
JULIAN HORTON

BEETHOVEN'S ERROR? THE MODULATING RITORNELLO AND THE TYPE 5 SONATA IN THE POST-CLASSICAL PIANO CONCERTO

Beethoven's 'Error' and the Problem of the Modulating Ritornello

Ex. 1 shows the medial caesura (MC) and second-theme group in ritornello 1 (R1) of the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 3 in C minor, Op. 37, overlaid with analytical commentary.¹ This passage has attracted comment for its mediant modulation: a III half-close MC secured in bars 48–49 produces a second theme (B) in E<f>. The theme is essentially periodic, but tonally conflicted. The antecedent is constructed from a compound basic idea (c.b.i.), continuation and half cadence in III, but Beethoven follows this with a modulating consequent that is effectively abandoned, terminating in a C minor half cadence (HC) at bar 61, after which the true consequent begins, via a mode switch, in C major at bar 62. This phrase is also cadentially extended: bars 66–69 furnish a tonic-major imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) and, in a modally mixed play on Janet Schmalfeldt's 'one-more-time' technique (Schmalfeldt 1992), bars 70–74¹ steer towards a PAC, whilst simultaneously switching back to the tonic minor. The cadence however resolves deceptively to V7/iv, and the true structural cadence follows in bars 83–85, after a first-theme-based sequential phrase extension.

<INSERT EX. 1 NEAR HERE>

In his essay on Op. 37 (Tovey 1936a), Donald Francis Tovey noted Beethoven's decision to present R1's second theme in the relative major with disapproval. This, for Tovey, constituted an 'error', arising from a confusion of concerted and symphonic formal principles, which Beethoven pursued in his first three piano concerti. Because the soloist revisits the second theme in S1 in the same key, Beethoven contrives a structural

tautology; and because R1's tonal trajectory invites comparison with a symphonic exposition, Beethoven effectively undermines the movement's defining generic principle, which is the association of tonal polarisation with the soloist rather than the orchestra. As Tovey explains: 'In the C minor Concerto [the transition] takes direct dramatic action and leads to a long passage of preparation for the second subject in its destined new key. This is sheer symphonic exposition; it rouses no expectation of the entry of a solo instrument and [...] leaves nothing essential for the pianoforte to add when its time comes' (1936a, p. 71). This decision exacerbates a misunderstanding, which for Tovey casts a shadow over Beethoven's first three concerti, before he rectified it in opp. 58 and 73; as Tovey opined in the essay on Op. 15: 'in all three concertos the nature of the opening tutti is radically misconceived; and that of the C minor Concerto [...] is an advance upon the other two only inasmuch as Beethoven seems to discover the error at the moment of committing it' (1936b, p. 64).

Tovey's critique served a broader agenda, which has theoretical, analytical and historical ramifications. In 'The Classical Concerto', he mobilised the fallacy of the modulating R1 as the cornerstone of an argument differentiating 'the true concerto' from generic imposters. For Tovey, true concertos are scarce and predominantly by Mozart: 'The number of great works in true concerto form is surprisingly small [...] . And of this small collection a good two thirds has been contributed by Mozart' (1936c, p. 3). For the most part, practitioners of concerto form misunderstood its foundational idea, either because they confused symphonic and concertante principles, or because they conceived the form as a vehicle for virtuosity rather than tonal drama, becoming enchanted with 'the splendid spectacular effect of a full orchestra as a background for a display of instrumental technique'. In the end, however, their music '[expresses] little else than that effect' (1936c, *ibid.*).

As William Drabkin has noted (1988), Tovey's argument – and especially the idea that R1 presents a problem for which Mozart furnished an ideal solution – has become foundational to the theory of concerto first-movement form, or the 'type 5 sonata', as James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy classify it (2006, pp. 430–602). Charles Rosen framed the issue in similar terms: if R1 is too short, then it infringes on the principle of dramatic dialogue; if it acquires the character of a symphonic exposition,

then it preempts and disarms the soloist's formal responsibility. The second-theme modulation is critical in this respect. Rosen identifies Mozart's monotonal solutions as a borrowing from the operatic aria, creating a 'passive' orchestral exposition, which mimics its solo successor without risking structural redundancy: 'The orchestral exposition of K. 271 [for example] remains in the tonic throughout without modulating; it is, in fact, exactly like the orchestral opening of an operatic aria. The dramatic modulation is left to the soloist; in so far as there are two real expositions in a concerto, one is necessarily passive and the other active' (1972, p. 198). For Rosen, the merging of symphonic and concerto forms favoured by some early nineteenth-century composers misunderstood Mozart's principle, at the heart of which lay precisely the contrast between orchestral tonic prolongation and solo modulation that Tovey identified.²

The notion of an ideal Mozartian solution to the concerto problem has informed more recent *Formenlehre*. William Caplin notes that R1's second theme usually acquires that status through formal positioning rather than tonal contrast: 'The [...] thematic unit [after the transition] continues to reside in the home key but, because of its placement following a transition, gives the impression of being a subordinate theme' (1998, p. 244). R1's rhetorical similarity to a sonata exposition is consequently compromised, since 'a genuine tonal conflict between home and subordinate keys' is absent. Caplin allies this reduced expositional function in Mozart to a distinctive distribution of tight-knit and loose characteristics, which articulate to the basic concerted principle of allowing the soloist to act as the arbiter of contrast:

[T]he 'subordinate theme' (or themes) is generally more tight-knit than would ordinarily be expected in a sonata exposition of a comparable orchestral movement, such as a symphony or overture. Formal loosening is kept to a minimum for a number of reasons. First, the home key, in which the subordinate theme resides, does not require any particular emphasis [...] . Second, long extensions of continuation function usually call for sequential treatment, whose developmental potential might undermine the solo part as the bearer of prominent harmonic activity in the movement. Third, major cadential expansions normally

bring in material of virtuoso character, best reserved for the solo part. (Caplin 1998, pp. 244–5)

Hepokoski and Darcy's theorisation of the type 5 sonata explains Mozart's two unequivocal deviations from this principle – in the first movements of K. 413 and K. 449 – as deformations, in which an 'S-misstep [...] is corrected *en route*', such that 'R1:\S soon restabilizes back to the original tonic'. This, for Hepokoski and Darcy, constitutes a play on generic convention:

In this situation, up to the point of the tonic correction, R1 resembles the modulatory exposition of the first movement of a symphony (since the soloist has not yet been heard from). The tonal correction is a definitive declaration of the genre at hand: "No! This is not a symphony. This is a concerto!" The nontonic feint-and-"decision" aspect of the subsequent correction are mechanisms that draw attention to what this piece *is* – to its very "concerto-ness". (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, p. 488)³

Tovey remains close to the surface here. Like Caplin, Hepokoski and Darcy locate the generic inappropriateness of the non-tonic second theme in a distinction between concerted and symphonic formal principles, to which the reservation of the structural modulation for the soloist is essential.

The critical tilt of Tovey's argument – its unfavourable comparison of Romantic examples with Mozart – has also persisted. It is, for instance, amplified by Jim Samson (1992, p. 51), who identifies 'two broad tendencies' in the early nineteenth-century repertoire, both of which 'result in structural crudity when compared to Mozart', and for which 'the changing role of the orchestral prelude' is central. The first involved the ritornello's 'drastic compression', such that 'its structural function was little more than the opening of a simple frame which would enclose an "accompanied solo"'; the second was 'to invest [it] with the tonal and thematic dialectic of a symphonic exposition', specifically by presenting the second theme in a non-tonic key.⁴ Samson, like Tovey, cites Beethoven's Concerto No. 3 as a seminal example of the modulating type, and

pursues its application in concerti by Field and Hummel, noting ‘the danger of formal redundancy’ as a critical concern in each case.

It is this article’s primary ambition to rethink the monotonal R1’s foundational status for the theory of the type 5 sonata, by examining R1 design in the music that Tovey disparaged: the so-called ‘virtuoso’ concerto, a term I employ broadly as a placeholder for the diverse, cosmopolitan repertoire written between the last decade of the eighteenth century and the mid-nineteenth century. The argument is made on theoretical, analytical and historical grounds. As a basis for *Formenlehre*, the charge of formal redundancy sustaining the monotonal R1’s normativity is far from conceptually self-evident. As an analytical premise, the literature’s overwhelming concentration on the Mozartian monotonal R1 often produces distorted perceptions of the formal strategies employed by subsequent composers. And as a benchmark for historical orientation, the monotonal R1 enforces a distinction between centre and margins, which misrepresents the post-classical development of the genre.

Tovey’s Error: The Modulating Ritornello in History and Theory

Challenges to the Toveyan orthodoxy have predominantly arisen in the music-historical literature. In his study of the piano concerto in late-eighteenth-century London, Thomas Milligan for instance finds fault with the charge of tautology, observing that the non-modulating R1 is in its own way no less problematic:

Since the cantabile [second] theme is in the dominant in the first solo section [in the London concerto repertoire of the 1790s], there is a sense of resolution when it appears in the tonic in the recapitulation. To present the theme in the tonic in the opening tutti before it is heard in the dominant in the first solo tends to negate the tension inherent in presenting material in a non-tonic tonality. If the theme is in the dominant in the first tutti section, there is no premature tonicization to detract from the resolution in the recapitulation. (Milligan 1983, p. 73)

Milligan in effect turns Tovey's objections into an advantage. Viewed from the recapitulation, Mozart's monotonal ritornelli anticipate resolution before the soloist has affiliated second-theme material with large-scale dissonance. In this sense, they are not 'passive', as Rosen suggests, so much as pre-emptive, foreshadowing the action of the recapitulation before any tonal dialectic has been fully established.

For Stephan Lindeman, the modulating R1 is one expression of a tendency towards harmonic digression that defines the genre after Mozart; as he comments: 'the key of the secondary theme [in R1] is anything but certain in the concertos of Mozart's successors in the late-eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth centuries' (1999, p. 24). Lindeman cites examples by Cramer, Dussek, Field, Hummel, Moscheles and Steibelt, but this list bears expansion: beginning with Dussek's concerti of the 1790s, it constitutes the favoured tactic of Beethoven, Hummel, Cramer, Czerny, Steibelt, Ries, Kuhlau, Field, Kalkbrenner, Moscheles, Potter, Bennett, Herz, Chopin and Henselt, a repertoire spanning London, Paris, Hamburg, Leipzig, Weimar, Copenhagen, Vienna, Warsaw, St Petersburg and Moscow.

The disparities of practice between Mozart and his successors are at least partly attributable to the fact that, as Claudia Macdonald (2004) has pointed out, the reception of Mozart's concerti does not begin in earnest until the second quarter of the nineteenth century, by which time a practice had evolved that privileged different principles. Macdonald's reconstruction of Robert Schumann's knowledge of the genre is instructive; she notes that:

His diaries, letters, reminiscences and the reminiscences of his friends give a fairly detailed picture of his early musical fare, as does an inventory of the scores he owned. Though this picture includes several piano concertos, those by Mozart and Beethoven are conspicuous by their absence [...] In 1831 the full extent of Schumann's exposure to the genre did not reach much beyond [...] eleven pieces [by Ries, Moscheles, Pixis, Field, Böchner, Herz, Kalkbrenner and Hummel], all composed between 1808 and 1829, and all reflecting the latest fashion. (Macdonald 1995, pp. 242–3)⁵

Schumann's earliest effort in the genre – his unfinished Concerto in F major of 1831 – reflected these precedents, and especially Herz's Op. 34.⁶ His experiments after 1840 acknowledged a more diverse genealogy, including Beethoven and Mozart, but his concept of generic innovation remained significantly indebted to the virtuoso repertoire, which, as Macdonald writes, 'overshadowed Beethoven's concertos and set standards for the radical recomposing of Mozart's concertos' (2005, p. 74). Schumann's experiences in Zwickau, although provincial, are not atypical; the reception of Mozart's concerti is similarly sluggish before 1830 in London, Paris, Berlin and Leipzig.⁷ As an historical phenomenon, the modulating R1 is easy to explain: it prevails not as an alternative to Mozart, but as the only model having widespread currency between 1789 and 1830. However influential Beethoven's Op. 37 may have been, it is simply not the case, as Tovey claimed, that 'Spohr, Hummel [and] Chopin [...] all took Beethoven's C minor Concerto as their model of concerto form' (1936a, p. 71); rather, Beethoven's Op. 37 is one expression of a practice, of which Beethoven partook.

This prevalence is reinforced in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century theory. In the *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* of 1793, for example, Heinrich Christoph Koch identified the modulating R1 as one of three possible models: 'The first ritornello may however also [...] be formed in such a way that the structural modulation leads to the key of the fifth [*die Tonart der Quinte geleitet*] and after the *Quintabsatze* a melodic idea in this key will follow'. Koch does not critically differentiate this model from the monotonal kind, but simply remarks that it 'is normal in the newest concerti [*ist in den neuern Concerten die gewöhnlichste*]' (1793, p. 335).⁸ Koch's third variant remained critical for Czerny, who adopted the first movement of Beethoven's Op. 37 as his paradigmatic R1 example in 'the concerto as it has been particularly established by Mozart' in the *School of Practical Composition*, published in 1848, because it exemplified the 'regular construction of the Concerto', in which the form of R1 'is much the same as the first part of a Sonata' (1848, p. 164).⁹ Czerny counselled that

The continuation of the theme [in R1], as well as the melodious middle subject, must be so invented, that they can be afterwards employed in the Solo [S1]. The middle subject is followed by a continuation, which, *after modulating more or*

less [italics mine], returns to the *original key* [italics in original], and closes tranquilly in it. In this continuation also, the ideas and the harmonies must be so chosen, that the Pianoforte passages can be afterwards formed upon them. (Czerny 1848, p. 159)

For Czerny, the critical difference between R1 and S1 is not the second theme's tonality (the 'melodious middle subject'), but the fact that R1 returns to the tonic (the '*original key*'), whereas S1 does not. A similar tolerance is apparent in A. B. Marx's *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition*, whose description of the type 5 sonata includes both monotonal and modulating R1 variants without prejudice: 'The first movement, or the Allegro, is usually designed in such a way that the orchestra introduces all, or the principal ideas of the main and subordinate sections as well as the closing idea [...] in the main key, or in the main key and the dominant (or parallel) and returning to the first' (Marx 1847, pp. 438–9). Marx, like Czerny, stresses the modulation's annulment if it occurs: R1 is tonally distinctive because, whatever tonal action occupies its interior, it is framed by the tonic.

The points raised here open up a field of theoretical debate for the type 5 sonata, central to which is the question of what kind of concerto principle results from a modulating R1. Mozart's favoured solution underplays R1's expositional character by associating its second theme with the tonic, and by articulating S1's structural modulation with one or more novel themes, in which context the recapitulation often achieves synthesis by presenting both R1 and S1 second themes in the tonic. In contrast, the modulating R1 promotes diverse responses to a shared modulation: the orchestra reverses a second-theme modulation, which the soloist sustains. The charge of tautology is therefore not straightforward, since R1 is structurally non-identical to S1 in both cases. Their differentiation turns on the balance of progression and prolongation: a modulating R1 houses a structural modulation within a prolongation of the tonic; a modulating S1 enacts a structural modulation and then prolongs the non-tonic key. A synthetic recapitulation is possible in both contexts, because a monotonal recapitulation constitutes a new 'rotation', which neither orchestra nor soloist has presented expositionally.

Rather than argue *ab initio* for a fresh theoretical model, my aim is to reconcile the modulating R1 with current *Formenlehre*, by offering a typology and tracing its implications for subsequent formal decisions, especially S1's tonal plot and thematic organisation, taking Beethoven's Op. 58 as a case study. To this end, I apply a theoretical vocabulary that mingles formal-functional and sonata-theoretical terminology, with modifications to each, with the twofold ambition of highlighting both deviations from and continuity with the Mozartian model. I deviate from sonata theory in the terminology used to describe the inter-thematic level: specifically, I replace P and S as first- and second-theme designations with A and B, for two reasons: first, in order to avoid applying the same term at different grouping levels (S1 S, for example, or if S1 has more than one clearly defined thematic unit, S1 S1); and second, in order to escape the inevitable connotation of formal hierarchy that the terms 'primary' and 'subordinate' imply.¹⁰ Consequently, I also replace sonata theory's classification of differing ritornello and solo inter-thematic groupings with the same inter-thematic but different large-scale labels (R1:\P being distinct from S1:\P). Instead, material common to R1 and S1 receives the same inter-thematic label, and new material occurring within a given inter-thematic grouping is signified with an integer suffix: R1 A might consist of R1 A1 and R1 A2; if S1 A introduces a fresh theme, it is labelled as A3; and so on. Unlike Hepokoski and Darcy, I employ superscript integers to designate repetitions of an inter-thematic function or sub-groupings thereof, rather than the subdivision of a 'module' within a larger span.

My approach is also alert to the William Caplin's form-functional typology, although the early Romantic preference for hybridity and the nesting of types within compound structures – what I have elsewhere called 'proliferation' – means that these categories are sometimes subject to adaptation.¹¹ Unlike Caplin, and mindful of Hepokoski's and Darcy's appraisal of the issue, I accord R1 the status of a provisional first exposition, which has both an 'expositional-rhetorical' and a 'referential-layout' function.¹² Given the prevalence of R1 modulations in early nineteenth-century concerti, it is hard to sustain the contention that R1 primarily projects a framing function.¹³ At stake is not only a debate about what is conventional or exceptional for R1, but about the more general terms within which we theorise the type 5 concerto – since the form's

strategies are critically dependent on the model bequeathed by R1 – and the way we understand any given example in relation to generic precedent.

Towards a Categorical Framework for the Modulating R1

The prevalence of the modulating R1 is graphically demonstrated by Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 identifies a corpus of 87 concerti, composed between 1789 (Dussek's Op. 15) and Henselt's Op. 16 of 1844, which Table 2 subdivides by R1 practice. Allowing for four concerti, in which the differentiation of modulating and non-modulating types is redundant (Kalkbrenner's No. 4, for example, in which the orchestral prelude is essentially an expanded thematic introduction to the piano entry and has no expositional design), the corpus overwhelmingly favours the modulating type, disclosing 64 modulating, as against only 19 monotonal examples. Some composers eschewed the monotonal R1 entirely: Steibelt, Ries, Pixis, Kuhlau, Herz, Hiller, Thalberg and Henselt all exclusively composed modulating ritornelli. Others employ monotonal ritornelli as a minority practice. Two of Field's seven concerti, one of Cramer's eight, and one of Moscheles' five concerti that contain an R1 for instance remain in the tonic for the second theme. Other cases are more evenly distributed – Dussek, for instance, who composed six of each, or Hummel, who marginally preferred the modulating R1 – but only one composer (Weber) rejects the modulating R1 altogether.¹⁴

<INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT TABLE 2 NEAR HERE>

Broadly speaking, modulating R1s in this corpus fall into five categories, summarised in Table 3. Category 1 involves the hybridisation of expositional and ternary designs, in which A is reprised in the tonic before the soloist enters.¹⁵ In category 2, the second theme closes with a non-tonic PAC, but a tonic closing section follows, linked to B by a modulating retransition (RT). Category 3 is more loosely organised: here, B has no non-tonic cadence, but returns to the tonic for the closing section via a I:PAC. Category 4 either sustains B's non-tonic key into the closing section and leaves the solo entry to restore the tonic, or, in more evasive cases, also returns to the tonic without a non-tonic PAC. Finally, category 5 R1s initiate B in a non-tonic key, but B is itself

tonally unstable, moving through various keys before returning to I. Category 1 can itself be subdivided. In 1a, R1 B is supplied with its own structural PAC, and the tonic return of R1 A follows a modulating retransition; in 1b, the latter stages of B return to I without a prior non-tonic cadence, and the reprise of A supplies the modulation's terminus. One work – Steibelt's Concerto No. 2 – exhibits a property unique in the corpus, and I have consequently positioned it outside the framework under 'other', although it does possess features of category 2 (on which more below).

<INSERT TABLE 3 NEAR HERE>

These categories raise structural issues that do not arise in Hepokoski and Darcy's theory except as deformations. In category 1a, the presence of a non-tonic PAC closing B means that the first candidate for the R1 essential expositional closure (EEC) anticipates the S1 EEC, whilst the ensuing retransition and A¹ adumbrate the recapitulation. This creates a structural dynamic that never occurs in Mozart's concerti: in effect, category 1a conveys a referential layout, which adumbrates not only S1 but the entire structural trajectory of S1, R2 and S2 as far as the recapitulation. Categories 2 and 4 raise comparable EEC complications, but without the additional implications for the recapitulation. Category 4 tends most strongly towards an anticipation of S1, because R1's return to I is never cadentially articulated before the soloist enters. In some cases (Chopin's Op. 21, for example), this is balanced by B's failure to reach a non-tonic PAC, producing a situation in which neither the modulation nor its cancellation are definitively articulated. Despite, or more specifically because of its harmonic complexity, category 5 poses fewest problems for the S1 EEC, since B fails to tonicise a single non-tonic key via a cadence, and the R1 EEC establishes I.

These complications necessitate adjustments to sonata theory's definition of the closing section (C) as music that 'spans the space from the EEC to the exposition's final cadence' (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, p. 180). In category 1a especially, the presence of two PACs – one non-tonic closing B and one in-tonic closing A¹ – dissociates the closure of B from the inception of C, which is rather located after the A¹ PAC. These category 1 situations need to be distinguished from other categories possessing what Hepokoski and Darcy call a 'P-based C', or closing section derived from the A theme (2006, pp. 184–5). Kuhlau's Op. 7, for example, comprises an expansive C section initiated by a recall of A

material, but there is no form-functional reprise of A, as there is, for instance, in the R1s of Dussek's opp. 14 and 15. In other cases, for example Dussek's Op. 49, A¹ supplants C: the tonic PAC that closes A¹ is R1's last event, elided with the soloist's entry.

The criteria for identifying retransitions (RT) also requires nuance. I define as retransitional any music that links the B theme to either an A reprise or a closing section. In category 1a, this is clearly articulated: a PAC closes B; RT modulates; and A¹ reprises A. In category 1b, B and RT are less obviously differentiated, because some of the modulatory work may be undertaken within B. In this case, RT captures music standing between the last form-functional unit of B, which is very often half-cadential, and the return of A, which is most commonly a standing on V. Retransitions typically do not arise in category 3, because the return to the tonic is usually fully achieved within B, the tonic presentation of which leads on to an R1 EEC that precipitates C, as is the case in Beethoven's Op. 37. Conversely, category 4 ritornelli often dispense with C altogether. At best, they feature a non-tonic PAC closing B and a retransition that the soloist completes; in other cases, the non-tonic B fails adequately to cadence, and the line between B and RT is consequently indistinct. Category 5 ritornelli may well include both RT and C, with the qualification that the preceding B group expresses no unequivocal non-tonic orientation.

Table 4 reveals the distribution of these categories across the corpus's 64 modulating ritornelli. Category 2 is the majority preference, thanks both to Steibelt's taste for it (his concerti nos. 1 and 3–5 all mobilise this category) and its relative popularity across practitioners (ten out of nineteen composers employ it). Category 5, in contrast, is rare, with only five examples and two advocates, although note that it accounts for three of the five Beethoven concerti. Categories 1 and 3 are evenly matched (15 examples each), even though the latter attracted more composers: ten favour it, as opposed to six adopting category 1, but the numbers for category 3 are distorted by Ferdinand Ries, who accounts for half of its applications. Category 1 is similarly nuanced by the fact that a small number of prolific composers adopted it (Dussek, Cramer and Field, who between them account for eleven examples). Category 4 contains ten examples by seven advocates and is evenly distributed (only one composer, Cipriani Potter, employs it more than once).

<INSERT TABLE 4 NEAR HERE>

These data can be parsed both chronologically and geographically. Table 5 attempts the former, partitioning the corpus's date range into five-year periods (expanded back by one year in the first period to capture the starting year) and populating them with works grouped by category. Table 6 then supplies the totals within each time period for each category. The data are illuminating in several respects. Strikingly, category 5 is almost exclusively a Beethovenian speciality. Only one other composer favours it (Ferdinand Ries), who was a pupil of Beethoven and Albrechtstberger and composed both works in this category before leaving Vienna permanently in 1809. Beyond this date, category 5 disappears from the corpus. Categories 1 and 4 are contrasted, to the extent that no evidence of category 4 exists before 1815 (Hummel's Op. 73 is the first example), whereas category 1 disappears after 1829 (the last example is Herz's Op. 34). Categories 2 and 3, on the other hand, are employed consistently across the corpus; their 33 representatives can be construed as a stable core practice, which remains central to the genre across a 60-year period. Category 2 is, moreover, the only practice that spans the corpus's full date range: a strategy instantiated by Dussek in 1792 (Op. 17) is retained by Herz (in 1843) and Henselt (in 1844).

<INSERT TABLE 5 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT TABLE 6 NEAR HERE>

Analysis of geographical distribution is more difficult, because most composers in the corpus were mobile during their careers, which means that positing centres and correlating them with practices is sometimes precarious, and because the exact place of composition is not always easily determined (should Hummel's opp. 73 and 85 be sourced to Stuttgart, where he was Kappelmeister at the time of their completion, or to Vienna, where they may have had their genesis, for instance?). Table 7 nevertheless attempts (cautiously) to cross-reference the categories with places of composition. The emergence of London, Paris and Vienna as centres for the production of modulating ritornelli accumulating the largest totals is hardly surprising. Of more significance is London's overwhelming presence as the fulcrum of this practice: as many examples are produced in London in this period (24) as are produced in Paris and Vienna combined (12 each). Other locations are manifestly outliers: Copenhagen, where Kulhau was resident in

1812; Godesberg, where Ries lived between leaving London and settling in Frankfurt; Hamburg, where Dussek lived between London and Paris; Warsaw, which accounts for Chopin's Op. 21; Weimar, which is the place of composition for Hummel's last two concerti; and Bonn, accommodating the early genesis of Beethoven's Op. 19, which straddles his move to Vienna. Stuttgart is also marginal, sandwiched as it is between Hummel's early career in Vienna and his later years in Weimar; his two contributions in this category could also be annexed to Vienna. Moscow and St Petersburg are more significant, amassing eight examples between them; but it is rash to assume the emergence of a separate Russian practice. Field and Steibelt, who account for six of these concerti, both gained seminal knowledge of the genre in London and, in Steibelt's case, Paris, where Dussek's influence was paramount. Henselt, in contrast, studied with Hummel in Weimar and Simon Sechter in Vienna, before moving to St Petersburg in 1838. All of the Russian entries in Table 7 therefore evidence Western European influences, and above all those of London and Vienna.

<INSERT TABLE 7 NEAR HERE>

The axis of London and Paris is of critical importance for interpreting these data. Dussek, for example, fled from Paris to London in 1789, to be followed by Steibelt in 1796. Kalkbrenner left Paris for London in 1814, but returned to Paris permanently in 1824. This ongoing reciprocity is naturally reflected in the sharing of formal strategies. As Table 7 shows, the predilection for category 2 that Steibelt developed in Paris continues in his London concerti. Conversely, Dussek revisited category 1 strategies developed in London in the early 1790s in his Op. 70, composed in Paris in 1810. There is a comparable, if less fecund, exchange between London and Vienna: Moscheles and Ries both began their careers in Vienna, but subsequently lived in London; Cramer, whose entire career was spent in London, visited Vienna and knew Beethoven, as did Potter, who studied there in 1818–19 before returning to England. Contributors to the Parisian repertoire also had strong pedagogical ties to Vienna, notably Pixis and Ries.

Other practices are more clearly geographically circumscribed. Most obviously, category 5 is exclusively Viennese, while category 4 has its epicentre in London and is otherwise scattered, with isolated representation in locations as widely dispersed as Paris, Warsaw and St Petersburg. Category 3 is notably favoured in Vienna (Beethoven, Ries,

Czerny and Moscheles account for eight of the sixteen examples)¹⁶ and by composers of Viennese training who transmitted it abroad (Ries in particular), whereas category 1 affiliates strongly with London (Dussek, Field, Cramer and Steibelt all employed it, either in London or, in the cases of Field and Steibelt, after departing for Russia). Category 2 is more complex. There is evidence of transmission from Paris to London (Steibelt's first five concerti), but also from London to Paris (Kalkbrenner's Op. 61 was composed in London, Op. 80 in Paris).

These observations are inevitably provisional, and would need to be secured by musicological research into networks of performance, transmission and dissemination, which is beyond the scope of this essay. Two encompassing points are nevertheless clear. First, all of this diversity contrasts markedly with the far more restricted distribution of Table 2's monotonal R1s, which are concentrated in London (five of Dussek's six examples and those by Cramer, Potter and Bennett were all composed there) and satellites thereof (Field in St Petersburg; Dussek having moved to Hamburg), or – understandably, given the continuing presence of Mozart's concerti – in Vienna (Beethoven's Op. 73, Hummel's op. 110, Czerny's op. 28, and perhaps also Moscheles's Op. 56, which dates from a period of intense international touring between his periods in Vienna and London). The one anomaly is Hummel's Op. 113, composed in Weimar in 1827, but we might reasonably classify this as a reversion to Hummel's earlier Viennese practice. Second, the modulating R1's ubiquity militates against the idea of an encompassing Mozartian influence on the two generations of composers active after his death as an empirically verifiable property of the corpus. The modulating R1 gained an international prominence, which the monotonal variant simply never acquired.

Category 1: Non-tonic B Leads to Tonic A Reprise

Of the fifteen concerti exhibiting category 1 R1s, twelve instantiate category 1a (Dussek's opp. 14, 15, 49 and 70; Steibelt's No. 6; Cramer's Op. 38; Field's nos. 1, 2, 4 and 7; Moscheles's Op. 45; and Herz's Op. 34) and only three employ category 1b (Steibelt's No. 7; Cramer's opp. 26 and 70). The features of category 1a are fully formed in Dussek's early concerti. Opera 14 and 15, composed between 1789 and 1791, deploy comparable strategies, as Tables 8 and 9 explain, Op. 14 albeit in a slightly more

straightforward way. In both cases, a substantial retransition connects B to A¹, and the retransition (RT) closes with an MC effect and a fill, which lends R1 the character of what Hepokoski and Darcy call a tri-modular block or TMB (2006, pp. 170–1), although without the sense of dissolution into a second transition that the sonata-theoretical concept identifies. Opus 15 augments this design with a clearly articulated closing section, whereas Op. 14 rounds R1 with a more modest codetta. Dussek’s use of a I:HC both for TR’s MC and RT’s MC effect mobilises its ‘bifocal’ properties in a manner that Mozart would normally distribute between exposition and recapitulation: TR’s MC is a springboard for modulating to V; RT’s I:HC prepares I.

<INSERT TABLE 8 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT TABLE 9 NEAR HERE>

Later on, Dussek took this design in different directions. The Concerto Op. 49, completed in 1801 and appraised in Table 10, provides a rare monothematic variant. The design’s five-part symmetry is heightened by the syntactic similarities between TR and RT, which go beyond the bifocality evident in opp. 14 and 15. Both are loosely and expansively sequential and, like opp. 14 and 15, both culminate on an MC effect, although here RT replicates TR’s MC in the tonic. This similarity extends to the caesura fill: the music bridging the gap between the III:HC MC and B is deployed to link the end of RT to A¹, which means that the fill and the material that follows are the same in each case, as Ex. 2 shows. Dussek also dispenses with a closing section and an A¹ codetta in Op. 49. Instead, A¹’s PAC is elided with the solo entry.

<INSERT TABLE 10 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 2 NEAR HERE>

Cramer’s Op. 26, composed in 1801, offers an ingenious example of category 1b (Table 11). The B theme duly arrives in V after a V:HC MC. Its consequent phrase tries twice to cadence, in bars 55–56 and 59–60, but as Ex. 3 shows, both PACs are evaded, and the music after bar 60 gives up its cadential efforts and converts A into V of D major, at which point we appreciate that RT is now in progress, a perception confirmed by A¹’s appearance in bar 64. In fact, B’s cadential evasions are typical of Op. 26’s R1 in general. Theme A also ends without a cadence: the V–I progression in bars 14–15 isn’t cadential, and the fanfare that follows prolongs I, after which TR simply begins with A in the tonic.

A¹ is similarly provisional: a converging HC is reached in bar 72, and the final bars comprise a standing on V, which is resolved with the soloist's entry in bar 80.

<INSERT TABLE 11 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 3 NEAR HERE>

Other instances of category 1b dispense with any aspiration to end B with a non-tonic PAC. Steibelt's Concerto No. 7, fancifully subtitled 'Danse le genre des Grecs' in reference to its partitioning of the orchestra into two antiphonal groups, reaches its periodic B theme (Ex. 4) in III after a clear III:HC MC. The theme's antecedent closes with a reinterpreted half cadence, as William Caplin defines it – that is, a V:PAC, which is immediately redefined as a half cadence in the tonic – but the consequent is redirected towards the tonic E minor, attaining a Phrygian i:HC at bar 77, elided with a standing on V, and RT begins over the dominant at bar 82.¹⁷

<INSERT EX. 4 NEAR HERE>

Category 2: Non-tonic B closed with PAC; RT leads to Tonic C Section

Category 2 was a particular speciality of Daniel Steibelt, whose concerti nos. 1–5 all deploy it (no other composer in the corpus uses it more than twice). The Concerto No. 1 of 1796, appraised in Table 12, is typical. Steibelt's periodic A and B themes are dwarfed by the 34-bar TR, which reaches a V:HC MC after a lengthy digression through the dominant minor. Theme B is firmly closed with a V:PAC in bars 64–65, after which Steibelt composes a brief RT and a tonic-major C section consisting entirely of an expanded cadential progression and its two-bar post-cadential extension.

<INSERT TABLE 12 NEAR HERE>

If earlier examples are strongly orientated around London and Paris, then later examples are more geographically dispersed. Kuhlau's Op. 7, composed in Copenhagen in 1812 (Table 13) is notable for an expansive, multipart closing section, which comes close to a reprise of A in its final part (C3) and therefore shades into category 1, although the A material here is decisively post-cadential. Hummel's Op. 85 of 1816 – his only contribution to this category – is described in Table 14. It is particularly ingenious for its dovetailing of B and RT via the subtle reuse of A material, and for the modal parallelism that extends RT. The multiple uses to which the A-theme continuation ('x') is put are

appraised in Ex. 5. Hummel redeploys ‘x’ as the continuation of B, leading on to the PAC with which the B theme is closed at bar 72, and again as the starting point for RT, thereby creating a functional ambiguity: the only III:PAC is located in bars 71–72 – the next phrase initiates the return to A minor – but x’s immediate reuse promotes the impression that the PAC is medial rather than terminal. Hummel also returns to x later in RT (bars 87–98), where it temporarily enables modal parallelism: A major intervenes here approaching the decisive PAC in bars 97–99, which finally ushers in C. Despite R1’s clear category 2 trajectory (B is closed with a III:PAC; RT returns to i; and C confirms the tonic minor without retrieving A), x provides a degree of thematic continuity that is unusual in the corpus, even though Hummel makes use of sharply profiled A and B themes.

<INSERT TABLE 13 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 5 NEAR HERE>

Category 3: B has no Non-tonic Cadence; Returns to Tonic for C

The properties of category 3 have already been explored in Beethoven’s Op. 37; other examples falling within the Viennese orbit owe a clear debt to Beethoven’s model, most explicitly in minor-key works. Both Ferdinand Ries’s Op. 115 in C minor and Czerny Op. 214 in A minor share properties with Op. 37. Ex. 6 shows Ries’s B group and RT. Like Beethoven, Ries arrives at a III:HC MC, and his periodic B theme is comparably characterised by rising, accented chromatic passing notes. The return to i is however more abrupt: the medial cadence is a iii:PAC in E<f>, and the consequent closes with a converging i:HC, leading to a twelve-bar retransition rounded with a i:PAC. Czerny’s B theme, given in Ex. 7, is more discursive and, like Beethoven’s Op. 37, folds a tonic restatement of B into the process of recovering the tonic. Czerny’s antecedent closes with a reinterpreted half cadence in C, but his consequent is much-expanded, digressing via A<f>major before achieving A minor in bar 66, where B is restated and precipitates the R1 EEC, after which C follows. The corpus also yields major-mode Viennese examples. Moscheles’s Op. 64 (Ex. 8) is even more decisive in its tonic reorientation of B than Czerny’s Op. 214. Here, B is organised as a double period, mediated by a retransitional

standing on V: bars 39–46 present the theme in V and close with a V:PAC; bars 46–51 prepare the tonic; bars 52–61 restate B and close with a I:PAC, which ushers in C.

<INSERT EX. 6 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 7 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 8 NEAR HERE>

Examples outside the Viennese sphere nonetheless reflect Beethoven's precedent. The B theme of Sterndale Bennett's Op. 9, composed in London in 1834, adopts the same tactic as Ries's Op. 115 and in the same key. It comprises a compound period, in which the antecedent closes with a III:HC and the consequent is expanded to encompass a sequential modulation back to the tonic, C minor, via an A-theme-based cadential phrase. Kalkbrenner's Op. 107, the first of his two Parisian concertos, also modifies a periodic theme's design in order to accommodate the tonic's return, but does so without a full tonic B restatement. Instead, Kalkbrenner varies the consequent's contrasting idea to include a one-more-time cadence, which, having failed to secure a III:IAC, deflects back to the tonic A minor for a i:PAC, which initiates C.

Category 4: Non-tonic B, but Return to Tonic only Confirmed by Solo Entry

Category 4 is almost exclusively the preserve of concerti composed in the 1820s and 30s. The most concise example in the corpus – Hummel's Op. 73 of 1816 – is also the first, its brevity being attributable to the work's status as a concertino rather than a concerto as such. Hummel composes a fully fledged A and TR, including a V:PAC MC, but B and C are replaced by an eleven-bar A-based standing on V, the last three bars of which are the first three bars of the solo entry. More strategically interesting is Ries's Op. 151. Like Hummel, Ries also uses the soloist to complete R1's unresolved V, which the pianist distends to eleven bars, including a brief unmeasured cadenza. The design of B, reproduced in Ex. 9, is ingenious. It starts in V at bar 60, but Ries's caesura fill reaches this via a digression to $\text{VI in E}^{\text{f}}$, which occasions a reminiscence of A. There is no cadence at the other end of B, and strictly speaking no R1 EEC. Instead, from bar 76, the music fixates on $\text{vii}^{\text{o7}}/\text{vi}$ for eleven bars; Ries only nudges the bass semitonally onto E^{f} , thereby converting $\text{vii}^{\text{o7}}/\text{vi}$ to V^7 of A^{f} , one bar before the solo entry.

<INSERT EX. 9 NEAR HERE>

A similar blending of RT and solo-entry functions occurs in examples by Bennett, Thalberg and Chopin. Bennett's Concerto Op. 1 of 1832 introduces a periodic B theme, the consequent of which shirks its responsibility to secure a III:PAC and instead returns to V of i via an HC, a dominant that is held until the soloist intervenes to resolve it with a root-position tonic. His Op. 4, completed a year later, is more subtle. A V:HC MC is reached at bar 89, but the B theme, given in Ex. 10, favours dominant prolongation and never fully secures V. The theme's consequent achieves a cadential 6-4 in V at bar 106 after a phrase expansion, which converts the antecedent's contrasting idea into a continuation, but the V-I prepared from bar 108 is undercut, because Bennett reinterprets B<f> as V⁷ in E<f> at bar 110, over which fragments of the A theme reappear. Again, it is left to the soloist to resolve this dominant with a decisive A-theme entry. The R1 of Thalberg's Op. 5 (1830; Table 14) also contains a periodic B theme, which here attains a III:PAC in bars 41–42. The retransition then finds its way to V of i by bar 46. R1 then dissipates above the standing on V, leading to a caesura effect in bar 53, and it is left to the solo entry to secure F minor. The end of the B theme and RT of Chopin's Op. 21, quoted in Ex. 11, is more subtle again. Chopin attempts a III:PAC in bar 58 in order to close the B-theme consequent, but this concludes deceptively in bar 59, yielding to a sequence, which terminates in the tonic at bar 63. No subsequent cadence is completed by the orchestra; instead, Chopin prolongs ii for eight bars from bar 65, over which the soloist enters with a sweeping descending arpeggiation from bar 71. This chord is revealed as a cadential pre-dominant one bar later, as soloist and orchestra collaborate in a i:IAC.

<INSERT EX. 10 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT TABLE 14 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 11 NEAR HERE>

Category 5: B Modulates through Multiple Keys; C Re-establishes the Tonic

Tovey's views on Beethoven's first three concerti are problematic not only because they simplify the modulating ritornello's strategic diversity, but also because they fail to differentiate Op. 37's clear initial association of B with a single non-tonic key from the tonal uncertainty evident in opp. 19 and 15, quoted in Exx. 12 and 13 respectively. In Op.

19, Beethoven establishes V/V with a conventional V:HC MC, but sidesteps F major by repeating the MC's hammerblows a semitone higher; B then sets off in D<f> major. D<f> is not secured, however; instead, the music modulates to its relative minor, which in turn provides a platform for returning to the tonic via modal mixture. A retransitional standing on V is attained at bar 57, and B<f> major is consolidated from bar 63, coordinated with the start of an A-based C. In Op. 15, the B group ranges more widely. Beethoven writes a I:HC MC, which is similarly evaded. B begins in E<f> with a four-bar c.b.i., which we realise by bar 56 is the first half of a large model, which is then twice sequenced in an ascending step progression, bringing the music to G minor by bar 63. The sequence is then fragmented, before arriving on V of C major for the start of RT at bar 72. Unlike Op. 19, the tonic's eventual return in Op. 15, secured at bar 86 via a decisive PAC, is articulated by new material.

<INSERT EX. 12 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 13 NEAR HERE>

Only two other concerti in the corpus – Ries's opp. 42 and 123 – exhibit comparable tonal diversity in their B groups. In Op. 42, Ries closes RT with a I:HC MC in E<f>, but his caesura fill deflects towards C minor, in which key the periodic B theme commences. The antecedent attempts a vi:PAC, but this is evaded, and a three-bar phrase expansion produces a ii:PAC, the resolution of which elides with the start of the consequent, which duly begins in F minor. Ries then converts the consequent's contrasting idea into a descending sequence, which sets up an ECP in E<f> that serves as a retransition, and C begins at bar 58 with a tonic restatement of B. Opus 123 is more extreme. The work's key is C major, but, uniquely in the corpus, Ries establishes a VI:HC MC, and B begins in A major after a two-bar fill. His strategy is then similar to Op. 42: the B-theme consequent fails to maintain the antecedent's tonality, here beginning in A minor and progressing towards an ECP in C major, which serves as the R1 EEC.

Hybrids and Anomalies

The constraints that define these categories also limit the potential for hybridisation, because the presence of one categorical feature tends to preclude another: an R1

exhibiting category 3 properties cannot also incorporate features of category 4, because category 4 is defined by the absence of the distinct tonic closing section that defines category 3. Similarly, an elision of R1 and S1 in the manner of category 4 might occur after an A reprise, as is the case in Cramer's Op. 26; but in this case, the very presence of the reprise enforces a preference for category 1 over category 4. A limited case for the hybridisation of categories 4 and 5 could be made in Ries's opp. 42 and 123: in both, B explores more than one non-tonic key and the closing section ends on an indecisive V, which it is left to the soloist to resolve. It seems more sensible, however, to affiliate both with category 5, since they are clearly distinctive primarily for the tonal mobility of their second-theme groups.

Steibelt's Concerto No. 2, on the other hand, genuinely evades classification, comprising a design, which, although it includes category 2 features, is really a hybrid of the modulating and non-modulating R1 types. As Table 15 reveals, the music arrives at a i:HC MC by bar 26, and B1 then ensues in III, reaching a III:PAC by bar 35. A retransition then restores the tonic; but before a tonic-minor C can occur, Steibelt pauses over a second MC effect at bar 52, and a new cantabile melody enters in the tonic major – in effect, B2 – which produces a I:PAC in bars 65–66, after which the music reverts to the tonic minor for the C section-proper. As a whole, this scheme, like many of Dussek's category 1a R1s, mobilises a TMB; here, however, B2 is deployed to cancel B1's mediant modulation via modal mixture. Elements of category 2 are present – there is a B-theme modulation, which is reversed en route to a closing section – but RT is complicated by the additional second theme, which, it later transpires, will be taken up as the B theme in S1.

<INSERT TABLE 15 NEAR HERE>

Redux: Beethoven's Orthodoxy

The principles exhibited in all of these works are consistently distinct from those favoured by Mozart; they are, nevertheless, a generic orthodoxy, which exhibits a diversity that music theory has thus far failed to grasp. This is not only a matter of rectifying the misrecognition that the confluence of theory and canon formation has

produced; more importantly, it provides a vital context in which to situate canonical repertoire. Above all, it encourages reappraisal of Beethoven's concerti: we see that Op. 37's tactics reflect an international body of practice. Opera 15 and 19 are, to be sure, more parochial: only one example of category 5 in the corpus was composed outside Vienna – Ries's Op. 123 – and this by a composer of Viennese training. They are nevertheless variants of an approach to the type 5 sonata, which is Mozartian neither in technique nor in origin.

One obvious stone left unturned in all of this is Beethoven's Op. 58. For Tovey, Beethoven rectified Op. 37's mistake in Op. 58, via the intermediate stage of the Triple Concerto, Op. 56, which Tovey regarded as 'the technical exercise by which Beethoven experimented with dry material in correcting the errors which he recognised in his first three concertos'.¹⁸ In Op. 58, R1 B makes this correction by confirming I despite its tonal mobility: 'Contrast those expensive luxuries [in opp. 15, 19 and 37] with the wonderful modulating single theme [in R1], which quietly takes its place in the procession and yet covers a wide range of keys, only to confirm the home tonic more strongly' (1936d, p. 78).

Yet Op. 58's R1 undoubtedly has more in common with opp. 15 and 19 than it does with opp. 56 or 73. Parallels with Op. 19 are especially close: again, Beethoven begins R1 B off-tonic with a large compound model, the sequencing of which modulates towards I (Ex. 14). Uniquely for his piano concerti, Beethoven does not preface B with a clear MC, but ends TR, in bars 28–30, with a tonic I-V-ii progression; A minor then supplies the point of departure for a B-theme basic idea from bar 31, the contrasting idea of which modulates to E minor. This, in turn, is treated as a model, which is twice sequenced, creating an unstable B group passing through cadential progressions in B minor and F<s> minor.¹⁹ Bars 40–67 then engender a non-congruence of harmony and rhetoric. Harmonically, they are entirely retransitional, beginning with a modulating model-sequence-fragmentation progression, which ultimately produces the tonic ECP in bars 60–68 that constitutes the R1 EEC. On the other hand, the climactic material intervening at bar 50 has the character of a closing section in terms of key (the tonic), rhetoric (there is a clear *fortissimo* theme over a *Trommelbass*) and texture (tutti), even though it occurs over the retransitional standing on V. This material is essentially

sentential, and consequently also has thematic integrity: a two-bar basic idea is repeated, leading to a continuation and expanded half cadence (in bars 55–59). Altogether, we might describe the material from bar 50, adapting Hepokoski and Darcy concept of S^C , as ‘ B^C ’: music, which is ‘literally in pre-cadential S-space’, but which ‘in other respects sounds as though it is more characteristically a closing theme’ (2006, p. 191). R1’s formal succession is therefore A-TR-B-RT- B^C -C.

<INSERT EX. 14 NEAR HERE>

Opus 58 also offers a uniquely sophisticated case study in the implications of a modulating R1 design for the form as a whole. The instabilities that Beethoven builds into R1 prompt him both to explore Mozartian practices in other formal regions and to develop strategies that have no evident precedent, Mozartian or otherwise. Beethoven’s radicalism becomes clear when we investigate the correspondences between R1, S1 and R2, appraised in Tables 16 and 17. S1 B emulates R1 B, with crucial variations, the most obvious of which is the new theme S1 B1, which precedes R1 B (now labelled B2) and supplies what R1 B lacks: a stable affiliation of theme and non-tonic key (V). The new material is organised as a variant of what Steven Vande Moortele calls a sentence with periodic presentation: the basic idea takes the form of an antecedent, complete with medial cadence (a vi:PAC in D), which is then repeated to create the response; a continuation and V:PAC follow (2013, pp. 412–14). R1 RT is then reproduced in an expanded form, which compels its formal reinterpretation (the passages are graphed comparatively in Ex. 15). R1 RT employs a single sequence on its model, after which fragmentation ensues. But in S1, Beethoven inserts an additional sequential unit, which has the effect of shifting the progression’s termination point and rendering the whole inter-thematic unit tonally closed: R1 B and RT progress from A minor to V of G; the corresponding music in S1 begins in D minor and eventually finds D major, not C major, which strict correspondence would produce. In consequence, Beethoven subtly reinterprets this music’s function, discarding its retransitional duties and instead incorporating it within B2.

<INSERT TABLE 16 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT TABLE 17 NEAR HERE>

<INSERT EX. 15 NEAR HERE>

R1 B's incipient non-congruence is nevertheless reproduced, generating a series of deferrals and elisions, which undermine the coordination of cadence and function and push the EEC beyond the boundaries of S1. B^C returns from bar 157, its basic idea now underpinned by a V<4/2>-I⁶ progression, and the ensuing ECP moves to its structural dominant at bar 166. The cadential differentiation of S1 and R2 is subtly undermined. The cadential trill established at bar 166 dissolves back into B^C's basic idea from bar 170, the continuation, half cadence and ECP of which are then taken up by the orchestra as the starting point for R2 at bar 174.²⁰ As a result, no authentic cadence occurs until bar 188, where R1 C is ushered in with a V:IAC; and no structural PAC occurs at all.

By these terms there is, strictly speaking, no C section in S1; rather, the formal space that S1 C should occupy is engulfed by B2 and B^C. R2 consequently loses its post-cadential function, working instead to bring about the cadence that S1 has failed to achieve and creating what Hepokoski and Darcy call 'a structural ellipsis' (2006, p. 548). Yet C rhetoric is not abandoned; on the contrary, C's deferral is balanced by the premature arrival of a display episode, which the soloist introduces as an elaboration of B2's third phrase as early as bar 142, and which persists until bar 170. R1's inter-thematic harmonic-functional non-congruence has now spawned a large-scale divisional overlap, because the soloist's inability to cadence means that the end of B^C and C as such are transferred into R2. There is only one candidate for the EEC, which is the V:IAC that bisects R2. The exposition thereby integrates the whole of S1 and R2 into a single formal span, achieved by rethinking the relationship between solo exposition and modulating R1 and discarding the soloist's customary articulation of the EEC.

Such departures from Mozartian practice as are evident in opp. 15, 19 and 37 pale in comparison with Op. 58. One Mozartian tactic – the allocation of a new B theme to the soloist – is retained; but whereas Mozart typically contrasts an R1 B theme that doesn't modulate with an S1 B theme that does, Beethoven's new S1 B theme serves as a preface to R1 B, which facilitates the latter's presentation in V. This is part of a broader strategic response to R1, which ultimately undermines the alignment of function and cadence that is basic to the articulation of form in Mozart's concerti, producing what Hepokoski and Darcy call an 'extraordinary variant' of the 'trill-cadence', which is deformational of the Mozartian norm (2006, p. 546). The type 5 practice I have sketched however encourages

a different interpretation. Beethoven's tactics respond to his category 5 R1, and in fact guarantee a notably close correspondence between R1 and S1, by differentiating R1 B and S1 B in terms of a modulating theme's transposition level and its point of termination. R1 B does not begin in the tonic, but it does end in the tonic; varied transposition in S1 brings the same progression to D major for the end of the exposition. Rather than explaining this as a deformation of Mozart's norm, we might see it as one strategic expression of an emerging post-classical practice, to which the modulating R1 is central.

Opus 58 serves up one final twist. S1 B2, B^C and their recapitulation map under transposition: when bars 134–173 return in bars 301–340, they reproduce the underlying progression, such that the material is now framed by a mode switch from G minor to G major. But, as we have seen, S1 B2 and B^C vary R1's template. In all other modulating R1s in the corpus, R1's non-tonic key anticipates the key of S1's B theme. In Op. 58, however, the first movement's formal problematic arises from the fact that R1 B is tonally directed, but does not anticipate the key of S1 B. The form's drama arises in the correctives to this template, which the soloist is obliged to make. In the exposition, the soloist contrasts R1 by framing the B group with the dominant; in the recapitulation, closure is achieved by transposing S1's B music into the tonic. R1, in other words, establishes a B-theme malfunction, which the soloist repairs, first by enabling its tonal closure in V, and then by transposing this variant into I.

Conclusions: Rethinking the Type 5 Sonata

This study has implications beyond its attempts to dispel the historical normativity of the monotonal R1. Hepokoski and Darcy rightly point out that type 5 sonatas engender a special relationship between sonata form and the principle of rotation, arising from the fact that R1 supplies a 'referential layout' for S1 and subsequent large-scale formal units; as they write: 'from the perspective of the successive rotational unfolding of the whole movement, R1's non-modulating proto-exposition also has a referential-layout function' (2006, pp. 451). This distinguishes type 5 sonatas, because in no other type is the exposition's rotational design anticipated in part or whole before it occurs. A theory of

the type 5 sonata predicated on the statistical prevalence of the modulating R1 therefore compels us to rethink the theoretical basis of the form as a whole in crucial respects, because the referential layout supplied by the modulating R1 is strategically distinct from its monotonal sibling.

Above all, this impacts the relationship between R1 and S1. Beethoven's Op. 58 provides one, notably sophisticated solution to the problem of how to generate a structural dialectic from a modulating referential layout; but the corpus offers a range of possibilities, including others by Beethoven himself. The predominant solution is to sustain R1's modulation in S1, although this tactic is naturally sensitive to the R1 category the composer deploys. In general, it is rare for composers to base S1 C on R1 C, especially where R1 exhibits category 1: closing-section display episodes elaborating a wholesale reprise of the A theme are hard to find, even though A-theme references in S1 C do sometimes appear. Far more common, and distinctly un-Mozartian, is the habit of retaining R1's B theme but contrasting it with a new S1 A theme, a strategy that makes good sense, given that B is the arbiter of modulation in R1. Instances are widespread across the corpus, but Field's Concerto No. 1 is succinct and exemplary: R1 comprises A, TR, B (in V, closed with a PAC), RT, A¹ and C; S1 introduces a new A theme, consisting of a bravura preface and a cantabile continuation, after which follows a display-episode TR, B (in V again), and C as display episode, maintaining V into R2, which retrieves R1 A and closes with a clear V:PAC. The harmonic instability of categories 4 and 5 can provoke more adventurous solutions. In Chopin's Op. 21, S1 returns to R1 B, and again in III, but exploits B's cadential open-endedness to engineer a three-key exposition: in S1, B closes with a v:PAC and C consists of a display episode in C minor. The S1 of Ries's Op. 42 responds, more extravagantly, to R1 B's tonal mobility by relocating the movement's cadenza to the MC fill as an expansion of V/V and then introducing R1 B beneath the cadenza's closing trill in the dominant minor, before correcting to the major at the start of C via a V:PAC. Ries's other category 5 movement, Op. 123, turns R1's modulation to VI into an opportunity, sustaining A major, with occasional modal mixture, from the start of S1 B to the end of C, perhaps acknowledging a debt to Beethoven's Op. 56, which does almost the same thing, and in the same key.²¹ Beethoven's approach differs in opp. 15 and 19. In Op. 19, S1 introduces a new B theme

in V, and R1 B, which is motivically an outgrowth of A, is absent from both S1 and the recapitulation. In Op. 15, S1 retains R1 B, but reconceives it as a stable, periodic theme in V.

My argument has further theoretical and musicological implications, which can only be sketched here, but which I have pursued in more detail elsewhere.²² Crucially, it exposes the historical and empirical vulnerability of formal theories. A theory of the type-5 sonata that takes Mozart as its evidential source will naturally conclude that the monotonal R1 is normative; a theory that casts its empirical net more widely will not. From its Mozartian vantage point, sonata theory might consider this corpus's modulating ritornelli to be deformational; perceived from this article's perspective, Mozart represents a Viennese minority. It is, moreover, likely that the development of the type 5 sonata is not significantly impacted by Mozartian principles between 1790 and 1830, because the dissemination of Mozart's concerti was gradual, both in terms of publication and performance, and considerably restricted before 1820.²³ By the time the scope of Mozart's achievement was widely appreciated, a body of practice orientated around London and Paris had already gained international currency. Significantly, the conventions of this practice remained in force in the later century, most obviously in Brahms's piano concerti, both of which contain a modulating R1, but also in concerti by Rubinstein (nos. 1 and 2), Litolff (nos. 2 and 5), Herz (No. 7) and Xaver Scharwenka (No. 2), amongst others.

Of course, Tovey's argument is differently angled: his view is not that Mozart's formal solutions are empirically normative, but that they constitute a formal ideal – the 'true' concerto – which subsequent composers did not understand. But what truth criteria underwrite this claim? How do we know what a form's authentic principle should be, if not by examining the conventions of the repertoire? The concept of a 'true' concerto suggests that a genre's defining principle obtains regardless of whether or not the repertoire instantiates it. In practice, however, Tovey's argument founders because it is self-justifying: his principle is *not* conjured *ex nihilo*, but is formulated as a result of his engagement with Mozart, whose music both generates and instantiates the idea. Worse, Tovey then uses this as a critical yardstick for the assessment of all generic examples. Mozart conforms to a principle, which only his music substantially exemplifies, but

which is perforce the measure of all type-5 sonatas. This critical dimension unmasks an aesthetic fallacy, which *Formenlehre* would do well to repudiate. The concept of a ‘true’ Mozartian concerto allows us to smuggle qualitative judgements into what should be empirical-historical research in the guise of a generic requirement: Mozart was, in general, a better composer than Dussek, Steibelt, *et al*, and therefore his concerti are naturally the appropriate source of formal authenticity.

Yet if the claims of *Formenlehre* are ever to align with the history of the forms they theorise, then we need to do better than this. Above all, we need to release formal theory from the constraints of aesthetic and canonical chauvinism. Mozart may very well be a better composer than Dussek, but an understanding of Dussek’s piano concerti is ultimately more useful if we want to analyse subsequent contributions to the genre. As close engagement with Tovey’s error reveals, Dussek’s invisibility ultimately rebounds negatively on other canonical composers. Beethoven’s type-5 strategies make good sense in their historical-repertorial context, but are largely incomprehensible as part of a myopically Mozartian genealogy. The ultimate reward of a post-canonical *Formenlehre* is a better understanding of canonical music.

Notes

¹ This essay builds on and considerably expands work on the post-classical modulating R1 published in Horton 2011, pp. 56–60 and 2017, pp. 76–86. The research that is its source was made possible thanks to an Irish Research Council Senior Research Fellowship. I would like to thank Benedict Taylor, Nicole Grimes, Steven Vande Moortele and Paul Wingfield for their contributions to this research, and Peter Smith for his generous comments on the text.

² ▲ As Rosen argues: ‘The dramatic modulation is left to the soloist; insofar as there are two real expositions in a concerto, one is necessarily passive and the other active, and the nineteenth century, which did not understand this, was often forced to do away with the orchestral exposition as tautological’. Rosen 1980, pp. 70–1 makes the point at more length, developing a narrative in which the modulating R1 is eventually discarded by the late eighteenth century: ‘a ritornello that starts on I, moves to V and then returns firmly to I with all dissonances and tension resolved is an action completed [...] establishing a

tonic-dominant opposition makes any impressive set of tonic cadences following it appear like a complete resolution, and it is too soon in the work for that [...] This is why the opening ritornello as sonata exposition never gains a firm foothold’.

³ Hepokoski has acknowledged the increased prominence of the modulating R1 after 1790 in 2012, especially fns 38 (p. 248) and 44 (p. 249). Hepokoski here contextualises the modulation to B<f> minor for the R1 S of Op. 15, additionally responding to Horton 2011.

⁴ Samson also argues that ‘The virtuoso concerto of the early nineteenth century was a response above all to Mozart’s concertos’ (1992, p. 50), a point I will contest below.

⁵ Macdonald 2005 explores this point in detail.

⁶ On this piece, see Macdonald 1986 and also 1992.

⁷ On the performance data for Mozart’s concerti in London between 1790–1800 and 1800–1850 respectively, see Milligan 1983, pp. 297–364 and Ellsworth 1991, pp. 279–312. Milligan records only two performances of Mozart concerti in London in the last decade of the eighteenth century, both of K. 466, and both by visiting soloists. Ellsworth records 43 performances over her 50-year period, but only six of these occur before 1820. Of the thirteen Mozart concerti in Ellsworth’s and Milligan’s research that can be identified, moreover, only five receive more than one performance, and two (K. 466 and 491) are atypically popular (six each, against two performances for K. 467, 482 and 503). If performance history is a reasonable measure, the influence of Mozart is really the influence of two, or at best three concerti. I have analysed these data in Horton 2011, pp. 47–51. The records for the performance of Mozart in Leipzig are found in Dörffel 1884 and also Macdonald 2005, pp. 78–9. On Mozart’s presence in Paris, see Cooper 1983.

⁸ Koch’s view of the form retrenched around Mozart in 1802, cols. 349–55. On Koch’s descriptions, see Stevens 1974 and Davis 1983.

⁹ Czerny is by no means myopically focused on Beethoven, but cites the concertos of Mozart, Beethoven, Moscheles, Ries and Kalkbrenner ‘as excellent models’ (1848, p. 164).

¹⁰ On the problem of the ‘strong’ subordinate theme, see Vande Moortele 2017, pp. 146–90.

¹¹ I have investigated issues of syntax in this repertoire in Horton 2015 and 2017.

¹² Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, pp. 450–1) define three essential functions for R1: an ‘introductory-anticipatory function’, which applies especially to more compact R1s having the character of an expanded up-beat; an ‘expositional-rhetoric function’, which installs the rhetorical, if not the tonal-structural, features of an exposition; and a ‘referential-layout function’, which sets up a template for subsequent rotations.

¹³ As Caplin (2013, p. 680) argues for the Mozartian R1: ‘the opening ritornello initiates the textural frame for the concerto’, which the closing ritornello completes.

¹⁴ The survey here expands that attempted in Horton 2011, pp. 56–60, responding to which Hepokoski (2012, fn. 44, p. 249) cites minor-mode examples by Hummel, Moscheles, Ries, Kalkbrenner and Field.

¹⁵ The ternary R1 has been noted in Milligan 1983, p. 73 and Macdonald 2005, p. 18.

¹⁶ In the cases of Ries and Czerny, there is direct evidence of the dissemination of Beethoven’s Op. 37 as a model.

¹⁷ On the reinterpreted half cadence, see Caplin 2013, pp. 90–2.

¹⁸ Tovey 1936d, p. 78. Opus 56 does indeed contain a monotonal R1, but departs radically from Mozart’s practice by transposing R1 B into VI in S1, commuted to vi in the closing section.

¹⁹ These progressions evidence Caplin’s distinction between cadential content and cadential function; they express the former, but not the latter. See for instance Caplin 2013, p. 59.

²⁰ As Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, p. 546) eloquently describe the passage: ‘the soloist, at first plunging efficiently toward Ritornello 2, undergoes a change of mind, seeking now to stop linear time, reluctant to bring such beauty to an end and wishing to back up for one more statement [of B^C]’.

²¹ Ries’s primary material also resembles the A and B themes of Beethoven’s Op. 56 to an extent that surely transcends coincidence.

²² For example in Horton 2011 and at length in 2017.

²³ On the publication history of Mozart’s concerti, see Macdonald 2004, p. 303.

Macdonald cites the publication of ten concerti by André from 1792 and 20 by Breitkopf and Härtel between 1800 and 1804.