of his death. As has already been argued, this study aims to emancipate Mendelssohn’s music from the seemingly inescapable shadow of Beethoven, while not turning a blind eye to the distinct impact that the music of Beethoven and other composers had on his compositional output. As will be developed below, Mendelssohn is following a decidedly different path, one that attempts to blend the achievements of late-eighteenth century style with the new aesthetic expressiveness of the early-nineteenth century.

3.1 Introduction to the Four Main Aspects of Mendelssohn’s Sonata Form

This study focusses on a cross-section of twenty-four of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works written between 1820 and 1847, encompassing a variety of compositional styles including solo works, chamber works, and large orchestral works. For the purpose of this dissertation, the concerti were omitted, and the focus was narrowed to works that were in dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 sonata. The works analyzed are included in Table 1.
Table 3-1: Mendelssohn’s Sonata-Form Works Analyzed, First Movements

| Violin Sonata in F Major, MWVQ7 | 1820 |
| Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105 | 1821 |
| Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1 | 1822 |
| Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4 | 1823 |
| Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2 | 1823 |
| Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11 | 1824 |
| Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24 | 1824 |
| Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14 | 1824 |
| Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110 | 1824 |
| Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 | 1825 |
| String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 | 1826, rev. 1832 |
| String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13 | 1827 |
| Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106 | 1827 |
| String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12 | 1829 |
| Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107 | 1831 |
| String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2 | 1837, rev. 1839 |
| String Quartet No. 3, D Major, Op. 44, No.1 | 1838 |
| String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 | 1838 |
| Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 | 1838 |
| Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58 | 1839 |
| Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45 | 1843 |
| Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 49 | 1845 |
After thorough analysis, several key features of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style came to light which include: 1) a preference for large-scale primary themes; 2) creating continuity through elision and/or “becoming” for the TR-zone and consistent use of caesura-fill which often gives rise to issues of formal closure; 3) issues of proportion in the latter half of the exposition (S- and C-space); and 4) the effect of re-composition and compression, especially in the recapitulation. These issues will be summarized below and explored in more detail in the sections that follow.

Mendelssohn appears to favour larger-scale primary themes, often selecting compound, rounded-binary, and multi-part themes for the P zone. Out of the twenty-four works analyzed, only one, the Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24, features an 8-measure tight-knit theme. Of particular interest is Mendelssohn’s repeated use of the compound Hybrid: Antecedent + Continuation, featured in six works from this sample. Although this compound theme is not addressed in full in Caplin’s formative study of tight-knit themes, it nevertheless is a favourite in Mendelssohn’s post-1824 works.

---

1. The term “becoming” is borrowed from the work of Janet Schmalfeldt (*In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2011]).

2. The issue of re-composition and compression in the recapitulation will be addressed in Chapter Four.

3. Even still, this P-theme features a repeat of the continuation phrase that dissolves into the TR.

Issues of formal continuity dominate these works. The large-scale P-themes commonly feature continuation phrases, which are used to create a constant sense of forward-driven motion. This compositional trait often spills over into the TR: twenty-three out of twenty-four works analyzed feature either an elided, dissolving, or otherwise “becoming” transition. Since the clear majority of these works feature an antecedent as their opening phrase, the effect of the dissolution or elision of the second phrase of the theme gives the illusion of an un-stoppable force that is driving the music forward, right through the expected cadence which should close P. These works do not always confirm the home key with a strong PAC to close P, resulting in a harmonically open P with either an unanswered HC (antecedent) or an unresolved dominant (ABA’).

For example, in the Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4 (1823), Mendelssohn combines several of the abovementioned features into the primary theme. The work features a twenty-four measure P-theme, presented as a compound period, consisting of twelve-measure antecedent and consequent phrases. The sub-phrases are made up of two hybrid themes: CBI + continuation. The CBI, made up of a basic idea and contrasting idea, features no cadence at the end of this formal structure, further highlighting the priority of continuation at several levels of structure.

---

*Form: An Approach for the Classroom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). Caplin allows for several eight-measure hybrids within his theory of form including ANT+CONT, ANT+CAD, CBI+CONT, and CBI+CONS. Caplin only briefly discusses 16-measure compound hybrid themes in a footnote in *Classical Form*, where he writes: “Compound hybrid themes appear seldom in the literature [with which Caplin is concerned, namely Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven] and thus require no special treatment here.” (267n13).

5. Only the String Quartet in E Minor, No. 4, Op. 44, No.2, features a non-elided TR that is marked by a half-beat rest at the end of the P-zone.

6. For a further description of the compound basic idea (CBI), see Caplin, *Classical Form*, 61.
Figure 3-1: Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4, i, (1823), mm. 10—35, P-theme and P⇒TR
In the antecedent of the Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4, the continuation is extended to eight measures, rather than the expected four. This extension technique is taken a step further in the consequent phrase, as the continuation is extended and then dissolves into the transition. The tendency to merge the end of P with the opening of TR becomes more prevalent in the recapitulations of these twenty-four works. Mendelssohn favours truncated P-themes in the recapitulation, returning only the very basic incipits of the theme (in many cases, just the basic idea) before plunging into TR rhetoric. The recapitulations will be discussed further below and in Chapter Four.

Twenty out of the twenty-four works feature a normative or slightly deformed MC, three feature completely abnormal MCs in the wrong key, and only one work features a continuous exposition, with no MC at all. Despite the adherence to the use of the MC, a similar feeling of forward-driven momentum that occurs between the P and TR arises at the moment of the MC: twenty-one out of the twenty-four pieces feature some type of caesura-fill (henceforth, CF), ranging from repeated hammer-blow chords to “juggernaut CFs,” some of which are extended well beyond the expected CF space. In the String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12 (1829), Mendelssohn combines two CF techniques, as

7. Slight deformations include an added seventh to the HC MC or the use of an inverted MC arrival chord.

8. See, for example, the Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4 (7 measures), the Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2 (10 measures), Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11 (12 measures), the String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13 (8 measures), Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’, D Major, Op. 107 (7 measures), the Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭, Op. 45 (10 measures), and the String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 (8 measures). Hepokoski and Darcy define the procedure of “juggernaut CF” as: “…the motivic drive and rhetorical energy of the preceding TR are so great that they spill over the MC proper, invading the expanded MC-gap with continued forte energy, momentarily refusing to lose energy in the normative, generic way. Often the juggernaut, forte effect will last all the way up to S, where it will either collapse back to piano or be suddenly hushed for the S-theme proper.” (Sonata Theory, 44).
demonstrated in Figure 3-2: hammer-blow repetition of the MC chord in the three lower string parts, and an extended arpeggiation passage in the first violin, prolonging the MC harmony of G minor.

**Figure 3-2** String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12 (1829), mm. 51—55.

In the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66, Figure 3-3 below, the MC space is filled by a “juggernaut CF”, marked *marcato e con forza*, and followed quickly by the emergence of the S-theme, marked *fortissimo* in m. 63. Analysis of the first subsection of these sonata-form works reveal an emerging trend, one that favours the obfuscation of form-critical cadences and caesuras in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form repertoire.
Figure 3-3: Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66, mm. 61—64.
Out of the twenty-four works studied, fifteen present a new theme for the S-zone.

Nevertheless, there are several cases where material from the P/TR sub-rotation appears in the S/C sub-rotation, creating a sense of monothematicism, or, at the very least, blurring the sense of a Classically-defined two-part exposition. Table 3-2 lists the S-theme types from the representative sample of works analyzed for this study.

**Table 3-2: The S-Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of S Theme</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Works</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Theme       | 15                          | 1) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
                  |                             | 2) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4  
                  |                             | 3) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11  
                  |                             | 5) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
                  |                             | 6) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
                  |                             | 7) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18  
                  |                             | 8) String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12  
                  |                             | 9) String Quartet No. 5 in Eb Major, Op. 44, No. 3  
                  |                             | 10) Cello Sonata No. 1 in Bb Major, Op. 45  
                  |                             | 11) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49  
                  |                             | 12) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 58  
                  |                             | 13) Piano Trio No. 2 in C minor, Op. 66  
                  |                             | 14) String Quintet No. 2 in Bb Major, Op. 87  
                  |                             | 15) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80  |
### P-based S

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Violin Sonata in F Major, MWVQ7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other basis (TR, slow intro)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works are routinely monothematic to some degree, which removes a common source of conflict from the overall structure: that of the conflict between P- and S-themes. This is further emphasized by the consistent elision of theme-zones and obfuscation of form-defining cadences: the clear P/TR and S/C that serves as the model for the Classical Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form is eschewed in Mendelssohn’s sonata repertoire in favour of an alternative approach to sonata form that favours continuity and continuation over the clear attenuation of structural goals.

The EEC and ESC remain crucial cadential goals in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works. These cadential goals are form-defining; without them, we could not speak of sonata
form, as defined by Hepokoski and Darcy.\(^9\) Thirteen of the twenty-four works analyzed have normative EECs, while five feature an IAC in place of the expected PAC. The EEC-types from the representative sample of works analyzed for this study are listed below in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: The EECs from the Analyzed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of EEC</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Works</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Normative   | 13                         | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
               |                           | 2) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105  
               |                           | 3) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
               |                           | 4) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4  
               |                           | 5) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11  
               |                           | 7) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
               |                           | 8) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6  
               |                           | 9) Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106  
               |                           | 10) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1  
               |                           | 11) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 |

---

\(^9\) Hepokoski and Darcy write extensively about cases where the EEC/ESC is not achieved, therefore creating a situation where we encounter a ‘failed’ exposition or ‘failed’ sonata. In these cases, it is true that the goal of the EEC/ESC is not properly achieved. Nevertheless, the goal itself is still prepared for and expected. The entire purpose of a sonata, as defined by Hepokoski and Darcy, is to drive toward these obligatory cadences: EEC in the new key and ESC in the tonic. They write: “In all instances [of failed sonatas] the interpretive point is that the processes of the sonata have proven insufficient to meet the generic demands imposed at the outset of the exposition. A generic contract to produce a sonata had been proposed and accepted, but the actual workings of the piece were staged as unable to carry it out successfully.” (*Sonata Theory*, 245–6). Their definition, however, does not require that these goals are actually met; the presumption that they will meet these goals defines the form as a sonata.
| IAC          | 5 | 1) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
2) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
3) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13  
4) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
5) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 |
|-------------|----|------------------------------------------|
| ‘Wrong’ Key | 3 | 1) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107 (EEC in A minor)  
2) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49 (EEC in A Major)  
3) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (EEC in G minor) |
| No EEC (blocked) | 1 | 1) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 |
| Other abnormalities | 2 | 1) String Quartet in Bb Major, Op. 12 (tonic chord in first inversion)  
2) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 58 (no clear PAC, but clear C-material). |

From this sample, only one work, the String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18, features a blocked EEC, resulting in a failed exposition, demonstrated in figure 3-4 below. A new

---

10. ‘Wrong key’ encompasses both a genuinely unexpected, wrong key, and the second-level default in the minor key, an EEC in the minor dominant. While technically not the wrong key, a move to the minor dominant for EEC is relatively rare, and could be considered ‘wrong’ in the sense of the strong first-level default to move to III.

11. S’s entire reason for being is to drive toward and secure a PAC in the new key (exposition) and in the tonic (recapitulation). Blocked or otherwise missing EECs/ESCs are a deformation to sonata
Theme emerges in m. 82 in E major. But a sudden return to A major in m. 100 permanently blocks the possibility of achieving EEC in E major and an extended tonicization of F# minor follows in mm. 110–136. E major is never successfully tonicized or confirmed after the sudden re-emergence of A major in m. 92.

Form and demand further hermeneutic interpretation. The concept of deformation, especially around the points of form-defining cadential goals in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four.
The ESCs are slightly more variable, as demonstrated in table 3-4.

Table 3-4: The ESCs from the Analyzed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ESC</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Works</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Normative   | 8                           | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
2) Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24 
3) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110 
4) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 
5) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13 
6) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1 
7) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 
8) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87 |
| IAC         | 3                           | 1) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13 
2) Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106 
3) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45 |

Figure 3-4 String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 (1826, rev. 1832), mm. 74—105, demonstrating the blocked EEC with the re-introduction of the tonic, A major.
Contrary to the EECs, only eleven ESCs are achieved normatively: eight achieve the ESC with a PAC, and three achieve the ESC in the major mode when the tonic is minor, the expected norm. Five works achieve a PAC, but they close the sonata in the minor mode, failing to emancipate the work from the bleakness of the minor mode.\(^{12}\) While many of the deformations of the ESCs were predicted by problematic EECs in the exposition, of the four recapitulations that fail to achieve an ESC through the deformation of ESC-substitute in the wrong key, only two of the four expositions predicted this outcome.\(^{13}\)

\(^{12}\) Hepokoski and Darcy argue that sonatas in the minor mode have an extra burden placed on them, since they alone are capable of transforming the initial minor-mode into the tonic major, usually at or around the ESC (Sonata Theory, 306). They argue that minor-mode sonatas are “generally interpretable within the sonata tradition as a sign of a troubled condition seeking transformation (emancipation) into the parallel major mode.” (Sonata Theory, 306). It is possible that nineteenth-century works demand a different interpretation of this position. This is an idea that will be explored further in Chapter Four of this dissertation.

\(^{13}\) ESC failures were predicted by the problematic EECs in the String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12, whose ESC in the home key is impeded by the modulation to G minor, and the String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18, whose ESC is impeded by modulation to A minor in mm. 352–53.
The other two works fall into the second type of nonresolution defined by Hepokoski and Darcy: “[this nonresolution] occurs when the recapitulation’s part 2 begins in the proper (tonic) key with the hope of accomplishing the ESC but loses that key by drifting or being wrenched away from it.”

An example from Mendelssohn’s sonata-form repertoire is demonstrated in Figure 3-5 below: the Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11, whose ESC is impeded by a sudden movement to A♭ major in m. 291. The S-theme in the recapitulation is severely truncated, lasting only from mm. 283–291 and leading to a cadence in A♭ major. A clear correspondence with C-theme material begins in m. 291 (corresponds with C¹, m. 67), suggesting that the moment for ESC has passed. The C¹ module is presented entirely in A♭ major, before C minor is finally regained by the end of the C² module in m. 331 (not shown in Figure 3-5).

Hepokoski and Darcy’s conceptualization of sonata form and its goal-oriented nature was presented in Figure 2-1. Mendelssohn’s sonata forms all retain a sense of formal division at the highest level of structure (i.e., exposition, development, and recapitulation sections), however, the sections are not always clearly demarcated, tending instead to flow one into the other. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory defines an expressive and dramatic trajectory, which drives toward medial and final caesuras and obligatory cadences of the form. Analysis of Mendelssohn’s works suggests a blurring of these

15. Ibid., 13.
boundary lines, requiring a reconceptualization of formal closure and its changing effect on the sonata narrative in the nineteenth century.

Figure 3-5: Symphony No. 1, Op. 11 (1824), mm. 280—292. The expected moment of ESC is blocked by a sudden modulation to Ab major, mm. 288–291.
The closing zone follows the articulation of the EEC/ESC. It is, by definition, postcadential and can only occur after the EEC/ESC has been securely attained. The role of the closing zone is to confirm the key achieved by the EEC/ESC: the new key in the exposition and the tonic in the recapitulation. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that, in cases where S is not P-based, “the subsequent C is unlikely to contain significant material from the S-zone, especially at its outset.” The characteristic trends in the closing zones from the samples studied are listed in Table 3-5.

Table 3-5: Characteristic Trends in the Expositional Closing Zones from the Analyzed Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-zone Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of Works</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P- &amp; S-based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Ibid., 180.
17. Ibid., 181.
Only one work from the sample, the String Quartet in A Major, Op.13, mixes both P- and S-theme material in the C-zone, while the Symphony No. 5, “Reformation” in D Major, Op. 107, is the lone example that only features five measures of closing material mm. 189–194, before locking on to a tonic pedal to close the exposition. Finally, six works introduce new material in the C-zone, which Hepokoski and Darcy argue is just as common as the P-based C.18

In the recapitulations, the closing section is the least likely to be significantly altered, as demonstrated in table 3-6.

Table 3-6: Closing Zones in the Recapitulations of the Analyzed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulation C-zone</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Works</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New Theme             | 6                           | 1) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
2) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11  
4) Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106  
5) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
6) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 |

18. Ibid., 186. Hepokoski and Darcy go on to say that “When C has a strongly independent melodic profile, it usually signals the presence of a discursive C-space or tableau, springing to new life with its own (or marginally derived) thematic material on the other side of the EEC, with the implication that this action-space is doing something beyond mere, efficient cadential affirmation” (186).
The String Quartet in Eb Major features a C-zone in the wrong key, the result of a
blocked ESC, and two works have no C-zone recapitulated at all. A sense of balance

---

19. The works that feature no recapitulation of the C-zone are the String Quartet in A Major, Op. 18, and the Symphony No. 5 “Reformation” in D Major. Both of these works have problematic ESCs: the Symphony’s ESC is in the wrong key of D minor, a “lights out” moment that immediately moves into the coda, while the Quintet completely fails to achieve an ESC by blocking it with a return to the tonic minor.
between the exposition and the recapitulation is therefore maintained and remains important in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style.

This brief overview of Mendelssohn’s sonata style, based on my analysis of a cross-section of twenty-four works spanning Mendelssohn’s compositional career, indicates that, even while Mendelssohn adheres to the overall sonata trajectory, and that the attenuation of the EEC and ESC remains critical factors of his sonata style, the mechanisms of achieving these form-defining goals shift from one piece to the next. Changing aesthetic aspects of the Romantic consciousness necessitate this transformation of genre-generating oppositions in the sonata style. Replacing the forward-driving, goal-oriented forms of the generation before, where the attenuation of the formal processes was of the utmost importance, is a new approach to musical form that favours the inversion of this ideal, where content is now superior to form. Peter H. Smith argues that Schumann’s two-part sonata forms “underplay polarity through strategies of continuity more typically associated with the continuous type…[T]wo-part expositions draw meaningfully on eighteenth-century conventions even as they develop more characteristically nineteenth-century strategies of tonal dialectics.”20 The recognition of the erosion of the MC in these nineteenth-century works coupled with the evolving harmonic generating principles of the form requires a reformulation of nineteenth-century sonata form. It is the intention of this dissertation, and the analyses within, to show that Mendelssohn was on the forefront of this evolution.

3.2 Mendelssohn’s Primary Themes, Transitions, and the Issue of Formal Closure

As noted in section 3.1, Mendelssohn’s sonata forms tend to favour larger-scale primary themes. He also strongly favours the use of an antecedent as the opening phrase that leads to a half-cadence which creates an expectation of resolution, and promotes the need for continuity. Based on my analyses, it appears that Mendelssohn also prefers the use of theme-types that feature continuation phrases—in particular, sentences and hybrids (CBI+CONT and ANT+CONT)—reinforcing, again, the desire for continuity.\(^{21}\) The P-theme types from the analyzed sample are summarized in Table 3-7 below.

**Table 3-7: The Primary Themes from the Analyzed Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Theme Type</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compound Periods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8) String Quartet No. 5 in Eb Major, Op. 44, No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound Sentences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) Caplin no longer uses the numerical hybrid labels (i.e. Hybrid 1 for ANT+CONT, etc.). See *Analyzing Classical Form: An Approach for the Classroom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
| **Compound H1 (ANT+CONT)** | 6 | 1) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
2) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18  
3) Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106  
4) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107  
5) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (P1.2)  
6) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 58 |
| **Rounded Binary** | 3 | 1) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
2) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66  
3) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87 |
| **Sentence** | 1 | 1) Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24 |
| **Other (2-part)** | 2 | 1) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
2) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 |

The compound hybrid ANT+CONT theme-type features prominently in Mendelssohn’s post-1824 works and further underscores his preoccupation with agents of continuity. In the Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106 (1827), Mendelssohn again makes use of the compound hybrid ANT+CONT. This time, however, instead of extending the large-scale continuation phrase as in Figure 3-6, Mendelssohn repeats the antecedent phrase, with slight recomposition of the cadential phrase of the CONT before moving on to the continuation phrase.
Figure 3-6: Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106 (1827), P-theme, mm. 1—23.
A second example of Mendelssohn’s use of the Compound Hybrid ANT+CONT is found in the Cello Sonata in D Major, Op. 58 (1843), demonstrated in Figure 3-7. This is one of the more straightforward examples of his use of this structure for the P-theme that leads to the TR via a dissolving consequent in m. 19.

The antecedent + continuation allows for two kinds of dynamic processes. The first is the half cadence that ends the antecedent phrase, which produces an aural expectation of tonal resolution. The second is the continuation phrase itself since “it is precisely the function of continuation to destabilize the formal context established [by the opening
phrase] and to provide greater mobility to the theme. With continuation function, we feel that we are “in the middle” of various melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic processes…”

Thematic structures that favour dynamic processes appear to be a preference for Mendelssohn’s P-theme structures.

Hepokoski and Darcy note that, in the eighteenth century, these more complex P-theme forms are rare, specifically the ABA’ rounded-binary P, and argue that “the presence of such an elaborate shape can produce…a breadth or vastness to the P-idea…” Their examples include Cherubini’s Overture to Médée and the first movement of Schubert’s Quintet in C, D. 956; the latter suggests that this choice for the P-theme was gaining in popularity in the nineteenth century. Hepokoski and Darcy go on to say that “for hermeneutic purposes it is sometimes helpful to notice that the ABA’ structure, when more vocal, lyrical, or cantabile in character, might have been intended to suggest an untexted song.” The larger, more complex forms also include more continuation function, which provides a larger sense of urgency than their eight-measure, tight-knit counterparts. The use of these theme-types additionally motivates consistent elision or dissolution into the TR, creating a sense of an uninterrupted flow throughout the entire P-TR subsection.

23. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 70.
24. Ibid., 70.
25. A typical eight-measure sentence would generally only include two measures of continuation function: fragmentation, rhythmic and harmonic acceleration, sequencing, etc., whereas the larger compound sentence would generally include up to six measures of continuation. The compound periods, when they feature tight-knit forms that include continuation, double the available continuation function, and have the added feature of repeating the continuation in the large-scale consequent, which more often than not, dissolves into the transition.
As demonstrated above in section 3.1, the TRs within this sample of twenty-four works are almost all dissolving, elided, or otherwise merged with the end of P. The use of elided versus dissolving or otherwise “becoming” is relatively evenly distributed throughout this sample: twelve works feature dissolving TRs, while eleven feature a TR that elides with the closing cadence of the P-zone. The consistent merging of the end of the P-zone with the beginning of the TR-zone showcases the avid desire for continuity and demonstrates an increasing preoccupation with a compositional style that favours thematic and motivic development over the contrast generated by the tonal polarity of the eighteenth-century sonata. This is especially true in the works that feature a dissolving consequent, continuation, or A’ section: the dissolution commonly features fragmentation of the primary motive, acceleration of harmonic and surface rhythms, and an increase in surface texture and dynamics.

The use of elided or otherwise merged TRs in the eighteenth century is well documented by Hepokoski and Darcy; Mendelssohn’s sonata-form practice builds upon this convention of his predecessors.26 Hepokoski and Darcy argue that the TR zone is “characterized mostly by dispositional location within a system of generic expectation (where they occur in the exposition; their functional drive to the MC) and by texture (energy-gain)” and argue against the often common expectation that the TR acts as a bridge between keys.27 The authors argue that eighteenth-century composers would have

26. Hepokoski and Darcy’s chapter on the transition opens with a discussion of the difficulties often associated with analyzing the onset of the transition. The majority of the chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the various types of merged TRs, suggesting that this is a common practice for the late-eighteenth-century works they are defining. See Sonata Theory, 93–116.
27. Ibid., 93.
considered the TR more like a set of continuation modules that follow the conclusion of the P-theme, “the upshot of which was to provide the energy-gain needed to produce an effective MC (or, in a continuous exposition, to drive past the point of conversion toward the EEC.)” What is critical for the TR is the “expectation of a normative, rhetorical energy-gain, a passage of rhythmic verve and increased harmonic action, driving toward and finally accomplishing the MC.” Mendelssohn’s expository TRs analyzed in this study consistently perform their expected rhetorical function of energy gain and increased drive toward the moment of MC articulation.

3.3 Mendelssohn’s Secondary Themes

As demonstrated in Table 3-2 above, fifteen of the twenty-four pieces analyzed for this study feature what can be labeled as a new theme for the S-zone. There are numerous cases where material from the P/TR sub-rotation reappears in the S/C sub-rotation, creating a sense of monothematicism despite the clear sense of new theme for S. The analysis of this sample of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works indicates that the harmonic contrast remains—generally, the expected S-space is governed by the appropriate contrasting harmony (the dominant in major-mode sonatas and the relative-major or

28. Ibid.
29. Ibid., 94.
30. See for example the Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2 that features a two-part S-theme, where S1.1 is P-based and S1.2 is TR-based; Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11 where a new theme in the woodwinds is contrasted with TR material in mm. 55–59; the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 that features TR material; Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107 that features a return of TR material in m. 163; and the String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2 that features a return of the TR theme in m. 58.
minor dominant in minor-mode sonatas). From the sample analyzed for this study, only three works produce an S-theme in an unexpected key: The String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12, where the S-theme appears in B♭ minor; Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45, where the S-theme initially begins in D minor; and the Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58, where the S-theme appears in A major. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that the S-theme occurs as a response to the cue given by the articulation of the MC. For them, “S is the most privileged zone of the expositional rotation” because “to S alone is assigned the task of laying down the planks of musical space that lead directly to the EEC (and that are expected to accomplish the corresponding ESC in the recapitulation).” However, Hepokoski and Darcy state that,

here and elsewhere, what we for convenience—and in part out of tradition—refer to as a “theme” indicates only the leading musical idea (usually the initial idea or initial-idea complex) of an expositional zone. “Theme” should not be understood exclusively to connote a melody, much less a self-contained and closed one. Many P-zones (and TR-, S-, and C-zones) begin with characteristic textures rather than melodies in the narrow sense of the term. Furthermore, Mark Richards contends that “ST is not merely a full-fledged theme set in the new key, but rather a theme in the new key that is articulated by one or more reinforcing signals which render that theme perceptible.” Therefore, it is possible to have S-theme rhetoric without actually having a standalone S-theme. Richards argues for a broadened approach to the S-theme coupled with the clarification that we should understand the MC as a process, rather than just a gap in the texture. This allows us to

31. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 117.
32. Ibid., 65n1.
gain an appreciation of how an ST can remain perceptible in the face of such deformations as the lack of a preceding MC gap (an integrated ST) and perhaps of a preparatory phrase-ending chord as well (a spontaneous ST). Moreover, in the music of Beethoven, these deformations were sometimes found to combine with ST processes, creating an entirely different sort of ST than was typically found in late eighteenth-century music.³⁴

The erosion of the MC coupled with the changing processes of the S-theme zone indicates a clear transformation of style occurring within the second part of the expositions of these nineteenth-century sonatas. Carl Dahlhaus observes a similar transformation in Schubert’s music. Discussing the first movement of Schubert’s String Quartet in G Major, D. 887, Dahlhaus notes that,

both the principal and subsidiary groups of the exposition comprise a series of variations. Each variation breaks off more because of the constraint of sonata principles...than because it points beyond itself and pushes ahead to the next “station” of the form. The “periods [Zeiten] of the form,” as August Halm called them, seem to be dissolved into a timelessness: the musical moment extends immeasurably.³⁵

Like his contemporaries, Mendelssohn’s music is not governed by the same generating principles as the music of his predecessors. Larry Todd argues that Mendelssohn’s music acts a mediator between the past and the present:

…[H]is music concerns exploring the continuity of the European musical tradition more than celebrating its rupture…[H]is revival of Bach and Handel—and his attempt to reconcile the classic-romantic dichotomy by overlaying onto richly expressive music the classical attributes of poise, balance, and clarity—has much to do with restoring and preserving, in an age Schumann decried for its philistinism, timeless values drawn from the exemplars of the past.³⁶

---

³⁴. Ibid., 26.
There is a change of governing expository forces from eighteenth- to nineteenth-century sonata forms: tonal polarity between P (tonic) and S (dominant) is being replaced with a sense of tonal pairing or tonal duality. Therefore, instead of P and S being understood as polar opposites, they form a duality, and the themes often share similar motivic material and contour, resulting in the sense of monothematicism in Mendelssohn’s works.

Analysis of this sample of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works reveals an apparent change surrounding the key choice for the S-zone between pre- and post-1825 works. Of the twelve post-1825 works surveyed for this study, almost all have some sort of ambiguity surrounding the second key area. Table 3-8 illustrates that every single S-zone in the post-1825 compositions has some sort of issue with the secondary key, from sections of instability that undermine the confirmation of the new key to out-right defiance of normative key choices for S.

**Table 3-8: The S-themes of the post-1825 Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>S-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18</td>
<td>1826, rev.</td>
<td>m. 80 on: new theme; no EEC; initially in E major, but returns to A major and then becomes F#-minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>mm. 59–76: S-theme grows from the second half of the P-theme (m. 30–32); in E minor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

37. ‘Tonal Pairing’ is understood as the “tendency for nineteenth-century composers to organize extended passages around an interaction between two (usually third-related) tonal centres, as an alternative to the unitary tonal hierarchy of the eighteenth century.” (Peter H. Smith, “Tonal Pairing and Monotonality in Instrumental Forms of Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, and Brahms,” *Music Theory Spectrum* 35, No. 1 (Spring 2013): 77.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>mm. 40–58, S is an exact restatement of P, but in G major (VI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>mm. 59–85: begins firmly in the key of B♭ major with a new theme marked <em>dolce</em>; tonal ambiguity mm. 75–83 where V is finally achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>mm. 138–189; begins in A major; loosely based on slow-intro theme; begin to lose C#s m. 154; running eighth-note figure from TR returns m. 163; fanfare calls in high woodwinds contrasted with descending eighth-note passages. mm. 182–188 lead to PAC in A minor in m. 189.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
<td>1837, rev. 1839</td>
<td>mm. 53–77: S is in G major. MC sets up an arrival of S in B minor but resolves deceptively at the last minute to III; the TR theme returns in m. 58, threatening a return to E minor; G major firmly in charge by m. 66, marked <em>con fuoco</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 3, D Major, Op. 44, No. 1</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>mm. 37–71: Begins with exact restatement of P-theme CBI but in D major; continuation phrase extended and modulates to A major (V); S^{1,2} in mm. 52–71 in the proper key; likely TMB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>S^{1,1}: modulates to B♭ major, the lower strings attempt to bring forward the theme mm. 47–54; S^{1,2} finally fully develops new S-theme beginning in m. 57 in B♭ major but unstable with the immediate tonicization of various other keys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>mm. 61–104: new theme emerges in m. 61 after the end of CF marked <em>con forza</em>; D minor is never stabilized as new tonic, consistently undermined as a dim-7 chord (m. 61, m. 63, etc.); eventually C major is set up but C minor arrives m. 69 using same S-theme; S space tonally unstable; the expected F major is set up mm. 92–94 but it is F minor that actually arrives in m. 94; F major finally achieved in m. 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>S (TM3) enters in cello, new theme marked <em>espressivo</em> and in A major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>S: anacrusis to mm. 67–106, new theme; A major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 49</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>S: anacrusis to mm. 63–95; begins in III E♭ major; m. 91 begins to modulate to G minor; leads to EEC in G minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>S: anacrusis to mm. 54–130; begins firmly in F major; several tonicizations of d minor undermine stability of F major in mm. 103–112; unison descending passage ends on V of A major, which is quietly prolonged mm. 116–121; ascending sequence leads to the securing of dominant of F major m. 127, and finally closes with EEC in F major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>S: mm. 61–88: new lyrical theme in V1 in III A♭ major interrupted in m. 69 by impatient oscillating figure in all parts (save for viola stays station on A♭); section repeats while violin repeatedly tries to bring about cadence; never quite successfully brings about PAC in A♭ major.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All but four produce the EEC in the expected key; however, the path to EEC achievement is not straightforward. One of the most adventurous works is the String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 (1826), which has already been noted several times above for its unusual treatments of form-critical moments. The opening P-TR subsection proceeds normatively and produces a normative $V$:HC MC in m. 76. After four measures of CF a new theme begins to emerge in m. 80, initially in E Major, the first-level default secondary key. S-space lasts a mere twelve measures before a sudden return to A major at m. 92, blocking indefinitely the achievement of the EEC. The situation is not any better in the recapitulation: the ESC is again blocked by a sudden “lights out” moment at m. 337 with the emergence of A minor, as demonstrated in Figure 3-9.  

![Figure 3-8: String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 (1826, rev. 1832), approach to the ESC, mm. 337—356.](image)

Hepokoski and Dary write of the polarity of major versus minor mode: “…on the most general level we refer to major and minor as binary signs of the positive and the negative (light and dark or, colloquially, ‘lights on’ and ‘lights out’).” (*Sonata Theory*, 308). In general, Hepokoski and Darcy use the term “lights out” to describe a moment when the major mode, often suddenly, collapses into the minor mode.
Mendelssohn’s earliest works are student works in that they were composed while following Zelter’s conservative pedagogical approach. These works were supervised by Zelter and likely fulfilled specific pedagogical requirements for his study. While Mendelssohn remained under Zelter’s tutelage for some seven years, his experimentation with form and harmonic language begins to flourish in the mid-1820s. According to Todd,

…when Felix’s lessons concluded in 1826, the prickly musician [Zelter] claimed Felix had “learned everything from him and not yet outgrown his guidance.” Ludwig Berger and A. B. Marx held decidedly different views: in 1822, Berger claimed credit for influencing Felix’s compositional development, while Marx likened Zelter’s role to that of observing a fish swim and then imagining he had somehow instructed the fish to swim.39

While Zelter’s influence can be seen in the young composer’s proclivity for motivic unity (especially across P- and S-themes), it would seem that Mendelssohn’s compositional style was influenced by the Romantic freedom and expression of the nineteenth century. Todd argues elsewhere that “1823 and 1824 mark the beginnings of Mendelssohn’s first serious encounter with Beethoven’s music.”40 Todd’s studies of the Mendelssohn manuscripts reveal a tendency by the young composer to “explore increasingly more complex textures, a line of development that would culminate in the stunning Octet of 1825.”41 He argues that the early string symphonies show Mendelssohn coming to terms with the music of Beethoven’s middle period. But in 1824, Mendelssohn begins to peel

away the strictures of the conservative Classical style, and starts to explore the textures, forms, and styles of the music of his contemporary time:

The spirit of Beethoven informs several instrumental compositions from this year [1824], including the expansive Double Piano Concerto in A-flat major, Viola Sonata in C minor, Piano Sextet in D major op. 110, and Symphony in C minor [No. 1, op. 11] …The works of 1824 reveal Beethoven’s presence in triple *forte* dynamic markings, in passages of massive dominant preparation, in a newly heightened dissonance level, and in sonata-form movements with disproportionately elongated bridges and codas.42

Research suggests that composers such as Schubert, Schumann and Mendelssohn tend to favour the model of the continuous exposition over the two-part exposition. Therefore, the appearance and use of contrapuntal techniques as a compositional tool to generate change and contrast in Mendelssohn’s music is logical, as the continuous exposition favours motivic and thematic development over thematic and harmonic contrast. Vitercik argues that “…the coordination of surface moments in the unfolding harmonic structure—the dramatization of the structure through a specific sequence of surface articulations—is one of the most distinctive characteristics of the classical sonata style.”43

This conception of the Classical sonata style is contrasted with the structures of the Baroque-era forms, which tend to maintain certain textures over the course of the work, rather than following a predictable pattern of structural relationships between events.44

Vitercik argues that the generating principles of the Baroque forms do not allow for the establishment of a defined pattern of events that will unfold across a movement and therefore “do not, in themselves, establish the conditions necessary to determine a

42. Ibid., 12.
44. Ibid., 11.
concluding point.”

Juxtaposed with the Classical sonata style, contrapuntal techniques serve to blur the boundaries between formal units, undermining the thematic and harmonic contrast generally associated with Classical sonata form.

Mendelssohn’s works retain a sense of thematic contrast between P- and S-themes. Hepokoski and Darcy define several different types of S-themes, including the “P-based S-theme” which provide for “an altered emphasis to the idea of a two-part exposition.”

In general, despite beginning with the same material, the P-based S will move on to differing material, especially in the closing section. Nevertheless, there are cases where the S/C space continues to refer to the ordered material of P/TR and Hepokoski and Darcy argue that this results in “the expositional rotation as a whole being conceived as two sub-rotations, or two varied cycles through similar materials.” The idea of the exposition being cast as a cycle of variations has been further developed by Dahlhaus in his analysis of Schubert’s String Quartet in G Major, D. 887 as mentioned above. Dahlhaus links this change in thematic structure to the evolving Romantic aesthetic; these aspects of the Romantic aesthetic will be addressed further in Chapter Four. In all, Mendelssohn’s S-themes retain their purpose of providing the route toward the achievement of the EEC/ESC; at the same time, they increasingly result from a transformed conception of MC-space as discussed above. Since the MC is the harbinger

45. Ibid., 10.
46. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 135.
47. Ibid., 136, emphasis added.
of S, S is undoubtedly affected by the transforming role of the MC in the nineteenth century.

3.4 Conclusion

The analysis of this cross-section of twenty-four of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works demonstrates several key features that comprise Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form. In particular, the analyses undertaken for this dissertation demonstrate four main aspects of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style: 1) a preference for large primary themes; 2) creating continuity through elision and/or “becoming” for the TR-zone and consistent use of caesura-fill which often manifest in issues of formal closure; 3) issues of proportion in the latter half of the exposition (S- and C-space); and 4) the effect of re-composition and compression, especially in the recapitulation. Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style blends the achievements of late-eighteenth century style with the new aesthetic expressiveness of the early-nineteenth century. Chapter Four will further explore the concepts of lyricism and deformation in both the broader context of the early-nineteenth century and for Mendelssohn’s works in particular
Chapter 4

The Transforming Medial Caesura, Recapitulatory Issues, and the Evolving Nineteenth-Century Aesthetic

The preceding chapters have laid the groundwork for Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form. Chapters Two and Three focused on the connections between Mendelssohn’s sonata forms and its Classical predecessors. They also attempted to shed light on the specific areas where Mendelssohn deviated from the norm and began to explore his own innovative aspects within the expectations laid out by the form. Chapter Four will explore these innovations more fully and look specifically at four main features of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works. First, it will explore the evolving role of the MC in the nineteenth century. Building upon the work of Mark Richards first introduced in Chapter Three, I will examine Mendelssohn’s specific treatment of the MC and its effect on the overall sonata narrative within Mendelssohn’s oeuvre. I will explore issues within Mendelssohn’s recapitulation rotations, specifically focusing on re-composition and compression within Mendelssohn’s recapitulations. This chapter will then explore the changing Romantic aesthetic, specifically addressing the issue of lyricism and its role in the transformation of sonata-form style in the nineteenth century. Finally, it will explore Mendelssohn’s use of the minor mode and issues of cyclicity, demonstrating that many of the compositional practices employed by Mendelssohn promote the need for a cyclical multi-movement sonata form as a whole.¹

¹ I use the term ‘cyclical’ here to define works that return material from earlier movements in their finales. While it is not always the case, there are numerous examples of works that leave something ‘unresolved’ in the first movement (Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5 is the locus classicus example of this feature), which demands resolution either within a discursive coda to the movement or in a later movement.
4.1 The Evolving Role of the Medial Caesura

There appeared to be an increasing trend in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century compositional practices favouring greater continuity and connectivity throughout an entire movement, and indeed throughout entire works. Mendelssohn’s compositional style favours thematic and motivic development, a style that Greg Vitercik argues shows “the transfer of the principal organizational impulse from the emphasis on harmonic structure that characterized the Classical sonata style to the thematic process that governs the Romantic sonata.” In Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata, the most common sonata-form generator is tonal dissonance between the P-TR and the S-C subsections of the form. The S-C subsection of the exposition generally appears in a new key and confirms that new key with the EEC setting up an expectation of tonal resolution later in the movement, at the corresponding moment in the recapitulation (ESC).

Hepokoski and Darcy are careful to distinguish a sonata-form’s tonal function from its rhetorical function, stating that,

[an exposition’s] basic tonal plot—moving from an initial tonic to a secondary key, then securing that new key with one or more cadences—constitutes the exposition’s tonal form…Tonal form is to be distinguished from rhetorical form, which includes personalized factors of design and ad hoc expression: modular and textural layout,

entirely. In essence, I am referring to works that resolve materials outside of sonata-space, either in a coda, or in another movement (that may or may not be in sonata form). This includes ‘un-emancipated’ minor modes but also includes the concept of the ‘Exposition vs. Development theme’ first introduced by Benedict Taylor in “Cyclic Form and Musical Memory in Mendelssohn’s String Quartet in E Major, Op. 12,” in Mendelssohn Perspectives, ed. Nicole Grimes and Angela Mace, 249–265 (Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2012).


3. Hepokoski and Darcy are opposed to the concept of the “sonata principle” as developed by Edward T. Cone in Musical Form and Musical Performance (New York: Norton, 1968). This will be discussed below in section 4.2.
selection and arrangement of musical topics, varieties of structural punctuation, and so on.\textsuperscript{4}

The rhetorical form becomes the referential layout for the sonata rotations; it is laid out by the exposition with the expectation that the development and recapitulation will follow this referential layout. While separate, the tonal and rhetorical forms are intimately intertwined.

While tonal dissonance and polarity are certainly not the only choice for a sonata-form generator, it nevertheless forms the backbone of Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form and, to some extent, demands the division of the two-part exposition.\textsuperscript{5} As described in Chapter Three, section 3.2, while many do, TRs do not carry a generic expectation to modulate. More importantly, the TR serves as a continuation of the initial P, and the main purpose is that of energy gain that drives toward the MC.\textsuperscript{6} The MC is the defining feature of a two-part exposition; Hepokoski and Darcy write “the \textit{medial caesura} is the brief, rhetorically reinforced break or gap that serves to divide an exposition into two parts, \textit{tonic and dominant}…”\textsuperscript{7}

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{4} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Sonata Theory}, 23.
\textsuperscript{5} See, for example, Hepokoski and Darcy’s own conception of the continuous exposition, \textit{Sonata Theory}, 51–64.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 93.
\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 24, emphasis added.
\end{flushright}
Recent scholarship has concluded that, starting with the late works of Beethoven, there is a general trend toward obfuscation of the articulation of the MC. Rather than a generating principle of thematic polarity that tends to define eighteenth-century sonata forms, nineteenth-century sonata forms favour tonal pairing, which results in an overall sense of formal continuity. Smith argues that “tonal pairing plays a vital role in [Schumann’s] continuous expositions, and one could say that pairing and formal continuity interact at the heart of their forms.” The obfuscation of the MC is a result of this shifting harmonic practice and transfers the generating opposition from P/S themes to the larger-scale exposition and development, an idea further discussed later in this chapter.

In the analyses of these twenty-four works from Mendelssohn’s sonata-form repertoire, it has become clear that continuation is of the utmost importance. As demonstrated by the
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analyses in Chapter Three, all but one work feature a non-stop flow of musical action from the moment they begin right up to, and beyond, the moment of MC. Twenty-one works from the analyzed sample feature some sort of caesura-fill, eighteen of which elide or otherwise obscure the expected rhetorical MC break. In many cases, the analyst is initially deceived into believing that these works are continuous expositions in nature. The MC proper is not necessarily the moment of half-cadence arrival: “…the moment of the MC proper—the articulation of the gap—is frequently not literally identical with the moment of the half-cadence arrival…” Hepokoski and Darcy acknowledge that the MC is part of a process; nevertheless, they are quite clear that the moment of the actual attenuation of the MC is equated with a literal gap, however brief, in the music.

Mark Richards notes a gradual and continuous process of MC erosion throughout Beethoven’s compositional oeuvre in sonata form. Richards traces Beethoven’s MC articulation throughout his compositional career and indicates that there is a “gradual shift in preference from crystal clear MCs to those in which its articulation is so obscured that, in most cases, the S-zone appears without any kind of punctuated preparation that was a staple of late-eighteenth-century style.” Richards concludes that the techniques used to obscure the MC in these works are an attempt to increase the connectivity between the transition and the secondary theme, signaling a transformation in Beethoven’s compositional style that favours a more continuous type of musical motion.

and greater connectivity.\textsuperscript{12} He is clear, however, that Beethoven is transforming the normative Classical two-part exposition and not shifting to the continuous exposition which he argues “would be at odds with the strong Classical preference for the two-part type…”\textsuperscript{13} This sample of Mendelssohn’s works does not indicate a clear trajectory of MC transformation like Richards’ analysis of Beethoven’s works; it does, however, indicate that Mendelssohn’s approach to the MC remained flexible over the course of his compositional career.

Analysis of this sample of works also suggests that Mendelssohn, unlike Beethoven, was more inclined to merge aspects of the two-part and continuous exposition, a practice which could be labelled a \textit{hybrid exposition} The hybrid exposition is my own term, coined to describe the phenomenon exemplified in many of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works that merge aspects of both the continuous and the two-part exposition. In order to affect a strong sense of continuation, Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works tend to progress through an almost FS-like unfolding of the exposition. His sonata-form movements often give the illusion of being monothematic, creating a sense of thematic variation throughout the exposition rather than a clear separation between P and S themes. His sonata forms also undermine strong harmonic closure at every turn.

Vitercik chronicles various examples of the undermining of harmonic closure by thematic development in Mendelssohn’s works, arguing that this “represents a significant attempt

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[12.] Ibid., 192. Richards argues further that the enhanced connectivity makes the approach and emergence of S far less predictable, allowing for a sense of spontaneity and improvisation in Beethoven’s later works.
\item[13.] Ibid., 167–68 n13.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
to bridge the gap between formalism and the dynamic essence of form.” Evasion of a crucial structural articulation “is characteristic of Mendelssohn’s later style [and] the transformation is rooted in the nature of the theme itself.”¹⁴ Evasion of structural articulation is certainly true for the space between P and TR; it is not, however, true for the moment of the MC. Richards’ description of the process of obscuring the MC is more apt; Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works align with the work of his contemporaries in that they increasingly blend components of the two-part and continuous exposition.

Although Richards argues against the migration from two-part to continuous expositions in Beethoven’s works, it appears that Mendelssohn’s sonata forms are undeniably influenced by the continuous exposition, and that he is preoccupied with perpetuating a sense of endless continuation. It has been noted above that this is also a trend of Schumann’s sonata forms, and a comparable transformation of style has been noted by Poundie Burstein in the music of Schubert. Burstein argues that lyricism in Schubert’s music results not necessarily from melodiousness, but from the way Schubert handles harmonic and thematic development:

The procedure seen [in Schubert’s Quartet for Strings in G Major, Op. 161, D. 887] is unlike those in typical motivic developments, in which themes tend to shorten. Motivic development through thematic fragmentation forms the prototype of that associated with masters of the classical era—especially Beethoven…there is no reason why fragmentation should be considered essential to development. Schubert’s lyrical method of exploring the inner workings of themes by developing them through expansion is no less logical a procedure.¹⁵

For composers like Schumann, Schubert, and Mendelssohn, expansion and continuous unfolding become the prototypes for their sonata-form compositional practice, one that “shows a desire to realize harmonic goals in a lyrical, nonaggressive fashion.” The concept of lyricism and its effect on the nineteenth-century approach to sonata style will be addressed later in section 4.3 of this chapter.

Mendelssohn’s compositional practice is so commonly compared and contrasted with Beethoven’s that it has become ingrained as an aesthetic benchmark for his works. The pitfall is that other approaches to sonata-form are overlooked. Hepokoski and Darcy indicate that the continuous exposition appears frequently in the sonata-form practice of Haydn. Smith argues that many critics of Schumann’s works often fail to see that “Schumann might be engaging another expository type entirely...[he] is exploiting the thematic and tonal possibilities of a Haydenesque continuous exposition.”

Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works appear to favour thematic and motivic development over the introduction and resolution of a large-scale dissonance created by the usual driving force of tonal polarity of eighteenth-century sonata forms. This suggests a change in the generating principles of the form, which were discussed in detail in Chapter Three. Mendelssohn is thus developing a similar model to Schumann’s, establishing a sonata

16. Ibid., 54. He is specifically referring to Schubert’s use of harmonic promissory notes and arguing that Schubert is avoiding the unrelenting harmonic drive to cadential goals common in late-eighteenth-century sonata-form works. Nevertheless, his comments apply to the more lyrical and continuous approach to sonata form noted in the work of Schumann, Schubert, and Mendelssohn as described above.

17. See Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 51–64 where two of the three musical examples are Haydn, and where almost all of the in-line examples are Haydn’s works.

form that favours continuation and interconnectedness over P- and S-theme polarity and resolution.

4.2 Recomposition and Compression in Mendelssohn’s Recapitulations

Mendelssohn’s recapitulations begin with the opposite situation than what is found in the exposition. Whereas Mendelssohn heavily favours more large-scale P-themes in the exposition, compression of these large expansive P-themes in the recapitulation occurs to some degree in seventeen out of the twenty-four works analyzed in this study, as shown in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1: P-themes in the Recapitulations of Analyzed Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulatory P-themes</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Exact Correspondence to Exposition | 7 | 1) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105  
2) Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24  
3) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
4) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6  
5) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107  
6) String Quartet No. 3 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
7) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1 |
| Truncated/Compressed/Merged with TR | 13 | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
2) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
3) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
4) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18  
5) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13  
6) Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106 |
Hepokoski and Darcy define the recapitulation as follows:

…the term recapitulation…suggests a postdevelopmental [sic] recycling of all or most of the expositional materials, beginning again with the module that had launched the exposition…Normally, the initiatory P¹ module of the recapitulation replicates the exposition’s opening key, mood, and sound. This reinforces the idea of a new start after the harmonic interruption typically found at the end of a development…Whatever its local variants…, the recapitulation provides another complete rotation through the action-zone layout initially set forth in the exposition (P TR ’ S / C).¹⁹

Mendelssohn’s recapitulations are anything but a straightforward reprise of the materials from the exposition; only seven of the twenty-four works surveyed correspond exactly to the exposition. Mendelssohn returns only the most fundamental aspect of the P themes required to initiate the recapitulation rotation before diving head-first into TR material. In some cases, Mendelssohn omits the TR material altogether, creating an even stronger
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sense of forward-driven motion. Table 4-2 demonstrates how each section of the recapitulation corresponds with its own counterpart in the exposition. Of important note is the fact that the closing zone is the one action space that receives the most consistent treatment in the recapitulation: fully two-thirds of this sample have a C-zone that corresponds exactly or almost-exactly with the C-zone of the exposition. Only one quarter of the P-zones correspond exactly with the exposition: most present the opening phrase of P—just enough to reintroduce the basic idea of the work—before moving on to TR or other material (see Table 4-2).

Table 4-2: Comparison of Each Action Zone in the Recapitulation to its Expositional Counterpart

a) The Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulatory TR characteristics</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Normative (with slight recompositions or truncations) | 8 | 1) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105  
2) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4  
3) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
4) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11  
5) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
6) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6  
7) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1  
8) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 |
| Merged with P or part of P | 11 | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
2) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
4) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
5) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13  
6) Sonata in Bb Major, Op. 106  
7) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
8) String Quartet No. 5 in Eb Major, Op. 44, No. 3 |
b) The *Medial Caesura*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulatory MC characteristics</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Over/No MC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Key (tonic minor)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong Key (MC in vi)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal MC (PAC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The Secondary Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulatory S-theme characteristics</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Exact or almost-exact correspondence to exposition | 11 | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
2) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105  
4) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
5) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13  
6) String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12  
7) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3  
8) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45  
9) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58  
10) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87  
11) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 |
| Recomposed/Truncated | 9 | 1) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
2) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4  
3) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
4) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
5) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107  
6) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
7) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1  
8) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45  
9) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 |
<p>| Major Deformation: PAC in the wrong key | 1 | 1) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11 |
| Major Deformation: Return of P material | 1 | 1) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Deformation:</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“lights out”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No S-theme at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2) Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**d) The ESCs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ESCs</th>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative but IAC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC in minor key</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC in major (tonic is minor)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC in minor (tonic is major)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC Blocked</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1) Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ESC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recapitulatory C-zone characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number from Analyzed Sample</th>
<th>List of Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Corresponds exactly/almost exactly to exposition** | 15 | 1) Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7  
2) Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105  
3) Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4  
5) Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14  
6) Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110  
7) Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6  
8) String Quartet in A Major, Op. 13  
9) Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106  
10) String Quartet in E♭ Major, Op. 12  
11) String Quartet No. 4 in E Minor, Op. 44, No. 2  
12) String Quartet No. 3 in D Major, Op. 44, No. 1  
13) Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58  
14) String Quintet No. 2 in B♭ Major, Op. 87  
15) String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80 |
| **Recomposed/Extended** | 4 | 1) String Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1  
2) Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2  
3) String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3  
4) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 |
| **Written Over/Other changes** | 2 | 1) Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45  
2) Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 |
| **No C-zone** | 2 | 1) String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18  
2) Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107 |
| **Wrong Key (result of blocked ESC)** | 1 | 2) Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 |

A majority of the events in the latter half of the recapitulations tend to correspond with the exposition, with only two works introducing a new, significant formal deformation at
the moment of the ESC. A significant number of TRs are either merged with the opening incipit of the P-theme or are completely left out of the recapitulation rotation, suggesting that the desire to progress through the form is more critical in the recapitulation.

Omitting portions of the exposition in the recapitulation rotation seems counterintuitive to the general definition of a recapitulation as a reprise of material stated earlier. While Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition clearly states that the recapitulation is understood as another rotation through the exposition’s action-zone layout (P TR’ S / C), they do not require that all materials return. What is form-critical is the achievement of the ESC in the tonic. Hepokoski and Darcy are patently opposed to the use of the term “sonata principle” as developed by Edward T. Cone. In summary, Cone’s argument is that any material that appears off-tonic in the exposition must return in the tonic at some point before the movement is over. Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata form requires the attainment of the ESC which, by definition, must appear in the tonic in order to successfully close the sonata as a whole. This privileges the S-zone and makes S an active agent for securing the ESC: “because of S’s role in driving toward the EEC and ESC (S is active, not inert), the obligation for tonal resolution applies most strongly here—and to the later modules of S more than to the earlier modules.”

20. These works include Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11 and the String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12. The deformations at the moment of the ESC in the Piano Trio no. 2 in C Minor, Op. 49, the Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation,’ D Major, op. 107, and the String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18 all had significant deformational issues with their EECs, which predicted the problems to come with the ESC.

21. Hepokoski and Darcy discuss their numerous objections to this idea in Sonata Theory on pp. 242–245.

22. Ibid., 243.
and Darcy’s theory of sonata form, there is no other formal requirement for the recapitulation.

As discussed above in Chapter Three, Mendelssohn favours elided and merged TRs in his expositions. He takes this standard practice a step further in the recapitulations, where he tends to suppress the concluding cadence of the P-zone by merging the conclusion of the opening phrase of P with the onset of TR in eleven of the works from this representative group of twenty-four sonatas. Furthermore, TR is completely omitted or otherwise written-over in the recapitulations of five of the twenty-four works: String Quintet in A Major, Op. 18; String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12; Symphony No. 5 ‘Reformation’ in D Major, Op. 107; Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 49; and Cello Sonata No. 2 in D Major, Op. 45. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that the recapitulatory TR is “the freest available spot for compositional craft and modification within a recapitulation…” In these instances the music seems to be rushing to get to the MC and on into S-space. As argued above, Mendelssohn returns only the shortest amount of the P-theme necessary to initiate the recapitulation rotation. For example, in the Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7 (1820) shown in Figure 4-2 below, the P-theme in the exposition was a sixteen-measure compound period that was elided with the TR. In the recapitulation, the P-theme returns with a restatement of the presentation phrase of the grand antecedent only, and the CONT⇒TR. Mendelssohn repeats only the most critical

23. Ibid., 235.
portion of the P-theme, the repeated basic idea, before charging forward into the CONT⇒TR.

Figure 4-2: Violin Sonata in F Major, MWVQ 7 (1820), mm.60—70.
Once again, in the String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 (1838) shown in Figure 4-3, only the opening phrase of the grand antecedent is repeated in the recapitulation, before the P-theme becomes the TR. In the exposition, the P-theme was presented as a thirty-two-measure compound period with an extended consequent phrase. The original melody for P in the exposition was in Violin 1; but in the recapitulation, the melody is in Violin 2. The addition of new ornamental material added by the first violin further obscures the onset of the recapitulation.

Figure 4-3: String Quartet No. 5 in E♭ Major, Op. 44, No. 3 (1838), mm. 203—221.
The same type of idiosyncratic approach to the onset of the recapitulation has been noted by Hepokoski and Darcy in the work of Haydn. They write,

While Haydn’s recapitulations almost always retain an underlying, readily traceable principle of rotation, their local details of are [sic] often substantially recomposed, with a penchant for remaining doggedly original all the way to the end. This principle of through-composition also resonates with eighteenth-century scientific conceptions of vitalism…Metaphorically, Haydn may be suggesting…that the task of the composer facing such self-willed vitalistic (musical) particles is to trim and shape their innate tendency toward unstoppable growth and self-mutation, to make certain that their compulsively generative sproutings (Fortspinnungen) do not lead the work into blind alleys or counter-generic directions…Sometimes Haydn will begin each recapitulatory zone with enough of an incipit to recall the corresponding zone of the exposition..., then significantly rework the material of that zone.24

Hepokoski and Darcy remark that Haydn’s treatment of his recapitulations is abnormal in the eighteenth-century, and since their study is largely focused on the late-eighteenth century sonata practice, they say little about the use of these strategies in the nineteenth century. Todd’s research into Mendelssohn’s musical education reveals that Mendelssohn studied Haydn’s music intently;25 therefore, it is appropriate to consider Haydn’s sonata forms as a viable model for Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form.

The consistent compression of the recapitulation rotation invites further interpretation. As stated above, Dahlhaus argues that Schubert often treats the exposition like a set of variations, expanding and extending the primary theme, rather than focusing solely on goal-directedness and cadential fulfilment.26 The idea of the exposition as a set of variations works relatively well for Mendelssohn’s expositions; however, the continued

compression and omission of subsections in the recapitulation suggests a shift in aesthetic values, placing more emphasis on the articulation of the MC and ESC than previously existed in the exposition. Nevertheless, this tension exists, to a lesser extent, within the expositions: the all-consuming desire for continuation that dominates these expositions, which suggests a keen desire for goal-directedness more common with late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century formal structures, is juxtaposed with an unrelenting sense of monothematicism and tightly controlled thematic material, due in part to the use of contrapuntal and variation techniques, more commonly found in Baroque and early-Classical works. As noted above, Todd has argued that Mendelssohn acts as a mediator between the past and the present, writing the rich music of the nineteenth century within the confines of the Classically structured eighteenth-century sonata form. The dichotomy between the techniques used in the expositions and the recapitulations of these works is but one example of the tension between past and present found within Mendelssohn’s works.

4.3 Lyricism and the Changing Romantic Aesthetic

Lyricism is one of the most common adjectives used to describe music that is said to be in the “Romantic” style, and many authors employ the term without much critical consideration. It is used by Vitercik, among others, as an aesthetic standard for composition. For example, Vitercik, in comparing Mendelssohn’s String Quartet in A Minor, Op. 13 to Beethoven’s Quartet in F Minor, Op. 95 says that “Mendelssohn has recreated the gestures of Op. 95 [lyrical theme and chromatic fugue] with awesome skill, but the confrontation between lyricism and fugue has been drained of both the structural
and emotional significance it has in his model.” 27 This is a remarkable claim and throws into relief the trouble with the term lyricism.

As it stands in Vitercik’s statement, ‘lyricism’ and ‘fugue’ must be considered comparable if they can be brought into a confrontation. A fugue is a compositional process with clearly defined rules and procedures. This is not the case for lyricism. Definitions of lyricism invoke ideas such as this one from the Cambridge Dictionary: “the beautiful expression of personal thoughts and feelings in writing or music,” or this definition from the Merriam-Webster Dictionary: “a quality that expresses deep feelings or emotions in a work of art: an artistically beautiful or expressive quality; an intense personal quality expressive of feeling or emotion in an art (as poetry or music).” 28 These definitions rely upon subjective features of lyricism—note the repeated use of the words “expressive” and “quality” within the definitions. Very little has been said about how these qualities objectively manifest in music. The subjective qualities often attributed to the term lyricism make statements like the following troubling: “The first movement is shaped by a lyricism that is surprisingly uncommon in these early works…What is remarkable in this work is that the lyric impulse provides the basis for the formal organization of the movement.” 29 The idea that ‘lyricism’ can shape an entire movement is concerning: Vitercik is making a large generalization about Mendelssohn’s works using a term that does not seem to be satisfactorily defined. Vitercik goes on to discuss


how Mendelssohn’s manipulations of thematic content and the tonic-subdominant relationship shape “every level of structure—from the harmonic organization of themes to the largest structural processes of entire movements [of Op. 12]…”

It stands to reason, then, that Vitercik equates the lyric impulse with cyclical procedures.

Lyricism is often associated with the music of Schubert. Su Yin Mak observes a similar disjunction between the term lyricism and its use in academic literature on Schubert. Invoking Adorno, Mak endeavors to develop a definition of lyricism in music that intertwines the subjective aspects mentioned above with concrete musical characteristics. She writes that,

the notion of lyrical form draws upon two related sets of compositional features conventionally associated with song. The first, roughly synonymous with ‘cantabile,’ refers to style: the words ‘lyric’ or ‘lyrical’ describe melodies in moderate tempo with relatively even note values, regular phrasing, and simple chordal accompaniment. The second refers to the closed binary or ternary designs often designated as ‘song form,’ a term that originated in A. B. Marx’s Formenlehre…Here, ‘song’ does not refer to actual vocal music but to an idealized abstraction. Marx’s Liedsätze are small closed forms with balanced phrasing, symmetrical periods, and cadential parallelism, supposed formal features of folk song.

Mak goes on to speculate “to what extent might the lyric constitute an alternative to drama as a sui generis discursive paradigm for the Classical sonata?” She argues that Schenker implies an association between lyricism and the elements of structure and that this idea is further developed by his student Felix Salzer who “correlates lyricism with a

30. Ibid., 276.
32. Ibid., 265.
tendency toward self-contained expansiveness, repetition, and sectional subdivision” and argues that the lyrical idea expresses specific emotions that the artist wishes to capture.\textsuperscript{33}

After an in-depth discussion of lyric poetry and grammar, Mak links Koch’s description of phrase expansion techniques to the concept of hypotaxis in rhetoric. Hypotaxis refers to the subordination of one clause to another that still preserves a logical, causal, or temporal connection to one another. Mak argues that “there are close correspondences between the concept of hypotaxis and Koch’s discussion of phrase expansion techniques, which illustrates the various ways in which the extended discourse of a large-scale movement may be derived from a basic periodic structure.”\textsuperscript{34} She goes on to argue that,\textit{\begin{quote}
Koch’s emphasis on tonal function of his principal periods suggests that the connections between the sections of sonata form are also hypotactic…In sonata form, then, the principle of hypotaxis is conceptually extended to refer to form as well as style, so that it dictates not only local syntax but also hierarchical subordination and functional interdependence in large-scale tonal structure.\textsuperscript{35}
\end{quote}}

Through a comparison of epic and lyric poetry, Mak attempts to clarify Carl Dahlhaus’ remark that Schubert has a lyric-epic approach to sonata form:

\textit{\begin{quote}
Theme and variation exhibits the same patterns of repetition, parallelism, and additive construction as the epic, and what is repeated are the small closed forms that have long been associated with lyricism in the analytical tradition…The epic is long, relatively objective, and communal, whereas the lyric is brief, subjective, and personal. Moreover, the former is narrative by definition, while the latter represents timeless moments—images, emotions, thoughts, situations. This distinction is crucial…for it brings to the fore the issue of temporality in Schubert’s extended sonata form discourse.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}}

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 266.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 275.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 278.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 286.
Parataxis, on the other hand, is defined as the use of coordinating, rather than subordinating, clauses. Furthermore, parataxis can often imply the juxtaposition of two starkly contrasted images or ideas. Mak argues that parataxis is the deliberate omission of connections between phrases, and the concept “provides the technical link between Schubert’s instrumental practice and the discursive strategies of poetry.” All of this has important implications for Mendelssohn’s sonata practice. It has been argued throughout this dissertation that changing aesthetic aspects of the Romantic consciousness necessitate a transformation of the genre-generating oppositions present in Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. Rather than the forward-driving, goal-oriented forms of the generation before, where the attenuation of the formal processes was of the utmost importance, Mendelssohn’s music is an example of the inversion of this ideal, where content is now superior to form. I have argued that much of Mendelssohn’s music retains a sense of pseudo-monothematicism through tightly controlled motivic material and motivic development and also contend that the erosion of the MC leads to an evolution of sonata-form style that underpins the transformation of the generating principle opposition from thematic contrast (P versus S) to the larger-scale contrast between formal units (exposition versus development) first noted by Benedict Taylor in his analysis of Mendelssohn’s String Quartet in Eb Major, Op. 12. 

37. Ibid., 286.
Recent research into form-function mergers, initially addressed in Chapter Three of this dissertation, is focused on the erosion and obfuscation of the MC across Beethoven’s compositional career. As was argued earlier, Mark Richards’ work demonstrates that Beethoven’s treatment of the MC shifts from preferring a clear articulation of the MC to a completely obscured MC over the course of his compositional output. Richards also argues that this shift transforms the normative Classical two-part exposition, rather than creating a model based on a continuous exposition. This position holds true for Beethoven’s treatment of the MC, but not for Mendelssohn’s. Mendelssohn’s treatment of the MC, and the exposition as a whole, appears to favour the model of the continuous exposition, while at the same time, retaining the defining feature of the two-part exposition, namely the articulation of the MC. Of the twenty-four works analyzed for this study, only one, the Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106, features a true continuous exposition, completely devoid of any sense of MC articulation. The other twenty-three works feature an MC; but the clarity of articulation becomes increasingly obscured over time. Only three of these twenty-three works feature no CF at all: the Violin Sonata in F Major, MWV Q7 (1820), the Overture for Wind Instruments in C Major, Op. 24 (1824), and the Piano Sextet in D Major, Op. 110 (1824). Of important note is that none of the works post-1824 feature a clear-cut MC that includes the literal rhetorical gap so common in the Classical sonata form.

As was discussed above in Chapter Three, Richards argues for a broader understanding of the MC, suggesting that the MC should be understood as a process, rather than just being

defined by the literal gap in the texture. In the case of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms, this broadened definition of the MC offers an explanation for the clear sense of an S-theme in almost all of the twenty-four works analyzed, despite the absence of the literal MC-gap in twenty of the twenty-four works.\textsuperscript{40} It was argued at the outset of this chapter that Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works feature what I have described as a \textit{hybrid exposition}. This term is intended to capture the unique treatment of the sonata exposition demonstrated by Mendelssohn, and to explain the phenomenon exemplified in many of the works analyzed for this dissertation that merge aspects of both the continuous and two-part exposition.

Saltzer’s definition of lyricism as a tendency toward self-contained expansiveness, repetition, and sectional subdivision, has proven a useful tool for Mendelssohn’s works. Saltzer observes that “the lyrical idea is the expression of a specific emotion that the artist wants to capture and, above all, to shape artistically. This desire to capture the emotion means that each lyrically determined idea has the tendency to expand itself and especially develop itself further by \textit{repeating the same group of motives}.”\textsuperscript{41} Thus perhaps Mendelssohn’s tendency toward pseudo-monothematic, continuous expositions stems from a change in the early-Romantic aesthetic which favoured expressive themes over tightly constructed Classical themes.

\textsuperscript{40} As mentioned above, only one of the twenty-four works analyzed features a true continuous exposition, and is thus not included in the number of works that do not include a literal gap.

Mak argues that Schubert’s cantabile style functions as a musical topic, representing the idea of song: “Schubert’s cantabile themes signal the lyric not only because they are sentimental and beautiful, but also because they are often deliberately set apart from the hypotactic norms of the Classical sonata style.”\footnote{42} Moreover, the lyric-epic is said to be exemplified by Schubert’s phrase construction: “its diffuse nature negates the teleological impulse of normative sonata rhetoric and dislocates the second theme from the symphonic rhetoric of the opening.”\footnote{43} It seems plausible that Mendelssohn’s concept of form in his post-1825 compositions begins to follow a similar trajectory, since these pieces exemplify less of a teleological drive to essential caesuras and closures.

In the case of sonata form, the clauses must be understood as the P- and S-themes; even more specifically, the tonalities of these two themes. Ultimately, the S-theme becomes tonally subordinate to the P-theme’s tonic, since the formal function of the S-theme is to bring about the ESC in the tonic. But what happens to this subordination if the conflict between the P- and S-theme no longer exists? Conceivably, composers such as Schubert and Mendelssohn are subverting the hypotactic structure of the Classical sonata form, preferring instead a paratactic structure that coordinates and juxtaposes elements, rather than one becoming subordinate to another. There seems to be a tendency in Mendelssohn’s music to avoid strong cadential closure of a clear majority of his formal units. At the same time, Mendelssohn maintains the tonal contrast—generally, the expected S-space is governed by the appropriate contrasting harmony (the dominant in

\footnote{42. Mak, “Schubert’s Sonata Forms,” 294.}
\footnote{43. Ibid., 300.}
major-mode sonatas and the relative-major or minor dominant in minor-mode sonatas).

What is missing in many cases is a clear sense of an entirely new theme for S. Mendelssohn’s works both retain and subvert the hypotactic nature of the Classical sonata form. He retains the hypotactic impulse by maintaining the sense of harmonic contrast between P-theme and S-theme zones; he subverts the impulse by avoiding clearly articulated S-themes. Thus, unlike Schubert, Mendelssohn does not seem willing to dismiss the hypotactic nature of the form in favour of a paratactic structure, but neither is he willing to accept the fully hypotactic nature of the Classical model. As such, Mendelssohn once again merges aspects of both eighteenth and nineteenth century sonata-form style. Mak argues that “the lyric is an alternative to the external reality epitomized by the hypotactic norms of the Classical sonata style.” She concludes that “in evoking the lyric in the sonata, that quintessentially hypotactic classical form, Schubert…secures a place for the poetic imagination in instrumental music.” It is my belief that Mendelssohn is exploring the new Romantic aesthetic in much the same way.

4.4 The Minor Mode and the Issue of Form-as-Cyclical in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms

Hepokoski and Darcy argue that sonatas in the minor mode have an extra burden placed on them, since they alone are capable of transforming the initial minor-mode into the tonic major, usually at or around the ESC. They argue that minor-mode sonatas are

44. Ibid., 300.
45. Ibid., 305.
46. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 306.
“generally interpretable within the sonata tradition as a sign of a troubled condition seeking transformation (emancipation) into the parallel major mode.”

It is possible that nineteenth-century works demand a different interpretation of this position. From the analyzed sample used as the basis for this dissertation, ten of the twenty-four works are in the minor mode. Table 4-3 lists these works, the key for the secondary theme zone as confirmed by the EEC, and the tonality at the moment of the ESC.

Table 4-3: Minor-Mode Sonatas from the Analyzed Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>MC Type</th>
<th>Secondary Key as confirmed by EEC</th>
<th>ESC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: B♭ major</td>
<td>PAC in G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 1</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: E♭ major</td>
<td>PAC in C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Sonata in F Minor, Op. 4</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: A♭ major</td>
<td>PAC in F minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet No. 2 in F Minor, Op. 2</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: A♭ major</td>
<td>IAC in F minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony No. 1 in C Minor, Op. 11</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: E♭ major</td>
<td>Blocked; no ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola Sonata in C Minor, MWV Q14</td>
<td>v: HC MC</td>
<td>v: HC MC but leads to III E♭ major</td>
<td>PAC in C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 4 in E minor, Op. 44, No. 2</td>
<td>v: HC MC</td>
<td>V: HC MC but leads to III G major</td>
<td>IAC in E minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piano Trio No. 1 in D Minor, Op. 58</th>
<th>1) i: HC MC</th>
<th>TMB: second MC leads to V: A major</th>
<th>PAC in D major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) V: HC MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: E♭ major</td>
<td>No ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet No. 6 in F Minor, Op. 80</td>
<td>III: HC MC</td>
<td>III: A♭ major</td>
<td>IAC in F major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the chart demonstrates, only three of the ten sonatas actually emancipate the minor mode at the end of the work within sonata-space. In several cases, the achievement of the minor mode is set up by the drive to the ESC, only to be hindered by the achievement of the ESC in the minor mode. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to look at the rest of the movements from these sonatas. However, as was intimated at the beginning of this chapter, there appears to be an increasing trend in Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works toward the use of compositional devices that demand the need for cyclical works; the use of the un-resolved minor mode is yet another example.

It is possible that the need to emancipate the work from the minor mode was not an aesthetic priority in nineteenth-century works. As was noted in Chapter Two, Dahlhaus links the change in thematic structure in Schubert’s music to the evolving Romantic aesthetic, which he argues tends to look backward in remembrance, rather than pushing ahead toward each structural goal.48 In a discussion of the first movement of Schubert’s String Quartet in G Major, D. 887, Dahlhaus argues that,

the connection between [P and S] themes seems to derive not from the principal idea, whose structure determines that of the subsidiary theme…but rather from the subsidiary theme itself, which seizes upon a train of the principal idea like a reminiscence. In Schubert, unlike in Beethoven, the most lasting impression is made by remembrance, which turns from later events back to earlier ones, and not by goal-consciousness, which presses on from earlier to later.49

Dahlhaus’s essential argument is that, for Schubert, the relationship between the P- and S-themes is altered from that of the Classical sonata form. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that the S-theme “strides onto the stage through the doorway opened by the medial caesura.”50 S is literally conceived as a response to the P-TR sub-rotation. Dahlhaus argues that, in Schubert’s sonata-form works, S acts as a remembrance, latching on to one particular facet of the primary theme and holding on, thus eroding the usual genre-generating force of the sonata form: the conflict between the P and S theme.

This erosion of the P/S conflict has been noted by other critics; specifically Benedict Taylor, who argues that the usual generating force of opposition between the P- and S-themes is replaced by an opposition between an exposition theme and a development theme in several of Mendelssohn’s works.51 This deformation elevates the fundamental structural opposition to a higher hierarchical level: between the exposition and the development, which “splits the shell of the sonata template down the middle” and becomes a “relationship which will have to be worked out at the larger level of the recapitulation and coda, and at the broadest level across the whole work.”52 Taylor argues

49. Ibid., 8.
50. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 117.
51. Taylor, “Cyclic Form,” 256.
52. Ibid.
that the development theme is left unresolved in the opening movement of Mendelssohn’s String Quartet No. 1 in Eb Major, Op. 12, which generates a need for cyclical procedures in the following movements such that the development theme is finally resolved in the finale. Such a deformation will necessarily have an impact on the overall sonata narrative. As has been argued earlier in this dissertation, changing aesthetic aspects of the Romantic consciousness necessitate this transformation of genre-generating oppositions. Rather than the forward-driving, goal-oriented forms of the generation before, where the attenuation of the formal processes was of the utmost importance, Mendelssohn’s music is an example of the inversion of this ideal, where content is now superior to form. Dahlhaus’s conceptualization of Schubert’s themes as a set of variations is a useful tool for explaining the consistent feeling that many of Mendelssohn’s works are pseudo-monothematically; it would seem that Mendelssohn is experimenting with a similar approach to thematic construction in many of the sonata-form works analyzed for this dissertation.

A more in-depth analysis of Mendelssohn’s use of cyclical multi-movement sonata forms will have to be saved for another study. However, it would seem that several compositional devices favoured by Mendelssohn allow for the expansion of the cyclical connections across the entire multi-movement work. In particular, Mendelssohn’s use of the minor mode, which, in the majority of cases, is left unresolved in the first movement, and the elevation of the genre-generating conflict to the structural level of the exposition/development, as indicated by Taylor’s analysis above, which necessitates resolution in the coda or in later movements. Both these practices require resolution, at least at the level of the expectation of the listener. An interesting study could be made of
Mendelssohn’s treatment of these situations, either in the codas or across the work as a whole.

4.5 Conclusion

It is clear that the tradition of the Classical sonata style underwent significant stylistic growth during the early years of the nineteenth century. This chapter, and the ones preceding it, have attempted to demonstrate that Mendelssohn’s compositional practice in the sonata-form style is on the forefront of that evolution. While perhaps not a style revolutionist à la Beethoven, Mendelssohn’s subtle, yet consistent, transformation of the sonata style is, I believe, an important link in the development of the Romantic sonata style. Chapter Five will demonstrate these subtle changes and compositional techniques through analyses of four representative works in sonata form from Mendelssohn’s oeuvre.
Chapter 5

5 Analytical Case Studies

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Mendelssohn’s sonata form practice reflected its Classical model while simultaneously developing his own sense of sonata form practice. The analytical case studies that follow aim to demonstrate the theory of Mendelssohn’s sonata practice developed in the previous chapters through analyses of several works spanning Mendelssohn’s compositional career. Included with these works are two piano sonatas: the Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 (1821) and the Piano Sonata in E major, Op. 6 (1825), both written while Beethoven was still alive. The Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6, has clear associations with Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A major, Op. 101 and the analysis presented below draws connections between Mendelssohn’s early formulation of sonata form and Beethoven’s middle and late style works, linking Mendelssohn’s early style to his Classical predecessors.\(^1\) The analysis of Op. 105 is presented as a counterargument to Wingfield and Horton’s claim that none of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works fit neatly into Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata, and confirms the link between Mendelssohn’s sonata-form practice and his Classical predecessors. Finally, the analysis of the Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (1838) and the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845) will

---
demonstrate the evolution of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style, examining the various stylistic manipulations and the evolution of what I have termed the hybrid exposition. These analyses aim to support the claim, first noted by Todd, that Mendelssohn’s compositional style manages to encompass both its Classicist heritage and the new aesthetic of the Romantic era.\(^2\)

These four works were selected as analytical case studies in order to demonstrate Mendelssohn’s deep connections to Classical form, even well into his later works. They will also demonstrate Mendelssohn’s penchant for expertly mixing aspects of the Classical and Romantic styles across his compositional career. The approach used throughout my research is clear: to allow the works to speak for themselves, and draw conclusions on Mendelssohn’s approach to sonata form by comparing and contrasting his own works against themselves. The four works presented below were selected because they demonstrate the areas in which I believe Mendelssohn shows the greatest stylistic growth and development. Aside from perhaps the Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105, these analyses should not be taken as prototypes for a ‘typical Mendelssohnian Sonata.’ Rather, they are intended to capture both the stylistically appropriate choices available for Mendelssohn’s specific conception of sonata form and the areas in which Mendelssohn demonstrated particular stylistic growth and development of the sonata form itself. Full analyzed scores for the case studies are found in Appendices A–D.

---

2. Todd, *Mendelssohn: A Life in Music*, xxvii. Todd argues that “Mendelssohn’s music constantly mediates between the past and present: his revival of Bach and Handel—and his attempt to reconcile the classic-romantic dichotomy by overlaying onto richly expressive music the classical attributes of poise, balance, and clarity—has much to do with restoring and preserving, in an age Schumann decried for its philistinism, timeless values drawn from the exemplars of the past” (Ibid.).
5.1 Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105

Research suggests that Mendelssohn wrote seven piano sonatas, but to this date, there exist only three published scores: the Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105, the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6, and the Piano Sonata in B♭ Major, Op. 106. The first piano sonata in G minor was composed in 1821, when Mendelssohn was a mere twelve years old and is one of the earliest works analyzed for this study. The work remained unpublished until 1868, twenty-one years after the composer’s death. Despite its frequent categorization as Piano Sonata No. 2, it is in fact the first sonata written among his published works. This early work of Mendelssohn’s features a relatively straightforward Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form, demonstrating the composer’s grasp of Classical sonata form. The full analysis of the first movement of this work can be found in Appendix A.

The P-theme is presented as a compound period made up of two nine-measure sentences that leads to a PAC in the home key, G Minor in m. 18 and the end of the P-theme is elided with the onset of TR in m. 18. Thirteen measures of TR lead to the MC in m. 30, which is articulated as a III: HC MC, highlighted by two hammer-blow dominant chords. The S-theme is P-based and opens with an exact re-statement of the presentation phrase of the P-theme, including the same harmonic support, transposed to the relative major, B♭ Major. The S-theme employs the same thematic structure as the P-theme, a compound period made up of two sentences (ANT=9 measures; CONS=10 measures). The consequent phrase of S is extended by one measure and the EEC is achieved in m. 51

3. Mendelssohn composed three others in 1820, the Sonata in F Minor, the Sonata in A Minor, and the Sonata in E Minor which are all available at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung.
with a PAC in B♭ Major. The C-theme recycles TR material and prolongs the new tonic. It ends with a reference to the initial motive of the movement functioning as a re-transition to the repeat of the exposition.

The development begins in m. 61. It opens with a fragment of the P-theme, the sixteenth-note figure that was prominent in the left-hand of the P-theme. The development makes numerous references to P-material, including the bi from P in iv, C minor, mm. 66–68. In fact, the entire opening of the development almost immediately refers to iv, C minor: octave Gs appear in m. 61 and immediately lead to V₆/₅ of iv in m. 62, which is prolonged until the full iteration of the P-theme bi in mm. 66–68. Hepokoski and Darcy note that “by far, the most common thing to do was to begin the development with a restatement of the opening of the P-theme, usually in the same key…in which the exposition had just ended.”⁴ In this case then, we should expect an appearance of the P-theme in III, B♭ Major. As already stated, this is not the case; Mendelssohn opts to open the development directly in C minor. Hepokoski and Darcy argue further that “should a development juxtapose the major-mode end of the exposition with a quick shift into an even-deeper subdominant direction, the effect can be somber indeed—the plunging into an abyss.”⁵ Here, they cite an example from Mozart, K. 421, which launches the development in Eb Major, the Neapolitan of the tonic D minor. Mendelssohn’s treatment suggests that while the S-theme was successfully able to close with a PAC/EEC in the relative major, the troubled nature of the minor mode may not be that easy to vanquish. The development’s

⁴ Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 207.
⁵ Ibid., 212.
opening sinks back into the minor mode, perhaps foreshadowing what is to come in the recapitulation.

The development also features two so-called false recapitulations: the first in mm. 80–82 is in G minor but does not properly launch the recapitulation rotation as it veers away into fragments of the main motive in measure 83. The second occurs in mm. 85–87, this time in the wrong key of Eb Major. Since much of the exposition’s material was built out of the P-theme, it is not surprising the development refers to and develops material from this theme almost exclusively. It is also perhaps not surprising that the development includes these two false recapitulations; they could, in this instance, be interpreted as a rotation through the S-zone material. Reference to C-zone material first appears in m. 95 with the descending triplets in the right hand. The dominant lock is achieved in m. 95 and the recapitulation rotation launches in m. 107.

The correspondence measures for the recapitulation of the Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105 are presented in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1: Correspondence Measures, Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Zone</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>mm. 1–18</td>
<td>mm. 107–124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>mm. 18–30</td>
<td>mm. 124–133. Recomposed to lead to MC in tonic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>m. 30 III:HC MC</td>
<td>m. 133: i:HC MC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The P-theme of the recapitulation corresponds exactly to the exposition, and again elides its closing cadence with the onset of TR (correspondence mm. 107–124 = mm. 1–18). The TR is slightly recomposed in order to reach the MC in the home key, which occurs in m. 133 as a I: HC MC. The recapitulatory S-theme begins with the presentation phrase in exact correspondence to the exposition, transposed into the tonic, G minor. However, only the consequent portion of the compound period is recapitulated. The continuation of the S-theme is re-composed to lead to the ESC in the tonic and is truncated by ten measures.

The ESC is articulated in m. 144 and C-space corresponds exactly to the exposition (mm. 144–152 = mm. 51–59) in G minor. The final four measures borrow the fragmented material that functioned as the re-transition preparing for the repeat of the exposition and again provides an expanded re-transition for the repeat of the Development-Recapitulation included in the score. The Coda begins in m. 158 using the same dotted-rhythm motive that opened the development and that was used as the link to launch the repeat of the Development/Recapitulation. The coda ends with two iterations of the P-theme motive, followed by one measure of plagal cadences before closing with three hammer-blow chords that confirm G minor.
This early example of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form practice demonstrates the composer’s proclivity for tightly controlled motivic development. Reappearances of similar motivic material link structural sections together and create an audible clue for long-range motivic connection. The P- and S-theme open with the same motive, initially suggesting a monothematic work. This is illusory, as the S-theme’s continuation gives way to new material, built over a descending sequence beginning in m. 36. After the achievement of the EEC in m. 51, material from the TR is immediately recycled as the basis for the C-theme. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that the P-based S

gives an altered emphasis to the idea of a two-part exposition. Both parts are set out from the same basic idea…Consequently, this type of sonata suggests that the “narrative subject” (the central musical character or idea of the “drama,” stated by P) is still in evidence and is now ready to undertake the second phase of the exposition, S and the production of the EEC. Should the broader S/C space continue…to refer here and there to ordered material in P-TR…one might suggest that the expositional rotation as a whole is being conceived as two subrotations [sic], or two varied cycles through similar materials.7

The latter part of this statement is compelling. It has been argued throughout this study that Mendelssohn, along with Schubert, Schumann, and undoubtedly others, conceived of sonata form differently than the teleologically-driven Classical sonata. The Piano Sonata in G Minor is an early example of a Mendelssohnian sonata-form that explores the possibilities of sonata form as a variation cycle. Despite its relatively strict adherence to the expected generic layout of a Type 3 “Textbook” sonata, Op. 105 displays some early examples of Mendelssohn’s original approach to sonata form. Mendelssohn’s inclination

7. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 135–6, emphasis added.
toward motivic unity and tightly-knit motivic development is further developed in his Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6.

5.2 Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6

The Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 (1825), composed when Mendelssohn was sixteen years old, is a fantastic example that betrays Mendelssohn’s study and knowledge of Beethoven’s works in sonata form. The opening gesture of Mendelssohn’s Piano Sonata in E Major is incredibly similar to the opening gesture of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 28 in A Major, Op. 101. The two opening gestures are included in Figure 5-1.

Mendelssohn’s opening bi of the antecedent phrase appears to follow a similar contour to Beethoven’s, and its apex is the same note, E. The lilting rhythm matches Beethoven’s opening theme as well. Todd notes this similarity as well, arguing that “the influence of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata, Op. 101 (1817) is especially evident. Both sonatas open with Allegretto in 6/8 meter; though Beethoven’s movement is in A major, it begins “out-of-key” in E major, the tonic of Felix’s composition.”

This connection is also documented by Vitercik, who is critical of this work and argues that,

when Mendelssohn wrote his elaborate—and often beautiful—parody of this work [Beethoven’s A Major Piano Sonata, Op. 101], he carefully inserted quotations from the first movement to frame the finale, but he missed the point of Beethoven’s design: the opening of Mendelssohn’s first movement is already squarely settled in the tonic, so there is no problematic tonal ambiguity to be rectified by the rather garish E major of this finale.

---


Vitercik is unable to see past the influence of Beethoven’s Op. 101 on Mendelssohn’s Op. 6, preferring only to analyze this work based on how well it replicates Op. 101.

Beethoven, Piano Sonata No. 28 in A Major, Op. 101 mm. 1–4:

Mendelssohn, Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6, mm. 1–4:

Figure 5-1: Opening motives of Beethoven Op. 101 and Mendelssohn Op. 6

This work is an important composition in Mendelssohn’s overall output: it is the only piano sonata that Mendelssohn himself saw through to publication. Todd argues that if Weber’s influence is evident in the vivacious virtuosity of the finale, elsewhere Felix’s music is steeped in the late piano sonatas of Beethoven. Points of contact include the singing lyricism of the first movement, pairings of keys separated by a step, special pedal effects, expanded registers and broadly spaced chords, the cyclic use of thematic material…and the incorporation of a free, unmeasured recitative into the slow movement.

11. Ibid., 159.
Its harmonic and formal content are more intricate than Op. 105 and a clear proclivity for motivic unity and agents of continuation begin to show with this work. The full analysis of the first movement of this work can be found in Appendix B.

The work opens with a P-theme that features a compound period, made up of two hybrids (CBI+CONT). Both the antecedent and consequent phrases of the compound period consist of large-scale compound hybrids with subphrases made up of the hybrid CBI+CONT. The antecedent phrase leads to a HC in m. 8 and the consequent phrase leads to a PAC in m. 18. This choice of form for the P-theme impersonates the halting character of the P-theme in the first movement of Beethoven’s Op. 101. The consequent phrase is extended by two measures and is elided with the onset of the TR in m. 18. The TR modulates to the dominant and arrives at the MC in m. 39, articulating a V:HC MC. The slight variation of adding the seventh at the HC arrival becomes increasingly common over the span of the works analyzed for this study. One measure of caesura-fill follows the articulation of the MC: the sixteenth-note figure that has been present since the onset of TR continues and spills over into S-space. The S-theme begins in m. 40 and is presented as a compound sentence. Curiously, the theme begins with similar material from the TR, specifically material from m. 27. The S-theme is constructed as a compound sentence, featuring two CBIs, mm. 40–47; the CONT phrase, which is elided with the end of the repeated CBI, begins in m. 47. S’s thematic material seems to be reminiscent of the material first heard in the TR; S is, however, firmly in the new key of the dominant, B

12. The character of Beethoven’s Op. 101 is slightly more unsettled as the entire opening theme is built over a dominant pedal.
major. The new key is reinforced by an extensive prolongation, including a descending sequence, mm. 47–49 (as the onset of CONT function). The EEC is successfully achieved in m. 65, firmly securing the new tonic of B Major. The C-zone enters immediately in m. 65 and is P-based.

The attainment of the EEC and the subsequent C-zone are slightly atypical. While not having the same desire for energy gain as the TR, the build-up and achievement of EEC is generally strong and Hepokoski and Darcy’s first-level default for C is the forte P-based C. As demonstrated in the score in Appendix B, a significant increase in dynamic, texture, and rhythmic intensity, beginning in m. 58, culminates in the forte and then fortissimo standing-on-the-dominant mm. 62–64 that prepares and eventually brings about the articulation of the EEC. However, a diminuendo is marked in m. 64 just before the arrival of the EEC, and the C-zone opens piano and continues to decrease in volume, with pianissimos marked in m. 68, m. 71, and m. 76. The C-zone is made up of two short, four-measure phrases that feature the bi of the P-theme ANT exclusively in mm. 65–68, and again, down the octave in mm. 69–72. Fragments of the new cadential motive that close these C-zone phrases are then repeated, reinforcing the new tonic, B major. Despite the significant reinforcement and seemingly stable ending for the

13. That being said, Hepokoski and Darcy caution that “the EEC need not be—and often is not—the strongest cadence within the exposition.” (Sonata Theory, 124). What is critical however for the EEC is the “first PAC” rule: the EEC is identified as the first PAC in the new key that goes on to differing material (Sonata Theory, 120–24). As has been demonstrated above, rhetorical reinforcement is just part of the identifying process for these key form-defining caesuras and cadences. Just as the MC is considered a process, so too can the build-up and achievement of the EEC be considered just the same type of process.

14. Here too, we see another nod to Beethoven’s Op. 101 in the octaves of the right hand in mm. 62–64, which clearly mimic mm. 29–34 that close the short exposition of Beethoven’s sonata.
exposition, a sudden move to vii\(^7\)/V in m. 76, with the associated D natural undermines the stability of the new tonic of B Major and serves as a ct\(^7\) or plagal expansion of the local tonic. While a weakening of the new tonic is to be expected as a re-transition to prepare for the repeat of the exposition, this is a unique feature in this work since there is no indicated repeat for the exposition. The trouble only lasts for three measures, and the security of B major is re-confirmed by a short codetta, mm. 79–82 that features three hammer-blow repetitions of the tonic chord, albeit marked morendo and pianissimo.

The relatively short development begins in m. 83 and opens with a reference to the P-motive. The opening of the development strongly implies that it may proceed in the global tonic, E minor. This initial move to the minor quickly gives way to G major before delving into a chromatically unstable development which only develops material from the P-theme. The dominant lock is achieved in m. 98 and the recapitulation launches, piano, in m. 105. Initially, one might assume that this is a false recapitulation, as the left hand neglects to relinquish the oscillating dominant octaves that have been prominent throughout the latter part of the development (from m. 92 on). Hepokoski and Darcy argue that “to begin [the recapitulatory rotation] on (or in) the dominant is to superimpose musical procedures that are normally kept separate. The recapitulatory P\(^1\) (or P\(^1.1\)) is called upon to appear simultaneously with tonal residues of its own dominant preparation.”\(^{15}\) They go on to give examples of works that open the recapitulation over a

\[\text{15. Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 275–6.}\]
dominant pedal, including Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, Op. 57, “Appassionata”
and suggest that

the fresh rebeginning sets forth in tandem with a sometimes-suspenseful
prolongation of what “in better circumstances” it would have left behind. As is the
case with the type of $S^0$ or $S^{1.0}$ themes that unfold over dominant pedals, the
altered P-passage has a double-function: the retention of the last element of an
earlier preparatory situation coupled with the beginning of something new.\(^{16}\)

It has already been argued above that this piano sonata is influenced by Beethoven’s late-
over a prolonged dominant pedal; Mendelssohn’s expositional P-theme in Op. 6 does not,
however, this non-normative opening of the recapitulatory rotation over a dominant pedal
is perhaps Mendelssohn’s subtle nod to Beethoven’s Op. 101. In addition, the launch of
the recapitulation marked *piano* is at odds with the initial presentation of the P-theme in
the exposition, which was marked *mezzo-forte* with the direction *Allegretto con
espressione*. One might speculate that perhaps the P-theme is somewhat reluctant to
enter, given the apparent inability to relinquish the dominant, and does so cautiously and
tentatively, marked *piano*. It is worth noting as well that the P-theme at the launch of the
recapitulation is given significantly more harmonic support in the right hand; again, we
can speculate that this is in fact due to the unrelenting dominant pedal throughout the first
portion of the recapitulation rotation.

The correspondence measures for the recapitulation of the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op.
6 are presented in Table 5-2.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 276.
Table 5-2: Correspondence Measures, Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Zone</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>mm. 1–18</td>
<td>mm. 105–112. Only the ANT phrase is recapitulated (repeated twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>mm. 18–39</td>
<td>mm. 112–124, recomposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>m. 39 V:HC MC</td>
<td>m. 124 I:PAC MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>mm. 40–65</td>
<td>mm. 124–140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC/ESC</td>
<td>m. 65</td>
<td>m. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>mm. 65–76</td>
<td>mm. 140–143, truncated and recomposed; slight reference to m. 69.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the antecedent phrase of the P-theme is recapitulated, first over a dominant pedal mm. 105–108, and then with increased harmonic support mm. 109–112. The truncated P-theme leads to an IAC in m.112, which is elided with the onset of TR once again. The transition is entirely recomposed, save for the continuous sixteenth-note pattern in the inner voice that was a hallmark of the exposition’s TR. The MC is achieved in m. 124 as a I:PAC MC. The I:PAC MC is considered a fourth-level default by Hepokoski and Darcy. Their argument regarding the rarity of this MC choice centres around the exposition, where the “TR…proves unable (or unwilling) to produce any of the three

---

17. The I:PAC MC is a fourth-level default in the exposition, but could be considered slightly more common in the recapitulation, since the expectation is that the MC will occur in the tonic.
more standard MC defaults...one confronts a 'failed' (or gesturally weak? Or obstinate?) TR that, still in the grip of the grounding tonal principle of the P-zone, dwells on an unusually static tonic.”

The expectation for the MC in the recapitulation is that it will occur in the tonic, generally as a I:HC MC. Since the opening of the recapitulation rotation was destabilized by a dominant pedal, the I/i:PAC MC was perhaps chosen to add additional weight in the form of a stronger cadence to confirm the security of the tonic return. The arrival of the MC is clear and corresponds almost exactly to the MC moment in the exposition (c.f. m. 39).

The re-appearance of the S-theme halfway through m. 124 strengthens the analysis of the MC as a PAC occurring at the beginning of m. 124. The S-theme enters a half-measure early compared to the corresponding material in the exposition; despite this, the S-theme otherwise corresponds exactly to the exposition. The expected cadence in m. 136 (which should correspond with the first IAC in the exposition at m. 56) is suddenly interrupted with an interpolation of the P-theme basic idea, mm. 136–138. The dominant is quickly re-established and the ESC is quietly achieved in m. 139, corresponding with m. 65 from the exposition. The C-zone begins with the anacrusis to m. 140 and corresponds to m. 69 from the exposition, still one half-measure early. The short C-zone, lasting only four measures, confirms the tonic, E major, with another PAC in m. 143, which launches the Coda. The Coda emerges from C-zone material and includes the relentless sixteenth-note rhythmic motive that has not given way since the transition. One final allusion to the P-theme in mm. 163–64 closes the coda.

18. Ibid., 29.
The entrance of the S-theme one half-measure early requires interpretation. The simplest explanation is that this is possibly just a slight of hand of the young composer—after all, Mendelssohn was only eighteen when he composed this work. This line of interpretation is not satisfactory; perhaps there is something going on that is more subtle. In fact, the entire recapitulation is slightly off right from the start. The reluctance of the $V_A$ to surrender to the tonic at the opening undermines the security of the tonic and the dominant is prolonged for the first seven measures of the recapitulation rotation, only giving way at m. 112 with the entrance of the TR. When the MC is articulated strongly as a I:PAC MC, the S is motivated to enter early perhaps as a response to this reluctance to secure the tonic. As has been argued throughout this dissertation, Mendelssohn appears to be preoccupied with agents of continuation. This small but significant moment in Op. 6 is arguably an early example of this desire.

The analysis of both the Piano Sonata in G minor, Op. 105 and the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6 offer an initial perspective of the young Mendelssohn’s early conceptions of sonata form. The influence of the Classical sonata, and especially of middle-period Beethoven, is clear. Rather than using Beethoven’s works as a yardstick for governing the analysis of Mendelssohn’s compositions, the connections drawn are intended to strengthen the argument that Mendelssohn’s interest in the Classical and late-Classical practices of Beethoven informed his own compositional style. These analyses demonstrate that several key compositions from Mendelssohn’s output do in fact fit the Type 3 “Textbook” sonata, further supporting the functionality of Hepokoski and Darcy’s method of analysis for this repertoire.
5.3 Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (1838)

The Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 was composed when Mendelssohn was twenty-nine years old and living in Leipzig. The Cello Sonata was composed at a time when Mendelssohn was deeply involved with the resurrection of the music of Bach and Handel, among others, with the first of the so-called ‘historical concerts’ in the Leipzig Gewandhaus on February 15, 1838. These concerts were dedicated to the performance of the music of the ‘masters’, a practice that Todd argues

betrays the beginnings of European canon formation in music. Discernible in Felix’s programming is a main line of German music descending from Bach and Handel through Mozart and Haydn to Weber and Beethoven. Also implicit is the recognition of distinct historical styles— the baroque, Classical, and modern (romantic), and further, the notion of a classic-romantic dialectic, under development in the intellectual discourse of the 1830s before it became a conceptual commonplace.19

Of the Cello Sonata No. 1, Todd observes that “a classical tranquility envelops this music, which avoids dramatic contrasts within and between movements, and favors balance and structural stability.”20 Structural balance and tightly controlled thematic material is certainly present and classicist in nature; however, Mendelssohn’s uses of agents of continuation consistently undermine strong cadential closure. The opening of the first movement of the Cello Sonata lacks strong cadential closure in the tonic and subsequent keys. Additionally, a three-key exposition [I–iii–V] reinforces the sense of continuation across the entire exposition; cadential confirmation of the dominant does not

20. Ibid., 367; Todd also observes here that Schumann detected an inclination towards the Mozartean in Mendelssohn’s music of the 1830s.
arrive until m. 104 with the articulation of the EEC. The full analysis of the first movement of this work can be found in Appendix C.

This work opens with a three-part P-theme: $P^A$ in mm. 1–8 is a hybrid ANT+CONT that ends with a HC ($V^7$) in m. 8; $P^B$ in mm. 9–16 is a sentence PRES+CONT that ends with a dominant arrival in m. 16; and $P^{A'}$ which is extended and again presented as a hybrid ANT+CONT. The ANT of $P^{A'}$ ends in m. 20, albeit somewhat unsteadily on the $V^7$ and is followed by a two-measure post-cadential extension in mm. 21–22. This lines up directly with the end of the ANT phrase in m. 4. An extended continuation phrase thus begins with the anacrusis to in m. 21, leading to an evaded cadence in m. 27, and a “one more time effect”\(^{21}\) mm. 27—30 that leads to a PAC in $B^b$ major in m. 31.

The onset of TR is elided with the end of the P-theme in m. 31. The TR is modulating and the expectation is that it will modulate to the dominant, F major. The TR increases significantly in energy and dynamic, with the relentless triplet figure first featured in the right hand of the piano in the continuation phrase of the repeat of $P^A$ now doubled in both hands and marked *fortissimo* beginning in m. 31. The triplet figure is picked up by the cello in m. 35. G minor is briefly tonicized in mm. 39–42 before an extensive tonicization of D minor in mm. 43–53. The $V_A$ is achieved in m. 51 but it is not in the expected key; the extensive tonicization of iii, d minor, has become the tonal goal of this section. The $P^A$ theme appears in the right hand of the piano mm. 51–52 and is then imitated by the

cello in mm. 53–54. The MC is articulated in m. 57, forcefully as a iii:HC MC. Four
measures of caesura fill follow the MC articulation, marked *forte* and finally *con forza* in
m. 60. The loud and forceful dynamics imply that the tonal goal of iii, d minor is being
forced upon the music; it is a wildly unusual secondary key, signaling a significant
“lights out” moment as it moves from major tonic to minor mediant key. The music
seems unwilling to proceed in D minor, and the gradual increase in dynamic, beginning
in m. 55, appears to be attempting to force the music to accept this unwelcome new key.

The S-theme emerges in m. 61 in D minor and is marked *sf*. D minor is never stabilized
as the new tonic: it is undermined as the bi of the presentation phrase is consistently
harmonized as a diminished-7th chord (m. 61, m. 63, etc.). This new theme is a
complicated and abnormal structure. It begins in D minor and is initially expressed as a
straightforward sentence structure, perhaps even the antecedent in a larger compound
structure. It is marked *forte* and reinforced with several *sforzandos* in m. 61 and m. 63.
However, this initial sentence phrase modulates and produces a PAC in C minor,
foreshadowed by a sudden drop to *piano* in m. 65. The S-theme is repeated, beginning in
m. 69, now in C minor, and marked *piano*. A crescendo in m. 73 corresponds with the
onset of the CONT phrase, which culminates on a *forte* dominant chord of D minor in m.
75. A series of tonicizations of F minor follows, including an attempt at a PAC in F
minor at m. 79, and eventually leads to an IAC in F minor in m. 95. With the
confirmation of F minor, the triplet material prominent in the TR also returns in the cello
and a gradual increase in dynamic and texture lead to the first appearance of F major in
m. 100. F major is prolonged and shortly thereafter reinforced by the arrival of the EEC
in m. 104.
What to make of these unusual proceedings of events? It is clear that this movement is an example of a three-key exposition: I–iii–V. What it does not seem to do is proceed as a normative tri-modular block, which results from apparent double MCs. Measures 77–87 could be interpreted as a standing-on-the-dominant of F, which may possibly be setting up a second MC or MC-like gesture. And in fact, it is C minor that arrives in m. 87, launching an ascending sequence which eventually leads to F minor in m. 95; the arrival of C minor in m. 87 could be considered a very weakly prepared second MC. However, there is no sense of new theme following this MC-like gesture. The TMB structure must be considered illusory at best. Since the material that returns in the cello in m. 95 with the arrival of F minor is in fact material from the TR, it almost seems as if the material that precedes it is some sort of large interpolation. But this description is unsatisfactory as there appears to be a clear articulation of an MC in m. 57 that prepares the D minor material. The reappearance of the TR material perhaps corresponds to an effort to ‘try again’ with regard to the achievement of the EEC. This fulfils part of Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition of the TMB:

…it is not uncommon to encounter the setup and execution of a second, additional medial caesura before the EEC. This can occur in a variety of contexts, but the invariable impression is that of apparent double medial caesuras, and, concomitantly, the effect of two separate launches of new themes (pre-EEC themes) following those MCs…The first new theme, following the first MC, will prove “unable” to move to the EEC and will instead be converted into the preparation for a new MC, possibly including the establishment of a dominant-lock and other features of MC-preparation.

23. Ibid., 171, emphasis added.
Noticeably lacking in Op. 45 is any clear or normative sense of a second theme and a second MC achievement. Once we seem to ‘get back on track’ in m. 95, the drive toward and actual arrival of the EEC articulation is unambiguous.

The C-zone begins in m. 104, is P-based and elided with the achievement of the EEC in F major. The opening bi of the P-theme appears in octaves in the left hand of the piano at m. 104 while the right hand continues with the triplet material from the TR. A series of codettas in mm. 124–26, 126–128; and 128–132 (over a tonic pedal) confirm the stability of F major, and the retransition occurs in mm. 132–137, preparing for the repeat of the exposition.

The development begins in m. 138 with a statement in the cello of the antecedent phrase of the P-theme. The development opens firmly in F major, but almost immediately moves to the dominant of D minor as the continuation phrase of P^ returns in mm. 141–145. The continuation phrase is then developed, starting with the piano and then moving to the cello in canon-like fashion. The continuation phrase of P^ is developed extensively in both the piano and the cello from mm. 142–169. The cello enters in m. 170 with a near exact restatement of the material from m. 53, which corresponds to the dominant lock in the exposition. P and TR material are juxtaposed by the piano and the cello respectively beginning in m. 173. The S-theme is developed by the piano beginning in m. 190.

Measure 199 loosely corresponds to m. 95, where the exposition ‘got back on track’ and lead to the articulation of the EEC. Save for the C-zone, the development completes almost a full rotation of exposition materials. A secure dominant lock is never achieved and in fact is never even alluded to. The music appears to be preparing to move to C minor, beginning in m. 207 with the introduction of the V^ chord of C minor and later
with a prolonged cadential 6/4 chord over G. However, in m. 211, the G becomes a G♭, producing a vii♭⁴/₂ of B♭ major, the global tonic.

A triplet figure in the cello in mm. 217–218 adds to the instability as it oscillates between G♭ and F before eventually giving way to a four-measure trill figure on F in mm. 219–222. The recapitulation begins in m. 219 with the return of the Pᴬ theme. The correspondence measures are listed in Table 5-3.

Table 5-3: Correspondence Measures, Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Zone</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pᴬ</td>
<td>mm. 1–8</td>
<td>mm. 219–227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pᴮ</td>
<td>mm. 8–16</td>
<td>mm. 227–238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pᴬ’</td>
<td>mm. 17–31</td>
<td>mm. 239 ⇒TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>mm. 31–51</td>
<td>Pᴬ’ ⇒TR around m. 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>m. 51 iii:HC MC</td>
<td>m. 259 vi:HC MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>mm. 61–104</td>
<td>mm. 261–288, begins with exact correspondence; small interpolation mm. 279–83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC/ESC</td>
<td>m. 104</td>
<td>m. 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>mm. 104–124</td>
<td>mm. 288–316: corresponds closely but C is extended in the recapitulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, like the Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6, the recapitulation launches over a dominant pedal, including the sustained trill in the cello. Pᴮ returns in mm. 227–38, and is recomposed. Pᴬ’ repeats, beginning in m. 239, corresponding with m. 17 from the
exposition. Starting in m. 251, the P^ theme begins to veer away from the correspondence measures with the exposition. This change is retrospectively understood as P⇒TR, as it is clear by m. 251 that TR rhetoric has emerged.

The TR zone uses fragments of P^, especially at the moment of the articulation of the MC, to emphasize its arrival. The MC is articulated in m. 259. Yet again, the MC is unconventional: it arrives as a V6/5 of vi, G minor. There is no stability at this moment and yet the MC effect is clear. Two measures of CF occur in mm. 259–60, corresponding exactly with mm. 59–60. Once again, the music is forced to accept the unexpected key, and the lead up to the entrance of the S-theme is again marked con forza.

The S-theme begins in m. 261, and mm. 261–279 corresponds closely with the exposition, mm. 61–79. The S-theme begins in G minor, vi of the global tonic and corresponds to the use of D minor (iii) in the exposition, which is vi of the local tonic of the S-theme key of F major. The S-theme is repeated, just as it was in the exposition. It first reaches F minor, in m. 269 and the repeated sentence structure returns to vi, G minor, in m. 276. Finally, mm. 277–279 correspond exactly to mm. 77–79 from the exposition. Rather than leading to the standing-on-the-dominant and apparent MC-like gesture of the TMB in the exposition, the recapitulatory rotation completely writes over mm. 79–94, leading directly to a cadence in B♭ major in m. 279, corresponding almost

---

24. This type of balancing of mediant keys finds is locus classicus example in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 21 in C Major, Op. 53 ‘Waldstein’ which features C–E in the exposition and C–A in the recapitulation.
exactly with m. 95 and acting as the crux.\textsuperscript{25} The ESC is achieved in m. 288, firmly in the tonic B\textsubscript{b} major.

The C-zone once again launches with a clear statement of the P-theme in the left hand of the piano, marked \textit{marcato}. The C-zone corresponds closely to the C-zone from the exposition, but C in the recapitulation is extended. Several evaded cadences occur (especially m. 307 and mm. 311–12) until a final PAC is articulated in mm. 315–16, confirming the tonic B\textsubscript{b} major and launching the coda. The Coda is discursive, beginning in m. 316 and extending for some thirty measures. It opens with material from the C-zone of the exposition in the piano but is P-based, as an incipit of the P-theme is presented in the cello in mm. 316–317, and again in mm. 330–31. A tonicization of ii, C minor occurs in mm. 335–36, which gives way to a rapid passage of sixteenth notes in the piano, marked \textit{con fuoco}. One final affirmation of the tonic B\textsubscript{b} major occurs with an extended prolongation of the tonic and dominant in mm. 344–46. The tonic is confirmed by a short codetta, initially with repeated V–I gestures acting as cadential reinforcement, and finally ending with two hammer-blow tonic chords in mm. 347–8.

The Cello Sonata No. 1 in B\textsubscript{b} Major, Op. 45 showcases many of Mendelssohn’s more innovative approaches to sonata form. The three-part primary theme demonstrates Mendelssohn’s proclivity toward the use of larger-scale formal units, which allow for more expansion and the recycling of materials throughout the movement. The repeat of P\textsuperscript{A} is expanded and is an example of a frequent choice for Mendelssohn’s primary

\textsuperscript{25} The only difference is the lack of the “lights out” moment in the recapitulation.
themes: the compound hybrid (ANT+CONT). A general lack of cadential closure in parts of the P-zone further highlights Mendelssohn’s desire for expanded continuation-like function within and between formal sections of the sonata. The transition modulates to the unexpected key of iii, d minor, but the EEC is achieved in the first-level default choice of F major. Despite the clear emergence of a new theme in the S-zone, the arrival of iii creates tonal instability throughout the S-zone that is not resolved until the arrival of F major in m. 100 and confirmed in m. 104 with the arrival of the EEC. The recapitulation maintains the desire for expanded continuation function with the merger of the P\textsuperscript{A} and the TR. The recapitulation also launches over a dominant pedal, building tonal instability and fueling a further desire for closure. The recapitulatory MC, like the expositional MC, is unusual, articulated as a vi:HC MC and in first inversion.

Lastly, an argument can be made for the consideration of Op. 45 as one example of what I have termed the hybrid exposition: a practice of Mendelssohn’s that appears to merge aspects of both the two-part and continuous exposition. In Op. 45, the MC is achieved over an unrelenting triplet figure in the piano. At the moment of MC articulation, there are two immediate reiterations of the P-theme: first in the right hand of the piano (mm. 51–52), then in the cello (mm. 53–54). Continuous expositions are generally monothematic in that they routinely do not include a secondary theme, and the rest of the movement unfolds in a Fortspinnung-like fashion. However, the Cello Sonata Op. 45 does in fact have an S-theme which emerges in m. 61. There is a clear sentence structure in mm. 61–69, and although the continuation phrase modulates to C minor, the repeat of the S-theme leads to an IAC in the local tonic, D minor in m. 76. The Fortspinnung-like
effects of the caesura fill and the reiteration of the P-theme material combine with the emergence of a new theme to create what I have termed a hybrid exposition.

5.4 Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845)

The final work analyzed in this chapter, the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845), serves as a demonstration of many of the key features of Mendelssohn’s mature sonata-form practice. In particular, this work again demonstrates Mendelssohn’s preference for large-scale P-themes and the unrelenting desire for continuity. It is also one of only four works from the representative group of twenty-four sonatas studied for this dissertation that, according to Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory, has a failed recapitulation and thus is a failed sonata. This failure to achieve the ESC is predicted by the exposition and opens the possibility for the inclusion of a hermeneutic analysis of this work.

This work opens with one of Mendelssohn’s largest P-themes from the twenty-four works studied for this dissertation: ABA’ with a dissolving A’ section. The A section is a compound period ANT+CONS with an extended consequent (14 measures), mm. 1–22. The B section is elided with the PAC that closes the A section in mm. 22. The structure of the opening of the B section is harmonically similar to the opening theme of the A section: the first bi prolongs the tonic and the second bi prolongs the subdominant. In fact, it seems like the B section’s theme is a compression and inversion of the A section’s theme: the A theme is ascending and in eighth notes; the B theme is descending and in sixteenth notes. The P§ section is comprised of two sentence structures: the first, mm. 22–26, leads to a cadence in the tonic, C minor. The second sentence is elided with the PAC in m. 26 and begins as a re-statement of the initial presentation phrase of the first
sentence, with similar harmonic support. The continuation phrase of this sentence is extended and briefly tonicizes III, Eb Major, before returning to the tonic and finally securing the dominant in m. 41.

The P'A' section begins in m. 42 with the theme once again presented in the piano. The P'A' section dissolves into TR around m. 48, and modulates to the expected key of III, Eb major (the relative major). The enharmonic respelling of the chord in m. 46, Cb-D-F-Ab versus Bb-D-F-Ab in m. 6 of the A section, signals that P'A' is beginning to deviate from P'A. The TR is based loosely on the A theme with the same contour of the rising and falling theme, now in the violin. The dominant lock is secured in m. 57 and the MC is articulated in m. 62 as a III:HC MC. It is followed with three beats of “juggernaut” CF in m. 62.

The S-theme begins with the anacrusis to m. 63, with the theme presented in the violin. The S-theme is also an ABA’ structure. The S'A theme is presented as a hybrid CBI+CONS that leads to an IAC in Eb Major in m. 70. The S'B section is a contrasting middle comprised of continuation-like function, mm. 71–79, that modulates and leads to a PAC in Bb Major in mm. 78–79. The S-theme then reappears with the S'A' section, again in Eb Major, mm. 79–86. The S'A' is followed by a section that modulates and grows in intensity with increased harmonic and surface rhythms, and increased chromaticism. Unexpectedly, this section then modulates to G minor through an extended prolongation

26. This theme structure is analyzed as a CBI rather than an ANT because there is a clear cadential evasion in m. 65–66 with the move to the V4/2 and resolution to I6 in the piano. The cello Eb is above the piano’s G, which is reinforced by the lower octave in m. 66.
of the vii\textsuperscript{7} of G minor. The EEC is articulated in m. 95 in G minor, rather than in the expected key of Eb Major. The achievement of the EEC is slightly unusual in that it is confirmed with an IAC rather than a PAC. However, Hepokoski and Darcy admit that, while rare, examples of the attenuation of the EEC with an IAC do exist and they argue that “before one comes to this decision, the rhetorical signals surrounding this EEC-moment—particularly regarding the status of C—should be overwhelming…”\textsuperscript{27} The reappearance of material from the P\textsuperscript{A} theme is a strong rhetorical signal that a new sub-rotation has begun. In fact, the C\textsuperscript{1.1} section rotates through the entire ABA’ structure of the P-theme, which will be discussed further below. Finally, an argument could be made that the Bb in the cello is actually the beginning of the C theme. Hepokoski and Darcy note that there are “…cases in which the EEC-event elides with a C theme entering in another voice.”\textsuperscript{28} Similar to the Cello Sonata discussed above, the EEC is articulated pianissimo, suggesting once again that the music is reluctantly accepting the unexpected key of G minor.

Hepokoski and Darcy note that minor-mode expositions that fall into the i-v category are used in order to create the special effect of intensely negative statements. This is even more apparent in works that initially attain the first-level default III for the secondary key area:

composers sometimes demonstrated [the loss of the normative, major-mode option] by constructing a tonal path that first seeks a move to the positive III, then collapses \textit{en route} or gets derailed at some pivotal moment. The major III is thus

\textsuperscript{27} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Sonata Theory}, 167–69.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 169.
depicted as a vision that cannot be realized, leaving open only the minor-v option. Such a strategy actualizes the collapse of modal “hope” within the generic sonata: we literally hear the possibility of the major mode being liquidated.\textsuperscript{29}

The “hope” of the major mode is lost with the modulation to and the articulation of the EEC in g minor. It will be up to the recapitulation to try and bring about the transformation to the major mode.

The C-zone is divided into two parts. $C^{1.1}$ appears in mm. 95–132, which is P-based and rotates through the entire P-theme (ABA’) leading to an IAC in G minor in measure 132. The piano and the violin present the P-theme bi in canon while the cello provides a chromatically descending line marked \textit{leggiero}. The canon continues between the piano and the violin and becomes increasingly complex with the addition of the cello adding fragments of the P-theme bi. An IAC in G minor is achieved in m. 105 which leads to a reappearance of the B section of the P-theme. This is extended until m. 128 where a dominant lock of G is achieved, setting up a cadence in G minor, marked \textit{fortissimo} in m. 132. The beginning of $C^{1.2}$ is elided with the cadence in m. 132. $C^{1.2}$ is P-based, using fragments of the A theme and leads to a final PAC in G minor in m. 140. A short, two-measure codetta reinforces the articulation of the PAC in G minor through repetitions of V–I and tonic triad arpeggiations in the violin and cello. A short two-measure passage of descending sixteenth notes in the piano connects to the start of the development rotation. There is no indicated repeat of the exposition.

\textsuperscript{29}. Ibid., 316.
The development launches in m. 144, building upon the codetta material and the descending sixteenth-note passage heard in the piano in the codetta of the exposition. The development opens with the juxtaposition of a staccato line from the codetta in the strings, answered by a descending passage in the piano. This repeats three times, mm. 144–155, and on the third repetition the cello enters with the S\(^A\)-theme. The cello presents the S\(^A\)-theme in m. 156 and the entirety of the development is devoted to developing the S-theme. This is unusual for the development which normally begins with a restatement of P-material to initiate the new rotation. All three instruments have an iteration of portions of the S-theme in turn: cello, violin, and piano, through to m. 165. The S-theme is then developed extensively throughout this section. However, in m. 186, the violin begins to re-introduce a fragment of the P-theme, lasting only one measure, and quickly dissolves back into S material. But again, a fragment of the P-theme motive appears in the cello in m. 190, and this time the fragment lasts for two measures, mm. 190–91. The re-emergence of the P-theme at this late point of the exposition gives the sense that the development’s rotation is reversed. Mendelssohn does not develop the P-theme to any extent in this development section. Moreover, the return of the P-theme motive seems to act more as a signal for the upcoming return of the recapitulation. While Mendelssohn’s development of the S-theme in the development section is not a first-level default choice, it is certainly not unprecedented. Hepokoski and Darcy write that,

While S does appear in many developments and even dominates some, it may be that its relative infrequency is related to its cadentially “sensitive” role in the exposition. To allude to S might be to call up connotations of its seeking the proper tonal “tack” on the way to the ESC…\(^30\)

---

30. Ibid., 205.
Perhaps because of the unexpected turn to G minor at the moment of the EEC in the exposition, the S-theme is developed more fully here in order to hopefully ‘seek the proper tonal tack.’

The dominant lock is achieved in m. 197 and the recapitulation begins in m. 213 with the A-theme in unison in both the violin and the cello. The correspondence measures are presented in Table 5-4.

**Table 5-4: Correspondence Measures, Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Zone</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>mm. 1–22</td>
<td>mm. 213–220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>mm. 22–41</td>
<td>not recapitulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA'</td>
<td>mm. 42 ⇒TR</td>
<td>mm. 221 ⇒TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>PA' ⇒TR around m. 48–61</td>
<td>P A' ⇒TR around m. 226–242.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>m. 62 III:HC MC</td>
<td>m. 242 I:HC MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>mm. 63–70</td>
<td>mm. 241–249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>mm. 70–78</td>
<td>mm. 249–257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA'</td>
<td>mm. 78–95</td>
<td>mm. 257–270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC/ESC</td>
<td>m. 95</td>
<td>No ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C^{1,1}</td>
<td>mm. 95–132</td>
<td>mm. 270–293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C^{1,2}</td>
<td>mm. 132–140</td>
<td>mm. 293–304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PB-section is not recapitulated and the PA section is repeated immediately starting in m. 221 with the piano and violin in canon, offset by two beats. Immediately following
this repetition of the P^A-theme in canon, the P^A section becomes TR in m. 225. The recapitulatory TR modulates to C major and the dominant lock is achieved in m. 237. The MC is articulated in m. 241 as a I:HC MC. One measure of “juggernaut” CF follows with the piano arpeggiating through the dominant chord of C major, all marked forte. The S^A theme begins with the anacrusis to m. 242 corresponding exactly to the exposition, and firmly in C major in the cello, marked cantabile. The S^B theme begins in m. 250 after an IAC in C major in m. 249. A PAC in G major in m. 257 corresponds with the PAC in B♭ major in mm. 78 in the exposition and leads to the S^A’ section, which is slightly recomposed but corresponds loosely with the material from mm. 88–95.

A heightened sense of drama in the S^A’ section, beginning in m. 264, is accomplished by the reappearance of both pitches B♭ and A♭, signaling trouble for the major key that so far has been quite secure. Throughout this section, a tension is created by the juxtaposition of B♭s, which push toward F major, and A♭s and B♮s that push toward C minor. A vii^6/3 chord in C leads to the devastating return of C minor in m. 270, corresponding with the cadential articulation in G minor in the exposition at m. 105. The ESC has been completely written over: not only does the sonata fail to achieve the ESC, it also fails to maintain the transformation of C minor to C major.

The C-zone begins in m. 270 with the return of C^1.1, corresponding to m. 105 from the exposition. Several portions of the C-zone are written over, including mm. 95–104 from the exposition. This opening section of C^1.1, marked leggero and pianissimo has no place in the new disastrous reality of the failed recapitulation. The portion of C^1.1 that is recapitulated corresponds to the G-minor IAC heard in the exposition at m. 105, a
foreshadowing that only now is recognizable after the loss of the ESC. From m. 270 forward the music corresponds almost exactly with the exposition until the coda launches in m. 305 with only slight recompositions. Lengthy prolongations of the C minor tonic follow the blocked ESC, beginning in m. 270, with several cadences reinforcing the reality of C minor.

A discursive Coda in m. 305 begins similar to how the development had begun. In m. 313, the coda continues to rotate through development materials, presenting the same material that opened the coda now in F minor, over a C pedal. Measures 319–326 suddenly appear in C major, reigniting hope of an emancipation to the major mode after all. A move to Ab major then leads to a V-dominant lock on G in mm. 349–52 which leads to a PAC that re-confirms the key of C minor at m. 353.

The P^A-theme appears in the violin in m. 353, augmented and harmonically supported by the cello, while the piano reintroduces the P^A-theme in its original form, all marked crescendo con fuoco. It is possible that m. 353 acts as the missing ESC from the recapitulation. It was perhaps written over in the recapitulation in an effort to stave off the possibility of the ESC occurring in the ‘wrong key’ of C minor. But the Coda fails to achieve the emancipation as well. The piano obsessively repeats the P-theme, occasionally varied, and a section marked sempre ff e con fuoco starts in m. 368 and drives toward another PAC in C minor in m. 376. Initially, it seems like mm. 377–385 are acting as codettas, attempting to close the work and supporting yet one more utterance of the P-based fragments from the violin. But, four measures of tonic pedal lead to a restatement of the S^A-theme beginning in m. 385 in both the violin and cello. This restatement leads to a climactic V^7 of iv (f minor) in m. 392. A nod to the minor
subdominant was not uncommon in late-Classical sonata structures, but was more commonly reserved for the recapitulation where either a later portion of the P-TR complex would appear in the subdominant after an initial re-statement of P in the tonic, or the P-theme would open the recapitulation in the subdominant.\textsuperscript{31} The second restatement of the $S_A$-theme in the minor subdominant could be interpreted as an extended plagal motion. The dominant of C minor is weakly tonicized in m. 394–5 and a final, decisive PAC in C minor is articulated in m. 397. Oscillating V–I chords and one final V$^7$ to i in mm. 398–400 confirm the C-minor fate of this work.

As stated in the introduction to this analysis, the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66, is another example of Mendelssohn’s preference for large-scale P-themes and the unrelenting desire for continuity in his sonata-form works. It also provides a clear example of a failed sonata, with the work’s inability to secure the ESC. This failure was predicted in the exposition, with the attenuation of the EEC in ‘the wrong key’ of v: G minor, instead of the more normative choice of the relative major, $E_b$, which was secured by the TR and the MC. Like the Cello Sonata, Op. 45, described above, Mendelssohn explores three key areas in the Piano Trio’s exposition. In both cases, this exploration of three keys has consequences for the recapitulation; in the case of the Piano Trio, the consequence is drastic and leads to a failure to secure the ESC in either the tonic minor or tonic major. Future analysis of this work could focus on the ramifications of a failed sonata in the first movement on the rest of the work. In particular, the analysis could determine whether or not the first movement’s failure is ever reconciled in later

\textsuperscript{31} For further exploration of this idea, see Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Sonata Theory}, 260–68.
movements through, for example, the possible re-appearance of the ESC material in the finale. There are also hermeneutic implications and interpretations that could be discussed after the analysis of the entire multi-movement work.
Chapter 6

6 Conclusions and Projections for Future Research

Much of Felix Mendelssohn’s musical oeuvre has been marginalized to the edges of the western art-music canon for generations by music critics. While never dismissed entirely, Mendelssohn’s works are consistently compared and contrasted with Beethoven’s works, and, more often than not, categorized as failed attempts at emulating Beethoven’s style. The purpose of this dissertation was to remove Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works from the looming shadow of Beethoven, replacing “the Beethovenian yardstick” with a more neutral analytical tool that would allow Mendelssohn’s works to speak for themselves.¹

As the preceding chapters attempted to demonstrate, Mendelssohn’s approach to sonata form mixes aspects of both the Classical model of the form and of the evolving nineteenth-century aesthetic. Rather than comparing Mendelssohn’s works with those of his predecessors, and especially Beethoven, this dissertation studied Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works as they stand on their own, guided by the analytical model developed by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy.

Chapter One explored the treatment of Mendelssohn’s music in current and past scholarship and served as an introduction to the need for an inductive study that sought to analyze Mendelssohn’s works for their own sake. Chapter Two made the case for using Hepokoski and Darcy’s methodology and theory as a model for analysis for this project. I

¹ As noted in Chapter One, Uri Golumb requests a re-visitation of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works as they stand on their own, rather than using Beethoven’s works as an aesthetic yardstick (see Uri Golomb, “Mendelssohn’s Creative Response to Late Beethoven,” 117).
argued that their analytical model provides an essential background structure for sonata form while, at the same time, remaining flexible and adaptable to stylistic change and expansion. A response was offered to the only published work that directly deals with Mendelssohn’s music and Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory: Wingfield and Horton’s “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms.” In sum, Wingfield and Horton’s potentially flawed understanding of the concept of deformation led them to conclude that none of Mendelssohn’s works could be considered in dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata. Wingfield and Horton’s definition and application of deformation theory seems too rigid and their dismissal of the background structure is based on a potentially flawed understanding of its intent. I argued that the spirit of Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of the fundamental background structure of sonata form is based on a set of expectations. Without these expectations, the analyst could never speak of stylistic change, growth, or deviations from the norm. Wingfield and Horton argue that any deviation from an expected norm constitutes a deformation; I argued that this is not the case. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory of deformation requires a more nuanced approach; in the authors’ own words, a deformation is “a technical term referring to a striking way of stretching or overriding a norm.” A deformation stretches a norm to its aesthetic limits and the composer employs a deformation in order to produce a calculated expressive effect. Deformations completely alter the expected form, and the

---

4. Ibid., 614.
result of that alteration requires interpretation. The sample of Mendelssohn’s works analyzed for this dissertation certainly includes examples of works with true deformations. However, Mendelssohn’s music in sonata form is clearly in dialogue with sonata form.

Chapter Two also served as an introduction to Mendelssohn’s own conception of sonata form. Several key characteristics were highlighted. Specifically, while Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form retain the overall structure of a generic sonata, and formal division at all levels of structure, they also tend to blur the boundaries at all levels of structure (i.e.: Exposition/Development, Primary Theme/Transition, etc.). Mendelssohn’s thematic construction, his use of the minor mode, and his use of developmental recession were highlighted as important aspects of Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form.

In Chapter Three, I described in greater detail the characteristic features of Mendelssohn’s sonata forms. I endeavored to illuminate areas of significant change and stylistic growth within a representative sample of twenty-four first movements spanning Mendelssohn’s entire compositional output. Through this analysis, I was able to allow the works to speak for themselves, by entering them into dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s background structure of the Classical sonata form. Areas of significant change and growth, first highlighted in Chapter Two, consistently featured the use of compositional devices that prominently favoured continuation function. I determined that Mendelssohn prioritized continuation function in an effort to move toward what I have coined a *hybrid exposition*. This term aims to capture the idea that Mendelssohn seems to be blending features of both the continuous and the two-part exposition, rather that veering toward a practice that gradually shifted from two-part to continuous.
Overall, from the analysis of this sample of works in sonata form, I demonstrated that four key trends of Mendelssohn’s sonata-form style emerged: 1) a preference for large primary themes; 2) creating continuity through elision and “becoming” for the TR-zone and consistent use of caesura fill which often gives rise to issues of formal closure; 3) issues of proportion in the latter half of the exposition (S- and C-space); and 4) the effect of re-composition and compression, especially in the recapitulation. Within the first category, Mendelssohn’s largest achievement is the introduction of a new compound hybrid form for the P-theme: the compound Antecedent + Continuation. It was demonstrated that the use of this compound form was a consistent way for Mendelssohn to introduce compositional techniques of continuation from the level of the sub-phrase up. In the majority of cases, Mendelssohn elides the end of the P-theme with the onset of TR, often completely running over the cadence that is expected to close the P-theme. Finally, I demonstrated that Mendelssohn’s tendency to compress the recapitulation rotation is another example of his penchant for structures of continuation.

Chapter Four delved further into several of these aspects common to Mendelssohn’s sonata-form works within the broader context of the early-nineteenth century. In particular, I addressed the evolving role of the medial caesura. Building upon the work of Mark Richards, I addressed how there appears to be a general trend toward the obfuscation of the articulation of the MC and further investigated Mendelssohn’s tendency to merge aspects of both the two-part and continuous exposition (the hybrid exposition). I then addressed the issue of re-composition and compression in the recapitulation rotation of Mendelssohn’s sonata form works, yet another example of Mendelssohn’s preference for forces of continuation. Finally, I made a case for
considering Haydn’s music, rather than only considering Beethoven’s middle- and late-period style as a significant exemplar for Mendelssohn’s own compositional style.

Finally, Chapter Five presented four analytical case studies of works extending across Mendelssohn’s compositional career. The two Piano Sonatas: G Minor, Op. 105 (1821) and E Major, Op. 6 (1825) were both composed early in Mendelssohn’s career and were used to draw connections between Mendelssohn’s early understanding of the form with its Classical predecessors. These analyses were also produced in order to refute Wingfield and Horton’s claim that Mendelssohn’s sonata oeuvre scarcely include an example of a work in sonata form that does not deviate in some way from Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata form. The analyses of two later works were then presented: the Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45 (1838) and the Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66 (1845) to demonstrate Mendelssohn’s stylistic growth with sonata form, confirming his preference for large-scale P-themes and agents of continuation. Additionally, the Cello Sonata, Op. 45 was used as an example of a hybrid exposition, one that merges aspects of both the continuous and the two-part exposition.

6.1 Future Research
Throughout the dissertation, I argued that changing aesthetic aspects of the Romantic consciousness resulted in a change to the generating aspects of sonata form. This, coupled with the gradual erosion of the articulation of the MC resulted in the

5. See Chapter Two, Note 11.
transformation of the genre-generating principle of opposition from thematic contrast (P versus S) to the larger-scale contrast between formal units (Exposition versus Development). My next project will look at this transformation in more detail, and consider Mak’s work concerning lyricism and Schubert more thoroughly.  

The representative sample of twenty-four first movements used as the basis for this study omitted the concerti in an effort to ensure that only works in dialogue with Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 3 “Textbook” sonata were included. Another project could build upon the work presented here in this dissertation and analyze Mendelssohn’s concerti (Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 5 sonata), to determine if similar characteristics emerge. Another potential avenue for research is to analyze Mendelssohn’s sonata-form oeuvre for works that represent Type 1 and Type 2 sonata forms.

Given that only the first movements of the twenty-four sonatas were considered in this dissertation, another next step is to analyze the works as a whole, building upon the idea first developed in Chapter Four, that Mendelssohn favours the use of compositional devices that demand the need for cyclical works. These devices include the use of the minor mode and the transformation of the genre-generating opposition to the level of the exposition/development. In the case of the minor mode, if one continues to ascribe to the notion that the minor mode is expected to be emancipated at some point to the tonic major, the vast majority of the cases within the representative sample do not achieve this emancipation within the first movement. A study of the works as a whole is required in

order to determine whether or not this emancipation happens later (likely in the finale). If this transformation does not occur, then a plausible explanation for why this expectation is thwarted or reshaped in the Romantic era. Secondly, the elevation of the genre-generating principle of opposition to the level of exposition/development demands either the addition of a coda or a cyclical work. In the Classical model of the sonata, the P- and S-theme contrast is resolved within sonata space, namely in the recapitulation. But the exposition/development thematic contrast cannot be resolved within sonata space; the development is not recapitulated in the way the exposition is. Therefore, according to Benedict Taylor, the development’s theme must either be resolved in a coda to the movement, or later in the work.  

Finally, the scope of this dissertation allowed only for the study of a small sample of Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form. Horton and Wingfield indicate that Mendelssohn wrote at least 154 works in sonata form. A long-term study to identify and analyze all works in sonata form from Mendelssohn’s oeuvre is certainly a next step in order to strengthen (or refute) the conclusions drawn here. It is also worth noting that a future study could look further into Mendelssohn’s connections with Haydn’s style by closely examining his study of Haydn’s works. This present study has merely scratched the surface of this fruitful topic. Mendelssohn’s conception of sonata form expertly blends

---

7. Benedict Taylor, *Mendelssohn, Time and Memory: The Romantic Conception of Cyclic Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 174. Taylor calls this procedure the “development breakthrough/new-theme deformation” arguing that “a new, if related theme enters in the development section and is recapitulated in the coda, hence presenting us with a parallel two-strophe design where the recapitulation mirrors the exposition and the coda the development” (ibid.).

8. Wingfield and Horton, “Norm and Deformation in Mendelssohn’s Sonata Forms,” 93.
aspects of the Classical model with the new Romantic aesthetic that was emerging during his lifetime.

Mercer-Taylor writes that “the notion of ‘falling between’ has emerged as something akin to a master trope of Mendelssohn’s reception.”\(^9\) While Mercer-Taylor’s statement is specifically dealing with Mendelssohn’s reception history, the metaphor is apt and describes Mendelssohn’s compositions impeccably: what has been gleaned throughout this dissertation is Mendelssohn’s expertise at being a ‘border-dweller’ between the Classicist heritage and the contemporary Romantic future. As argued in the introduction to this dissertation, Mercer-Taylor traces a long and rich history of the struggle between numerous dichotomies in Mendelssohn research and reception history. A deeper examination of Mendelssohn’s works in sonata form as presented here reveals yet another example of the struggle between the Classicist and Romantic ideals that was being worked out by Mendelssohn throughout his compositional career. As Schumann suggests, Mendelssohn was “the most brilliant among musicians; the one who has most clearly recognized the contradictions of the age, and the first to reconcile them.”\(^{10}\) I submit that Mendelssohn’s approach to sonata form in the early-nineteenth century is but one example of his ability to reconcile these contradictions that faced composers of the early Romantic age.

---

Appendices

Appendix A: Piano Sonata in G Minor, Op. 105, First Movement, Analysis
Appendix B: Piano Sonata in E Major, Op. 6, First Movement, Analysis

\textbf{P}\textit{ Allegretto con espressione}

\textbf{ANT.}
\begin{align*}
\text{ANT.} & \quad \text{bi} & \quad \text{ci} & \quad \text{CONT.} \\
\text{frg.} & & \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{CONS.}
\begin{align*}
\text{ANT.} & \quad \text{cad.} & \quad \text{bi} & \quad \text{ci} & \quad \text{CONT.} \\
\text{frg.} & & \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{TR.}
\begin{align*}
\text{frg.} & \quad \text{cad. (extended)} \\
\end{align*}
modulates to B-major
correspondence - m.47, half-beat early

P-theme interpolation

* cadence expected here

CODA

ESC corr. m.65
Appendix C: Cello Sonata No. 1 in B♭ Major, Op. 45, First Movement, Analysis
Standing on the Dominant of "F"?

ev. PAC in "F"

PAC in C minor. Illusory MC or MC-like effect?

V7 g minor

IAC

V5 f minor
No dominant lock
S-theme begins in G minor

vi: HC MC (g minor)

S-corresp. to m.61

f minor
Appendix D: Piano Trio No. 2 in C Minor, Op. 66, First Movement, Analysis
begins to modulate to g minor
dominant lock
*corresp. m. 110, slight recomposition

m. 121

marcato
corresp. m. 132

c minor [IAC]

CODA

c minor [IAC]
like opening of dev.

C minor confirmed

V/iv f minor

f minor over C dom. pedal
C minor
P-theme: augmented

PAC: C minor reconfirmed

sempre cresc.
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