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ABSTRACT

Drawing on the work of Janet Schmalfeldt and William Caplin, I explore the way in which emergent formal function determines our perception of form in four piano sonata movements by Schubert: D.840, D.845, D.850 and D.894. Janet Schmalfeldt adapts the notion of formal function to directly address the dialectic between “being” and “becoming,” approaching formal function from a phenomenological perspective. Building on her work, I define emergent formal function as a formal function that is conditioned by how the listener’s expectations change. It is an important analytical tool that helps us understand how and why Schubert’s sonata forms depart from prior Classical models. Drawing on Schmalfeldt’s work, emergent formal function depicts the phenomenology of when consequential formal conjecture that is revoked or modified by an earlier assertion—an analytical tool that combines diachronic and synchronic listening strategy. As a corollary, I discuss how harmonic reinterpretations, like emergent harmonic functions, contribute to creating indistinct edges between thematic functions in these four piano sonata movements. Emergent formal function expands the scope of inquiry into the harmonic bivalence in Schubert’s late style from the study of local chromaticism to the realm of tonal form.
INTRODUCTION. IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING AND SCHUBERT’S BEETHOVEN PROJECT

The knowledge gained from all kinds of scholars—biographers, musicologists, and cultural historians about Schubert’s illness and about his ‘Beethoven project’ should remind performers and analysts that music cannot be construed as an autonomous activity, separate from cultural, sociological, psychological and deeply personal concerns.

—Janet Schmalfeldt, In the Process of Becoming

Background

In her 2011 book In the Process of Becoming, Janet Schmalfeldt draws a connection between Beethoven’s and Schubert’s large-scale instrumental works, specifically, their sonata forms. By “Schubert’s Beethoven project” Janet Schmalfeldt refers Schubert's attempts to continue in Beethoven’s footsteps in the development of large-scale instrumental works, specifically the sonata movements.¹ Schmalfeldt’s analysis derives from Dalhaus’s dialectical observations in Beethoven’s “Tempest” Sonata, where the initial assertion of the formal function in the beginning is negated by formal conflict in the later passage.² Schmalfeldt extends a Hegelian approach “being into becoming” to the understanding of formal—the formal process that becomes “the form.” Schmalfeldt’s idea provides a valuable justification for formal analysis that combines both diachronic analysis and retrospective reinterpretation.

In her book, “In the Process of Becoming,” Janet Schmalfeldt provides an analytical view from the lenses of both a performer and a theorist. She applies a dialectical view in her processual analysis to Beethoven’s “Tempest” sonata and Schubert’s piano sonata in A minor, op.42, D.845.³ Schmalfeldt’s work reminds theorists should not separate themselves from the human nature, a

¹ Schubert’s Beethoven Project is a term that borrowed from John Gingerich, Schubert’s Beethoven Project.
² Schmalfeldt, In the Process of Becoming, 31. Such observation also comes from a Beethoven-Hegelian tradition.
nature of processual interpretation as listeners and performers. Relevantly, Gingerich devotes a chapter specifically to the sonatas that are closely related to the A minor piano sonata chronologically. That is, the piano sonatas that Schubert composed between 1825-1826. Gingerich mentions that Schubert, in a letter of 1824 to Leopold Kupelwieser, speaks of “paving the way towards a grand symphony,” in a Beethovenian manner; and the “Great” Symphony No.9 in C major was composed around the same time as the four piano sonatas.

Drawing from both scholars, in this thesis, I provide a close read of Schubert’s late sonata style from Schmalfeldt’s analytical method to the four piano sonata movements in “Schubert’s Beethoven project:” the C major piano sonata, D.840; the A minor piano sonata, D.845; the D major piano sonata, D.850; and the G major piano sonata, D.894. I hope a group of works chosen here that shares a close chronological relation will bring valuable investigation on Schubert’s late sonata style.

| Table 1.1. Chronological order of the four piano sonatas composed during 1825-1826. |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| April 1825                     | Piano Sonata in C major, D.840 (incomplete) |
| May 1825                       | Piano Sonata in A minor, D.845 |
| Summer 1825 - 1826             | Started to draft “Great” Symphony No.9 in C major, D.944 |
| August 1825                    | Piano Sonata in D major, D.850 |
| October 1826                   | Piano Sonata in G major, D.894 |

**Emergent Formal Functions and Sonata Form**

Janet Schmalfeldt’s theory of *form as a process* provides a backbone for my work. I expand upon this idea and call it *emergent formal function*. Unlike synchronic analysis, which prioritizes

---

4 The sonatas in C major (D.840, the “Reliquie”), A minor (D.845), D major (D.850), and G major (D.894)

5 Gingerich, John Michael. *Schubert's Beethoven Project*, 236.

6 Emergence is “a philosophical term of art. We might roughly characterize the shared meaning thus: emergent entities (properties or substances) ‘arise’ out of more fundamental entities and yet are ‘novel’ or ‘irreducible’ with respect to them. (For example, it is sometimes said that consciousness is an emergent property of the brain.) There has been renewed interest in emergence within discussions of the behavior of...
retrospective formal reinterpretation, emergent formal function incorporates a diachronic analysis of formal function along with the synchronic strategy that is more typical of the analytical practice of Hepokoski and Darcy, and Schenker. In other words, emergent formal function is an analytical tool that uses diachronic observations preliminarily and confirms the analysis by retrospective listening. While Caplin’s method views formal functions in a primarily diachronic manner, Schmalfeldt provides views that are both diachronic and synchronic. That is, formal functions are not inherent, but rather established as we process musical events, and any initial expectation may be replaced or modified. Emergent formal function, like the Schmalfeldtian method, aims to emphasize on the processual nature of musical listening and performing experience. As Schmalfeldt states,

As a temporal art, music in performance insists that we hear it diachronically; thus we perceive all performances—of any kind of music—as processual...these new approaches encouraged the idea that the formal process itself becomes ‘the form’. Listeners of this kind of music are being asked to participate within that process, by listening backward as well as in the moment—by recalling what they have heard, while retrospectively reinterpreting formal functions in the light of an awareness of the interplay between conventions and transformations. As perhaps the most active of all listeners, performers themselves are being urged to play a far more authoritative role in articulating such form-defining moments as beginnings, middles, and endings, while projecting the overall shapes that these might define. It is the idea of form coming into being that being exploring here.

Drawing on the work of Janet Schmalfeldt and William E. Caplin, I explore the way in which emergent formal function determines our perception of form in a select group of sonata form movements by Schubert. As used by Caplin (1998), formal function describes the specific role that complex systems and debates over the reconcilability of mental causation, intentionality, or consciousness with physicalism.” as in Stanford Philosophy

Continuing the Schmalfeldtian analogy of the Hegelian dialect—if synchronic analysis is the thesis, and diachronic hearing opposed as its antithesis, then emergent formal function serves as the synthesis to conciliate the two.

played by “a self-contained ‘chunk’ of music”—a phrase or similar unit—in the formal organization of an instrumental work of the Classical period. Schmalfeldt adapts the notion of formal function to directly address the dialectical process of music—a dialectic between “being” and “becoming”—approaching formal function from a phenomenological perspective. Building on their work, I define emergent formal function as formal functions that emerge from the dialectical process of music. That is, the processual change of a specific role that a musical phrase plays in a larger formal context. Since a discussion of the process in a larger formal context is involved, it is a technique that requires both diachronic and synchronic analysis of the form. For instance, in the A minor piano sonata, the process of the formal function changes from the intro to MT of the opening when one reflecting back at a later point of the process.

I shall note, however, the difference between Janet Schmalfeldt’s form as a process and my work of emergent formal functions. That is, Schmalfeldt emphasizes on the dialectical reading of coming retrospective reinterpretation, but not a confirmation of a final formal reading. That is, for an example drawn from her analysis of D.845, Intro ⇒ MT does not mean necessarily the final formal function should be read as MT; instead, the final reading is the process itself—as represented by the double arrow sign “⇒.” On the other hand, emergent formal functions emphasize the perceptual shift caused by a series of failed expectations concerning initial, medial, and cadential functions. Leonard Meyer proposes when an expectation is not meet, as Leonard Meyer proposes, the failed expectation results in uncertainly of meaning, i.e. formal ambiguity. Thus, through both diachronic analysis and retrospective reinterpretation, emergent formal

---

11 Caplin, Classical Form, 43.
functions provide a solution of the human mind when encountering the ambiguities, here, in Schubert’s late sonata style.

Emergent formal function reflects our understanding of which evolves in the course of our involvement with a musical work as it unfolds. Emergent formal function regards how listeners’ expectations concerning a unit’s formal function can change in the course of a performance of the work, and how this shift in expectations must in some sense seem an intended part of one’s experience of the work. Given the relevance of dialectical approaches to sonata form, emergent formal function is an important analytical tool to understand Schubert’s sonata forms, given their reliance on, but departure from, prior Classical models. The ambiguity of harmonic function in Schubert works symbiotically with the ambivalence of formal function, necessitating a strategy of combining dialectic hearing and retrospective reinterpretations.\(^\text{12}\) In emergent formal function, we retain Schmalfeldt’s symbol of the double arrow “⇒”.\(^\text{13}\) The arrow can represent a harmonic flux, or changes in phrase rhythmic or texture. The listener may first perceive a passage as possessing one formal function, and then substitute a different hearing retrospectively. It provides both formal affirmation and formal negation, and in some cases, that are discussed later, the initiation of a formal function overturns the arrival of the formal function.

As mentioned, Schmalfeldt’s analysis provides novel view in the debate of Romantic sonata forms in Beethoven and Schubert, which has been dominated by synchronic and structural listening strategies.\(^\text{14}\) Recently, sonata form analysis has been dominated by Hepokoski and Darcy, their Sonata Theory (2006) giving further weight to a type of hermeneutic reading that incorporate

\(^{12}\) Besides Janet Schmalfeldt, Theorists like Poundie Burstein also propose such a strategy. For instance, Burstein’s argument about Schubert’s technique of “tonic allusion”--“when a chord is initially heard as a tonic but is retrospectively understood to lie within a larger prolongation” Burstein, “Devil’s Castles and Schubert's Strange Tonic Allusions,” 70.

\(^{13}\) Schmalfeldt, Janet. In the Process of Becoming, 9.

\(^{14}\) Webster, James. “Schubert's Sonata Form and Brahms's First Maturity”, 21.
techniques of retrospective reinterpretation. Although I come from a different point of view with them, Sonata Theory’s lexicon provides an essential tool when discussing how thematic rotations provide formal ambiguities with unconventional tonal plan. On the other hand, Sonata Theory proposes a rhetorical formal boundary in sonata forms, namely, the “caesura.”¹⁵ In my analysis, I aim to demonstrate Schubert’s unconventional formal composition techniques in the diachronic analysis. These techniques that challenges the style of Classical sonata form are reflected by the series of instances of emergent formal functions. In my preliminary research, such formal innovations often find in the exposition towards end of the Main Theme (MT) and end of the Transition (TR). In other words, a place where a Medial Caesura (MC) is expected to be happen, as according to Sonata Theory. Consequently, I find that the MC could be intangible to identify. Thus, emergent formal functions serve as a phenomenon from the result of these blurred boundaries that defines by the rhetorical caesuras, as I name “indistinct edges.”¹⁶ One direct consequence the kind, for instance, is that it creates is what scholar called “false recapitulation.” That is, as James Webster proposes, one trademark of Schubert’s late sonata form, a separation of the thematic return and the tonal return in Schubert's sonata form. Coming from Schmafeldt’s Hegelian tradition, I propose, the indistinct edge neither aims to connect or to disconnect the two sections but serve as an Aufheben—a mediator that falls between the two functions. The term is inspired by Richard Kramer’s aesthetic argument in Schubert’s “Reliquie” sonata, that we will discuss later in chapter 2.¹⁷

¹⁵ As defined by Hepokoski and Darcy, Medial Caesura (MC) is the “brief, rhetorically reinforced break or gap that serves to divide an exposition into two parts, tonic and dominant (or mediant in most minor key sonatas)” Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 24.
¹⁷ Aufhebung is translated to “sublation” in English. It is a word that originates from aufheben, a verb that has a contradict meaning and could simultaneously interpretable as 'preserve, cancel, and lift up.' For Hegel, an unresolved contradiction was a sign of error. The contradiction between thesis and antithesis
CHAPTER 1. EMERGENT FORMAL FUNCTIONS IN A MINOR PIANO SONATA, D.845

In this chapter, I propose a new reading that draws on Schmalfeldt’s analysis of the A minor piano sonata, D.845. A reading that confirms emergent formal functions.\textsuperscript{18} Schmalfeldt first applies Carl Dalhaus’ analysis of Beethoven’s “Tempest Sonata” to the beginning of this movement in Schubert’s D.845.\textsuperscript{19} In the “Tempest,” the lyrical character of the Main Theme (MT), does not match with the expectations where MT declare the home tonic assertively. It also proposes a question of whether the opening should be seen as introduction or MT. The late arrival of the first root-position, metrically accented tonic creates an aural illusion of where the “real” presentation of the Main Theme (MT) happens. Thus, Dalhaus argues that “the beginning of the sonata is loosely constructed, and both harmonically and syntactically open-ended, so that at first it seems to be an introduction, not the exposition of a theme.”\textsuperscript{20}

Thus, Schmalfeldt combines Caplin’s work in formal functions, and presents this kind of processual relation with the double arrow sign “⇒”.\textsuperscript{21} The performing debates of the opening in D.845 evokes Schmalfeldt mapping a formal analysis with Dalhaus’ reading of the “Tempest” sonata.\textsuperscript{22} The formal function ambivalences in the exposition of Schubert’s A minor sonata constructed similarly to the “Tempest” Sonata. Similarly, in Schubert’s D.845, since there is not a single root-position tonic harmony until m. 26, Schmalfeldt points out that the listener won’t hear results in the dialectical resolution or superseding of the contradiction between opposites as a higher-level synthesis through the process of Aufhebung.

\textsuperscript{18} Schmalfeldt, Janet. \textit{In the Process of Becoming}, 113-129.
\textsuperscript{19} Dalhaus’s original comment concerns the first movement of Beethoven’s tempest sonata: “the beginning of the movement is not yet a subject, the evolutionary episode is one no longer.”
\textsuperscript{20} Schmalfeldt, Janet. \textit{In the Process of Becoming}, 38.
\textsuperscript{21} Schmalfeldt calls the processual phenomenon as “becomes”, she proposed that “it is the especial case whereby the formal function initially suggest by a musical idea, phrase, or section invites retrospective reinterpretation within the larger formal context”
\textsuperscript{22} Schmalfeldt, Janet. \textit{In the Process of Becoming}, 118. Schmalfeldt proposes that there are several possible performing interpretations for the opening to compensate for the formal ambiguity in the A minor sonata.
the beginning as a MT (Main Theme) in time but would realize it becomes the MT only in retrospect. The listener would only realize that the beginning of the movement is the actual MT once “the subsequent modulatory passage can no longer be regarded as the MT.” The opening theme’s monophonic, lyrical texture causes us to mistake it for an introduction, and to expect a “Main Theme” to come after this “Introduction”. Subsequent events cause us to realize that it is actually the real “MT”. Schmalfeldt refers to this event as Intro ⇒ MT.\(^{23}\)

Furthermore, Schmalfeldt brings out multiple levels of interpretative possibilities for the opening phrase, resulting from her processual interpretation of the phrase structure.\(^{24}\) Since the opening phrase begins with a conventional two-bar basic idea (b.i.) followed by a two-bar contrasting idea (c.i.) and leads to a half cadence, an antecedent function is suggested for this opening statement, and further confirmed when what appears to be a consequent phrase follows, beginning in m.5.

However, instead of an authentic cadence in m. 8, there is a two-measure phrase expansion that leads to a dominant harmony. If we reconsider the opening as a Compound Basic Idea (CBI) in mm. 1-4 and its expanded repetition in mm. 5-10, we would require a continuation of comparable length, like the sixteen-bar parallel period constructed from paired sentences that begins the Moment Musical in A\(_b\), D. 780 no. 6 (1824).\(^{25}\) That is also lacking here. Schmalfeldt concludes that the formal function of the second phrase in mm. 5-10 needs to be heard as a second

\(^{23}\) Robert Bailey, and Richard Wagner. Prelude and Transfiguration, 103. Schubert’s way of implying A minor foreshadows that of Wagner. The dominant chord prolonged in mm. 10-25 stands in place of its tonic; one could interpret the passage either in A minor or A major.
\(^{24}\) That is, relating to or involving the study of processes rather than the study of discrete events.
\(^{25}\) Compound basic idea is a basic idea that lacks a cadence.
antecedent to logically make sense of the next musical event, the “continuation”, and thus labeling it as \( \text{conseq.} \Rightarrow 2^{\text{nd}} \text{antecedent} \).^{26}

Schmalfeldt analyzes the next formal function event—the transition at m. 26 similarly. Just as in Beethoven’s “Tempest” Sonata, there is no “official” establishment of the main key until m.26. At the moment of m.26, the much-awaited resolution of the dominant is provided by a new idea that sounds almost like it could be a MT. This passage, however, is ultimately revealed to have transitional (TR) function; it ends with the dominant of the relative major. But given the arrival at m. 26 of a new thematic idea, as well as of the first metrically strong root-position tonic harmony, we don’t realize it is the transition \textit{in time} but only \textit{in retrospect}—until we hear the consequent modulatory passage is actually moving into the secondary key area, C major.\(^{27}\) Thus, we might hear it as the launch of the true “MT” initially, but we realize m. 26 is actually the beginning of the transition when we hear the harmony is gradually moving to its tonic—C major. That is, when we hear the \( G^\# \) in m.29, it dissolves the sentence rhetoric of this entire phrase as TR function. Schmalfeldt refers to this event as \( MT \Rightarrow \text{Transition} \). At m. 28, emergent formal function occurs when a musical phenomenon revokes a formal expectation.\(^{28}\)

Other moments in the movement also support emergent readings. Here, I want to share a different analytical point of view from Schmalfeldt’s. In the opening, if we did perceive the opening eight measures as MT, we would do so before we go to the transition at m. 26. So, when

---

\(^{26}\) Because of the lack of an authentic cadence and a consequent that follows, we could not accept it fully as a second antecedent. Thus, Schmalfeldt put a question mark at the end of her label. Pianists also need to make different performance choices to “create” a phrase that makes sense here. To present this level of relation, she labeled it \( \text{consequent} \Rightarrow 2^{\text{nd}} \text{antecedent} \)?

\(^{27}\) In fact, the dominant harmonies at mm. 4, 10, 14, 18 and 15 are truly Wagnerian ways of implying A minor. Robert Bailey wrote in the Norton Critical score to the Tristan Prelude/Transfiguration

\(^{28}\) In this case, that is, the moment when G nature appears and followed by a C major chord. Here is how we “realize” the phrase is serving as a transiting function. Thus, the only way to rationalize the whole passage is to see the opening as the “real” MT, and that is the only logic to make to have a TR starting at m. 26.
that new theme appears at m. 26, I first took it as the ST. In fact, the “true” ST did consist of the same thematic materials at m. 40. Thus, for me, I would label the emergent formal function in m.26 as $ST \Rightarrow \text{Transition}$ rather than $MT \Rightarrow \text{Transition}$.

Figure 1.1. Schmalfeldt’s analysis of the opening phrase of Schubert’s A minor sonata

Figure 1.2. Schmalfeldt’s analysis of D.845, mm. 28-31

At m. 40, the Secondary Theme (ST$^1$) arrives; its compressed continuation (m. 48) appears after the double repetition of the basic idea. Then, a variation of ST$^1$ follows at m.51, labelled as “var. rep. of ST$^1$”. Then, surprisingly, the MT returns in the parallel minor key of the dominant, C
minor. Schmalfeldt refers to this as $ST^2$. However, this time, the tonal ambiguities of the opening phrase is weakened, as she points out, the tonic establishes strongly by root-position tonic chords. The antecedent could be seen as stated twice, to rationalize the 12-bar opening phrase, so Schmalfeldt labels such reinterpretation as “1st consequent” and “2nd consequent” in her analysis (see figure 1.1).

The next moment that emergent formal function takes place is m. 151, near the end of the development. The MT comes back in F# after a moment of silence at m. 146. It serves as a point of departure for the “hints” of Core III, creating a false-recapitulation effect. Then, after another moment of silence, the MT seems to come back at m. 151, as we might expect—a “true recap” that follows a “false recap,” as shown by figure 1.3. However, the imitative voicing and the way that its second phrase modulates reveals that this is merely another “illusion” that Schubert creates. Accordingly, Schmalfeldt labels this event as “true recap” $\Rightarrow$ false, and we are still in our stage of Core III in the development. When the imitative presentation of the opening themes changes to another pattern at m.168, we arrive at Core IV. This time, it is also a true retransition—we realize the passage is moving back to E, the dominant of the original tonic A minor. Similarly, Schmalfeldt labels this event as $CORE IV \Rightarrow true retransition$. The recapitulation begins with the return of the transition arrives at m. 186, where we finally hear the returning of the root-position tonic, A minor. The structural recapitulation of the sonata does not happen until here. Note the absence of a double return, of both MT and tonic. The other sonatas in the set do not exhibit this structural irregularity, nor do the first movements of any of Schubert’s other piano sonatas; D. 840 (piano sonata in C major) is unique in this respect.

According to William Caplin, the key area of a Subordinate Theme (ST) needs to contrast with that of the MT, and ST is typically constructed more loosely in its phrase and thematic structure.
than the MT. For Caplin, a ST should have some kind of initial function, a medial function, and finally a cadential function, and end with a PAC in the subordinate theme key area.

Figure 1.3. Schmalfeldt labels the “false recap” as the initiation of Core III (m.144)
Here, the home key is stabilized by TR in the recapitulation at m.186. In fact, Schmalfeldt proposes m.186 as the start of the recapitulation, since that is the first return of the tonic harmony. Thus, an unexpected perception of a larger formal function emerges, where the main theme does not serve as the initiation of the recapitulatory rotation.

According to Caplin’s Classical Form, the components of a phrase can typically be expressed in terms of the formal functions of introducing, initiating, medial, cadential, and post-cadential. Emergent formal function typically weakens the initial and cadential functions, as shown by the following figure.

Figure 1.4. Weakened functions in emergent formal function
Caplin mentions that in some main themes, the lack of a clear sense of functional initiation creates a sense of nonconvention. “In such cases, the theme seems to start ‘in the middle’, or
‘towards the end’, that is with continuation or cadential function.”

The initial functions are weakened by neglecting presentation of a strong tonic (no matter a local tonic or global tonic) harmony in down-beat and root position. Schubert tends to destabilize the key from the initial of the phrase by inserting a distant pedal tone under harmonies—often $\bar{5}$ of the tonic. The cadential function is also weakened by denial of any kind of an authentic cadence—and it is a result of a weakening presentation of any root-position tonic harmony.

Here, I shall summarize the emergent formal functions that Schmalfeldt labels in her analysis of Schubert’s piano sonata in A minor.

i. Intro $\Rightarrow$ MT. When the beginning of a sonata sounds like an introduction at first, but then the illusion is rejected later, because of insufficient presentation of a “real MT.” In Schubert’s case, the new thematic material that appears could only be heard as a transition rather than a MT. Thus, the listener needs to re-adjust their first interpretation of the opening as MT, so the Intro becomes MT.

ii. MT $\Rightarrow$ TR. When the first presentation of a root-position tonic harmony is delayed (that is, not in the beginning of a sonata), listeners might mistake the delayed arrival point of the first root-position harmony as the start point of MT. However, if the listeners realize the proceeded passage is a modulatory passage that is moving into another key (in this case, its relative minor), then we would replace the first assumption. That is how MT becomes TR (transition).

iii. Core III $\Rightarrow$ false recap. Without a retransition, the MT comes back in a ‘’wrong key’. In this case, we hear a new gesture in the development (Core III) becoming the “failed” recapitulation (false recap)

iv. “true recap” $\Rightarrow$ false recap. The MT comes back in the right key (in this case, right after that “failed” recap), but not develops as it supposed to be (in other words, not develops as

---

29 Caplin, William Earl. *Classical Form*, 199. Here, Caplin implies an emergent formal function of substituting the initial formal function with the continuation or the cadential function.
similar to what happened in the exposition.) Thus, we hear the expected “true recap” becoming another false recap.

v. Core IV ⇒ true retransition. After failure(s) of the recapitulation, we have a new gesture (in here, m.168). This time, the new gestures gradually trying to establish the original tonic key. Thus, we hear this new gesture, Core IV becoming the true retransition.

Now, I want to share a few more observations of emergent formal functions in the A minor piano sonata.

i. ST ⇒ false ST. The listener already switched our perception of the Intro to MT by m.26. Thus, when a new theme appears at m. 26 one might first interpret it as a ST. Then, when the “real” ST appears at m.26, one would hear retrospectively the original new thematic material as a “false” ST.

ii. Transition ⇒ true recap. In the recapitulation, we went through a few stages of re-acclaiming and declaring the true recap. When we first recognize that transition material comes back, we might first take it as the transition—although we are still uncertain about the exact return point of the recapitulation by this time (m.186). When we realize we have attained the home key, root-position tonic returns—like we had in the exposition, it is the time we “find” our true back home recapitulation. Thus, the Transition becomes the true recap.

Janet Schmalfeldt’s analysis permits us to talk about Schubert’s sonata in a different way than before. First, she permits us to discuss diachronicity without throwing away synchronicity. Second, by drawing on Caplinian formal function, she forces us to ask how each phrase shapes the overall form in Schubert’s piano sonata in A minor. Third, she helps us confront the way in which Schubert problematizes cadential rhetoric—and that is the origin of Schubert’s indistinct edges. Therefore, there are some further points that one can make beyond her analyses. That includes expanding the application of the methodology to other works in “Schubert’s Beethoven Project” that she mentions in her book and rethinking the sonata design in Schubert’s late-career compositional development.
CHAPTER 2. EMERGENT FORMAL FUNCTIONS AND EMERGENT HARMONIC FUNCTIONS

2.1 EMERGENT HARMONIC FUNCTIONS IN THE “RELIQUIE” SONATA

As the title indicates, the “Reliquie” sonata, D.840, contains three completed movements and an unfinished fourth Scherzo movement. Whether it is a coincidence or not, this sonata composed only a month earlier than the A minor piano sonata is in its relative key C major. The “Reliquie” sonata was composed in April 1825, the first sonata of the piano sonatas composed during 1825-1826, and it’s the only sonata that was published posthumously.

The piano sonata in C major, D.840, begins with a similar gesture to that which opens the A minor piano sonata, D.845. The opening statement (BI) consists of a composing-out of the tonic chord, and the subsequent contrasting idea (CI) is an expansion of the dominant chord. It begins with MT that plays in octaves (mm. 1-2) and follows by the antecedent phrase that moves to a cadential six-four (m. 3). In both openings (of the A minor sonata and the C major sonata), a unison idea is followed by a chordal predicate. Considering the basic idea as the subject in a sentence, its formal function is strengthened by the CI, just like the verb that follows the subject as a predicate. Despite opening with a similar gesture and in a relevant key, the tonal plan of the C major sonata differs from that of the A minor sonata in that the phrase structure of the “Reliquie” is less ambiguous than that of the A minor sonata. Surprisingly, by the second consequent phrase (m.13), the passage goes to a repetition of the same consequent phrase in A♭ major, the ♭VI of C major. Here, a functional ambiguity arises by the oscillation of the tonality. Perhaps here we also have an oscillation in formal functions when we have A♭ major—which is not an expected key area in MT action-space. It is possible that one interprets m.12 as the start point of the transition section. When

---

30 The title “Reliquie” was also a mistaken one by the publisher to take this sonata as Schubert’s last sonata he composed, as “Reliquie” means a “relic.”
one hears the resolution of the $A_b$ chord to G chord at m.24, one will interpret the passage retrospectively as false transition⇒2\textsuperscript{nd} consequent at m.12.

At m. 28, a vital moment is revealed by the doubling of the opening theme in octaves by both hands. Similar gestures of formal function also appear in the A minor sonata at m. 26, where MT appears in louder dynamics and polyphony. Considering the latter “MT” present the theme and the tonic more firmly, listeners might take the it (m. 28) as the beginning of “MT” and the opening as an “Intro” in their first hearing. However, such interpretation will need to be denied when we realize the harmony is moving to a new key, in this case, B minor at m. 54, and we interpret m. 28 retrospectively as MT ⇒ Transition (TR). Just as in the A minor sonata (m. 26) in. Although the emergent formal function happens at m. 28 (MT ⇒ TR) is a typical example in Schubert’s piano sonatas, what happens next is novel.

First, the restatement of the tonic is presented with a pedal of the dominant, G. The sequence moves to $b\text{VII}$ at m. 30, iv at m. 33, $b\text{VI}$ at m.40, and (somewhat surprisingly) V at m. 43. The interpolation of V interrupts the ordinary flows of functions. Suzannah Clark points out that the dominant interrupts the flow of this modulatory passage, thus the V chord at m.43 serves a bifocal function to build-up to the cadence that triggers the Medial Caesura (MC).\textsuperscript{31} Clark’s suggestion of the dominant here serves as a bifocal close that results in an “illusion” to conceal Schubert’s unconventional tonal plan. In particular, I suspect the MC that Clark claims here at m. 50 (caesura fill, mm. 51-54) is a failed one. That is, the dominant chord at m. 46 does not lead to the expected Subordinate Theme (ST) key area, G major, but rather to vii of the home key (B minor) at m. 55.

\textsuperscript{31} Clark, 2011. “Analyzing Schubert”, 253. “Schubert negotiated the relative relations between the first and second themes and the second theme and the closing theme—when recapitulating a set of relations that do not readily lend themselves to block transposition.”
Notice that the Ab comes back as b9 of the dominant chord, resulting in a salient Gb9 chord at m. 48. That is, the Vb9 chord is prolonged from mm. 45-50, and then the b9 (A♭) is reinterpreted enharmonically as G# at m. 51. The enharmonic respelling results in an emergent harmonic function, where the interpretation of the harmonic function is changed by the subsequent passage. In this case, the G# serves as part of the parsimonious voice leading and leads to the B minor chord in the second inversion at m. 51, beat 2. This chord is in retrospect, again heard as a cadential six-four over F#, resolves to the F# chord in root position in m. 52.4, and leads to the incomplete B minor chord in m. 53, beat 1—in which has anticipated the official arrival of an unexpected ST key area, B minor.

Deriving from Schlegel and Hegel, Kramer suggests that the emergent harmonic functions between mm. 50-51 serve as evidence for Aufhebung. As Kramer proposes, the Ab creates a conflict, the dissonance—the b9 of the G major harmony, and its enharmonic reinterpretation (Ab and G#)—becomes the resolution. He also points out that the ninth does not resolve to G conventionally. It becomes Ab, an appoggiatura, undergoes transmutation into G# above a putative root C#—all of this sounding somewhere in the crevices between mm.50 and 51, so that the residue is understood as a suspension of that fifth above C#.

However, I doubt that an unsounded C# chord could be heard in here. In fact, both F and Ab are enharmonically respelled as E# and G#—notes that resolve to a B diminished 7th chord (with E# and G# respelled enharmonically to F and Ab). At m. 51, when the G in the bass leads to F# on

---

32 Aufhebung is translated to “sublation” in English. It is a word that originates from Aufheben, a verb seems has a contradict meaning, and could simultaneously interpretable as 'preserve, cancel, lift up.' For Hegel, an unresolved contradiction was a sign of error. The contradiction between thesis and antithesis results in the dialectical resolution or superseding of the contradiction between opposites as a higher-level synthesis through the process of Aufhebung.
the downbeat and the G# in the soprano also leads to F# in the last beat, we would hear m. 51 only as of the second inversion of a B minor chord, a cadential six-four that leads to a root position F# major chord in m. 52.4. I suggest that the enharmonic respelling between m. 50-51 only serves as a smoother voice leading tool here in m. 51—as opposed to a functional progression. Although I disagree with Kramer’s assertion of a “putative root” C#, I understand where that interpretation comes from. In fact, it is possible to read it as a suggestion of Db (i.e., bII), enharmonically speaking, in which its V7, Ab-C-Eb-Gb also appears in mm. 19-23. Kramer’s suggestion indicates that a whiff of this unresolved V7’s missing tonic hangs over all the way to ST.

*Aufhebung* is a term that addresses the nature of the “becoming” process in retrospective reinterpretations in music-listening. The term depicts a similar process to those of emergent formal functions and emergent harmonic functions. Unlike Schmalfeldt, who considers the ambiguities of formal function processes a form of “becoming,” Kramer considers Schubert’s fragmental aesthetics itself pursues a form of the “becoming,” and a complete work is a work that shows the process of “becoming.” Therefore, Schubert’s conceptual fragment, though aesthetically “fragmented,” should still be considered as “completed” one since it shows the working process of a piece, which is equivalent to the process of showing how it becomes. I propose that the idea of indistinct edges also possesses a similar and contradictory nature as the process in *Aufhebung*—as a mediation between two kinds of formal reading (diachronic and synchronic) that results in emergent formal functions, that serves reconciliation between two events of ambiguities.

To further understand the rationale of Schubert’s unconventional tonal plan in the exposition, we shall scrutinize how Schubert prepares for the ST in the recapitulation. The return of the MT begins in m. 169 in F minor. Without a double return of the original MT in the home key, the recapitulatory rotation of TR returns at m. 182. The event is similar to what happened in the
recapitulation of the A minor sonata, where (as we have discussed in the last chapter) the first return of the MT after the development is fugal and in F# minor--i.e. it is a false recapitulation, where the recapitulatory rotation of the MT returns with a “wrong key” (a non-tonic key). Table 2.1 summarizes all the emergent formal functions and emergent harmonic functions in the C major piano sonata.

Table 2.1. Formal diagram of Piano Sonata in C, D.840.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>EHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Intro ⇒ MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Stronger home-key tonic presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>TR ⇒ ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>ST var.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td>MT and ST fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Pre-core</td>
<td>Beginning with MT materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation?</strong></td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Recap ⇒ Retransition (False Recapitulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Retransition)</td>
<td>MT in non-home key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation!</strong></td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Return of TR in home key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Return of MT and ST in home key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, it makes us wonder whether TR in the recapitulation serves as the “real” beginning of the recapitulation, and the subdominant MT serves as a “false” recapitulation but a true retransition. Kramer adapts Andreas Krause’s term of Scheinreprise to discuss the “return for the first time of the complete and characteristic thematic shape’ in the subdominant at mm. 169-176.” Kramer proposes that the term Scheinreprise indicates “the illusory, the feigned, the false, thereby diminishing the sense of the moment as epiphanic” (from the development). Kramer further
bothers a Hegelian concept of *Aufhebung* to describe the way in which the false recapitulation or *Scheinreprise* provides “the point of fusion between development and recapitulation.”

![Figure 2.1. Analysis of “Reliquie” piano sonata in C major, D.840, i.](image)

Back to the TR in the recapitulation, every measure is an exact copy of the exposition until m. 175, whether it might at first be heard as a copy of m. 15, but later as m. 19. Here, the prolonged second consequent of MT is elided, resulting in a faster arrival of the TR in m. 182, finally in the

---

33 Kramer, 1997. “The Hedgehog.” 144. Kramer notes the example of *Scheinreprise* in the A minor sonata, D.845, where the first return of the MT is in F# minor, instead of its home key (as we discuss in the last chapter.)
expected key, C major. However, when this TR section comes to its end in the recapitulation, the subsequent key area of the ST defies expectation: the ST is presented in the submediant of the home key, A minor. In fact, the arrival of the expected cadence, an authentic cadence in the home key of C major, does not happen until the closing section of the recapitulation, at m. 246.

In Schubert’s sonata form, one prevalent characteristic is that the development and the recapitulation partially elide, resulting in a smoother transition from the development to the recapitulation. I find that the term “indistinct edges,” inspired by Caplin and Martin, better frames this phenomenon of smooth transition that results from the operation of emergent formal functions.\(^{34}\) The indistinct edge neither aims to connect or to disconnect the two sections but serve as an *Aufheben*—a mediator that falls between the two formal functions.

![Figure 2.2. Transition in C major piano sonata, D.840.](image)

Schubert redefines the Romantic sonata form in the A minor and C major piano sonata. That is, he questions the purpose of sonata form—is it primarily the exploration of the thematic

---

\(^{34}\) Caplin, and Martin. 2016.
function? Or is it an exploration of the tonality?\textsuperscript{35} The effect of organicism arises from such free expression, and it is realized through \textit{emergent formal functions} described above. Schubert guides listeners through the sections with the thematic developments, but he also adds a bivalence to the listener’s experience with his unconventional tonal plans. One can find numerous instances of the \textit{indistinct edges} in both piano sonatas. The indistinct edges that achieves by the \textit{emergent formal functions} fulfil a Romantic aesthetic of \textit{Aufhebung}. That \textit{Aufhebung} is the uncertainty between certainties, the distance between yearning and realizations, and the possibilities of the unexpected that we have seen in Schubert’s \textit{Lieder}. Similar topics emerge in Schubert’s sonatas as well.

\textsuperscript{35} This dichotomy is also proposed by Charles Rosen in his book \textit{Sonata Forms}, 98.
2.2 **Indistinct Edges in the “Gasteiner” Sonata, D.850**

Starting from May 1825, Schubert had his last (and perhaps the longest and happiest) vacation with tenor Johann Michael Vogl. From mid-May to early October, during about 4.5 months, Schubert travelled to places like Steyr, Linz, Gmunden, Salzburg, and Bad Gastein with Vogl. In both Gmunden and Bad Gastein, where Schubert had access to a piano, he wandered for a bit longer. He started to sketch to “pave the way to the grand symphony” at Gmunden (June 1825), and in Bad Gastein (August 1825) Schubert started to work more on the “Great” Symphony in C major. Meanwhile, he finished the piano sonata in D major, D.850, as known as the “Gasteiner” sonata.36 Schubert seems cured by this trip, as himself described the environs of Gmunden as ‘truly heavenly’; and of Bad Gastein, whose ‘mountains rise higher and higher’, he wrote that ‘the country surpasses the wildest imagination.’ The “Gasteiner” sonata seems to reflect such peaceful images through its less dramatic and transgressive sonata style.

Unlike the C major and the A minor sonatas, the D major piano sonata fits into a more conventional sonata scheme. Unlike the other two sonatas, the D major sonata begins with a strong tonic establishment with a non-lyrical Main Theme. An emergent formal function of a disguised introduction is also missing. That is, the opening gesture indicates a strong tonic, with a root position tonic chord, unlike the other two, where a root position tonic is missing until the Transition. In general, The D major sonata follows a more conventional tonal plan, as the Subordinate Theme goes to the dominant key of the home key, further, for instance, a false recapitulation is absent.

---

The conventionality of the D major sonata’s form conceals subtle examples of emergent harmonic and formal function. Although an emergent formal function of Intro ⇒ MT is missing, the TR is dependent on MT. That is, as the term is borrowed from Sonata Theory, the thematic material of TR develops from the MT. A formal elision occurs at the consequent of the opening phrase in m. 5, when the MT is restated in its parallel minor (figure 2.3). Then, an unexpected bIII in second inversion arises in m.8. As the C emphasized as a pedal tone in mm.8-9 and B♭ (b6) emergences, we realize retrospectively that the bIII chord is better interpreted as a cadential six-four in F minor (III). The dominant pedal on III fits our aural expectation illusively of this continuation passage of the MT to be “standing in the dominant”, yet what we have in reality is “standing in the key of mediant” until the arrival of the V7 chord at m.14. Then, at m.16, we have a formal pun—the antecedent of TR strictly develops MT. The TR resembles an abbreviation of MT in the recap, which blurs the MT/TR distinction, and also leads to an emergent formal function—although not obvious here, it is explicit in the recapitulation.

Figure 2.3. Analysis of the opening in the D major piano sonata, D.850.

Note that the V chord arrives from a PL transformation of the V#/III chord at m.12. This salient aural event is noted with C#.
In *Sonata Theory*, Hepokoski and Darcy recognize events like this as a “developmental TR.” As the term indicates, a developmental TR is when a thematic material of a Transition (TR) depends or develops among the thematic materials from the Primary Theme (or the MT). In cases like this, the listener could also view the MT as a “grand antecedent” and TR as a “grand consequent”, attributed by the shared basic ideas (figure 2.4). As we discussed in the previous chapters, this is a common technique in Schubert’s sonata form and it especially creates a formal confusion at its recapitulatory rotation. Coincidently, Hepokoski and Darcy refer to the thematic development of MT of this kind as a “Merged Transition”, and use the same semiotic double arrow sign “⇒” to indicate such motivic relation between the MT and the dependent TR. Their observation coincidently conforms with the Schmalfeldtian emergent formal function MT⇒TR.

The formal pun of the dependent TR eventually results in a distant emergent formal function in the recapitulation. As in our case studies of the A minor sonata and the C major sonata, we know that Schubert creates a developed TR so that he starts the recapitulatory rotation from the MT, but often in a “wrong key”, causing an effect of “false recapitulation (*Scheinreprise*)”; and

---

38 Hepokoski and Darcy, 95.
39 In the C major sonata, TR develops from reharmonizing the basic idea of MT. In the A minor sonata, the TR anticipates thematic materials of ST.
40 By the word “distant”, I suggest that the emergent formal function created by the [e]merged MT and TR is not in effect immediately but rather is generated when the same material returns.
the actual “double return” won’t return until the recapitulatory rotation of the TR. However, as demonstrates by figure 2.3, we have a slightly different case of such emergent formal function in the D major sonata. That is, the perceptual process of the emergent formal function combines three steps. That is also how we seem to have a “double return” at the first glance—the MT does apparently return in the home tonic key, D major, in m.163. However, instead of going through the whole opening phrase of the MT, it soon becomes clear that this is only the antecedent of MT; followed immediately by TR in *fortepiano*, which serves as its consequent, thereby realizing the situation of the “grand antecedent of MT and consequent of TR” realized literally: the recapitulatory rotation of MT becomes a convincingly conventional antecedent, and the TR fits perfectly as its consequent. Measures 5-15 are excised, with their turn toward the parallel minor, then to F major and F# minor—as a consequence, the dominant of mm. 14-15 does not appear, dominant harmony returning in m. 181 (corresponding to m. 30).

The listener eventually *realizes* the beginning of the recapitulation should be perceived as TR, and thus they would *hear it* retrospectively as a lack of double return in the recapitulation. In other words, the beginning of the recapitulation (m.163) would first be heard as a double return of the MT in the home key, but later overturned by its consequent phrase that copies the TR exactly. Then, the listener has to assume m.163 serves as an extra antecedent phrase of the TR, and thus an attempt of a double return would fail here. Again, by using Schmalfeldt’s semiotic, I label the frustration of expectation MT ⇒ TR (m.163).

Figure 2.3. demonstrates perceptual process in the recapitulation. The number in the figure demonstrates the step of the processual perception. First, we recognize the MT returns in the home tonic, but when the consequent TR phrase appears, we realize the return of MT is only partial (step 1). A subtle indistinct edge between the antecedent phrase and the consequent phrase is built by
the dynamic contrast between the two (fortissimo at m.163 and fortepiano at m.167) Then, a retrospective reinterpretation of the actual function of the phrase is required (step 2). In other words, the nature of the formal function needs to be revisited since the phrase ends with a return of the TR. Accordingly, a final reading (step 3) is realized by reinterpreting the antecedent phrase (mm. 162-166) as part of the recapitulatory rotation of the TR rather than MT.

Figure 2.5. Recapitulation of D.850.

Figure 2.6. Emergent formal function flux in the recapitulation of D.850.

I shall note that although we have already seen the same label across the other two sonata movements as well, their operational processes are quite different from one another, shown by
That is, despite the fact that they share the same label “MT ⇒ TR” at the beginning of recapitulation, the analogous passages between three sonatas have distinct differences. In the case of both the A minor and the C major sonatas, the emergent formal function of the recapitulation MT ⇒ TR is a consequence of the “false recapitulation.” Thus, the label is determined by the music that happened previous to the event. In the D major piano sonata, however, there is a “double return” of the MT and tonic, but we have to recognize it as the TR retrospectively. In this case, the label is determined by the music that happened preceding to the event. By developing TR from preexistent MT materials, Schubert creates a formal reinterpretation. The reinterpretation is caused by the definition of a phrase, depending on the presentation of the basic ideas. By eliminating the continuation from the original MT, it creates an illusion of “double return” in the recapitulation. That is, a double return is hinted at by the recapitulatory rotation of the MT thematic material, along with the return of the home key, but since the second half of recapitulatory rotation is not successfully realized, a double return is still lacking.

In the exposition, the TR soon diverges from the MT when the chromatic note A# appears at m.18, foreshadowing the emergence of D minor that begins from m.21. The frustration of resolving this vii˚7 chord drags us from mm.20-32, for 12 measures! The most prominent aural event that governs this passage is perhaps the B♭ (♭6) pedal, as the seventh of the vii˚7 chord. This note first appears as a doubled pedal in m.22 and the same pattern repeats in mm.24-25. The B♭ returns in the bass in m.31, this time as the bass of a German augmented 6th chord, and finally resolves to the V chord in D major in m.32. As discussed in previous chapter, this kind of harmonic reinterpretation is a typical case of Emergent Harmonic Functions. Note that the ♭6 is emphasized again by the ♭II chord at the last beat of m.31. The Schenkerian graph in Figure 2.7 shows an...
interrupted three line at the end of the exposition, as expected. And the three line is continued and confirmed in the recapitulation.

![Diagram](chart.png)

Figure 2.7. Schubert, Piano Sonata in D, D. 850, i, exposition (mm.1-94).

The ascending chromatic fifth progression in figure 2.4 also indicates the ST achieves a conventional tonal plan moving from the dominant to the tonic on the dominant. The bII derives from the scale degree of the tonic in the basic idea of the TR (m.17). then V⁶ with C# in the bass (m.18), and vii6/V with D in the bass (m.20), then to the viio⁷ chord with D# in the bass (m.20). the D# resolves expectedly to E in the next chord, but then in m.22, it returns enharmonically as Eb, functioning as a subdominant to Bb. Then, the viio⁷ chord in mm.21-22 serves as a common-tone diminished ⁷th that leads to the bVI chord in m.23.

The modulation to A major is confirmed by the IAC in the new key on the downbeat of m.35. Then, the ST is approached by a Medial Caesura (MC)-like gesture in mm.38-40. In the recapitulation, every measure remains an exact copy from mm.16-38. the confirmation of the home key (D major) does not occur until the very last moment of the ST, in m.190: in m. 190, however, Schubert replaces the G# of m. 39 with G♮, so the descending scale in mm.189-190 leads to D, the tonic, rather than A, the dominant.

---

41 Since its function as a Medial Caesura is failed, only the gesture would fit in the narrative of a MC.
A new lyrical theme arrives in m. 40 in A major, presented in octaves. This lyrical theme evokes the pastoral topic, reflecting an imagine of the “rising mountains.” This lyrical theme of the descending sixths and fifths reflect a imagine of the “rising mountains” at Bad Gasteiner. As we have observed in the previous two sonatas, the ST is essentially in theme-and-variation form. It does not only occur in D major piano sonata--as we see it in all four piano sonatas that we discuss here. The first variation starts from m.48, as the expression marks “un poco più lento”, in C major; the third ST starts from m.59 with the tonic to A minor. Four measures of the basic idea presentation (mm.40-43) is followed by four measures of the contrasting idea (mm.44-17). By repeating part of the motif in dominant at the end of this phrase, a similar effect of a Half Cadence (HC) to bring in the second part of ST. This time, the length of the basic idea (mm.48-53) is three measure but the contrasting idea is still four measures (mm.55-58), connecting by a transitional measure (m. 54).

Here, a temporary key change to C major happens, but is neutralized by a shift back toward A in m. 54, where the left hand’s low C descends by semitone to provide the bass note of A major’s V⁴/₃. The third variational repetition of the ST appears at m. 59, back to A major. This time, the motivic descending sixth appears in the left hand. The passage contains an alternation between the E major (V/V) and the A major chord (V), as expected. However, a cadence is absent at the end of ST phrase, but an elided authentic cadence is present in the downbeat of m.59. Moreover, the Closing Theme (CT) is characterized by dotted eighth note/sixteenth note rhythm, anticipated by the end of the TR (m. 34; m. 37). The motivic development between the Closing Theme and the Transition brings organicism in the exposition.
Figure 2.8. Development of D.850.

Note that both of the ST variations compose out scale degree 2 of the *Urlinie*, shown by figure 2.7. The expected descending fifth progression in the dominant key area starts from the beginning of CT at m.75. The final descent to local tonic (but the home dominant) occurs in the Closing Theme; and then to C♯--the fifth of the F chord, in mm.80-85. However, with 86 intended to take out C in the F chord, the raised C returns in m.87, and marks the return of the CT. Here, harmonic
function creates different meaning in the extension of the phrase by a parsimonious voice leading from C# to C#, and that is, an emergent harmonic function. The same kind of emergent formal function is signaled by the C# and C# is also found in the MT, as we’ve discussed. Finally, a Perfect Authentic Cadence in V arises in the left hand at mm.88-89 to conclude the exposition.

The development section seems convince an opposite imagine of the peaceful and patrol topic in the exposition. The development begins with a p-like Pre-Core but in B♭ (♭VI) Major. The ♭VI of the MT here, I argue, foreshadows the uncanny atmosphere that dominates the development. It also softens the edge between the exposition and the development by stating a familiar theme in an unfamiliar key. The tonal map of the development consists of three part: the flat side (mm. 95-123), the sharp side (mm. 124-143), and the retransition (mm. 144-162). The Pre-Core phrase lasts for 12 measures, from mm.96-108; then, the core begins in the key of F major, the dominant of B♭ major, from m.111. The sequence of the core moves to A♭ major in m.117-123, the tritone away from the tonic. Schubert’s sonata often known in favor of developing the flat side of key in the development. The new core begins in m.124 in B minor, the relative minor key that could easily leads back to the home tonic D major. However, Schubert chooses a tortuous way for the retransition. He first goes to the C# minor from mm. 132 – 137. The most distressed climax of the whole movement arrives next, contributed by the series of parsimonious voice leading events. The C♭ diminished seventh chord at m.141 leads to the B dominant 7th chord in the next beat, by moving note B♭ one step down. The dominant 7th chord resolves to the E major triad as expected, but the C dominant 7th chord in the next beat in m.142 brings tension again. Although it does go to a 5th down, the F minor triad at m.143 is unexpected. Again, it moves parsimoniously on the second beat of m.143, to a C# dominant 7th chord, by moving the note C a step up and adding note
B. We arrive at D major at m. 144, again, instead of directly going back to the home tonic, it moves to a II chord at m.146 and a I chord at m.148, and moves to A major at m. 152.

Table 2.2. Formal diagram of D.850.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Formal Functions</th>
<th>Measure numbers</th>
<th>Key Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D and Dm (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>D, HC in I (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>D, HC in V (47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>C, HC in V (58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Am, HC in V (73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>D, PAC in V(88-89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>D, HC in V (m.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Pre-Core</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>B♭ (♭VI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core I</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core II</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Dm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codetta</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda (Stage 1)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 2)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 3)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now, I shall summarize the techniques that contribute to the creation of indistinct edges in this conventionally-formed sonata, D.850. In the exposition, by developing TR from preexisting MT materials Schubert creates a formal reinterpretation. The reinterpretation is caused by the definition of a phrase, depending on the presentation of the basic ideas. Similarly, by opening the development with a highly similar MT material, although in a very different key (♭VI), it weakens the edge between the exposition and the development. When the same events happen in the recapitulation, it serves to create a confusion of where we are in the rotation. Last, although the MT seems to come back in the right key, the abridging of the material between MT and TR creates a subtle illusion of “double return.”

The indistinct edges that Schubert built in the D major sonata are weakened by the conventionally followed tonal plan, that is, the edges are more obvious than in the other sonatas. However, where they do occur, of the indistinct edges are more indistinct, as they function more subtly. As I proposed earlier, the more conventionally followed sonata style that we’ve seen in the sonata might reflect Schubert’s less stressed mental state at the time. Certainly, I can’t claim to know the composer’s intention, but as a listener, the less dramatic sonata style and exploration of the lyrical ST section in the D major sonata always brings a peaceful joy to me.
CHAPTER 3. INDISTINCT EDGES IN THE G MAJOR PIANO SONATA, D.894

Schubert’s G major piano sonata, D.894 is the third one published during his lifetime and differs from the other two that were published at the same time, the A minor (D.845) and D major (D.850) sonatas, chronologically and stylistically. It was composed in October 1826—14 months after his previous piano sonata (D.850), when Schubert returned from his trip outside of Vienna with the tenor Johann Michael Vogl.\(^\text{42}\) The first movement begins in a slow tempo, *Molto Moderato e Cantabile*, and a compound quadruple meter 12/8—which is not common in Schubert’s sonata composition. Robert Hatten’s analysis proposes such unconventional meter and tempo as a result of the pastoral topic in Schubert’s G major piano sonata.\(^\text{43}\) In the following paragraphs, I aim to discuss the consistencies and-differences in Schubert’s G major piano sonata (D.894), from Schubert’s late sonata style that we have observed in other three sonata movements. In specific, how the irregular phrase rhythm in exposition contributes to create indistinct edges, in addition to emergent formal functions and emergent harmonic functions.

The G major sonata movement begins with a fanfare-like Main Theme (MT), but the soft dynamic (pp) does not arouse a sense of fanfare. Although Schubert’s sonata form is known for the characteristic lyrical-like MT, we have still observed fanfare MT both in the C major and D major piano sonata.\(^\text{44}\) The theme divides into two sentential halves, an antecedent (mm. 1-9) and a consequent (mm. 10-18). Its basic idea (mm. 1-2) is first repeated (mm. 3-4), and then imitated by its continuation (mm. 5-6), yet with a deceptive cadence at m. 6. The deceptive cadence brings the continuation phase of the sentence to a premature close and signifies the major increase in dissonance at m.7. Then the continuation phrase modulates to B minor—the minor mediant—at


\(^{43}\) Hatten, “From Topic to Premise and Mode,” 2017.

\(^{44}\) Webster, “Schubert’s Sonata Form,” 19.
m.10—as we realize retrospectively it serves a cadential function, with the IAC in I at m.9. Thus, mm.5-9 acts as a doubled function of continuational and cadential. In other words, the premature closure at m.6 precipitates an outburst in m.7, leading ultimately to an imperfect resolution at m.9.

The theme’s consequent begins at m.10, with a basic idea that could be seen as a thematic answer to the basic idea of the MT.\textsuperscript{45} The F dominant pedal and the new accidentals (C#, A#, D#, and E#) imply that we are in a new key, B major (III). Although B major would be an unexpected subordinate key area in the Classical sonata style (but one could find it in Schubert’s sonatas, as Webster discusses), the modulatory nature of the passage deceives the listener into taking it as a Transition (TR).\textsuperscript{46}

However, the listener soon finds out that this phrase cannot be the TR, since it does not establish a secondary key area, but rather modulates back to the home tonic, G major at m.16, with an elided IAC in I at m.16, beat 1. That is, false TR⇒MT continuation. Such emergent formal function is further confirmed by the next phrase, which is the real TR. Here, an emergent harmonic function also appears as one finds out the chromatic change between $\bar{3}$ and $\#\bar{3}$ here: The D♮ in the minor tonic chord in the b.i. (m.10) becomes D# in the b.i. repetition (m.13). Such emergent harmonic function suggests the emergent formal function “false TR⇒MT continuation.” It is exceptionally gradual: as on one aspect, one would mistake the start of such phrase as TR considering that B minor is a closely related key to D major (the expected ST key area in the dominant), but such assumption is overturned when the same idea repeats in a very distant key, as shown by figure 3.1. The consequent of the theme begins over a pedal on the local dominant, F#; this weakens the presentation of the local tonic, further suggesting a TR function for this passage.

\textsuperscript{45} Thus, I mark it as b.i. answer in my analysis (figure 3.1 and figure 3.3.)

\textsuperscript{46} Webster, \textit{Brahms’ Maturity}, 26.
D major returns in m. 16, at first as the mediant of the mediant (III/III), then as a pivot point back into G major. This kind of emergent cadential event often coincides with the emergent formal function $\text{MT} \Rightarrow \text{TR}$, as we have discussed in the A minor sonata.

![Phrase structure analysis of Piano Sonata in G, i, exposition, mm. 1-16.](image)

Figure 3.1. Phrase structure analysis of Piano Sonata in G, i, exposition, mm. 1-16.
A shift of harmonic function emerges by the reinterpretation of D. That is, the first D in m.16 serves as the third of the B minor chord (especially considering we were standing on the dominant of B major from mm.10-15), but it soon shifts to serve as the root of a D7 chord from the second chord in m.16. Thus, although the D pedal note remains throughout the measure, its function shifts from scale degree 3 in the mediant key (B major/minor) to scale degree 5 in the tonic key. The moment of pivot is rather ephemeral, but an emergent harmonic function is presented in such a short moment. Here, the harmonic trajectory of this passage should be clarified: m.6 hints at E minor momentarily; then, we move back into G in mm. 8-9. The second MT (mm. 10-16) first tonicizes B minor (mm.10-11), then B major (mm.12-15) before veering back to V7 of G major through the dominant of B minor (F♯-A♯-C♯ in m.15 leads to D-F♯-A-C in m.16), creating a very smooth, SLIDE-like voice leading move.

Furthermore, an irregular phrase rhythm and hypermeter also contributes to create an indistinct edge between MT and TR, in addition to the emergent formal function MT ⇒ TR. The boxed red numerals between the two staves in Figure 3.1 demonstrates the irregular phrase rhythm of the opening phrase (MT, mm.1-16). Conventionally in Classical sonata form (see figure 3.2), we expect a sixteen-bar period of the MT, divided into four phases of four measures each. Instead of a 4+4+4+4 regular and symmetrical phrase rhythm (a 4-bar hypermeter), however, the MT has an almost-symmetrical 4+5+3+4 phrase rhythm, divided (as mentioned above) into two sentences forming a 16-bar compound period-like phrase, with the first 9 measures as antecedent and the last 7 measures as consequent. Figure 3.2 shows a normative 16-bar compound period sentence for comparison; figure 3.3 shows how a listener would hear the MT as a 16-bar compound sentence period. Here, the premature continuation in m.6, leads to the turbulent harmony of m.7; on the small-scale, that is an emergent formal function of continuation ⇒ cadential in mm. 8-9. The
antecedent fulfills the expectation of a 16-bar period until measure 10, when the consequent passage moves to B minor (the bVI). Measures 13-15 repeat mm.10-13 happens as expected, but the pedal on D in m.16 that continues the same pattern also functions as a cadential pedal bringing us back to D major. That is: b.i. ans rep ⇒ continuation + cadential.

Figure 3.2. Normative 16-bar compound period sentence (Caplin, 2006)

Figure 3.3. Schubert, Piano Sonata in G, D. 894, i, mm. 1-16

The initiation of the next phrase, the true TR, confirms this overturn of false TR⇒MT continuation. First, although the basic idea (17-18) of the phrase is nearly identical to the opening MT phrase (1-2), the second part of the idea ends slightly differently. In the MT, a beat of rest separates the first statement of the b.i. from the second; in m. 18, a staccato anacrusis figure connects the two basic ideas, in both the antecedent (m. 18) and the consequent (m. 22) of the TR; the latter anacrusis figure connects to a continuation that actually moves to D major, the dominant. Thus, an emergent formal function of TR⇒MT occurs. Here, even though the thematic material is highly identical to the MT, the formal function of MT does not realize. The job of MT should be
prolonging and establishing the tonic—as the very first thing you hear in a sonata (exposition). Thus, a conflict between the formal function and thematic material is presented here: MT is supposed to be associated with a tonic prolongation function but here it is modulatory—it appears as MT but “acts” (momentarily) as TR—as another way creating an indistinct edge between MT and TR.

Subsequently, we arrive at our Subordinate Theme (ST) at m. 27, in the expected dominant key, D major. It is heard twice—its original form is followed by a more elaborate variation. As In the MT, there are three key groups, laying out a small ternary ABA in the ST area. ST begins with on V/V. With a more regularly distributed harmonic rhythm, the ST is more lyrical than MT. Its phrase structure is predictable. The basic idea of the ST first presents in mm.27-28, and then repeats in mm.29-30, and precedes with a somewhat expanded continuation that ends with a cadence at m.36.

Table 3.1. Formal diagram of Piano Sonata in G, D.894, ST, i, exposition, mm. 27-64.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D (V)</td>
<td>A (V/V)</td>
<td>D (V) – E (V/V of V)</td>
<td>D (V) – G (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ST rep var 1</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>MT returns at m.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-36</td>
<td>37-48</td>
<td>49-56</td>
<td>57-64(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp - p</td>
<td>p - fz</td>
<td>p - ffz</td>
<td>p - pp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, a variation of the ST is presented from m.37. To accelerate energy in the exposition, a sixteenth-note counter-melody appears in the right hand and ascends into the highest register, while the ST appears in the left hand. This section concludes not with a PAC, but with a half cadence in the secondary dominant key (A major).

The cadences in mm. 36 and 46 signal the end of each statement of the ST, and m.48 concludes the ST with a half cadence on the secondary dominant (V65/V/V). The theme that begins in m. 49 starts on a locally tonicized dominant but is never in danger—as it turns out—of truly tonicizing
V/V in the dominant, D major. Compared to the first CT (mm.49-56), two extra measures (mm. 55-56) are added after the HC in V/V. That is, at mm.55-56, an emergent harmonic function achieved through a series of parsimonious voice-leading events.

Although a true tonicization of A major may not be confirmed in mm.37-48, we have more certainty of D major after the HC in A major at m.48, as we have an EEC-like PAC in D at m.52, but with a melodic elision of the cadence (jumping right from D to C#), the half cadence in the secondary dominant key is executed again. Thus, retrospectively, we have an emergent formal function of CT $\Rightarrow$ false CT at the beginning of m.49. The “real” CT now starts from m.56, as we finally reach our PAC in the dominant key at the beat 3 of m.60. Here, MT comes back, and the 4-bar phrase (mm. 61-64) could be heard as a cadential function to the MT phrase—if we had it in the beginning.

Perhaps, one could conceive two ways of reading of the form in ST, as demonstrated by table 3.1. On the one hand, if one follows the key change, from D major to A major in the first and second ST groups, and back to D major in the Closing Theme group, a similar kind of three-key-like layout appears in the D major piano sonata (D.850). On the other hand, if one’s ear follows the development of the thematic groups in the ST area, a small binary form emerges from such a hearing—the two-part ST area divides by the thematic change in m.48, as shown by table 3.1.

Such a thematic event (the thematic group change in m.48) suggests a weak tonicization of A here, however, the V 6/5 doesn’t convey cadential rhetoric—it is more of an interruption or outburst than a cadence. Rather, it serves as a punctuation between the two formal functions (STs and CT.) . It creates an emergent formal function between a possible third ST group and the CT group. That is, ST$_2$ $\Rightarrow$ CT. The three key exposition, or the modulating subordinate theme as Caplin
defines it, is built in the following way.\textsuperscript{47} The first time through, the ST is presented in mm.27-36 in the dominant D major; the ST variation in mm.37-46 then appears in A major. Both end with a V:PAC on beat 3 of their final measures. Measure 47 is a phrase extension that leads to m. 48’s caesura, which presents only a weak cadential function that is one level beyond what we define as a cadence in Classical music; mm. 49-60 constitutes a second ST that is elided by the first stab at a CT, and thus ST\textsubscript{2} ⇒ CT.

To borrow a Hegelian analogy that Schmalfeldt incorporates in the process of becoming, the ambivalent formal interpretation (either a ternary or a binary, that is the thesis and antithesis) results in a synthesis of emergent formal function at mm.49-56. Whether to see it as a continuation of ST or a failed CT, an indistinct edge between the ST and CT is formed by the process of emergent formal function.

At the end of exposition, mm.61-64 is a P-based codetta that ends with a PAC in the dominant (D major), leading us back to the G major opening at the repeat sign. Such a harmonic and thematic transition drives smoothly to the opening of the development in the minor tonic (G minor), with a PT-based basic idea again. The thematic transition thus acts as a \textit{Doppelgänger}, serving both as a codetta that connects back to the beginning of the exposition, and as a pre-pre-core to connect to the beginning of the development smoothly. That is, indistinct edges build between the expositional codetta and the exposition repetition, and between the expositional codetta and the development.

The developmental rotation begins in m. 61, and its Primary Theme component continues on through most of the development section.\textsuperscript{48} The indistinct edge between the exposition and the

\textsuperscript{47} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 119.
\textsuperscript{48} Here, I borrow terminology from Hepokoski and Darcy’s rotation theory in their \textit{Sonata Theory (2006)}, 611.
development (which begins with a P-based pre-core) is also built from the closely related voice leading relation between D and G minor (dominant and the parallel minor of tonic). That is, although the edge is indistinct, there’s still an edge—and the balance between the familiar and the unforeseen contribute to such a Formenlehre reading of Schubert’s sonata form. The transition from the exposition to the development is gradual, yet one can still recognize sectional change due to the dramatic change of the key, from D major (two sharps) to G minor (two flats). Overall, the development is established on the flat side of the chromatic mediants of G, providing a sense of instability.\textsuperscript{49} Such abrupt presentation of MT fragmentation in the parallel minor tonic (G minor) contributes to a sense of \textit{in medias res}, “beginning in the middle.”\textsuperscript{50} Table 3.2 summarizes the overall shape of the development—the indistinct edges here are the result of both of the parallel major-minor relations that possess through each section, and alternating between the previous thematic groups in the exposition (MT, ST, and CT).

The MT model (basic idea) of pre-core is followed by a sequence in G minor, i.e. a V 6/5 to VI progression in G minor, then V 6/5 to I progressions in D minor and C minor, and then an anomalous Eb minor 6/4 to V 6/5 to I pattern is picked up in Bb minor at m.72. We confirm the formal function (pre-core) when the same idea repeats in Bb minor (bvi of D) at m.73. Here in the pre-core, the model does not end with any cadence, but with a bVI chord with the local minor tonic ¹ in the soprano at m.66. While bVI creates uncertainties and turbulence, the balance is maintained by ringing the home tonic ¹ in the melody, and G minor remains the key we’re in from 65 through 70.

\textsuperscript{49} Caplin, 139. Instability as the function of the development in sonata form.
\textsuperscript{50} Caplin, 199. “omission of initiating function”; \textit{In medias res}. 43
Table 3.2. Formal diagram of Piano Sonata in G, D.894, i, development, mm. 65-115.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Core</th>
<th>Pseudo-Core</th>
<th>Core I</th>
<th>Core II</th>
<th>Core II⇒Core III</th>
<th>Retransition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>ST + CT frag.</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B♭m</td>
<td>V Pedal in B♭</td>
<td>B♭m − Cm(90)</td>
<td>C − dm(103)</td>
<td>Dm − B♭m(106)</td>
<td>Gm − G(115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-76</td>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>82-95</td>
<td>96-104</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>111-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff - fff</td>
<td>p - fz</td>
<td>p - fff</td>
<td>p - f</td>
<td>f - p</td>
<td>pp - ppp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4. Schubert, Piano Sonata in G, D. 894, i, development, mm. 65-115.

Then, a 3-line descending motion begins with the G5 in the soprano at m.66. The progression lasts from G5 to E♭5 in mm.66-70, as shown by figure 3.5. The E♭ has been prolonged across the bar line in m.71, and a Gb unfolds from the Eb major chord at the last beat of m.71. The Eb major chord (Eb−Gb−B♭) leads to C-E♭-Gb at down beat m.72, once again prolongs Gb, which is a half stop below the tonic. By keeping the C♮ in the bass, C-E♭-Gb leads to A-C-F in the next beat, hinting at the local dominant (V of B). Then, an 8-line descends from F5 in m.72 to F4 in m.77.3.

Figure 3.4 provides an overview of the voice leading in the development. The structural reading that I discuss above provides a look into Schubert’s smooth voice leading strategy—another way that creates indistinct edges between pre-core and core—and foresees the act of pseudo-core that happens next. A descending 8-line begins with F♮ at m.72 and extends to Eb (m. 74). D♭ as part of a B♭ minor chord, C and B♭ (m.75), and A and G as part of the G minor chord, finally descending to F4 as the part of the F major chord—the dominant of the local tonic, B♭ major (m. 77).
I call the passage that starts in m. 77 a pseudo-core since it acts like a core, that is, establishing a “model” by a regular 4-bar phrase—but the model does not develop further nor precedes any sequential or fragmental material that was established by the model. Rather, it serves as an uncanny passage in the parallel realm (B♭ major) to the previous and preceding key (B♭ minor), while recalling short fragments from the Subordinate Theme but standing in B♭ major. Caplin refers to such a passage as a “pseudo-core”, due to its similarity to a false recapitulation.\footnote{Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 155.}
As described earlier, the core of a development typically expresses restlessness, instability, and *Sturm und Drang*, as well as bringing a relatively loud dynamic, thicker textures, and continuous rhythmic activity. The appearance of these traits strongly suggests a core, even when the musical material is not organized by processes of model, sequence, and fragmentation. Such a *pseudo-core* sometimes features a prominent sequential organization of the harmonies, but they are not used to support the extensive model=sequence technique typical of a core. A pseudo-core is usually preceded by a unit that functions as a pre-core and generally closes with a half cadence, or dominant arrival, followed by a standing on the dominant.

Events like this pseudo-core are a kind of emergent formal function that builds indistinct edges between pre-core and core—just like how false recapitulation acts between the development and the recapitulation. In the case of pseudo-core, similarly to false recapitulation that we’ve discussed in D.840 and D.845, the initial function (the model) of the formal function phrase (core) is present but the continual function (core sequence and core fragment) is absent.

Once again in m.82, we are back to B♭ minor, a model presenting Core I that derives from the same pre-core material, specifically, from the first bar of the b.i. of the MT. Differently, this time, a sequence follows such a model. At m. 95, the cadential 6/4 in C minor of Core I (m. 92) leads us to Core II in its parallel, C major. Here, a new model develops from ST, with a half cadence in D minor, at m.104. An emergent formal function appears as Core II ⇒ Core III. This Core II ends with a half cadence (cadential six-four) on D minor again at m.104, beat 1. Despite the idea at m.105 assembles with Core II (m.96), since they both derives from ST, a new model establishes by this new “variation” of ST, and thus, Core II ⇒ Core III, causing by the thematic assembles and persistent of the key in D minor.
Then, a new model derived from ST appears in m.111 and is immediately developed through fragmentation with a half cadence in G in m.113; the E♭ in the C minor chord, C# and A in the D major 7th chord are suspended to achieve the French augmented sixth chord on the down beat of next measure (m.114), as m.111-115 serves as the Retransition. This French sixth chord is prolonged until m.115, and resolves to V of G major, and arrives in the home tonic.

Although we return to the home tonic with MT in m. 116, this represents an illusory double return like the one we have discussed in the D major piano sonata, D.850 (see figure 3.3). As figure 3.6 shows, the antecedent of MT recapitulates in the home tonic, G major. However, at m.121, the consequent passage recapitulates derives from TR instead of MT—the opening of the recapitulation as the antecedent phrase of TR, instead of MT. In other words, the double return of the home key and MT fails again—as we have seen in every other piano sonata under study (D.840, D.845, D.850, D.894).

Figure 3.6. Piano Sonata in G, D.894, I, recapitulation, mm.116-117

ST then returns in the home tonic of G major at m.128 (see figure 3.7), however the recapitulatory rotation of the second ST returns in D major in m.138. Just as the first unquestioned PAC in the exposition occurred in m.60, the confirmation of the tonic key, G major, does not take place until one of the last moments in the recapitulation at m.165. The three-key-like layout of ST remains in the recapitulation and is carried away until home tonic to suspend the expectation of
the tonic confirmation. To compensate for such long suspension of the dominant in the recapitulation (mm.138-157), the coda is constructed almost fully of tonic statements of the MT’s basic idea (mm.166-174). This provides a robust sense of the tonic before the first movement ends. Table 3.3 summarizes the formal layout of the movement as a whole.

![Figure 3.7. Piano Sonata in G, D.894, I, recapitulation, mm.118-130](image)

In conclusion, the sense of organicism throughout the first movement of Schubert’s G major piano sonata, D.894 urges us to reconsider the Formenlehre in the movement. Such organic coherence exists in thematic development, harmonic relation, the balance between regular hypermeter and irregular phrase rhythm, and the arch shape of the diverse dynamics. These phenomena present as emergent formal functions, that catalyzes a Formenlehre reading in Schubert’s late sonata style. Table 3.3 provides a structural and formal reading of the overall first
movement. It also is presented where the emergent formal functions are located in the G major piano sonata. These locations (or edges) coincide with the critical rhetoric points that Sonata Theory discusses, i.e. the rhetorical moment where the medial caesuras (TR and ST) and essential caesuras (ST and CT) are supposed to happen.\(^{52}\)

Table 3.3. Formal diagram of Piano Sonata in G, D.894, i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action-space/ Dynamics</th>
<th>Formal function/ Measure numbers</th>
<th>Key areas</th>
<th>Cadences</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>MT (1)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>PAC in I (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TR⇒MT (9)</td>
<td>B major (III)</td>
<td>HC in I (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT⇒TR (17)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>IAC in V (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST (30)</td>
<td>D major (V)</td>
<td>IAC in I (36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST var rep (37)</td>
<td>A major (V/V)</td>
<td>HC in I (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT (49)</td>
<td>A major (V/V)</td>
<td>HC in I (56)</td>
<td>V pedal in A (54-56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT’⇒Codetta (57)</td>
<td>D major (V)</td>
<td>PAC in I (64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Pre-Core (65)</td>
<td>B♭ major (♭III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudo-Core (77)</td>
<td>B♭ major (♭III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core I (82)</td>
<td>B♭ (♭III) – Cm (iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core II (96)</td>
<td>C (IV) – Dm (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core II⇒Core III (105)</td>
<td>Dm (v) – B♭m (♭iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retransition (111)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>Elided IAC in I (116)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>MT⇒TR (116)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>cadential in I (124)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST (128)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>cadential in I (136)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST var rep (138)</td>
<td>D major (V)</td>
<td>HC in I (149)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT (150)</td>
<td>D major (V)</td>
<td>HC in I (157)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CT’⇒Codetta (158)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>AC in I (161)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coda (162)</td>
<td>G major (I)</td>
<td>PAC in I (165)</td>
<td>I prolongation (166-174)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{52}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, Sonata Theory, 24.
EPILOGUE. BEING, BECOMING,Emerging.

The subjective and the objective, forming Schubert’s landscape, constitute the lyrical in a new way... The substance of the lyrical is never something that has been manufactured: it consists of the smallest possible cells of actual objectivity, of which it remains an image long after the large structures of such objectivity no longer hold sway. The force behind all of this is human, not artistic. It is human emotion that animates the work of art.

Theodor W. Adorno, *Schubert* (1928)

To return to Schmalfeldt’s Adornian tradition, emergent formal function seeks a balance between subjective and objective modes of analysis—a balance between the subjectivity of discussing the processual nature of music-listening experience, from the diachronic analysis; the objectivity of looking at a piece at a more systematic and structural level of details, from the retrospective reinterpretations.

Just as Caplin investigates “formal functions operating at multiple levels in a work,” emergent formal functions and indistinct edges also operate at different levels in Schubert’s sonata movements. As shown in Fig. 3.8, which is reproduced from Caplin’s *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre*; Table 3.4 provides a summary of all the emergent formal functions across the four works surveyed. At a surface level, we have *emergent harmonic function*. That is, just as enharmonic reinterpretation of a single chord changes the harmonic meaning of the chord, syntactic reinterpretation can lead to adjustments in the formal functions of a phrase. At a deeper structural level, we have emergent formal functions between phrases; for instance, MT ⇒ TR, where retrospective reinterpretation of a sentence or period phrase resulting in reviewing the analysis between the Main Theme, Transition, Subordinate Theme. Lastly, we have emergent

---

formal functions at the deepest level, like the false recapitulation, resulting in formal ambiguities between entire sections of a work—the development and the recapitulation, e.g.

Table 3.4. Summaries of emergent formal functions in four sonata movements: D.840, D.845, D.850, D.894.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D.840, C major</th>
<th>D.845, A minor</th>
<th>D.850, D major</th>
<th>D.894, G major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td>Intro ⇒ MT (1)</td>
<td>Intro ⇒ MT (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TR ⇒ MT (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR (28)</td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR s-based (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST Variation</td>
<td>ST Variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetitions (51-61)</td>
<td>Repetitions (48-70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>Recap ⇒ False</td>
<td>Recap ⇒ False Recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Retransition)</td>
<td>Recap ⇒</td>
<td>Recap ⇒ False Recap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retransition (168)</td>
<td>⇒ Retransition (151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td>TR ⇒ True Recap (183)</td>
<td>TR ⇒ True Recap (186)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR (163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MT ⇒ TR (122)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.8. Caplin’s multiple levels of formal functions

The C major sonata and the A minor sonata has a more similar formal plan than the other two. Besides in the relative mode and similar length, both of the beginnings have challenging sections Intro/MT/TR for analysts. These series events of Intro ⇒ MT and MT ⇒ TR foreshadows the ambiguities in the beginning of the recapitulation section, by the manipulations of the thematic materials. That is, resulting effect of false recapitulation by another series events of emergent formal functions: Recap ⇒ False Recap ⇒ Retransition and TR ⇒ True Recap. On the other hand, the emergent formal functions in the D major and the G major piano sonatas realize from their prolonged harmonic reinterpretations and irregular phrase rhythms rather than thematic transformations.

I should note that I don’t completely deny the existence of the classical “caesura’ in Schubert but I argue that the strong rhetorical formal boundaries that the caesura presents, as Hepokoski and Darcy propose, are often missing in these piano sonatas of Schubert. That is, Schubert’s music does not lack boundaries or edges, but they tend to be indistinct or attenuated. Discussion of Schubert’s Formenlehre forces scholars to reconsider the application of Sonata Theory in romantic sonata forms. Sonata form is considered less flexible than other Romantic forms like a fantasia,
and impromptu. In Schubert, we see him challenge the definition in such term, by manipulating unconventional tonal plans, irregular phrase rhythm, and unexpected thematic development—to a point where the problem arises concerning the boundary that defines sonata and fantasia (for instance, the G major piano sonata, D.894, that is discussed in chapter 3 here).

It is unknown if in composing the four piano sonatas during 1825-1826 Schubert intended to “pave the way to the grand symphony in this manner,” as mentioned in his 1824 letter. I hope my thesis work inspires further investigation into Schubert’s late sonata style--specially, between the four piano sonatas and the “Great” Symphony No.9 in C Major, composed within the same year and a half. I hope my analysis and discussion here, furthermore, provide new insights that might also help in the analysis of Schubert’s last three sonatas of 1828.

Taken together, Janet Schmalfeldt’s analysis and the notion of emergent formal function permit us to talk about Schubert’s sonata in a different way than before. They permit us to discuss diachronicity without discarding synchronicity and disregarding how each phrase shapes the overall form in Schubert’s piano sonatas. They also help us confront the way in which Schubert problematizes cadential rhetoric—and thus creates indistinct edges that reinvent sonata form, inspiring further analytical insights that go beyond the futile exercise of failed caesura hunting in Schubert’s sonata movements. Expanding the application of Schmalfeldt’s methodology to other works in Schubert’s “Beethoven Project.” It facilitates rethinking these sonata designs in Schubert’s late-career compositional development. Emergent formal function can expand our understanding of Schubert’s harmonic ambivalence—a characteristic of Schubert’s style that is represented by emergent harmonic functions and expands it into the realm of tonal form.
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