

# HAYDN

The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America

---

Volume 2  
Number 2 *Fall 2012*

Article 5

---

November 2012

## Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn

Alexander Ludwig

Follow this and additional works at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal>

---

### Recommended Citation

Ludwig, Alexander (2012) "Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn," *HAYDN*: Vol. 2 : No. 2 , Article 5.  
Available at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal/vol2/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Research Media and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in HAYDN by an authorized editor of Research Media and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact [jmforce@berklee.edu](mailto:jmforce@berklee.edu).

## **Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn**

by Alexander Ludwig

### *Abstract*

In their massive book *Elements of Sonata Theory*, James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy frequently allude to or explicitly detail Joseph Haydn's well-known proclivity for using humor and wit. By constantly qualifying Haydn's music as witty or humorous, they succeed only in marginalizing both Haydn and his music. But given Haydn's status and influence as a composer in the late eighteenth century, this marginalization, historically speaking, hardly seems accurate. I propose two modifications that will enhance the overall effectiveness of Hepokoski and Darcy's theory, particularly as it relates to Haydn's compositional practices, and thereby soften the theory's current marginalization of Haydn. First, extracting the concept of "deformation" entirely and replacing it with a lower-level default will allow the direct examination of defaults between composers instead of juxtaposing defaults and deformations. Second, reconfiguring the foundational binary opposition from "two-part" or "continuous" expositions to those "with" or "without" medial caesuras will effectively open for consideration the previously excluded "three-part" exposition, a structural type prominent in Haydn's works. These two changes will help Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory to more fair-mindedly consider Haydn's music, thereby reshaping their theory into a more versatile, robust, and historically faithful tool.<sup>1</sup>

### *Introduction*

For the better part of two decades, James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy have concerned themselves with various aspects of the sonata in the late eighteenth century. Their body of work, which comprises multiple books and articles, culminates in the monumental and comprehensive *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*.<sup>2</sup> Taken

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is a substantially revised version of a paper read at the AMS New England chapter meeting (Winter, 2012). The author wishes to thank this Journal's anonymous readers as well as Allan Keiler, Sandra Fallon-Ludwig and Michael Ruhling for their careful attention and comments.

<sup>2</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy's first joint endeavor, an article introducing the medial caesura, serves as a preview for their later text, *Elements of Sonata Theory*. See "The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition,"

as a whole, these works have ridden a groundswell of interest in the issues of form in the Classical style.<sup>3</sup>

Upon completing Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*, the reader should feel no guilt for having the impression that detailed within its pages is an account of Mozart's works alone. According to the "Index of Works," Hepokoski and Darcy cite 74 compositions written by Ludwig van Beethoven and another 150 each by Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and Joseph Haydn.<sup>4</sup> But these numbers belie the true substance of the text. William Drabkin describes the index more accurately in terms of columns: in the index, Beethoven's and Haydn's works together occupy four columns while Mozart's works garner ten.<sup>5</sup> In other words, Hepokoski and Darcy discuss the latter more often and in more depth than in their combined discussion of Haydn and Beethoven. Such an imbalance gives rise to misleading conclusions, particularly in the authors' method of illustrating "default" examples, using a word drawn from their own work. Predominantly, they look first to Mozart's *oeuvre*, which is problematic for a text that purports to encompass the sonata in the late eighteenth century.<sup>6</sup>

---

*Music Theory Spectrum* Vol. 19, No. 2 (1997): 115-154; and *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). Hepokoski also participated in an engaging publication that postdates *Elements of Sonata Theory*; titled *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009). It presents the methodologies of, as well as responses from, Hepokoski, James Webster and William Caplin. Hepokoski is the sole author for a number of articles: "Masculine-Feminine," *The Musical Times* (1994), 494-499; "Back and Forth from Egmont: Beethoven, Mozart, and the Nonresolving Recapitulation," *19th-Century Music* Vol. 25, nos. 2-3 (Fall/Spring 2001-02), 127-54; "Beyond the Sonata Principle," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 55, no. 1 (Spring 2002), 91-54. Both Hepokoski and Darcy have written articles that fall outside of the purview of the late eighteenth century, but nonetheless impacts sonata theory broadly: see Hepokoski's "Framing Till Eulenspiegel," *19th-Century Music*, 30 (2006), 4-43; and Warren Darcy, "Bruckner's Sonata Deformations," in *Bruckner Studies*, edited by Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hackshaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 256-77.

<sup>3</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy are not solely responsible for such a resurgence: see also Leonard Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer, 1980), James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and William Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

<sup>4</sup> For more on the extra attention paid to Mozart, see William Drabkin's review-article "Mostly Mozart," *The Musical Times* Vol. 148, no. 1901 (2007), 89-100, and Paul Wingfield, "Beyond 'Norms and Definitions': Towards a Theory of Sonata Forms as Reception History," *Music Analysis* Vol. 27, no. 1 (2008), 137-177. Wingfield, for example, calculates that Mozart accounts for 34% of the total movements cited in Index of Works, 141.

<sup>5</sup> Drabkin, "Mostly Mozart," 99.

<sup>6</sup> Wingfield's calculations reveal that "a colossal 76% of the examples [given in the text] are taken from Mozart's works, 42% of which are concertos." Wingfield, "Beyond 'Norms'," 141.

But this bias is modest compared with Hepokoski and Darcy's broad generalizations of Haydn and his compositional style. They describe him as an idiosyncratic composer, "seeking constant surprise, invention, and originality;"<sup>7</sup> or, that he has a "startlingly original musical language."<sup>8</sup> Paul Wingfield has rightly alerted readers to one such consequence of these choices: "Almost all references to Haydn are prefaced by the epithet 'witty.'"<sup>9</sup> But their descriptions of Haydn's formal designs carry a different connotation entirely: almost from the start, Hepokoski and Darcy characterize Haydn's structures as humorous, jocular deformations of the typical. Indeed, they continue, "[deformations] are rampant in Haydn, who delighted in producing surprising effects."<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Haydn:

sought a pervasive originality of content and design in his works, as though he were remelting at each compositional moment the crystalizing forms and procedures that had come to be normative, even schematic, in the hands of others into a persistent volatility of instantaneousness, an unpredictable malleability that often eludes a clean capture by the standard, heuristic formal categories.<sup>11</sup>

This particularly vivid description is an accurate reflection of Hepokoski and Darcy's perception of Haydn's music, a perception that rarely fails to mention originality and surprise.

But one wonders about the cumulative effect of these characterizations. Do the constant references to Haydn's wit and originality bleach the validity from Hepokoski and Darcy's claims? Even worse, do these references marginalize Haydn's music on a large scale? In this article, I will examine aspects of Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory that prominently marginalize Haydn's music, propose alterations to their theory that are designed to better assimilate Haydn's music,<sup>12</sup> and afford Haydn's

---

<sup>7</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 233.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>9</sup> Wingfield, "Beyond 'Norms'," 147.

<sup>10</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 11.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 413.

<sup>12</sup> In fact, Hepokoski and Darcy invite this type of criticism: "At any point, the method outlined here can be expanded or modified through criticism, correction, or nuance. Indeed, we invite this." *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 9.

music a fair-minded reading, thereby softening its marginalized status within Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory.

### *Sonata Theory and Haydn's Music*

Hepokoski and Darcy's depiction of the sonata as a product of a particular social, cultural and musical environment is perhaps one of their most under-appreciated contributions. According to their theory, each sonata exists in a dialogue between the composer and what Hepokoski and Darcy call generic norms and expectations.<sup>13</sup> Such a dialogue is the product of a complex nexus: any hypothetical composer, steeped in the tradition of the late eighteenth century, could pull options from different default options or norms, thereby "enter[ing] into a dialogue with an intricate web of interrelated norms as an ongoing action in time."<sup>14</sup> Thus each sonata is both a reaction to what came before and a potential catalyst for what comes after.

Hepokoski and Darcy plot the various outcomes and solutions of each sonata along a series of default options that are commensurate with their frequency of usage. Frequency is a key component of their theory: "composers selected (or adapted) first-level options more frequently than second-level ones, and so on."<sup>15</sup> The spectrum ranges from "level-one" defaults to level four. Furthermore, various modifications or unique alterations of a specific default can take place. These are termed "deformations." Generally speaking, this system is weighted, meaning that a first-level default occurs more often than a third-level default.<sup>16</sup>

At times, Hepokoski and Darcy seem confounded by the unpredictable nature of Haydn. The authors are frequently agitated by his stubborn refusal to follow conventional patterns; one can almost

<sup>13</sup> One of the more controversial aspects of Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory is the precise generation of these norms and expectations, or lack thereof. At no point in their text do they explicitly delineate the process by which they ascertained the status of various default settings. "Surely the most common decisions were made efficiently, expertly, and tacitly on the basis of norms that had been internalized (rendered automatic) through experience and familiarity with the style." *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>16</sup> "Reconstructing the genre involves recreating the specifics of this flexible set of weighted default-choices for each interior zone." *Ibid.*, 608.

visualize Hepokoski and Darcy raising their hands in exasperation. In fact, this “hands-in-the-air” trope appears early in Hepokoski and Darcy’s justification for their sonata theory:

but the only alternative to throwing one’s hands in the face of such diversity (rallying around the cry, “Anything can happen!,” which is obviously untrue) was to find a reasonable middle ground between confiningly rigid schemata and the claim of a near-total-freedom.<sup>17</sup>

Haydn, too, fought against these twin perils of rigidity and freedom, ironically earning disdain from Hepokoski and Darcy. Their frustration is foregrounded most clearly in their discussion of the recapitulation.

The recapitulation’s function as the culminating member of a sonata places unusual demands on the perception of its material. First heard in the exposition, this material is subjected to various manipulations in the development and subsequently repeated in a transformed state in the recapitulation. Such a transformation is rooted in the harmonic basis of sonata form: typically, material originally played in the key of the dominant is “recapitulated” in the key of the tonic.<sup>18</sup> The repetition of this material, even in its new key area, presents a challenge for the composer—a challenge Haydn readily accepts.

After they introduce the barest précis of a typical recapitulation, Hepokoski and Darcy invoke an extended caveat explicitly pertaining to Haydn’s treatment of the recapitulation. This particular paragraph includes the following statements:

The main exceptions to these generalizations are to be found in the works of Haydn. . . . One should not draw general conclusions about eighteenth-century recapitulations from [Haydn’s] idiosyncratic works.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>18</sup> Edward T. Cone describes the tonal process of sonata form, or “sonata principle,” as such: “...important statements made in a key other than the tonic must either be re-stated in the tonic, or brought into closer relation with the tonic, before the movement ends.” *Cone, Musical Form and Musical Performance* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968), 76-77.

<sup>19</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 233.

The reason for Hepokoski and Darcy's hard line on Haydn is soon made clear. In general, thematic materials of the exposition typically reappear in order, a process that Hepokoski and Darcy label "rotation." Although the recapitulatory paradigm of an ordered repetition of thematic material often occurs in Haydn's music, at times this paradigm gets manipulated by Haydn in ways that Hepokoski and Darcy find troubling. They assert that repeated material rarely survives intact in Haydn's recapitulations, thereby creating a rich source for encountering anomalies:

While Haydn's recapitulations almost always retain an underlying, readily traceable principle of rotation, their local details are often substantially recomposed, with a penchant for remaining doggedly original all the way to the end.<sup>20</sup>

This characterization of Haydn's originality has multiple layers, too. Hepokoski and Darcy rarely miss an opportunity to illustrate the ways in which Haydn's formal strategies exploit ambiguity for humorous or witty effects. Their extended description of the recapitulation of the first movement of the String Quartet in D, Op. 33 no. 6, mentions at various points ambiguities that Haydn "enjoy[s] teasing out" and traditions that he "plays on." Moreover, they describe how Haydn ambiguously draws on, or alludes to, multiple formal types simultaneously. They conclude:

Thus Haydn provided his audience with a witty work cleverly suspended in the force fields of at least three formal categories without declaring definitively on behalf of any of them.<sup>21</sup>

Aided by this unusual science-fiction metaphor, their analysis highlights the recapitulation's new rotation with special attention on the design to "iron out" deformations from earlier in the exposition.<sup>22</sup> According to their analysis, this work is "witty" because of its formal ambiguity, but the explicit humor of this work is less than obvious. It is well known that some of Haydn's works have an obviously humorous orientation: the finale of the "Joke" String Quartet, Op. 33 no.2 and the slow

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 233.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 277.

<sup>22</sup> In this example, the recapitulation begins with remnants of the development still lingering, thereby introducing an air of unpredictability into the unfolding formal processes. For more, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 277.

movement of the "Surprise" Symphony No. 94 are both designed to emphasize explicitly humorous moments. Likewise, manipulations of the actual surface create more subtle, yet still accessible, examples of humor. For instance, these movements may begin with an obviously cadential phrase, such as the first movement of the String Quartet in G, Op. 33 no. 5.<sup>23</sup> But Hepokoski and Darcy are less systematic with their use of the concept of "humor," using the words "witty," "humorous," and "deformational" almost interchangeably.

Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory is built upon a system of default options and norms. Given the taxonomical nature of their theory, Hepokoski and Darcy must account for those moments that do not accord with one of the many available default options. They do so by utilizing the term "deformation." But Hepokoski and Darcy are careful to articulate a nuanced view of "deformation" as a term:

We steer clear of the verb "to deform" along with (especially) the related word "deformed" (let alone deformity!) to describe the effect of a deformation. . . . The abstract noun "deformation" is cooler, more detached—hopefully, more connotationally "technical." It marks only our noticing (and often relishing) of a remarkably unusual compositional choice; it is not judgmental.<sup>24</sup>

Later they attempt to mollify Joseph Straus's critique by disavowing the implicit binary opposition of "well-formed" versus "deformed."<sup>25</sup> But despite their protestations, the term "deformation" carries a distinct connotation of abnormality, a connotation that is reinforced time and again throughout Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory.

---

<sup>23</sup> Ambiguities like these have been examined successfully in Gretchen Wheelock's book *Haydn's Ingenious Jestings With Art: Contexts of Musical Wit and Humor* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992).

<sup>24</sup> *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 615.

<sup>25</sup> Joseph Straus, "Normalizing the Abnormal: Disability in Music and Music Theory," *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 59, no. 1 (2006), 113-184.

Their theory comprises a foundation of normative options. Only after this foundation, or what they call a “backdrop,” is put into place, can one truly explicate the function of a sonata or any musical work.<sup>26</sup> As they rightfully illustrate:

In order to arrive at an adequate sense of meaning within a work, we must reconstruct a sufficiently detailed generic and cultural backdrop against which such individual works sought to play themselves out.<sup>27</sup>

Such a comment suggests the possibility of prizing the idiosyncratic over the normative. But in practice, Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory seems to be engineered to produce results diametrically opposed to the idiosyncratic. It is also clear that, within this context, normative examples are synonymous with Mozartean ones.

To rectify this imbalance, I propose a simple solution: extract the concept of “deformation” from the theory entirely and exchange it for a lower-level default. Effectively, this slight modification accomplishes three goals. First, it allows for considerations of Haydn’s music to take place on the same terms as Mozart’s or Beethoven’s; instead of juxtaposing a positive default with a negative deformation, one can now compare defaults of varying weights, free from their marginalizing modifiers. Second, it eradicates from Hepokoski and Darcy’s lexicon the harmful term “deformation.” Third, it enlarges the compositional matrix of options, thereby strengthening the founding principle of sonata theory, namely that sonatas exist in a dialogue with compositional norms.<sup>28</sup>

### *The Three-Part Exposition*

The removal of “deformations” from Hepokoski and Darcy’s arsenal reorients their characterizations of Haydn’s music. Deformations now become “expressively charged stretchings” or “engaging

<sup>26</sup> “But what occurs notationally, or does not occur, can make sense or create an impression only within a backdrop-field charged with generic expectation.” *Ibid.*, 608-9.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 604.

<sup>28</sup> Of course, in the current form of Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory, most of Haydn’s music exists as a deformation of some type. Rectifying this division is important: given its taxonomical nature, sonata theory can only benefit from drawing examples from the largest pool of works as is possible.

foray[s] into the unanticipated.”<sup>29</sup> Although this change occurs mostly at surface level, it contextualizes Haydn’s music in terms that are less detrimental. A remaining structural problem, however, still threatens to marginalize Haydn’s music. This marginalization derives from an artificial division of expositional types built into the structure of Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory: expositions that they label either “two-part” or “continuous.” Two-part expositions appear in a majority of sonata-form movements;<sup>30</sup> continuous expositions fill the remainder.<sup>31</sup> In both expositional types the medial caesura (MC) plays a vital role. According to Hepokoski and Darcy,

Whatever the character of the central texture of the exposition —either that of Fortspinnung proper or that of something more overtly thematically based — one should suspect the presence of a continuous exposition if one cannot locate a convincing medial caesura dividing the exposition into two parts.<sup>32</sup>

This opposition of expositional types is problematic. It creates a subtle yet powerful hierarchy of forms, a hierarchy that reveals a predisposition for two-part expositions over continuous ones.<sup>33</sup> The concept of the “binary opposition” is drawn from Roman Jakobson and the Prague School of linguistics.<sup>34</sup> It explains a crucial stage in the development of language: once an object is named, it receives meaning, yet assigning meaning often implies the existence of an opposite meaning, thereby

---

<sup>29</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 617. “Deformations are compositional surprises, engaging forays into the unanticipated. But the paradox of art is that the nature of the game at hand also and always includes the idea that we are to expect the unexpected. If deviations from the merely expected never happen within an individual work, that is no sign of aesthetic health or integrity...On the contrary...the work is more likely to be sidelined by historical consensus as unimaginative, composition-by-the-numbers, a boiler-plate product.”

<sup>30</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 18: “The exposition begins with the primary theme or primary idea (P) in the tonic that sets the emotional tone of the work. The most common layout for the remainder of the exposition continues with an energy-gaining zone of transition (TR) that leads to a mid-expositional break or medial caesura (MC). This is typically followed by the onset of a specialized, secondary-theme zone (S) in the new key.”

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 51: “The continuous exposition is identified by its lack of a clearly articulated medial caesura followed by a successfully launched secondary theme. Instead of providing a TR that leads to a medial caesura and thence to an S, as with the two-part exposition, the continuous exposition, especially in Haydn’s works, usually fills up most of the expositional space with the relentlessly ongoing, expansive spinning out (Fortspinnung) of an initial idea or its immediate consequences.”

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>33</sup> A similar hierarchy appears in the opposition of default and deformation.

<sup>34</sup> For more, see Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle, *Fundamentals of Language* (The Hague: Mouton, 1956).

differentiating one object from another.<sup>35</sup> Robert Hatten describes this process as often asymmetrical:

Wherever one finds differentiation, there are inevitably oppositions. The terms of such oppositions are weighted with respect to some feature that is distinctive for the opposition. Thus, the two terms of an opposition will have an unequal value or asymmetry, of marked versus unmarked, that has consequences for the meaning of each term.<sup>36</sup>

Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory comprises two categories of expositions: those with and those without medial caesuras. Furthermore, these two categories are defined, both positively and negatively, in terms of the MC: it is present in the two-part exposition, and is absent in the continuous exposition.

The decision to base their sonata theory on a binary opposition of expositional types has serious ramifications for the expositional type known as the "three-part" exposition, a less common though equally convincing structure utilized almost exclusively by Haydn.<sup>37</sup> For example, a typical three-part exposition often includes a caesura-like break, but always lacks a conventional secondary theme.<sup>38</sup> The relationship between the medial caesura and secondary-theme zone (S) is vital for Hepokoski and Darcy's definition of the two-part exposition:

The MC and S are the defining rhetorical features of the two-part exposition. Both are lacking in the continuous exposition. This means that as a compositional or analytical construct S

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., 47: "The binary opposition is a child's first logical operation."

<sup>36</sup> Robert Hatten, *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 34.

<sup>37</sup> For the original description of the "three-part exposition," see Jens Peter Larsen's seminal article, "Sonata Form Problems," *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, translated by Ulrich Krämer (UMI Press: Ann Arbor, 1988), 269-80. Originally "Sonatenform-Probleme," in *Festschrift Friedrich Blume* (Bärenreiter: Kassel, 1963), 221-230. See also, Michelle Fillion, "Sonata Exposition Procedures in Haydn's Keyboard Sonatas," *Haydn Studies. Proceedings of the International Haydn Congress, Washington, D.C., 1975*, edited by Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster (New York: Norton, 1981), 475-481.

<sup>38</sup> The matter is further clouded by the nomenclature "three-part" exposition, which is often confused with the "three-key" exposition, a structure that comprises three distinct tonal areas. For more, see Rey M. Longyear and Kate R. Covington, "Sources of the Three-Key Exposition," *The Journal of Musicology* Vol. 6, No. 4 (Autumn, 1988), 448.

cannot exist unless a MC has opened space for it.<sup>39</sup>

Considering only this quote, one might easily categorize the three-part exposition as a continuous exposition; its lack of a conventional secondary theme all but assures the three-part exposition status as a continuous exposition. But the presence of caesura-like breaks adds a layer of complexity that Hepokoski and Darcy do little to assuage.

Herein lies the main conceptual problem of Hepokoski and Darcy's binary opposition: in short, some expositions fit neither the two-part nor the continuous model. The three-part exposition is precisely one of these exceptions. It is a singular expositional form, neither a continuous nor a two-part exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy assert, incorrectly, that the three-part exposition is a precursor of their own continuous expositional type. Moreover, they claim that the term "three-part" exposition is misleading.<sup>40</sup> Categorizing the three-part exposition as a continuous exposition diminishes its expressive power. Some of this power is derived from the confusion surrounding its structural identification: is it an unusual two-part exposition? a continuous exposition? or a three-part exposition? The byproduct of this struggle is often, but not exclusively, humorous. In fact, this obfuscation is an important strategic component of the three-part exposition.<sup>41</sup> Confusion abounds in these matters, so much so that its mixed analysis in the scholarly community should not be surprising.

By way of example, note what happens after the medial caesura (bar 26) of the first movement of

---

<sup>39</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, "The Medial Caesura," 122. Hepokoski and Darcy are careful to define exactly the constitution of a medial caesura: the initial description ("[a] brief, rhetorically reinforced break or gap," *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 24) quickly spirals into a series of dependent clauses, such as only a "proper" MC launches a "successful" secondary-theme zone (S), which in turn, culminates in the first perfect-authentic cadence in the new key, what Hepokoski and Darcy label the essential expositional closure (EEC). If any one of these events fails to succeed, then each previous event, including even the original medial caesura, is also deemed a failure. For more, see their discussion of the Trimodular Block (TMB), *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 170-176.

<sup>40</sup> They find it misleading because, according to their sonata theory, two subtypes of continuous exposition exist: in addition to the "Expansion-Section," which shares a great amount of DNA with the three-part exposition, they also describe the "Early PAC in the New Key Followed by (Varied) Reiterations of the Cadence." For more on the continuous exposition, see "The Continuous Exposition" in *Elements of Sonata Theory* (51-64).

<sup>41</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy describe an underlying psychology of the continuous exposition as such: "We believe that this expectation [of psychological conversion from two-part expositions to continuous ones] may have been shared by the competent listener in the decades surrounding 1800 and that Haydn, in particular, often made the process of conversion into a central feature of his pieces with continuous expositions." Hepokoski and Darcy, "Medial Caesura," 133. I believe that this psychology is central to three-part exposition as well.

Haydn's String Quartet in C, Op. 33 no. 3 [Example 1].<sup>42</sup> Is this material typical or atypical? It displays very few of the markers that are today considered characteristic of a traditional secondary (S) theme: although it is marked piano, this material is highly active and virtuosic — not lyrical in any way. Furthermore, it is heavily chromatic, with numerous B-flats implying the key of the minor dominant, G minor.<sup>43</sup>

When viewed in context of the entire exposition, it is clear that the material found after the medial caesura is designed to confound expectations. Specifically, a developmental and chromatic passage, which alludes to the key of G minor, appears in lieu of a lyrical theme in the key of the dominant (bars 27-37).<sup>44</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy do include short descriptions of these situations (minor-mode modules in the S-space;<sup>45</sup> thematic units of a non-cantabile nature),<sup>46</sup> but they do not mention Op. 33 no. 3. It is clear that the material found in bars 26-42 is not typical for a secondary-theme zone, according to Hepokosi and Darcy. Assertions along these lines are unconvincing.

---

<sup>42</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy agree that bar 26 includes a medial caesura: "The exposition provides a clear I:HC MC in bar 26, followed by a bar of S<sup>0</sup> (bar 27), then S<sup>1</sup> proper (bar 28)." *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 239.

<sup>43</sup> The key of G major is the anticipated new key of the dominant: it is introduced by a strong chain of parallel tenths, descending from the fifth-scale degree (d<sup>''</sup>) to the second (a'), but culminates in a first-inversion G-minor chord (!).

<sup>44</sup> For more on this movement, see Alex Ludwig, "Three-Part Expositions in the String Quartets of Joseph Haydn." PhD diss., Brandeis University (2010), 92-96.

<sup>45</sup> *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 141.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

Example 1: Haydn, String Quartet in C, Op. 33 no. 3;  
first movement, bars 22-48

Violin 22

Violin

Viola

Violoncello

27

Vln.

Vln.

Vla.

Vlc.

31

Vln.

Vln.

Vla.

Vlc.

Ludwig, Alexander. "Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn"

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 2.2 (Fall 2012), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2012. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Musical score for measures 34-36, featuring Violin I (Vln.), Violin II (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello (Vlc.).

Musical score for measures 37-40, featuring Violin I (Vln.), Violin II (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello (Vlc.).

Musical score for measures 41-45, featuring Violin I (Vln.), Violin II (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello (Vlc.).

Musical score for measures 46-49, featuring Violin I (Vln.), Violin II (Vln.), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello (Vlc.).

However unusual this passage may be, it is typical (if one is ever comfortable labeling anything written by Haydn as typical) of the “middle” group of a three-part exposition.<sup>47</sup> Also known as the expansion section, this middle third instills a dynamic sense of motion into the three-part exposition. As defined by Larsen, the *Entwicklungspartie* comprises a developmental structure, a description that Michelle Fillion later enlarged:

a dramatic area of directional tonal activity . . . makes use of most or all of the following devices: long-range avoidance of strong root-position cadence and root-position tonic triads in the new tonality until the end of the expansion section; sequences; introduction of the dominant minor.<sup>48</sup>

This description is especially pertinent for the work under consideration. For example, sequences are the preferred treatment of the thematic material, and the tonic triad rarely appears outside of the parallel minor. Hepokoski and Darcy do allow for the appearance of minor-mode material in S-space, but they clearly state that the effect is temporary: “In virtually all cases the minor-mode effect is corrected later in the exposition, often within S-space itself.”<sup>49</sup>

Haydn utilized a three-part exposition in almost fifty percent of his string quartets,<sup>50</sup> and more than thirty percent of his piano sonatas.<sup>51</sup> Clearly, his compositional practice supports the three-part exposition as a unique formal option, but such a practice has not received scholarly attention that is commensurate with its status. Hepokoski and Darcy exacerbate this disparity by grouping the three-part exposition within the catch-all category of continuous expositions. In doing so, they disregard the nuanced ambiguities native to this unusual form and continue to marginalize the three-part exposition, and by extension, Haydn's compositional practices.

---

<sup>47</sup> The three sections are generally referred to as the opening, expansion and closing sections. For an overview of the general characteristics associated with the three-part exposition, see Ludwig, “Three-Part Expositions,” 53-75.

<sup>48</sup> Fillion, “Sonata Exposition Procedures,” 478.

<sup>49</sup> *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 141 (emphasis added).

<sup>50</sup> Ludwig, “Three-Part Expositions,” 53-75.

<sup>51</sup> Fillion, “Sonata Exposition Procedures,” 475-481.

To incorporate the three-part exposition into their theory, Hepokoski and Darcy need only alter the components of their structural binary opposition. In keeping with their original emphasis, Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory would be on firmer ground if they changed their binary opposition from two-part or continuous expositions to "those expositions with a medial caesura" or "those without a medial caesura." The various expositions in the latter category would be defined thusly: "continuous" expositions feature the total absence of a medial caesura; "three-part" expositions include the appearance of a caesura, although not a medial caesura as defined by Hepokoski and Darcy.<sup>52</sup> The expectation of this medial caesura is a strategic aspect of the three-part exposition. By changing Hepokoski and Darcy's binary opposition in this way, the representation in their sonata theory of a larger number of Haydn's expositions, indeed all "non-two-part" expositions, would be more accurately reflect historical practice.

### *Conclusion*

Of course, there are many reasons to employ Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory as it currently stands. Most importantly, it minimizes the impact of the so-called "jelly mold" or textbook type of formal analysis, which has antagonized analysts since at least Donald Tovey. Hepokoski and Darcy do so by depicting the compositional process as a dialogue between composers and a complex web of generic conventions. This type of analysis, especially its flexible and open-minded approach to formal choices, seems perfectly suited for the analysis of Haydn's compositions. But Hepokoski and Darcy neglect to take full advantage of their own theory, and instead are content to depict Haydn as a musical humorist, flouting the rules in a constant search for new laughs.

By point of comparison, it might be useful to examine Hepokoski and Darcy's treatment of the ways in which Mozart approached the concerto, a form with as many generic expectations as the late-eighteenth-century sonata. Hepokoski and Darcy begin with a familiar disclaimer: "Mozart took every opportunity to realize [generic constraints] in surprising and inventive ways." Qualities that might have been deformations in other circumstances are here listed as virtues. They continue:

---

<sup>52</sup> They are extremely specific in defining a medial caesura: it includes not only the MC itself, but also a number of factors after the event. See above note 40.

Surveying Mozart's concertos, one gets the impression that he has individualized as much as can be individualized, that taken together these works provide a treatise on how to refresh even the most rigid of schemes. Mozart exploited the potential for ingeniousness in every standardized zone, turning a genre weighted down with near-obligatory conventions into a continuous source of astonishment.<sup>53</sup>

It seems clear that given the current structure of Hepokoski and Darcy's Elements of Sonata Theory, Mozart and Haydn receive unequal treatments. Mozart is depicted as a composer of evocative, moving works, while Haydn is often portrayed as a composer with a penchant for "deformations." It is clear that Hepokoski and Darcy built their theory on a model closely aligned with Mozart's music; one such byproduct of this decision is the nearly continuous characterizations of Haydn's music as a deformation of the Mozartian model.

I have illustrated some of the ways in which Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory marginalizes Haydn and his compositions. Some of these injustices are concrete in nature, others are more superficial, off-hand characterizations. Collectively, they seem to add up to wholesale marginalization by this sonata theory. The most persistent treatment of Haydn pertains to his penchant for humor, but this label is applied in an inconsistent, unscholarly manner. If everything from large-scale formal manipulations to small motivic quirks are considered "deformational," then what does that label truly mean?<sup>54</sup> By including the suggested alterations contained herein, Hepokoski and Darcy could portray a truer picture of Haydn's works in their sonata theory.

I have detailed a simple solution to this problem above, namely that one should disregard the concept of deformations entirely. Doing so would place the descriptions of Haydn and his music onto an equal footing with those of Mozart and Beethoven. Of course, a more structural obstacle also remains for Haydn's music. By grouping the "three-part" exposition within the general class of continuous expositions, Hepokoski and Darcy do a disservice to the three-part exposition, an already little-known structural type. My second proposition would incorporate the three-part exposition wholly into

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 470.

<sup>54</sup> In its own way, this process is like the prolongation of a tonic chord: if repeated too much, it begins to sound like something else entirely.

Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory by redefining the binary opposition to include on the one hand all expositions with a medial caesura and on the other all those without a medial caesura. As it currently stands, Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory* represents less of a paradigm shift than a tightening of focus, concealing the characters left outside of the frame; with these modifications, Hepokoski and Darcy's sonata theory may reach the versatility for which they strive.

### *Works Cited*

- Bergé, Peter, ed. *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.
- Caplin, William. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Cone, Edward T. *Musical Form and Musical Performance*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.
- Darcy, Warren. "Bruckner's Sonata Deformations." In *Bruckner Studies*, edited by Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hackshaw, 256-277. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Drabkin, William. "Mostly Mozart." *The Musical Times* Vol. 148, no. 1901 (2007): 89-100.
- Fillion, Michelle. "Sonata Exposition Procedures in Haydn's Keyboard Sonatas." In *Haydn Studies: Proceedings of the International Haydn Congress, Washington, D.C., 1975*, edited by Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster, 475-481. New York: W. W. Norton, 1981.
- Hatten, Robert. *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Hepokoski, James. "Back and Forth from Egmont: Beethoven, Mozart, and the Nonresolving Recapitulation." *19th-Century Music* Vol. 25, nos. 2-3 (Fall/Spring 2001-02): 127-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Beyond the Sonata Principle." *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 55, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 91-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Framing Till Eulenspiegel." *19th-Century Music* 30 (2006): 4-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Masculine-Feminine." *The Musical Times* (1994): 494-499.
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. "The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition." *Music Theory Spectrum* Vol. 19, no. 2 (1997): 115-154.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Jakobson, Roman and Morris Halle. *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague: Mouton, 1956.
- Larsen, Jens Peter. "Sonata Form Problems." In *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, translated by Ulrich Krämer, 269-80. Ann Arbor: UMI Press, 1988. Originally "Sonatenform-Probleme." In *Festschrift Friedrich Blume*, 221-230. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963.
- Longyear, Rey M. and Kate R. Covington. "Sources of the Three-Key Exposition." *The Journal of Musicology* Vol. 6, no. 4 (Autumn, 1988): 448-470.

Ludwig, Alexander. "Three-Part Expositions in the String Quartets of Joseph Haydn." PhD diss., Brandeis University, 2010.

Ratner, Leonard. *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York: Schirmer, 1980.

Straus, Joseph. "Normalizing the Abnormal: Disability in Music and Music Theory," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* Vol. 59, no. 1 (2006): 113-184.

Webster, James. *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wheelock, Gretchen. *Haydn's Ingenious Jesting with Art: Contexts of Musical Wit and Humor*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1992.

Wingfield, Paul. "Beyond 'Norms and Definitions': Towards a Theory of Sonata Forms as Reception History." *Music Analysis* Vol. 27, no. 1 (2008): 137-177.