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This thesis compares formal analyses by various authors of each movement of Shostakovich’s Symphony No. 5 and relates these scholars’ analyses to James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s Elements of Sonata Theory and William Caplin’s Classical Form. The thesis focuses on how aspects of inherited formal structures such as sonata form and scherzo/trio form have been used and/or adapted within Symphony No. 5.
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CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND: HISTORY, PREVIOUS RESEARCH, AND ANALYSIS OF SYMPHONY NO. 5

**History**

My new composition can be called a lyrical heroic symphony. Its basic idea revolves around human suffering in which jubilant optimism holds sway. I wanted to show how optimism is affirmed as a state of mind by means of various tragic conflicts during the course of a great inner spiritual struggle.¹ – Dmitri Shostakovich on Symphony No. 5

Dmitri Shostakovich (1906-1975) composed his Symphony No.5, Op.47 in 1937, in the midst of the Great Terror, when Soviet artists were under extreme duress by the Soviet government of Joseph Stalin.² The exact beginning and ending of the Great Terror is debatable, but most scholars agree it was the most prominent from 1936-1939. Citizens who were considered a threat to the government were taken and punished as Stalin saw fit – arrested, deported, condemned to death, etc. Richard Taruskin described the Soviet people as “hostages” and “condemned prisoners of the Soviet government.”³ Therefore, the Soviet people needed to be cautious of what they said and with whom they associated. Political activists, artists, and writers were among the people purged. In 1936, Shostakovich would be among the artists who would experience this threat through his opera *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District*.

*Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District* was Shostakovich’s second opera, and it was based on Nikolai Leskov’s 1864 novella sharing the same title.⁴ In the novella’s plot, Katerina Izmailova murders the male members of her family in order to start a new life.

---

with one of her estate workers. She and her lover are exiled to Siberia for their crimes. While traveling to Siberia with other convicts, her lover falls for another woman. Katerina murders the other woman and finally commits suicide.\(^5\) Shostakovich and co-librettist Alexander Preis decided to make Katerina a victim of circumstance who had no other choice but to commit these vile acts.\(^6\)

Shostakovich initially received positive reviews of *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District* after its premier in January 24, 1934.\(^7\) Michael Mishra notes that Soviet reviews deemed it a “success of Soviet construction,” said it “exposed the false and lying methods of the composers of bourgeois society,” and reflected Soviet ideals and interpretation of “pre-Revolutionary moral corruption as the story’s true culprit.”\(^8\) In fact, within two years of its premier, theaters were already requesting to stage new productions of the opera.\(^9\)

But in January 1936, when Stalin attended one of the performances of *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District*, he was unimpressed. Further, *Pravda*, the Communist party newspaper, published a review that condemned the work as “muddle instead of music” within a few days of Stalin’s viewing.\(^10\) The opera was attacked for a lack of morality because of the perceived sympathy with the opera’s main character who is a murderer, and for violence and eroticism.\(^11\) Many scholars believe the true author of the *Pravda* review was Stalin.\(^12\)

---

\(^7\) Mishra points out that *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District* success in the Soviet Union was not replicated in much of the Western world, but this did not conflict with the opera’s Soviet success.
\(^12\) Mishra, *A Shostakovich companion*, 89-90. Mishra states the general assumption is that even if there is a different author, it was probably a front for Stalin.
The importance of portraying Soviet values in a positive manner during the time cannot be understated because of Socialist Realism. Socialist Realism became a government-mandated policy that began about 1934 and continued until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. David Castro explains,

When examining the music of Shostakovich, one must also address the official strictures of Socialist Realism, which required Soviet authors, painters, sculptors, composers, and all other artists to portray Socialist values in an essentially positive way.\(^{13}\)

When those values were not present or apparent, an artist as well as those close to the artist could be punished by the Soviet government. Stalin’s negative review in Pravda placed Shostakovich in this frightening position. He, his family, and his friends were in danger.\(^{14}\) After the Pravda review, Shostakovich visited the chairman of the Arts Committee, P. Kerzhentsev, and arts patron Marshal Tukhachesky, to discuss how to handle his dilemma. The chairman advised Shostakovich to say he made a mistake in composing the opera. Tukhachesky wrote a letter to Stalin on Shostakovich’s behalf.

However, in 1937, Tukhachesky was arrested and executed.\(^{15}\) In addition, Nikolai Zhilyaev (a close friend of Shostakovich), Shostakovich’s uncle, and his brother-in-law were arrested, and Shostakovich’s sister was exiled from Russia all before the premier of Symphony No. 5 on November 21, 1937.\(^{16}\)

After the Pravda review, Shostakovich wrote Symphony No. 5 in response to the review. His new symphony won over critics, artists, government, and the general


\(^{15}\) Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 145.

\(^{16}\) Mishra, *A Shostakovich companion*, 105.
In addition, the Soviet government’s approval meant Shostakovich was no longer threatened. Elizabeth Wilson describes the premier as a “public vindication of the humiliating and unfair criticism Shostakovich had suffered.”

A review from Vechernyaya Moskva gave the Symphony the unofficial subtitle, ‘A Soviet Artist’s Reply to Just Criticism.’ Scholars believe this was coined by Stalin. Despite Shostakovich’s private opposition to the subtitle, Wilson suggests that he allowed it to be included in programs because it would serve as a means of “admission of his errors and gesture of repentance.”

Wilson asserts that Shostakovich understood the importance Symphony No.5 held for his future as a composer. Shostakovich cancelled the premiere Symphony No. 4 (1936) after the criticism of his opera Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District in the Pravda review, and wrote Symphony No.5 within a few months, composed in a more traditionalist manner, to appease Stalin and the Soviet government officials.

Shostakovich had a conversation with conductor Boris Khaikin on the matter of the finale of his symphony:

I finished the Fifth Symphony in major and fortissimo…It would be interesting to know what would have been said if I finished pianissimo and in the minor?

– Dmitri Shostakovich on the finale from Symphony No. 5

The Symphony No.4 ended in minor and pianissimo, and the Symphony No.5, ended major and fortissimo. In addition, Mishra argues Symphony No.4 did not conform

---

17 Wilson, Shostakovich, 151.
18 Wilson, Shostakovich, 151.
19 Mishra, A Shostakovich companion, 116.
20 Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
21 Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
22 Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
23 Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
to formalist or traditional styles of Social Realism. Therefore, *Symphony No. 4* was not premiered until much later in his life (1961), about ten years Stalin’s death when Social Realism was more relaxed.\(^2^4\)

**Previous Research and Analyses of Shostakovich’s *Symphony No. 5***

...Shostakovich's music is a burgeoning area of research. Shostakovich's music has always enjoyed popularity in the concert hall and musicologists have seen his biography and historical context as a rich source of investigative opportunities for several decades now, with often heated debates occurring surrounding his relationship to the Soviet government. But it has only been recently that his music has come to the attention of music theorists.\(^2^5\)

Research about Dmitri Shostakovich’s *Symphony No. 5* has primarily focused on political issues surrounding the composition.\(^2^6\) For example, the finale changes mode from D minor to D major at the coda. The mode change has been often interpreted as a representation of forced praise to Stalin and the Soviet government.\(^2^7\) David Ralph Castro argues that analyses of Shostakovich’s compositions provided by music theorists, in general, have been limited because Shostakovich was primarily a tonal composer while

\(^{24}\) Mishra, *A Shostakovich companion*, 93.


\(^{26}\) There are brief analyses of *Symphony No.5* in David Fanning, ed. *Shostakovich Studies* (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); and Pauline Fairclough, ed. *Shostakovich Studies 2* (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Mishra, Michael. *A Shostakovich companion*, (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2008) addresses Shostakovich’s life in the first half of the book, and in the second half, has theorists and historians discuss specific works by Shostakovich; Micheal Rofe, *Dimensions of Energy in Shostakovich’s Symphonies* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012) talks about how he derives his harmonic and melodic choices to create energy; and *Shostakovich Symphonies and Concertos* by David Hurwitz which applies aural perception to formal structure. However, the choices of form are often not described in detail and vary from source to source.

the discipline of music theory focused on the analysis of dodecaphonic music, music comprised from sets, and free atonal music during Shostakovich’s life.\(^{28}\)

Only in the past twenty years has it become more common for Shostakovich’s music to be analyzed.\(^{29}\) Scholars who have provided analyses of *Symphony No.5* include Michael Mishra, David Hurwitz, Hugh Ottaway, and Joseph Huband, but their analyses are either brief overviews of form or a comparision of the symphonies as a whole rather than detailed analysis of *Symphony No.5* itself.\(^{30}\)

In addition, Castro argues that many analyses of Shostakovich’s works have not been completely theoretical works. Castro asserts that authors focus on themes as expressions of Shostakovich’s polictical views rather than providing an analysis of the music.\(^{31}\) Such analyses include Ian MacDonald’s “menace” theme in the opening of the symphony. McDonald argues the theme is based around Stalin’s two syllable name:


\(^{31}\) Castro’s statement predates Pauline Fairclough’s *Shostakovich Studies 2* and Micheal Rofe’s *Dimensions of Energy in Shostakovich's Symphonies* were written. These books have much more theoretical writing


name only, but that he was aware of “the processes and patterns that have [had] a long association with the symphonic tradition.”

This thesis will discuss forms most commonly found within the symphonic tradition and proposed by analysts to be used in *Symphony No. 5*: sonata form, ternary, and binary. In the current literature, scholars have proposed that the first movement is in sonata form; the second movement is a scherzo in compound ternary; the third movement is either binary, ternary, or sonata form; and the fourth movement is in either binary with a coda and sonata elements, ternary with a coda and sonata elements, or sonata form. The criteria for determining each form will be discussed in depth.

---

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Binary and Ternary Form According to William Caplin

Since the second movement is a scherzo and some scholars propose that other movements are in binary and ternary forms, this thesis will use William Caplin’s *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* to establish determining the criteria for ternary, compound ternary, and binary forms.

In its most simple form, binary form comprises two sections. The first section is constructed with at least an eight-measure idea, consisting of a period or a sentence. The eight measures can either modulate to another key (commonly the dominant in major or mediant in minor) or remain in the original key. It usually ends with a repeat (written out or with a repeat sign). The section will typically close with a half or perfect authentic cadence (PAC) in the new key (imperfect authentic cadences, IAC, are rarely used).

The second section of simple binary will commonly begin in the dominant key and contain thematic sequencing. The second section then modulates back to the tonic and concludes with a perfect authentic cadence in tonic. The melodic material in the second part is derived from material in the first section. It is important to note that in a

---

41 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 87-89.
42 The first four measures of a binary can be considered a contrasting middle and can be connected to a cadential phrase, continuation, consequent phrase, and further dominant prolongation.
simple binary, the second section is not a recapitulation. Example 2-1 shows the binary model according to Caplin’s description.

Example 2-1: Binary model according to Caplin

Caplin notes that examples of small binary forms tend to be found within movements that have multiple reoccurrences of thematic material, such as a rondo. The small binary can also been viewed in larger contexts. Wallace Berry states a binary may take up entire movements of a work.

A large ternary is a three part form, consisting of a first section (exposition), second section (contrasting middle), and the third section (recapitulation). The exposition will typically end on a PAC in the original key. If it modulates within the middle of the first section, the original key will be reestablished for a PAC. The recapitulation will end on a PAC in the original key. However, the contrasting middle will typically end

---

43 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 87.
44 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 211.
with a dominant harmony. Caplin notes a large ternary is often set to slow tempi, but slow tempi does not apply to scherzi or minuet/trios.\textsuperscript{45}

The exposition of a large ternary usually contains a theme that is typically constructed in a small ternary or binary structure. The exposition can modulate to another key, but it will modulate back to the opening tonic. Each section of a ternary is closed.\textsuperscript{46} A closed section may stand on its own because each section concludes with a PAC. There may be use of transitions and re-transitions, but the sections themselves are typically closed.

The contrasting middle of a large ternary can make use of modulation, sequencing, or even an interpolated episode (new material). The contrasting middle section is in a different key, different texture, and often more complex than the exposition and the recapitulation. In compound ternary forms, such as minuet and trio form, the second section is usually considerably longer than the exposition or the recapitulation.\textsuperscript{47} The second section typically ends with a retransition to the recapitulation.\textsuperscript{48}

The recapitulation functions as a return of the exposition in tonic. This return is not always an exact repeat, but often employs some variant of the original statement: ornamentation, extension, and truncation of themes (Example 2-2).\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 211.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 211-212.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 224-225.
\item \textsuperscript{48} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 213.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 215-216.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Example 2-2: Ternary model according to Caplin

There can be some difficulty in distinguishing ternary from binary, especially with rounded binary. Rounded binary is structurally similar to binary with one exception: the first section partially returns at the end of the binary work. Rounded binary then seems similar to a small ternary structure. Caplin provides a couple of way to distinguish small ternary from binary. When ending with a perfect authentic cadence, the first part of a binary cannot be distinguished from the exposition of a ternary. If the first part ends with a half cadence, then a potential small ternary is not implied, since the exposition of ternary rarely ends with a weak (imperfect authentic cadence) cadential figure.  

The second movement of Symphony No. 5, which is a scherzo, is not in simple, but in compound ternary form. Caplin argues that there is no real formal distinction between minuet/trios and scherzos/trios, so when describing the form of the second movement, the term minuet/trio form will be used.

---

50 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 87-88.
51 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 219.
The *scherzo* is a variant style of the minuet and features a faster tempo and a livelier character... Given the problems of distinguishing a minuet from a scherzo, I treat in this book the two styles as a single movement type. In regard to formal organization it is impossible to differentiate them.\(^{52}\)

A compound ternary has the same overall structure as a ternary, but a compound ternary contains a smaller complete form within at least one of the larger sections. For example, the first section of a compound ternary could contain a complete binary or ternary.\(^{53}\) (See Example 2-3.) Examples of a compound ternary include scherzi, minuet/trios, and intermezzi.

---

\(^{52}\) Caplin, *Classical Form*, 219.

second theme, which Caplin designates as a “subordinate-theme function.” The subordinate-theme function will often modulate, and it will end in a PAC in the newly established key. It is important to note that this is different from Caplin’s large ternary structure. As previously stated, a large ternary will return to the opening key within the exposition. The first section can modulate and cadence in another closely related key. Caplin argues if there is closing material, it will follow the subordinate theme and cadence in the key of the subordinate theme. The trio section functions like the contrasting middle of a large ternary. The trio will often feature an imbedded form, ternary or binary.

**Sonata Form According to Hepokoski and Darcy**

One prominent feature to the study of sonata form in recent decades very much in the wake of [Donald] Tovey’s similar assertions has been the repeated declaration that the “textbook” view of sonata form is inadequate to deal with the actual musical structures at hand. Hepokoski and Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory* will be used because of its thorough exploration of the subject. The movements discussed in this thesis will follow Hepokoski and Darcy’s two-part exposition model. In some movements of *Symphony No. 5*, there will be deviations from the formal structure. Hepokoski and Darcy call these deviations “deformations.” Specific deformations will be discussed during the movements to which the deformations pertain rather than defined here. Therefore, only an overview of Hepokoski and Darcy’s two-part exposition model of sonata theory will be provided in this chapter.

---

54 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 220-221.
To illustrate why Hepokoski and Darcy will be used, consider a traditional “textbook definition” of sonata form. The conventional description of sonata form consists of contrasting themes in two tonal regions (exposition), increasing thematic development (development), and the restatement of themes in the tonic (recapitulation). The primary theme is set in tonic and has a transition to the secondary theme typically in the dominant (or mediant in minor). There may be more than one primary or secondary theme in the theme area, but the exact details how to determine this are not discussed in most texts. Following the secondary theme, there may be a codetta or closing theme. A closing theme is more substantial in length and material, but the codetta involves quick cadential figures. The location of the closing theme can be ambiguous.

In the “textbook” model, the material in the development is often derived from previous themes or motives found within the exposition. The development is described as an unstable section that conflicts with the established tonal center. The development typically concludes by standing on the dominant of the movement’s opening key.

The recapitulation is the return of the exposition; it may include some variation or shortening of the previous statements of the material. The major difference between the recapitulation and the exposition is that the recapitulation stays in the tonic key. In addition, returning thematic material from the exposition may be varied some small manner.  

---

While the textbook description provides the basic structure of many places in sonata form it does not address issues within the structure if there are deviations from this outline. Example 2-4 shows the “textbook” version of sonata form.

Example 2-4: “Textbook Model,” represented using Hepokoski/Darcy’s style diagram

Hepokoski and Darcy’s explanations and examples provide details and criteria that apply to sonata form. Their terminology and criteria differ from other theories of sonata form: their view of sonata form is that “[it] is neither a set ‘textbook’ rules nor a fixed scheme. Rather, it is a constellation of normative and optional procedures that are flexible in their realization.” The “textbook” version has many flaws. For example, there are versions of sonata form in which there is a well-established primary theme, but the secondary theme is not present because of the use of fortspinnung; this is rarely discussed in “textbook” sonata form. Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory is useful because reviewing form as a set of choices allows deformations to occur without questioning the

---

58 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 15.
form. They fully define a sonata theory and apply it to many typical and atypical situations (such as continuous versus two-part expositions).

As expected, Hepokoski and Darcy’s divide sonata form in three large sections: exposition, development, and recapitulation. The exposition begins with the primary theme zone (P).\textsuperscript{59} P is set in tonic, and it is important to developing the “personality and drama of each individual work.”\textsuperscript{60} There are several patterns that may begin a P-zone. A few examples of this include triple-hammer-blows (this may also found before the end of a transition), fanfare gestures, loud and aggressive material (“strong-launch” option), and soft and lyrical material (“weak-launch” option).\textsuperscript{61} Hepokoski and Darcy assert that P has both a short term and a long term goal. The overall short term goal is to reach a PAC in a new key in the exposition; the overall long term goal is a PAC in the tonic in the recapitulation during the secondary theme area.

Theme labelling from Hepokoski and Darcy will be adopted. The first theme within a P-zone will be indicated as P\textsuperscript{1}. Each variant of P\textsuperscript{1} will be labeled with decimal designators: P\textsuperscript{1.1}, P\textsuperscript{1.2}, P\textsuperscript{1.3}, etc. New themes within the P-zone can be labeled P\textsuperscript{2} or P\textsuperscript{3}, but only if they occur after a PAC and if the material is new. Otherwise, it is a continuation of the previous theme. If a theme returns in its original form such as P\textsuperscript{1}, the original indicator will be used. Returns of primary theme zone (P-zone) materials later in the form will also use designations P\textsuperscript{1.1}, P\textsuperscript{1.2}, P\textsuperscript{1.3}.\textsuperscript{62} Anything occurring before P\textsuperscript{1}, such as a brief introduction or fanfare, will be regarded as P\textsuperscript{0} because of its preparatory function.

\textsuperscript{59} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 65.
\textsuperscript{60} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 69.
\textsuperscript{61} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{62} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 71.
Hepokoski and Darcy describe sonata form as rotational because of the return of themes within thematic areas as well as within the overall form. The primary rotation of the form is P TR S C -> P TR S C (these labels will be explained below) though there may be other rotations as well.

At the same time P establishes its rhetorical function as the initiator of rotations. Its first appearance signals the beginning of the expositional rotation…Once the exposition is completed, a decisive, prepared return to P or a recognizable variant thereof may indicate the onset of a new conceptual rotation, which may be either full or partial.63

The P-zone continues until the transition (TR). The TR is an energy-gaining zone that leads to the secondary theme zones (S-zone). Hepokoski and Darcy state that finding the beginning “for [the transition] is problematic, [and] at times misleading.”64 There are some cases where the beginning of the TR-zone is clearly defined. However, some TRs “begin only as extensions of P-activity (merged transitions).”65 In this situation, rather than labeling the transition mid-phrase, the TR indication will be placed at the beginning of the phrase.

The TR, and thus the first part of the exposition, is concluded by the medial caesura (MC). The MC is a break in the music, often indicated by rests, preceded by a half cadence in the key of the second tonal area. The MC can be filled in by light by textured material, creating a caesura fill (CF). The MC can be filled with a heavier texture that crescendos creating a caesura-fill of the juggernaut type. In this case, there is a gradual build of energy by becoming rhythmically, harmonically, and dynamically

---

64 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 94.
65 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 95.
unstable where the MC occurs. After the *caesura-fill of the juggernaut type* the music will become softer.

Once the MC occurs, the secondary-theme zone (S) begins in a new key (often the dominant in a major key sonata). However, if there is no MC, there will not be an S-zone. In addition, lack of S-zone indicates that the movement cannot be a two-part exposition; instead, it is a continuous exposition.

S begins part two of the two-part exposition, which may be further divided into S and closing-theme zone (C).\(^66\) The S-zone usually reaches a PAC. The first PAC after the S-zone is established is called the “essential expositional closure” (EEC). The establishment of the EEC means there can be C. Without an EEC, there is no C-zone. However, if the EEC occurs too late in the form, it will most likely cause the C-zone to be more like a codetta. If EEC occurs too soon to the beginning of the development, this indicates no C-zone entirely. This differs greatly from the “textbook” version of sonata form in that it becomes clear whether and where a C-zone occurs.

Similar to the “textbook” model, Hepokoski and Darcy call the next large section the development. The development contains many tonal shifts, tonal instability, thematic manipulation, and occasionally new themes. The material is often drawn from the exposition’s P, TR, S, and C material.\(^67\) There is not a set formula for the development. However, it will commonly end with a retransition on the dominant of the sonata’s opening key, known as a dominant lock.\(^68\)

---
\(^{66}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 117.
\(^{67}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 18.
\(^{68}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 196-198.
Following the development is the recapitulation. The recapitulation typically begins and remains in tonic; there are rare exceptions that start on the dominant or subdominant.\textsuperscript{69} Since the recapitulation is all in tonic, the TR will not modulate, and S will remain in the tonic key. One other difference is that what was called the EEC in the exposition (the first PAC within S) becomes the essential structural closure (ESC) in the recapitulation. The trajectory started by P in the exposition is completed at the ESC in the recapitulation.\textsuperscript{70}

The recapitulation may be followed by a coda. A coda “begins once the recapitulation has reached the point at which the exposition’s closing materials…have been revisited in full.”\textsuperscript{71} The coda’s function can use either preceding thematic material or keys (see Example 2-5).\textsuperscript{72} Because Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory works to provide explanations, normative procedures, and common deformations their approach to sonata theory will be used.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{69} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 19-20.
\textsuperscript{70} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 231-254.
\textsuperscript{71} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 281.
\textsuperscript{72} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 281.
\textsuperscript{73} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 15.
Are Binary, Ternary, and Sonata Form Applicable to Symphony No.5?

Although Hepokoski and Darcy focus on Classical sonata forms, their theories still are applicable for sonata form movements found in Symphony No.5. Charles Rosen argues in Sonata Forms that sonata form after Beethoven became structurally a fixed idea; there are alterations of sonata form even though there were alterations to sonata form, there were no more new sections added to the structure. Berry Wallace and Rosen argue that sonata form is flexible enough to be applied to twentieth century music.

Because, the actual sonata form paradigm did not evolve as a whole, the structure of sonata form as it developed in the eighteenth century can be appropriately applied to works outside of the eighteenth century. Even though some movements will not be as straightforward because Shostakovich is not thinking in the eighteenth-century paradigm,

\[75\] Wallace, Form in Music, 198-199.
the main structural concepts can be applied. In fact, Shostakovich believed understanding music history was necessary in order to understand the evolution of musical forms, and he received a “very traditional conservatory education in ‘form.”

However, “despite this apparent flexibility in the Darcy-Hepokoski model, the finer points [i.e. MC, EEC, and ESC] of Sonata Theory, which are intended to facilitate the examination of deformations within compositions from the decades around 1800 are, in the main, not applicable to the music of Shostakovich.” Whereas some deformations in *Symphony No. 5* provide difficulties with the location and the use of atypical keys for the EEC and ESC, overall, this thesis will show the Hepokoski and Darcy sonata theory is applicable to *Symphony No. 5*. In addition, the MC, which Castro claims do not exist within Shostakovich’s works, are found in this symphony.

Rofe explains Shostakovich’s sonata forms are diverse. Nonetheless, there are many features that are retained within Shostakovich’s sonata forms. There are several acknowledged deformations of traditional sonata form in the works of Shostakovich. One example is found in the first movement of *Symphony No.5*. Mishra refers to this as an arch form. An arch form reverses the themes within the recapitulation, creating a retrograde-symmetrical form. Retrograde-symmetrical forms are not typical of traditional sonata form because retrograde-symmetrical forms create “an almost static sense of formal deadlock. The form is circular, it ends are its beginnings, rather than propulsive and forward-moving.” Wallace notes that another known deformation of Shostakovich’s

---

recapitulations is the omission of large portions of the second thematic era in general. This can result in a recapitulation being largely developmental because it reworks material from the P-zone.  

**Overview of the Forms in Symphony No. 5**

An in-depth analysis of each movement will demonstrate how each movement conforms (or not) to Hepokoski and Darcy’s and Caplin’s theories of form. This will include analyses from various authors, and an examination of their analytical choices. For the third and fourth movement, there will be more than one plausible view of the form.

The first movement in D minor contains aspects of sonata form with an introduction; primary and secondary thematic zones; a long development; and a recapitulation.  

But there is debate among analysts about the location of the recapitulation.  

The second movement is a scherzo and trio in A minor, and it follows the Classical model of a compound ternary with interior binary forms. In fact, Rofe asserts that of all formal structures, Shostakovich’s scherzi are the simplest.  

The trio comprises sixteen-bar double periods with reduced instrumentation mimicking the Classical period texture of a trio, but with twentieth-century melodic characteristics, such as glissandos over large intervals.

---

The third movement begins in F♯ minor key and excludes brass. As mentioned earlier, Hurwitz and Huband assert that the third movement is in sonata form, yet Mishra asserts that it is in binary form. This will be discussed in comparison to Hepokoski and Darcy’s criteria for sonata form and to Caplin’s criteria for binary form in order to understand why these different analyses result, and which aspects of each form the movement most closely resembles.

The fourth movement in D minor has been called both a compound ternary (Huband) and sonata form (Hurwitz). This movement contains two themes within the primary theme zone, but the second of these themes does not occur elsewhere in the piece, even in the recapitulation. The development starts with material from the secondary theme zone and brings back material found in previous movements. The recapitulation then returns only with the first theme from the primary theme zone, but not the second theme zone. Finally, the coda provides a transition from D minor to fff D major. But it is the deformation of sonata form that provides difficulty determining the form.

---

CHAPTER 3: SYMPHONY NO. 5: I. MODERATO

Traditional Settings

Movements I and II are the most straightforward formally within Symphony No. 5. Analyses of these movements are included not to disagree the analysis of various authors, but to demonstrate how Shostakovich composes in these more traditional versions of these forms. This chapter will demonstrate how Hepokoski and Darcy’s theories of sonata form applies in a more traditional setting in the first movement of the symphony; the next chapter will demonstrate how Caplin’s theories of scherzo and trio form are approached in a more traditional Shostakovich setting in the second movement. In addition, these analyses will provide a basis for what to expect in Shostakovich’s traditional settings, and to demonstrate Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology in a more typical sonata form before considering the deformations of sonata form found in movements III and IV.

An Analysis of Movement I According to Mishra, Translated into Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory Terminology

Scholars agree that the first movement of Symphony No. 5 is in sonata form. The focus of the chapter will not be to discover new aspects of the form, but to demonstrate how Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata model works with Shostakovich’s more traditional settings of sonata form. This chapter will rely on the analysis provided by Michael Mishra in A Shostakovich companion pp. 356-376.89

Mishra describes this particular version of sonata form as an “arch-sonata,” and argues that this is Shostakovich’s trademark form. Mishra describes the arch sonata as a

89 The only addition to Mishra’s analysis will be Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology.
sonata where the P, TR, and S thematic zones return in reverse order in the recapitulation, creating a palindrome-like sonata, retrograde-symmetrical. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that typically, thematic zones in the recapitulation will happen in the order they appeared in the exposition, but acknowledge that occasionally composers will re-order the thematic zones.

Mishra describes the introduction of the first movement as, “the austere opening of the Fifth, with its simple, two-part dialogue between low and high strings as it is dramatic…” This type of opening, with slow canonic double-dotted rhythms, is not mentioned in Hepokoski and Darcy’s writings as a typical opening gesture. The double-dotted rhythmic motive has been nicknamed the “menace theme.” McDonald argues the theme is based on Stalin’s two-syllable name: STA-LIN. The menace theme takes place in P⁰ (see Example 3-1). P⁰ begins in D minor with cellos and basses starting on D leaping to B♭ and then in the violins answer in strict imitation at the octave. The imitation takes place in mm. 1-3, and then in mm. 4-5 the key of D minor is stabilized by the strings through A and D, dominant and tonic.

---

90 Mishra, A Shostakovich companion, 370-371.
91 Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 233.
Example 3-1: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, P-zone, mm. 1-4

$P_1$ is introduced by the violin in m. 6 (see Example 3-2). With the additions of $E_b$, the theme moves from D minor to D Phrygian, with Neapolitan harmonies in mm. 9-10 helping to reinforce $E_b$. Mishra argues that these and further chromatic alterations from mm. 9-12 eventually pull the key down to C minor through mm. 11-13. $P^{0.1}$ is used as thematic material in mm. 13-17, now in C minor. $P^{0.1}$ separates $P_1$ and $P_2$ in m. 18 beginning in E minor (see Example 3-3).
Example 3-2: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, P-zone, mm. 4-11

Example 3-3: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, P-zone, P² mm. 17-2
P³ is introduced in the oboe in mm. 32-34 in D min. P³ will return many times throughout this movement, and will also return in movement IV during the second section (see Chapter 6).

Example 3-4: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, P-zone, P³

Finally, P⁰ has one last occurrence in the P-zone in m. 34 starting in D minor. In fact, P⁰ rounds out the P-zone as both the first and last theme to occur. TR occurs from mm. 47-50, and is primarily built from the P⁰ theme. The MC in m. 50 ends on a B♯ half cadence in the new key of E♭ minor. This is a typical P-zone and MC. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that after the 18th century, the P-zone’s modulation to dominant became less common. Therefore, the modulation to E♭ minor is not atypical.

---

93 The dotted line is placed in the score to show the tempo change. This was not added in to show the MC.
Example 3-5: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, S-zone, MC

The S-zone begins with $S^1$ from mm. 50-83 in $E_b$ minor. The EEC occurs in m. 81 with a PAC in $E_b$ minor. Because the EEC cadenced properly in the new key, this predicts that the recapitulation should succeed and cadence in the key of D minor.

Following the establishment of the EEC, there is usually a C-zone. The C-zone is from mm. 84-106 in $B_b$ minor. Rather than cadencing in $B_b$ minor, the strings and woodwinds have an IAC in F minor; the clarinet plays the last repeat of $C^1$ as a transition to the development section.
Example 3-6: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, C-zone

The exposition is typical of a two-part exposition sonata form. As previously mentioned, two-part exposition sonata form is a structure that has a P-zone that successfully modulates to a new key at the S-zone, creating a second key area. This exposition also contains two other important structural markers: MC and EEC. Both are used in a typical manner. The MC prepares the new key by ending on a half cadence to the new key and creating a break in the music. The EEC is established in the S-zone in the correct key, predicting that the recapitulation should return to D minor. (This typical EEC does not in movements III and IV, because they cadence in different keys from the rest of the S-zone. C\(^1\) is atypical though. Normally, the C-zone will be presented in the same key as the S-zone, but this does not occur in this movement. In fact, this will be a common occurrence in the C-zones throughout this symphony.)
Development

The development begins with a quote of S in B minor from mm. 106-120. In m. 108, the harmonic background starts with a C major chord with an F# in the Viola. From mm. 106-117, modulates to F Phrygian. Example 3-7 shows the harmonies that occur in these eleven measures. The melody and homorhythmic accompaniment texture change with the soli viola from mm. 117-119. The violas begin the modulation to F Phrygian, which is confirmed in m. 119 with the cadence on F and the imitation in the cello and bass in mm. 119-120.
Example 3-7: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Development, mm. 106-121
From mm. 120-243, the development uses material exclusively from the P-zone. Measures 120-140 use material from $P^1$, written in rhythmic augmentation and beginning in F Phrygian. From mm. 130-139, the harmonies change to D minor. From mm. 140-163, the material is derived from $P^3$, beginning in D minor and moving to B♭ minor by m.157. From mm. 157-165, $P^3$ occurs. The key begins in B♭ minor, moves to C minor and then C major in mm. 160-161, and F minor in mm. 161-164.

The thematic material evolves into $P^0$ from mm. 163-171. The key starts in F minor and stays in F minor from mm. 168-172. From mm. 172-173, there is another reiteration of $P^3$, but $P^3$ starts in F minor and quickly moves to C major with lowered scale degrees six and seven. Momentum begins to build as mm. 176-188 begin contrapuntally spinning out $P^1$ through m. 216. $P^1$ becomes militaristic march in F Lydian (Example 3-8). The development ends with material from the P-zone, $P^3$ in A major in mm. 202-204, and $P^0$ in B♭ major in mm. 205-243.

Example 3-8: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Development, mm. 187-189
The development supports Mishra’s argument that Shostakovich’s developments usually have many types of thematic development and contrapuntal ideas. Also, Hepokoski and Darcy note that a development will probably end with some type of dominant lock. The dominant lock occurs from mm. 239-242 on v.

**Recapitulation**

The recapitulation begins with a statement of P1 in mm.243-259 in D minor. Mishra notes that some analysts have had trouble identifying the beginning of the recapitulation. Some wait until the beginning of the S-zone in m. 261. The reason Mishra argues that locating the start of the recapitulation is difficult is because the thematic material emerges out of the development. This means that the recapitulation does not appear clearly because the P-zone is still surrounded in what seems to be a developmental texture.

In fact, Michael Mishra notes that Hugh Ottaway and Jacques Wildberger place the recapitulation in m. 243 where the orchestra plays the theme from the primary zone in unison yet fails to resolve harmonic tension occurs through the next several measures of the recapitulation. In other words, there is not a clear return to tonic at the beginning of the recapitulation if the recapitulation is located at the return of P. However, there is retransition to establish the recapitulation. Ottaway argues this development seems to meld with the recapitulation.  

---

The TR in the recapitulation is a little longer from mm. 254-258 than in the exposition. The MC occurs on a unison A in m. 260. There is an atypical mode change to D major in the S-zone, mm. 259-294. A similar mode change occurs in the coda of movement IV.
Example 3-10: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Recapitulation, MC

The ESC is also atypical in m. 294 because the key modulates to A minor and the ESC cadences with a PAC. This begins the C-zone in D minor.

Example 3-11: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Recapitulation, ESC (Cl. Not transposed)
Because the ESC cadenced in A minor, the C\(^1\), in mm. 294-300, is begins in D minor. The C-zone dissolves into the coda. The coda starts in m. 300 and contains elements of \(P^1\) and \(P^3\) in E Phrygian and moves to D minor with \(P^0\) as the last theme heard.

Example 3-12: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Coda mm. 313-end

The recapitulation mostly functions as Hepokoski and Darcy describe, but the ESC and C-zone are set in A minor instead of D minor, which is atypical. The situation is more peculiar because it not typical of an ESC to fail if the EEC succeeds. Mishra does not discuss this in his book. However, this may be explained through the mode change to D major. Because the mode changed to D major, the key had to return to cadence in D minor which might have led to the need for the C-zone re-establish a dominant function.
Conclusions

The exposition functions as expected for two-part exposition sonata form except for C occurring in the wrong key in the recapitulation. As previously mentioned, a two-part exposition sonata form is a structure that has a P-zone that successfully modulates to a new key at the S-zone, creating a second key area. Both the MC and EEC are used in a typical manner. The MC prepares the new key by ending on a half cadence to the new key. The EEC is established in the S-zone in the correct key. Again, a successful EEC does not occur in movements III and IV because those cadences occur in different keys from the S-zone.

As previously mention, the development supports Mishra’s assertion that Shostakovich’s developments usually have many types of thematic development and contrapuntal ideas. The development follows Hepokoski and Darcy’s theory in that there is a dominant lock at the end of the development.

The recapitulation mostly functions as Hepokoski and Darcy describe, but the ESC and C-zone are set in A minor instead of tonic D minor, which is atypical. A successful EEC usually predicts that the ESC will be successful in cadencing in the tonic key, but the ESC and C-zone instead move to the minor dominant key. As discussed earlier, because the mode changed to D major and the piece had to return to D minor for a final cadence, there is a need for the C-zone re-establish a dominant function so that the movement may return to D minor in the coda (see Example 3-13). As mentioned earlier, the C-zone and closing material change keys not only in this movement; this pattern will continue throughout the whole symphony.
Example 3-14: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, Sonata Form
CHAPTER 4: SYMPHONY NO. 5: II. ALLEGRETTO

Of the external archetypes that Shostakovich employs most frequently in the symphonies, his scherzi often have the simplest formal structures…\(^9^5\)

Scholars agree that the form of Symphony No. 5’s second movement is a scherzo and trio. In fact, this is the only movement with almost no disagreement about the formal structure. Ottaway notes the traditional form of the movement, stating, “After this searching expression [of the first movement] the second movement is quite properly relaxation; a genial, outward-looking scherzo and trio, formally unremarkable but well made…”\(^9^6\)

Rofe also notes the traditional form of this movement, arguing that “it is the nature of a symphonic scherzo to function in a more block-like manner than other movement and…Shostakovich aligns himself with that tradition.”\(^9^7\) Scholars designate the scherzo (exposition) from mm. 1-86, the trio (contrasting middle) from mm. 87-157, the return of the scherzo (recapitulation) from mm. 158-242, and a coda from mm. 243-end.\(^9^8\)

Because the form of this movement is not ambiguous, unlike movements III (see Chapter 5) and IV (see Chapter 6), the focus of this chapter is not to determine the form. This chapter will discuss Shostakovich’s use of this traditional from, which aspects of this form are, and how Shostakovich’s scherzo fits Caplin’s theory of minuet and trio form. As noted earlier Caplin, does not distinguish between the formal organization of

---

\(^9^5\) Rofe, *Dimensions of Energy in Shostakovich's Symphonies*, 94.
\(^9^7\) Rofe, *Dimensions of Energy in Shostakovich's Symphonies*, 94.
\(^9^8\) Exposition, contrasting middle, and recapitulation are terms used by Caplin to describe this first, middle, and last sections of a minuet and trio form. Similar terminology is used in Caplin’s discussion of ternary form.
the scherzo and trio and the minuet and trio, so the terminology that applies to minuet and trio form will be applied to this movement.\footnote{Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 219.}

\textbf{Scherzo}

The exposition of this movement is a scherzo. The exposition begins with a brief introduction in the lower strings from mm. 1-9. The key starts in C major and moves to F major (Example 4-1).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example4-1.png}
\caption{Example 4-1: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 1-9}
\end{figure}

The main-theme function (see Chapter 2) begins in m. 10 in A minor with the upper woodwinds stating the theme in m. 13.
Example 4-2: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 10-13

The main-theme function comes to a PAC in m. 33. Since there can be multiple themes within the exposition and recapitulation areas, PACs are important for distinguishing the length of thematic material and determining how many themes are present. Caplin argues if “the [exposition] is highly expanded and embraces more than one thematic unit, each [will end] with a perfect authentic cadence.” Caplin also argues the thematic units will often have a transitional link between them. In accord with Caplin’s theory, after the PAC in m. 33, the main-theme function is connected to the subordinate-theme by a brief transitional link in mm. 33-44 (see Example 4-3).

The subordinate-theme function begins in m. 45 in C minor with a full orchestral entrance. C minor is confirmed at m. 55 with an IAC (Example 4-4). Closing material occurs in mm. 56-59, in the key of F major. Caplin argues that the closing theme will often be a new thematic idea following a PAC at the end of the subordinate-theme function.

---

100 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 220-221.
101 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 220-221.
Example 4-3: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 33-46

Transition:

PAC: A minor
Example 4-4: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 51-55

There is a deformation in the exposition. A closing section could obscure cadential and postcadential functions by providing an extra PAC, but the closing section in this movement moves away from the C minor key established in m. 55, to F major in mm. 56-59, and finally cadences in $A^b$ major in mm. 60-63. Following $A^b$ major, a scalar passage in m. 63 brings the key back to C minor for a repeat of the subordinate-theme function (Example 4-5).

---

102 Caplin, Classical Form, 220-221.
Example 4-5: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 55-64

The subordinate-theme function is repeated in C minor from mm. 64-74. As before in mm. 56-59, the closing material returns to F major at mm. 75-78. F major modulates again to A♭ major in mm. 79-84 and cadences in A♭ major in m. 84. Caplin does not list any examples for a scherzo or minuet ending a half-step lower than the opening key (in this case, A minor and Ab major). This is atypical compared to a traditional scherzo and trio form.¹⁰³ As with Caplin’s definition of ternary, a scherzo can modulate, but the exposition will remain the key of the subordinate-theme function. This is the first of two major deformations from traditional scherzo and trio form. (The second will occur in the recapitulation.)

¹⁰³ Caplin, Classical Form, 220-221.
**Trio**

Caplin argues that the binary form trio section will usually have equal proportions.\(^{104}\) This trio does not really reflect this because the first section from mm. 87-118 is 31 measures, but the second section from mm. 119-157 is 38 measures. The trio begins in C major with a violin solo with harp and cello accompaniment. Rofe argues that Shostakovich is paying homage to traditionalism by starting the trio with three instruments, which was typical of early trios making the beginning of the trio “a trio in the purest sense of the term.”\(^{105}\)

The theme is made up of a double parallel period from mm. 87-102, with the antecedent phrases with an IAC m. 94 and a PAC in m. 102. The double parallel period is then repeated from mm. 103-118 with the flute playing the solo with bassoon and string accompaniment (Example 4-6).

The second part of the trio begins in m. 119 with characteristics of the previous section. This second section immediately begins to explore multiple different keys. This distinguishes the second from the first section of the trio, which remained in stable keys for long periods of time (Example 4-7).

---

\(^{104}\) Caplin, *Classical Form*, 229.

\(^{105}\) Rofe, *Dimensions of Energy in Shostakovich's Symphonies*, 96. See footnote.
Example 4-6: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 85-102
Example 4-7: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 120-137
Recapitulation

The recapitulation begins as a measure-by-measure recapitulation of thematic and harmonic materials, but with lighter orchestration such as pizzicato strings from mm. 157-200. The most substantial modification from the exposition to the recapitulation is the key change of the subordinate-theme function. The subordinate-theme function is in C# minor instead of C minor, making mm. 201-219 a half step higher than mm. 45-63 (Example 4-8). (This is the second deformation from traditional scherzo and trio form). Following this deformation, the subordinate-theme function in mm. 220-240 returns to C minor, the key in which the subordinate-theme function in mm. 64-84 originally appeared, the key should have stayed in C minor.

Example 4-8: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 45-46 and mm. 200-203
There is a codetta using material found in the trio. Caplin argues that the codetta is often made from material found within the exposition, not the middle section.\textsuperscript{106} Rather than the returning in C major, the trio theme occurs in the original key of A minor for tonal closure, and a PAC occurs in the last measure to confirm the return to A minor.

\begin{example}
\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example4-9.png}
\caption{Symphony No. 5, Mvt. II, mm. 242-245, codetta}
\end{figure}
\end{example}

Conclusions

The second movement is a typical scherzo and trio form. This movement has only a few deformations of the scherzo and trio form: the cadence in $A^b$ instead of C minor in the closing material of the scherzo, and the half-step adjustment to $C^\#$ minor instead of C minor in mm. 201-219 within the subordinate-theme. Unlike Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory, Caplin’s definition of scherzo and trio form does not include common deformations and consequences of these deformations. However, the overall structure was not affected by the two unusual key changes.

\textsuperscript{106} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 227.
CHAPTER 5: SYMPHONY NO. 5: III. LARGO

The form of the third movement has been called binary with a coda and elements of sonata form by Mishra, and sonata form by Hurwitz and Huband. These two analyses share commonalities, but they are fundamentally different from one another because of how they interpret the thematic material. The commonalities among authors include key areas, new thematic material, and sonata form elements. Examples of disagreement include the differences in the length of each thematic section (Table 5-1) and the division of material found within sections (Table 5-2).

Table 5-1: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Section</th>
<th>Second Section</th>
<th>Third Section</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishra</td>
<td>mm. 1-94</td>
<td>mm. 94-180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mm. 181-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huband</td>
<td>mm. 1-94</td>
<td>mm. 94-156</td>
<td>mm. 156-180</td>
<td>mm. 181-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz</td>
<td>mm. 1-69</td>
<td>mm. 69-156</td>
<td>mm. 156-180</td>
<td>mm. 181-end</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-2: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, First section, Second Section, Third Section/Coda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Section</th>
<th>P-zone</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>S-zone</th>
<th>C-zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishra</td>
<td>mm. 1-23</td>
<td>mm. 24-32</td>
<td>mm. 33-67</td>
<td>mm. 68-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huband</td>
<td>mm. 1-23</td>
<td>mm. 24-32</td>
<td>mm. 33-67</td>
<td>mm. 68-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz</td>
<td>mm. 1-23</td>
<td>mm. 24-32</td>
<td>mm. 33-67</td>
<td>solo themes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Section</th>
<th>P themes</th>
<th>TR themes</th>
<th>C themes</th>
<th>P themes</th>
<th>S themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishra</td>
<td>mm. 103-120</td>
<td>mm. 120-129</td>
<td>mm. 130-155</td>
<td>mm. 156-167</td>
<td>mm. 168-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huband</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz</td>
<td>mm. 103-120</td>
<td>mm. 120-129</td>
<td>mm. 130-155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Section/Coda</th>
<th>P-zone</th>
<th>S-zone</th>
<th>Coda with C-zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mishra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mm. 181-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huband</td>
<td>mm. 156-167</td>
<td>mm. 168-181</td>
<td>mm. 181-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurwitz</td>
<td>mm. 156-167</td>
<td>mm. 168-181</td>
<td>mm. 181-190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where do Authors Agree?**

Their common findings of the analyses will be presented first. Since Hurwitz, Huband, and Mishra all agree that elements of sonata form are present, Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology will be used in the discussion of the sonata form elements.

There is no dispute among these authors that there is at least a P-zone, TR, and S-zone in the first section. (However, Huband and Mishra argue there is also a C-zone.) The P-zone occurs from the beginning to m. 23. \( P^1 \) is presented by violins II and III in F\(^{##} \) minor (Example 5-1).
Harmonic instability begins as G# and G natural begin to alternate starting in m. 12. The P-zone’s instability becomes more apparent when the key changes to C minor (with some Phrygian tendencies) from mm. 17-23. The P-zone finishes in m. 24 with a resting point on a D+M7 chord. This chord acts as a dominant to the G major that begins the TR (see example 5-2). TR starts in G major, but quickly changes to cadence on the mediant B minor. TR is only eight measures, from mm. 24-32 (see example 5-3).
C minor:

D\(^{M7}\)

Example 5-2: Symphony No. 5, Movement III, mm. 19-24, end of P-zone

G major:

Example 5-3: Symphony No. 5, Movement III, mm. 25-31
Hurwitz, Huband, and Mishra all agree the S-zone starts in m. 33, signaled by $S^1$ in the flute. The S-zone begins in B major (enharmonically respelled as C$^b$ major for the harp) from mm. 33-45 with a return of $P^{1,1}$, and moves to C minor by m. 69.

![Example 5-4: Symphony No. 5, Movement III, mm. 31-35, beginning of S-zone](image)

However, after the statement of $P^{1,1}$, the music begins to climax while under a G dominant pedal from mm. 51-59. The dissonant harmonies almost disguise the resolution to C minor.
Hurwitz believes that the second section begins in m. 69, but both Huband and Mishra instead believe that this is where the C-zone begins in C minor. Huband and Mishra’s C-zone is from mm. 69-86. There is an EEC, for Huband and Mishra only, in m. 67, but the EEC does not cadence in the key of the S-zone (C minor). The EEC is in A$_b$ major. If this is in sonata form, Hepokoski and Darcy argue that if the EEC fails or cadences in the wrong key, this creates the expectation that the movement will also fail globally. This means it can be expected that the S-zone will not secure an ESC in the tonic key in the recapitulation. This issue is not one brought up by the authors mentioned, but to call the following a C-zone, there needs to be a PAC in the established key and instead there is a cadence in A$_b$. This will be discussed in later sections.
Linking material:

Example 5-6: Symphony No. 5, Movement III, mm. 62-80, beginning of C-zone

Hurwitz and Huband agree that m. 156 is where the second section ends.

Huband does not discuss the middle section and the material developed. Hurwitz
identifies the themes used, but only Mishra discusses the material being developed in detail. Mishra argues that the development is atypical for Shostakovich because there is a lack of thematic development and contrapuntal writing. This is what convinces Mishra that this section and the third section are probably combined, making it a two-part form instead of sonata form (discussed in the next section). However, Hurwitz and Huband believe there is a distinct third section beginning in m. 156. They believe the third section is truncated recapitulation.

**Where the Authors Differ?**

There are two formal concepts the authors disagree about. The first is whether the overall form is binary or sonata form. For Mishra, the recapitulation is too truncated for sonata form, and instead he calls it a large binary structure. Mishra argues that what others call the exposition does function as a sonata form exposition, but the development beginning on tonic with the movement’s P¹ is problematic. He mentions that developments beginning on tonic do not usually occur.¹⁰⁷ Mishra also argues that the second section does not begin like a development. The second section begins more like a recapitulation because the second section begins in the opening key.

Hepokoski and Darcy discuss instances where some analysts label sonata forms as binary forms because of unsatisfactory recapitulations. These types of sonata forms were often categorized as binary sonatas or polythematic binaries. The idea behind these labels was that the recapitulation was too truncated to be considered sonata form, but the tonal requirements of sonata form were present. Another characteristic of this type of sonata

form is that the P-zone replaces the beginning of the development. This would lead to scholars categorizing works as expanded binary instead of sonata form.\textsuperscript{108}

Huband and Hurwitz argue the movement is in sonata form with an abbreviated recapitulation. Hurwitz does not provide details about why he chooses sonata form other than understanding that the work was written in a more traditionalist setting. (Hurwitz uses the term “traditionalist setting” to describe forms typically found in the symphony, but not in any typical order.) Huband provides a little more information in that he believes that “the delayed presentation of the original tonal area [at m. 156] in the recapitulation along with the terseness of the thematic materials are departures from the traditions of sonata form.”\textsuperscript{109}

The disagreement about the form seems to stem from the context of the second and third section of this movement. Mishra even states:

\begin{quote}
Placed within the context of a potential sonata form, [m. 94] thus looks more like a recapitulation than of a development. In some ways, this moment is similar to the recap in [Symphony No. 6 mvt. 1], where the tonic restatement of the movement’s opening theme breaks the spell cast by its central section. Yet, if the arrival at [m. 94] has a recapitulatory feel about it, what follows does not.\textsuperscript{110}
\end{quote}

Mishra’s observes of the second section seems to start with characteristics of a recapitulation rather than characteristics of a development. The material that follows the restatement of $P^1$ in the tonic key does occur in full. This is not the only theme area to return in the second section. TR and the C-zone also return before reaching Hurwitz and Huband’s recapitulation at m. 156. The occurrence of these themes, lack of contrapuntal

\begin{footnotes}
\item[109] Huband, \textit{The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovitch}, 44-45.
\item[110] Mishra, \textit{Soviet Musical Criticism and Shostakovitch's Fifth Symphony}, 111.
\end{footnotes}
and thematic development in mm. 94 – 156, and the recapitulation in C minor all lead Mishra to conclude the form must be a bipartite setting.

This passage [mm. 94-156] cannot really be considered a developmental in the Shostakovich sense. In the gradual build-up between [mm. 94-146], each thematic fragment is treated individually…. The characteristic most associated with Shostakovich’s development sections, namely thematic and contrapuntal intensification, is notably absent. Following the collapse of the climax, the tentative repetitions of part of the opening theme’s first phrase in C minor, the remotest possible key from tonic, are entirely without recapitulatory force [at m. 156].

The second and third section will be looked at more closely to see if they follow the harmonic and rhetorical strategies of a development or recapitulation according to Hepokoski and Darcy, or if Mishra’s theory of a two-part structure is more accurate.

**The First Section**

The movement begins with divided strings. As previously noted, P1 occurs from mm. 1-23, presented by violins III and viola I in F♯ minor (see Example 5-7). The F♯ minor tonality begins to slip at m. 16 with the addition of B♭. In mm. 17-23, the key appears to have changed to C minor. However, in mm. 23-24, the lower strings move down in half-step to F♯, and the upper strings split between moving up from G to A♯, holding on to D, and the addition of violin I playing C♯, creating an D♯M7 chord (refer back to Example 5-4). TR starts in G major (Example 5-8). S1 begins with the flute solo and harp accompaniment at mm. 33 in B minor. The rest of the orchestra returns in m. 45, with an occurrence of P1.1 in m. 45 in B minor (see example 5-9).

---

Example 5-7: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, P^1

In m. 50, there is a change to G minor. G minor’s tonal function changes to a minor dominant of C minor from mm. 57-58, and, in m. 59, the key modulates to C minor. In m. 62, the key seems to change from C minor to A^b major. Hurwitz identifies the section with solo instruments in m. 62 as the end of the first section and the beginning of second section. However, the resting point on A^b major creates a possible EEC. This EEC is not in the key of the S-zone, B minor, and this EEC really is not a cadence. This predicts that the ESC in the recapitulation will also fail to establish the original tonic. However, because there is an EEC, there may be a C-zone. Hurwitz and Mishra identify this area, mm. 68-94, as the C-zone (Example 5-10). Then from mm. 94-103, there is a transition to the second section.
Example 5-8: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, mm. 13-24
Example 5-9: Symphony No.5, Mvt. III, mm. 45-50

Example 5-10: Symphony No.5, Mvt. III, EEC
The tremolo violin provides transition-like material to m. 69 in C minor to the C-zone (refer back at Example 5-6). The C-zone starts in C minor, but the C-zone begins to modulate a half step higher in m. 88 to cadence in C# minor in m.94. C# minor serves as a transition to the second section that begins in m. 103.

Example 5-11: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, 92-94

The first section acts more like an exposition of sonata form rather than the first section of binary. Harmonically, the first section moves from tonic to a different key. Since the first section moves from F# minor to B minor, and has an EEC in A♭ minor, Mishra, Huband, and Hurwitz’s theories all seem logical, even though the EEC arrives in the unexpected key A♭ minor. Mishra’s theory of binary is still plausible.
Caplin states the goal of a binary form is to achieve a PAC in the new key or an HC in the tonic key. Therefore, this seems to fit the first section of an enlarged binary/rounded binary or sonata form.

However, the two distinct theme areas pose an issue to Caplin’s definition of a binary structure. Caplin has does not list any situations with binary forms with multiple distinct themes within the exposition or recapitulation. As mentioned earlier, Hepokoski and Darcy talk about instances where analysts label sonata forms as binary forms because of unsatisfactory recapitulations and these types of sonata forms were originally categorized as binary sonatas.¹¹² These two distinct theme areas fit as part of a two-part sonata form exposition.

Overall, the elements of sonata form seem to prevail over the elements of binary form. The evidence favors the exposition of sonata form because of the thematic implications (two distinct themes which is not common within binary forms) and structural implications (presence of TR, MC, and EEC). However, despite the strong evidence for sonata form, a conclusion cannot be made until the second and third sections are analyzed.

**The Second Section and Third Section Combined**

The second and third sections of this movement present a major issue: is the second section really a development? Table 5-3 below shows the second and third section combined with all thematic material, the order in which the thematic material occurs, including which keys each section starts and ends in.

Mishra argues the second section resembles a recapitulation, not a development. In fact, if the recapitulation started in m. 103, the exposition and recapitulation would almost be the same length and have themes occur in a similar order, except that the C-zone and S-zone are reversed (Table 5-3).

Hurwitz and Huband argue that the third section is a truncated recapitulation with the return of $P^{1.1}$ in m. 156 in C minor, not $F^#$ minor. This poses an issue with the recapitulation returning a tritone away from the movement’s original key of $F^#$ minor. $S^1$ starts in m. 168 in A minor, and the $F^#$ minor does not return to until a PAC in m. 180. Measure 181-end is $C^1$. The movement ends on a PAC in $F^#$ major. The main flaw in this argument is there is no return of $P^1$ in the original key of $F^#$ minor.

There is a deformation at the beginning of the second area. If this were a development, it would not start in $F^#$ minor key. In addition, there are full statements of the original thematic areas (P, TR, and C) mostly in the order they occurred and structural markers (MC and ESC). Table 4 shows the exposition and recapitulation side-by-side to show the close structural relationship.
Mishra’s view that this movement is set in a two part structure makes more sense, but the movement is in sonata form. Mishra’s finding of the “development” beginning on tonic raises the question of whether the development, is a development. His evidence shows that the second section lacks two qualities commonly associated with Shostakovich: contrapuntal and thematic development. This theory is strengthened because the themes return almost in the same order they appear in the exposition. Hurwitz and Huband’s recapitulation in C minor seems unlikely because their recapitulation lines up with where P^{1.1} had occurred before in a different key.

In fact, movement III matches what Hepokoski and Darcy call a Type 2 sonata, which is a sonata form without a development. In a type 2 sonata, the exposition has all the elements needed for a sonata form exposition, but second/third sections have an “identity crisis.” The identity crisis occurs because the tonic key has trouble being established where expected. Generally, tonic would return in the S-zone without a P-zone.

Table 5-4: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, Exposition and Recapitulation Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Starting/Ending Keys</th>
<th>Recap</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Starting/Ending Keys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P^{1}</td>
<td>1-23</td>
<td>F♯ minor</td>
<td>P^{1}</td>
<td>103-120</td>
<td>F♯ minor – B♭ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>24-32</td>
<td>G major – B minor</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>120-129</td>
<td>B♭ minor – B♭ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>MC</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>B♭ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S^{1}</td>
<td>33-45</td>
<td>C♭ minor – B minor</td>
<td>C^{1}</td>
<td>130-155</td>
<td>D minor – C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P^{1.1}</td>
<td>45-67</td>
<td>B minor – C minor</td>
<td>P^{1.1}</td>
<td>156-167</td>
<td>C minor – D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>A♭ minor</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C^{1}</td>
<td>68-94</td>
<td>C minor – C♯ minor</td>
<td>S^{1}</td>
<td>168-181</td>
<td>A minor – F♯ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrans.</td>
<td>94-103</td>
<td>C♯ minor – F♯ minor</td>
<td>C^{1}/Coda</td>
<td>181-190</td>
<td>F♯ min/ F♯ maj PAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beginning the recapitulation. In this case, since the EEC was also in the “wrong key,” the ESC had little chance to return to tonic in the S-zone during the recapitulation.

**Conclusions**

Movement III is almost certainly in sonata form without a development. When analyzing the first section, it has the essential components of sonata form with a two-part exposition. In the exposition, the P-zone is established from beginning to m. 23, followed by a TR from mm. 24-32, MC in m. 33-45, S-zone from mm. 45-67, an EEC in m. 67, a C-zone from 68-94, and a retransition from 94-103. The recapitulation begins with the P-zone from mm. 103-120, TR from m. 120-129, MC 129, C-zone from 130-167, ESC in m. 167, S-zone 168-181, and coda from 181-end.

Thematically, movement III does not seem match the definition of either binary or rounded binary. While the exposition presented by Hurwitz and Huband did fit traditional sonata form, their development and recapitulation did not fit any of the typical deformations of sonata form or expected features of Shostakovich’s developments. In actuality, Mishra’s two-part form fit, this movement better, but rather than traditional binary form, it is a sonata form without a development.
Example 5-12: Symphony No. 5, Mvt III, Sonata Form without Development
CHAPTER 6: SYMPHONY NO. 5: FINALE: ALLEGRO NON TROPPO

The fourth movement has been called binary with a coda and elements of sonata form by Mishra, ternary with a coda and sonata features by Huband, and sonata form by Hurwitz. On closer examination, these three analyses are not dramatically different from one another. Each author defines the first large section from mm. 1-123, the second from mm. 124-247, and the third from mm. 248-358. In addition, there are several overlaps in their analyses. These common findings will be presented first. Since each author mentions that elements of sonata form are present, especially in the first large section, Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology will be used to discuss the sonata form elements.

Where do the Authors Agree?

There is no dispute among these authors that there are three main themes in the two thematic zones within the first section of this movement. They identify the primary theme zone as occurring from the beginning to m. 80. The movement begins with a $f$ D minor chord that crescendos to $fff$ to the second measure, where the timpani plays tonic and dominant in an alternating eighth-note pattern. This brief fanfare-like introduction is $P^0$. The first theme ($P^1$) is presented in the trumpets and low brass in D minor from the anacrusis of m. 3 to beat three of m. 6, as shown in Example 6-1. This theme will occur many times throughout the finale.

---

113 Mishra, A Shostakovich companion, 100-115, 143.  
114 Huband, The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich, 44-45, 137.  
Example 6-1: \( P^1 \), Symphony No.5, IV, mm. 2-6

The second P-zone theme in D minor (\( P^2 \)) occurs immediately after beat 4 in m. 11 in the woodwinds and strings. All authors note that this is the only occurrence of this theme (see Example 6-2).

Example 6-2: \( P^2 \), Symphony No.5, IV, mm. 11-15

Mishra, Huband, and Hurwitz agree that the S-zone (\( S^1 \)) begins in m. 83 with a solo trumpet accompanied by strings (see Example 3-3). The string accompaniment
causes harmonic instability by shifting between G minor, E diminished, F diminished, and A diminished harmonies. In m. 85, the trumpet even has an A♭ against the A diminished harmony.

Example 6-3: Symphony No.5, IV, S^1 mm. 81-87

S^1 and the shifting harmonies all occur before arriving in the more stable, dominant A major center at m. 98, where the woodwinds and strings carry S^{1.1}.

Example 6-4: Symphony No.5, IV, S^{1.1}

While all authors are in agreement over the basic thematic context of the exposition, none talk about the location of TR or C, which will be discussed later. In
addition, all authors agree that the development or middle section is located in mm. 124-247, and agree that the material from the second theme area starts the development. The authors also note that materials from previous movements are found in this section.\textsuperscript{116}

**Where do the Authors Differ?**

As previously noted, Mishra supports a binary form with sonata elements,\textsuperscript{117} Huband supports a ternary form with sonata elements,\textsuperscript{118} and Hurwitz supports sonata form.\textsuperscript{119} The main area that the authors disagree about is what to call the third section, mm. 247-end. Mishra argues that the entire third section is a coda, Hurwitz argues that the third section is a truncated recapitulation, yet Huband argues the third section is a truncated return of the first section but not a true recapitulation.

Mishra asserts that the function of a recapitulation should reflect on and sum up previous thematic and harmonic material, yet mm. 248-end uses thematic material from only P\textsuperscript{1} from the P-zone, but no other P, TR, or S themes.\textsuperscript{120} Mishra states:

> Generally, the movement is viewed in terms of a sonata form in which [m. 247] is considered a recapitulation, with the coda consisting only of final D major peroration. What, to this author, prevents [m. 247] from sounding recapitulatory is the lack of structural synthesis of themes and/or tonalities that is generally implied by the term “recapitulation.”

In addition, Mishra is persuaded that because the third section in m. 247 enters on what could be perceived as a dominant functioning cadential i\textsuperscript{6} chord, instead of tonic, and the mode change in m. 324 is so sudden, that these sections must be part of a larger

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116}Hurwitz, *Shostakovich Symphonies and Concertos*, 30-31.
\item \textsuperscript{117}Mishra, *A Shostakovich companion*, 100-115,143.
\item \textsuperscript{118}Huband, *The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich*, 44-45, 137.
\item \textsuperscript{119}Hurwitz, *Shostakovich Symphonies and Concertos Series*, 29-31.
\item \textsuperscript{120}Mishra, *Soviet Musical Criticism and Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony*, 129-130. Mishra provides a quote from Preston Stedman. “The recapitulation becomes more of a rush to conclusion rather than a true summing up of previous materials.”
\end{itemize}
functioning structure. Therefore, because of the truncation and what he argues is a tonally unsatisfactory recapitulation, Mishra states that the final section cannot be a recapitulation. Mishra proposes that the true function of this section is as a coda.

However, Hepokoski and Darcy note that this type of dominant functioning cadential $i_6$ chord is not really an issue because TR and S will provide the return to the original tonic. Since neither $P^2$ nor $S^1$ are present in the recapitulation, this leads Mishra to believe, as well as Huband, that the form is too far removed from both sonata form and modified sonata form.

Mishra further justifies the coda beginning here because the mode changes to D major at m. 324. Mishra states that many analysts view the mode change as a feeble attempt to regain momentum to the end, but instead, the mode to D major creates a dissatisfying ending. Mishra argues that the D major ending is part of a longer coda process that begins at m. 248.121

The symphony’s D major peroration contains the longest sustained passage of major-key music in the entire work, and has undoubtedly become the focal point for the work’s main hermeneutic controversy. Inevitably, the aesthetic impression left by this coda depends ultimately on the conductor…122

Guiding Mishra’s thought is the idea that different tempi present different ways to hear the form; thus he believes the faster tempo in m. 247 obscures the idea of a recapitulation.123 Mishra argues that at faster tempi, the third section becomes an unsatisfactory arrival which needs to be resolved, and the section never truly resolves

---

until the mode change to D major m. 324. Then, m. 324 seems too rushed, unprepared, and forced.

Yet, it is not just analysts who destroy the integrity of Shostakovich’s coda. Conductors who opt for the faster tempo at [m. 324] are, in essence, doing the same thing, creating an ending that does not extend organically from out of the previous material, but instead runs away from it. Following the more limited tempo adjustments prescribed by Shostakovich undoubtedly gives the coda a greater structural cogency in performance.¹²⁴

Therefore, Mishra views the mm. 247-324 part of a longer coda process noting that, “The tendency amongst analysts to separate the D major ‘coda’ [mm. 324-end] from what they dub ‘recapitulation’ [mm. 247-323] is thus unfortunate.”¹²⁵

Huband places the recapitulation from mm. 247-323, with mm. 324-end as the coda of a large ternary form. Huband states that there is problem with the beginning of the recapitulation acting as a true return because it occurs on the dominant instead of tonic (an issue also noted by Mishra). Huband suggests that Shostakovich is purposely avoiding a lengthy recapitulation by thematic omission (and that this omission does alter the form to ternary)¹²⁶ because this is commonly found in the recapitulations of Shostakovich’s symphonies and in Tchaikovsky’s symphonies.¹²⁷ Huband draws his conclusions from Hugh Ottaway, who states, “Although the dramatic life is centered on the interaction of two contrasting themes, or thematic groups, this is in no sense a sonata

¹²⁵ Mishra, *Soviet Musical Criticism and Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony*, 132. Mishra continues to point out that tempo set by conductor’s can influence the argument. If the tempo is too fast, then the material does not grow organically from the material.
¹²⁶ Huband, *The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich*, 47. Huband also states this trait can be seen in Tchaikovsky’s *Symphony No.6*.
¹²⁷ Huband, *The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich*, 47.
type movement, ‘modified’ or otherwise.”

Ottaway, like Huband, also believes the recapitulation is too truncated to be sonata form.

Hurwitz presents the form of the finale as sonata form. Unlike Huband and Mishra, Hurwitz is not opposed to calling mm. 247-323 a true recapitulation and mm. 324-end a coda of a sonata form. Hurwitz argues that the work was purposely written with reference to a more traditional form. In fact, Hurwitz believes all the movements except the scherzo are set in sonata form. “Shostakovich’s [use of] three very different examples of the sonata style certainly throws down the gauntlet to those who felt that by forcing him to write in a more conservative idiom, they would cripple his talent and mute his expressive intensity.”

**The First Section of Binary/Ternary or Exposition of Sonata Form?**

As mentioned above, regardless of the scholar, the finale contains three large distinct sections: the first section from mm. 1-123, the second from mm. 124-247, and the third from mm. 248-358. Until a form is determined, each large section will be referred to as the first, second, and third section. Again, because each author has discussed the use of sonata form elements, Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology will applied to the following sections. In addition, since these scholars argue the first section has many elements of sonata form, there will be an in-depth look at the first section. The remainder of the chapter is the author’s analysis unless otherwise noted.

---


129 Hurwitz, *Shostakovich Symphonies and Concertos*, 34.
The first section begins with a short $P^0$ in mm.1-2, and as previously stated $P^1$ is presented in the trumpets and low brass from the anacrusis of m. 3 to beat three of m. 6, establishing the key of D minor. There are four “hammer-blows” in mm. 6-7. Hepokoski and Darcy note that hammer-blows are typically found within the transition to set-up the MC of a two-part exposition, or to begin a work. Here the hammer-blows are being used at the beginning to initiate to an imperfect authentic cadence in D minor in m.11 (Example 6-5).\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{130}Hammer-blows are typically in threes and the figure is commonly called the triple hammer-blow. Hepokoski and Darcy mention that two hammer blows are not that uncommon either, but four is not mentioned in their writings.
Example 6-5: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, mm. 1-11

Following the IAC, \( P^2 \) begins in flutes, clarinets, and violin I from mm. 11-19. This is the only occurrence of this theme. Measures 19-24 are the last occurrence of \( P^1 \) set in D minor until the recapitulation. (There is an occurrence of \( P^{1.2} \) at m. 41 in D
Phrygian, but this will be discussed in more detail later.) The next thematic zone that occurs is S in m. 81. This leaves approximately sixty problematic measures between P and S to account for. Mishra, Huband, and Hurwitz do not account for this area in their analyses. To further distinguish between binary/ternary and sonata form there must be an in-depth look at this section to determine whether the first section meets the criteria for a sonata form, because another marker for sonata form structure is a distinct TR section rather than the shorter modulatory passage encountered in open binary and ternary forms.

Hepokoski and Darcy define TRs in allegro movements as a “rhetorical energy-gain, a passage of rhythmic verve and increased harmonic action, driving toward and finally accomplishing the MC.” Hepokoski and Darcy note that identifying the beginning of TR can be difficult, and they discuss characteristics of TR and how to find where TR begins. For example, the start of TR is often signaled by a strong tutti affirmation. A tutti affirmation is often a forte entrance of P. After a tutti affirmation, TR will often repeat the last musical idea heard. If a TR is primarily made up from reworkings or figures that had been in P, the TR is called a developmental TR. Hepokoski and Darcy make the argument that finding the exact location of the MC first and then working backwards is beneficial because the MC occurs at the end of TR.

As mentioned in chapter one, the MC is important in determining whether the movement is a sonata form with a two-part exposition, because without an MC there is no

---

131 This is due to the fact that it was beyond the scope of what they were written about.
132 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 94.
133 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 94.
134 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 95.
S-zone. The MC indicates where TR ends. To find the MC, Hepokoski and Darcy list a few normative procedures that surround the MC. For example, the MC exists to signal the onset of the S-zone, so the MC will occur before S. Also, there will often be a triple hammer-blow and normally a half cadence at the MC in the key of the upcoming S.

The triple hammer-blows can be found in the string section at m. 75. There is a slight modification in that the triple hammer-blows are only voiced in the string section and not the rest of the orchestra. (This particular hammer-blow motive was first located in $P^1$ as four hammer-blows and is now set in B minor). The triple hammer-blow is followed by fragmentation of the $P^1$ spelling an $F^#_{\text{min}}$ minor chord and then to an $F^#_{\text{dim}}$ (with the third beat enharmonically spelled as $G^b$ in violin II, viola, and cello in m. 79) leading directly to an MC, the caesura-fill (CF), at m. 79. As stated in Chapter 2, the CF is a MC “technique [that implies the] gap but filling it in with a brief sonic link in one voice (or, sometimes, in more than one).” The MC begins on the off-beat of 3 in m. 79, with the piccolo, flute, piccolo clarinet, and violin I filling the gap (Example 6-6).

---

There are two candidates for the start of TR: m. 31 and m. 57. These two areas are distinct sections that meet Hepokoski and Darcy’s criteria of an energy-gaining area. As previously mentioned, a tutti affirmation can indicate the beginning of TR. Both m. 31 and m. 57 contain a tutti affirmation (see Example 6-7).
Example 6-7: Comparison with a TR with two themes versus a short TR with one theme

At m. 30 there is a one-measure change of time signature from $\frac{4}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ back $\frac{4}{4}$ to that has a *ff* scalar descent in D minor that articulates the possible beginning of TR in m. 31. Following the D minor scalar decent there is another one affirming that the key has changed to B$^b$ minor. This fulfills a couple other criteria for TR described by Hepokoski and Darcy: a TR repeating the last motive heard (in this case the scalar descent); an increase in harmonic motion (in this case from D minor to B$^b$ minor); and reiterations of P$^1$ in various keys, fulfilling Hepokoski and Darcy’s criteria for a developmental TR. The only real concern is that the length of the TR would be 51 measures, which is longer than the entire P-zone (Example 6-8). A discussion of the length of TR will be included with the analysis of TR beginning m. 57.
The other possibility for the beginning of TR is m. 57. To contextualize m. 57, we need to back track to m. 42 where $P^{1,2}$ occurs in the D Phrygian (Example 3-7). After the D Phrygian $P^{1,2}$, $P^{1,3}$ occurs in E$^b$ minor followed by four tutti ff hammer-blows in E minor and a closing tutti ff in D Phrygian. Following this ending in D Phrygian at m. 56, the strings enter in piano with a crescendo and accelerando marked (see Example 3-8). This section starting from m. 57 becomes rapidly harmonically unstable (D Phrygian, E
minor, F major, and D minor, sequence harmonies, within nine measures) and rhythmically active, arriving at an MC in m. 80.

Example 6-9: Symphony No.5, Mvt. IV, mm. 42-43 D Phrygian
Hammer-blows:

D Phrygian: again $b_2 = \text{Phrygian not minor}$

Possible TR:

D minor resolution on beat one

Example 6-10: Symphony No.5, Mvt. IV, mm. 51-59
Locating the beginning of TR at m.57 raises potential problems. The first is that the P^{1,2} is presented over eighth notes with unstable harmony indicating the music has already gained energy. The second is that by m. 57, the music has already been harmonically and rhythmically more active before this point which would indicate TR has already begun. Therefore, TR starting at m. 57 is unlikely.

The reason these two areas stand out is because they each provide new themes within in TR. If TR starts in m. 31, it would support an analysis posited by Yuriy Kholopov that m. 31 actually starts a new thematic idea.\textsuperscript{136} Kholopov states, in his brief analysis, that mm. 31-49 is S. However, this is an unlikely candidate for S because there needs to be a MC before m. 31 to make it a two-part exposition. Kholopov was correct in asserting that a new theme occurs at m. 31, but it is a theme within TR, not S. Measure 57 does acts in a similar manner starting a new theme in TR. This is why TR is 51 measures long. Example 6-9 shows TR beginning at m. 31 vs. m. 57.

Therefore, m. 57 is the launch of a new TR theme, not the start of TR itself. TR\textsuperscript{1} starts at m. 31 and TR\textsuperscript{2} starts at m. 57, which is why the TR zone is lengthy. Separating the themes is a brief cadence in D minor in m. 57 (see previous Example 6-8). This cadence would serve as Hepokoski and Darcy’s necessary PAC to have a new theme within a theme area, in this case creating TR\textsuperscript{2}. Hepokoski and Darcy do not really discuss having multiple TR themes, but this does fit their criteria for starting a new theme within an area. Example 6-11 shows the form to these points using the Hepokoski and Darcy’s model.

\textsuperscript{136} Kholopov,“Form in Shostakovich's Instrumental Works,” 60.
Example 6-11: P-S

As previously mentioned, the MC in m. 80 initiates the S-zone. The exact key is obscured as the string section provides an unsteady harmonic background for the beginning of the S-zone, (presented by a solo trumpet). The trumpet part’s tonality is unclear, and is accompanied by harmony that is also unclear.137 (Example 6-12)

Exaple 6-12: Symphony No.5, Mvt. IV, $S^1$

137 Mishra, Soviet Musical Criticism and Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony, 121.
When an S begins with an unstable harmonic center, Hepokoski and Darcy call it a tonally migratory S.\textsuperscript{138} The harmonic instability of the introduction of the S-zone creates the need for a stable and usually different tonal center. Following S\textsuperscript{1}, mm. 87-97 contains transition-like material which leads to a stable version of S in m. 98 in A major (V).

The S-zone resembles a deformation described by Hepokoski and Darcy as a trimodular block (TMB). A TMB is a trimultimodular structure that can occur within an S-zone in the exposition or recapitulation. A TMB occurs when S is first presented, but instead of creating a new stable key area, S is harmonically unstable. A TMB is separated into three distinct sections: TMB\textsuperscript{1}, TMB\textsuperscript{2}, and TMB\textsuperscript{3}. There are distinct themes for TM\textsuperscript{1} and TM\textsuperscript{3}, but TM\textsuperscript{2} is a transition between the two themes. Because TM\textsuperscript{1} and TM\textsuperscript{3} are themes, they require a preceding cadence, so a TMB is associated with a rare double MC.

Therefore, S\textsuperscript{1} is now labelled as TM\textsuperscript{1}, which begins in m. 81 with the trumpet solo. After TM\textsuperscript{1} occurs, it dissolves into the transitional TM\textsuperscript{2} at m. 87. Unlike a normative S-zone, TM\textsuperscript{1} is too unstable to secure an EEC, which is why it dissolves into TM\textsuperscript{2}. The establishment of TM\textsuperscript{2} indicates there will be an MC. Instead of a typical MC following TM\textsuperscript{2}, a \textit{caesura-fill of the juggernaut type} occurs from mm. 94-97.\textsuperscript{139} A \textit{caesura-fill of the juggernaut type} is similar to CF in that they both fill in space where an MC occurs, but a \textit{caesura-fill of the juggernaut type} will constantly build and gain energy. Hepokoski and Darcy write that following the \textit{caesura-fill of the juggernaut type} the music will always become softer. The harmonic stability after this CF does create a

\textsuperscript{138} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 120.
\textsuperscript{139} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 44.
release of tension, thus creating a more stable sound, but it is not softer. The dynamic is marked *fff* with no indication to become softer.

TM$^3$ begins at m. 98 with the strings and woodwinds presenting the theme in a stable A major tonality. However, there is another deformation from a typical TMB. In this TMB, TM$^3$ is the same theme as TM$^1$. In a typical TMB, TM$^1$ and TM$^3$ contain different thematic material. Whereas the TMB conforms harmonically to Hepokoski and Darcy’s definition, the thematic material is not normative. Therefore, TM$^3$ will be labeled as TM$^{1.1}$.

Example 6-13: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. 4, S-zone TMB mm. 81-98

The structural EEC, the first PAC to occur in the S-zone, is absent. Hepokoski and Darcy note that in “sonatas after the 1800s, S may break down without producing a PAC.” Instead of cadencing in A major, TM$^{1.1}$, mm. 107-112, arrive on an expanded G$^\#$ diminished harmony. P$^1$ makes a brief reappearance in imitation from mm. 113-118 climaxing on a G$^\#$ fully diminished chord. There is a tutti rest in m. 118 which leads to a low brass pick up into a closing figure from mm. 119-124 with an immediate key change to B$^b$ minor. There has not been an EEC yet, so this area cannot be a C-zone. This

---

140 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 190.
reaches a resolution in m. 124 with a PAC in B♭ major. The PAC in B♭ major is a possibility for an EEC, but the complication with this EEC is that it ends in B♭ major instead of the most stable key of S, A major.

A more reasonable location of the EEC is at m. 143 because of the PAC in F minor, but the EEC is still in the wrong key. (This idea is not based upon arguments from Mishra, Hurwitz, or Huband.) The reason for this location is because there is a clearly established PAC in this area for the first time in the S-zone. “The purpose of S within the exposition is to reach and stabilize a perfect authentic cadence in the new key.” Here the horn repeats the theme heard from the TM and TM, begins in B♭ major and ending in F minor. This reiteration of the theme from the TMB has often been considered the start of the second section or development. Because this theme occurs outside of the TMB, but still in the S-zone, this horn theme will be referred to as TM

Whether looking at binary, ternary, or sonata form, a PAC is expected to establish the new key and the end of a section. The cadence in m. 143 is convincing in that the motion has stopped, and new thematic ideas begin in the following measure (m. 144). The S-zone in this thesis will be from mm. 81-143. (The TMB is from mm. 81-112 and with transition-like material in mm. 113-119, to TM mm. 124-143. Example 3-13.)

Example 6-14: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, the S-zone

141 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 177.
Therefore, mm. 124-126 serve as transition-like material to TM\textsuperscript{1,2} at m. 126 in B\textsuperscript{b} major. At m.126, the horn begins in B\textsuperscript{b} major and ends in F minor. All winds, minus clarinets, drop out at m. 144 which further indicates a change to a new section. The PAC in m. 143 serves as an EEC. Since the EEC occurs right before the middle section begins, this indicates that there will not be a C-zone in the exposition (Example 6-14). As in the other movements, the EEC does not cadence in the appropriate key.
Example 6-15: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, mm. 122-143 (Horn in concert pitch)
The first section of the piece acts more like an exposition of sonata form rather than the first section of binary or ternary. Caplin argues the first section of a ternary will typically remain in tonic. If the first section does modulate, Caplin argues the first section will modulate back to close in the tonic key. Measure 143 cadences in F minor, so the first section does not resemble Caplin’s definition of the first section of ternary. Maybe this is why Huband argues that the form is ternary with sonata elements. Unfortunately, Huband (based on Ottoway) does not give a clear defense of why it is a ternary with sonata elements other than there is too much missing material in the third section to be able to call it a true recapitulation.

Harmonically, the first section does move from tonic to a different key. Since the first section moves from D minor and cadences on a PAC in F minor, Mishra’s argument for binary seems more logical. This would be a very large binary, but it is plausible nonetheless. Caplin states the goal of a binary form is to PAC in the new key, or an HC in the tonic key. By extending the first section to m. 143, Mishra’s argument fits Caplin’s definition. Since sonata form grew out of rounded binary, this seems to fit the first section of an enlarged rounded binary.

Unfortunately, the two distinct themes challenge Caplin’s definition of binary and Mishra’s theory of movement IV being set in binary. Caplin has does not list any situations with binary forms with multiple distinct themes in an exposition or recapitulation. However, Hepokoski and Darcy talk about instances where analysts label sonata forms as binary forms because of unsatisfactory recapitulations. These types of sonata forms were originally categorized as binary sonatas or polythematic binaries. The
idea behind these labels was that the recapitulation was too truncated to be considered
sonata form. This would lead to categorizing works as expanded binary instead of sonata
form.\textsuperscript{142}

Finally, sonata form seems to fit well for this first section. Many necessary
elements present include a P-zone, TR, S-zone, and EEC. Without the EEC, the function
of the P-zone would fail. Even though the PAC in F minor cadence does happen a little
late in the form, there still is a PAC. However, a closing material and an EEC in a
different key from the S-zone, the F minor EEC is a little surprising. This pattern has
been seen before in movements I and III. However, an EEC in a different key than the
rest of the S-zone is unusual. EEC’s can be substituted, but this is often rare. Hepokoski
and Darcy note that this S-zone deformation occurs in S-zones with wandering key
centers, which can mean:

\begin{quote}
The subsequent recapitulation is deeply problematized. Sometimes the
recapitulation corrects the expositional decay and produces a successful ESC in
the tonic key. In other pieces the recapitulation’s S succumbs to the same tonal
problem and produces a nonresolving recapitulation.\textsuperscript{143}
\end{quote}

If the EEC did not occur, Hepokoski and Darcy call the deformation a failed
exposition noting that the S-zone needs to establish a PAC in the newly established key.
This deferral of the EEC would not only cause the P to fail in the first section, but
globally, because this means there will be no ESC in the recapitulation. This indicates
that the movement will not achieve closure.\textsuperscript{144}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{142} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 366-368.
\textsuperscript{143} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 179.
\textsuperscript{144} Hepokoski and Darcy, \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, 179.
\end{footnotes}
Overall, the elements of sonata form seem to prevail over the elements of binary and ternary forms in the first section of the piece. The evidence favors sonata form because of the thematic implications (two distinct themes which is not common within binary forms), harmonic implications (modulating to new keys for new theme areas), and structural implications (TR, MC, and EEC). However, despite the strong evidence, a conclusion cannot be made until the second and third sections are analyzed.

**Part Two, Middle Section, or Development**

As in the previous section, since there are elements of sonata form present, the analysis of the middle section will use terminology from Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory. According to the Mishra, Huband, and Hurwitz, the middle section begins at m. 124 with the horn solo. However, as discussed previously, since there is a clear PAC in F minor in m. 143, the middle section for this thesis will begin at m. 144 with the string section.

The beginning thematic material in the middle section is drawn from themes found within the S-zone (Example 3-13; the example places violin I down one octave for ease of reading). Also provided is TM\(^1\) (the trumpet solo) and TM\(^2\) (woodwind and string melody being presented by the oboe) to help compare the S-zone TMB to the opening theme of the middle section. Because of rhythmic augmentation of TM\(^{1,2}\) in mm. 126-143, it has been left out, but TM\(^{1,2}\) does have material similar to the TMB.

The violin theme begins in C minor in m. 144 and has been labeled to show where the thematic material is borrowed from. The material begins with a clear borrowing of the P4/P5 motive (segment A). Segment A is followed by the rising and falling quarter notes
(segment B). The violin then repeats this B segment again with the addition of passing tones and an upward leap of a P5 followed by a downward P5 leap (not an A4 upward leap followed by a P5 downward leap). Segment C and D show the use of rhythmic motives from both trumpet and oboe themes to violin theme. Finally, from mm. 154-164, there is an almost-complete statement of the S-zone theme in C major. This is the last occurrence of material from the S-zone. Example 6-16 is marked with asterisks and brackets to show the S-zone material. Materials not marked are passing/connective figures.

Following the violin theme, there is a woodwind soli section. The flute begins with a familiar theme from the first movement (mm. 32-34). This was originally presented by the oboe (Example 6-17). This is the first of a several themes are presented in the middle section that appear from previous movements of the symphony. It is not uncommon for composers to bring back material from previous sections, but this technique is not necessarily discussed in either Hepokoski and Darcy’s or Caplin’s writings. This theme is passed from the flute, to the bassoon, and finally to the cello (Example 6-17).
Example 6-16: Comparisons of themes from the S-zone and S theme figures found in the middle section
Example 6-17: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. I, mm. 32-34 comparison to Mvt. IV, mm. 165-175

Example 6-18: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, mm.176-178

While the violin plays the background figure, the cellos and basses play a fragmented augmentation of $P^1$ in $E_b$ minor. The $E_b$ minor $P^1$ is then passed to the horns, woodwinds, back to the cellos and basses in C Phrygian, and then back to the horns in G Phrygian (Example 6-18).
Example 6-19: Symphony No.5, Mvt. IV, mm. 185-189 P¹

The violin background figure then passes down through a Db major scale into the lower strings, and the passage is transformed into Db chordal arpeggiation. At m. 212, there is elaborated version of P¹ now beginning in Db major instead of a minor key (Example 6-20). After P¹, there is a small quote in the celli and basses at m. 231 playing a similar background to the opening of movement III (Example 6-21).

Example 6-20: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV mm. 206-224
Example 6-21: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. III, mm. 2-5 comparison with Mvt. IV, mm. 231-234

The background arpeggiation is passed up to violin I, and the background motive is transformed again. As the violin the climbs higher at m. 231, the motive is passed to the harp at m. 239 and continues to rise. Measures 239-246 begin the retransition to the third section in m. 247. In m. 246, a secondary dominant 9th (b5) of V, in D minor, resolves to $i_4^6$ to begin the new section. This is not normative because, regardless of the form, the second section would be more likely to have a dominant chord of D minor resolving to root position D minor to begin the third section.
Example 6-22: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, mm. 246-247

The second section has qualities that are not typical of a development in sonata form. For example, themes from previous movements provide developmental material. Themes from the other movements are reused as well to provide unity to the work. There are a couple deformations. The first is there is no dominant lock. The second is that there is a deformation of a secondary dominant of V, in D minor, resolving to i\textsuperscript{6} at the beginning of the new section will be discussed more in the third section.

Caplin notes that a middle section of a ternary does not usually contain previous material unless it is presented in the beginning of the second section with a mode alteration. While the second section of ternary does change key, it is not as tonally
migratory as a sonata form development. Binary forms will start tonally migratory and develop previous material at the beginning of the second section. However, rounded binary is plausible because the middle section of a rounded binary will be larger, and the third section would resemble more of a return of A’. However, the section seems to carry more sonata form characteristics than ternary or binary characteristics.

Coda, Third Section with Coda, Recapitulation with Coda

The beginning of the third section has no prolonged satisfactory return to tonic. In fact, after m. 262, the third section begins to modulate again (Example 6-23). According to Hepokoski and Darcy, if the recapitulation begins over a dominant pedal, the section starts open and will reach a tonic resolution after TR at the S-zone. Hepokoski and Darcy argue that when this type of recapitulation occurs, a PAC in tonic is needed. This PAC can occur within the S-zone. However, all the previous TR and S-zone themes and MC are left out. The recapitulation becomes tonally migratory after m. 262 to reach a PAC in D. Since only P^1 is brought back in the recapitulation, an S-zone cannot be established for the normative ESC, the tonal goal of the first section’s P-zone. To adjust for the lack of S-zone, the coda provides a necessary PAC in D major in m. 324 (instead of D minor) which acts as a substitute for the ESC. The beginning of the recapitulation then almost functions as the absent dominant prolongation from the end of the development.

---

Example 6-23: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV, mm. 247-end

Mishra’s argument for the whole third section as coda seems unlikely. A coda will usually be present after a restatement of the first section, including the cadence, in full which means binary is unlikely to be plausible. The third section failed to make a stable return to D minor. Therefore, the entire third section, mm. 247-end, cannot be a coda. For binary to conceivably work, m. 247 would need to be considered part of the second section for the return to D minor with \( P^1 \), and m. 324 to the end would need to be a coda. By moving the end of section two to m. 247, this makes rounded binary a plausible conclusion. In addition, the exclusive use of \( P^1 \) would then fit the rounded binary paradigm. However, as mentioned before, Hepokoski and Darcy note that a larger binary or binary where often applied to sonata forms with unsatisfactory recapitulations. For example, if the recapitulation was too truncated or if the recapitulation did not return to tonic in the P-zone, but the tonal requirements were present, then the movements were identified as either binary or rounded binary.\(^{146}\)

Caplin’s definition of a large ternary defines the third section a return of the first with some ornamentation. The last section is unlikely as a third section of a ternary

---

\(^{146}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 366-368.
structure because it is unlikely for the third section of a ternary to be as tonally migratory as this section (look back at 6-23).

**Concluding Movement IV Remarks**

The finale is almost certainly set in a sonata form. The first section clearly has the essential components for a sonata form with a two-part exposition. In the exposition, the P-zone is established from beginning to m. 30, followed by a TR from mm. 31-79, MC in m. 80, S-zone from mm. 81-142, and an EEC in m.143; the development takes place from mm. 144-246; truncated recapitulation from mm. 247-323 and PAC in m. 324 (possible ESC substitute); and coda from mm. 324-end.

Thematically the movement does not seem to match the definition of either binary or rounded binary because as stated in previous chapters, binaries do not typically have multiple themes. Because sonata form and rounded binary are harmonically the same, the key changes are not an issue. However, since the movement contains many sonata form characteristics in the exposition, then the question arises of why not to call it sonata form.

Huband’s ternary structure seems unlikely due to the first and middle sections not matching Caplin’s definition of ternary. If the first section of a ternary modulates, it will return to the tonic key before moving to the second section. The second section is also too tonally modulatory for the middle section of a ternary. The main argument Huband and Ottaway provide is that the recapitulation is truncated, so the final movement is too far removed to be considered sonata form.

However, using Hepokoski and Darcy’s model for sonata form has provided a more plausible solution for the final movement being in sonata from with a truncated
recapitulation and coda. Because Hepokoski and Darcy’s view of sonata form is “neither set ‘textbook’ rules nor fixed scheme [but] a constellation of normative and optional procedures that are flexible in their realization,”147 this makes the conclusion possible, and more likely, for the finale to be sonata form.

Example 6-24: Symphony No. 5, Mvt. IV formal structure based off Hepokoski and Darcy model

---

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

As demonstrated in this thesis, Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata form theories are applicable to Shostakovich Symphony No.5. Hurwitz argues that Shostakovich’s goal was to write in a more traditional setting. This is why three of the four movements are set in various types of sonata form (arch-sonata, type 2 sonata form, and sonata form with a truncated recapitulation) and a scherzo and trio.

The forms of movements I (sonata form) and II (scherzo/trio) are closer to traditional forms. Both these movements are very clear in their form, with few deformations. Their key relationships are more unusual than those noted by Hepokoski and Darcy, but that is because Symphony No. 5 is a twentieth-century work. For example, the C-zone in the exposition of movement I, III, and IV all changed to unexpected key areas. Movement I starts in D minor moves to E♭ minor, but the C-zone modulates to B minor; movement III starts in F♯ minor and moves to B minor, but the C-zone modulates to C minor; and movement IV starts in D minor and moves to A major, but the C-zone modulates to F minor. Movement II’s third section starts the subordinate theme in C♯ minor instead of C minor.

Despite some unusual key relationships, movements I, III and IV are two-part exposition sonata form. Movement IV is not as clear, but the movement did share common deformations found in the previous movements such as the EEC and C-zone being in the wrong keys. Each of the movements had the subtle features of sonata form such as an MC, EEC, and ESC. These deformations were more apparent with the EEC and ESC in each sonata form movement. Movement I was an example of the EEC
succeeding, but the ESC failing; movement III was an example of both EEC and ESC failing and needing to find alternative ways to return to the tonic key; and movement IV is an example of the EEC failing, but the ESC succeeding.

The deformations in movements III and IV did cause an analytical challenge. For example, movement III is a sonata without a development, or Hepokoski and Darcy’s Type 2 Sonata. This is a procedure that can be found in past works by Beethoven, such as the *Quartet in C-sharp Minor mvt. II, op 131* and *Piano Sonata No.5, mvt. III.* The other more unique variant of sonata form occurs in movement IV. The fourth movement’s recapitulation has been largely truncated. This technique has been used by not only Shostakovich, but by Tchaikovsky as well. However, these deformations do raise interesting questions such as how much material is needed before a large rounded binary becomes a sonata form (as seen in movement III)? Also, how much material is needed or not needed before sonata form becomes a ternary (as seen in movement IV)?

As mentioned in Chapter 1, because there is tension between traditional forms and the styles of composition within the twentieth century. Straus argues that in the twentieth century, “[sonata] form is then challenged, undermined, and held in tension with new kinds of musical organization.” (This may provide insight to why the C-zone changes keys in each of the movements.) Using Hepokoski and Darcy’s two part exposition sonata theory helps to provide clearer conclusions because their theory is “neither a set

---

148 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 349.
149 Huband, *The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich*, 47.
150 Straus, *Remaking the Past*, 98.
‘textbook’ rules nor a fixed scheme. Rather, it is a constellation of normative and optional procedures that are flexible in their realization.”

The successful results from using Hepokoski and Darcy’s sonata theory with Symphony No.5 provide future analysis opportunities. It would be interesting to see if the results can be replicated in other Shostakovich symphonies. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Symphony No.4 was postponed to a later date because the symphony was not set in traditional forms and pessimistic. It would be interesting to compare Symphony No.4 to Symphony No.5 to see if Symphony No.4 was truly not set in traditional forms: sonata form, dance forms, etc. The results may demonstrate why Symphony No.4 was postponed, but why Symphony No.5 was written in Symphony No.4’s place. As stated in Chapter 1, Shostakovich understood the importance Symphony No.5 held for his future as a composer. Shostakovich cancelled the premiere Symphony No. 4 after the criticism of his opera Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District in the Pravda review, and wrote Symphony No.5, composed in a more traditionalist manner, to appease Stalin and the Soviet government officials.

There were some differences between Symphony No.4 and Symphony No.5 such as a pessimistic finale in Symphony No.4 as opposed to the major, ff ending of Symphony No.5.

I finished the Fifth Symphony in major and fortissimo…It would be interesting to know what would have been said if I finished pianissimo and in the minor?\textsuperscript{154} – Dmitri Shostakovich on the finale of Symphony No. 5

---

\textsuperscript{151} Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 15.
\textsuperscript{152} Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
\textsuperscript{153} Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
\textsuperscript{154} Wilson, Shostakovich, 152.
In addition, Mishra also argues *Symphony No.4* did not conform to formalist or traditional styles of Social Realism. Therefore, *Symphony No.4* was not premiered until much later in his life (1961).\footnote{Mishra, A Shostakovich companion, 93.} The next step would be to see if the results would show structural deformations that may have made the form less traditional and not a matter of content of *Symphony No.4* and *Symphony No.5*’s finale.
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APPENDIX: ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS FROM HEPOKOSKI/DARCY AND CAPLIN

1. C – Closing theme (C¹, C¹.¹, C² all designate themes within the C-zone. If the number contains a decimal, this indicates the theme is varied either melodically, harmonically, and/or thematically)

2. Caesura fill of the juggernaut type – loud section where an MC occurs, followed by a quiet S

3. CF – Caesura Fill (lightly fill texture within the MC)

4. Closing section – the last theme in a scherzo/trio form’s exposition and recapitulation

5. C-zone – Closing theme zone (Material following the EEC)

6. EEC – Essential Expositional Closure (first PAC that occurs within S in the exposition)

7. ESC – Essential Structural Closure (first PAC that occurs within S in the recapitulation)

8. HC – Half Cadence (a cadence that ends on V)

9. IAC – Imperfect Authentic Cadence (A dominant to tonic cadence that does not follow the construction of a PAC)

10. Main-theme function – first theme within a scherzo/trio form’s exposition and recapitulation

11. MC – Medial Caesura (built are a dominant and usually is a break in the music)

12. P – Primary theme (P¹, P¹.¹, P² all designate themes within the P-zone. If the number contains a decimal, this indicates the theme is varied either melodically, harmonically, and/or thematically)

13. PAC – Perfect Authentic Cadence (A cadence from a root position V to I or i with the root in both the lowest and uppermost voice on the tonic chord)

14. P-zone – Primary theme zone (First theme area)
15. S – Secondary theme ($S^1$, $S^{1.1}$, $S^2$ all designate themes within the S-zone. If the number contains a decimal, this indicates the theme is varied either melodically, harmonically, and/or thematically)

16. Subordinate-theme function – all themes following a PAC after the main-theme function within a scherzo/trio form’s exposition and recapitulation

17. S-zone – Secondary theme zone (Follows an MC)

18. TMB – Trimodular Block (multimodular structure in the exposition or the recapitulation, always associated with a double MC)

19. TR – Transition (follows P, and TR is an energy-building section that leads to the MC)