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Abstract

An examination of the formal designs of the three movements that comprise Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in B-Flat Major, K. 450, this thesis, along with a performance of the work (April 16, 2016), completes my Honors Project in the Macalester College Music Department. Drawing connections with standard musical forms that had been developed by the late eighteenth century, the formal analysis of K. 450, through a hermeneutic approach, offers a way of understanding the formal aspects of the three concerto movements. Particularly, it reveals that this concerto simultaneously presents the distinction of an individual in the societal context and the emergence of individual consciousness within a collective structure, two of the most enduring ideologies of the Enlightenment. Manifested in the musical sense, these two concepts further provide the concerto with formal stability.
Part 1: Introduction

The mid-twentieth century saw the long overdue vindication of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, whose work, bewailed Donald Francis Tovey, had “been treated with neglect and lack of intelligent observation.”1 Since then, musicologists have been reexamining Mozart’s music — with an “ear for fine detail” and a “grasp of musical works as definite wholes”2 — especially in the genres of opera and concerto, in which his music greatly departed from precedent. Regarding the latter, a fair amount of work has been devoted to the twenty-eight concertos for (solo) piano and orchestra, an instrumentation that occupies nearly three-fifths of Mozart’s entire concerto oeuvre. And among the piano concertos,3 musicologists have observed and agreed on certain structural features that never change. For example, all twenty-eight concertos have three movements, with the first almost always beginning with an orchestral prelude, the second being nearly always an andante, and the third generally a rondo.4 Over the structure of each individual movement, however, there are disagreements.

1 Donald Francis Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis, Volume III: Concertos (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), 3. According to Grayson, Mozart: Piano Concertos No. 20 in D minor, K. 466 and No. 21 in C major, K. 467, 11, the introduction to this volume is a reprint of Tovey’s 1903 essay “The Classical Concerto.”

2 Ibid.

3 For readability purposes, I will often prefer the colloquial term “piano concerto” (pl. “piano concertos”) to the more accurate term “concerto for piano and orchestra” (pl. “concertos for piano and orchestra”).

In terms of the concerto in question — Mozart’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in B-Flat Major, K. 450 — the formal plan of its first movement is rather complicated and controversial, whereas those of the other two movements are more clearly understood. Through formal analyses of the three movements, I shall observe implications behind the musical forms. In other words, I am interested in trying to answer what the form contributes to the expression of the music. Specifically, I will take a hermeneutic approach — which is a process of understanding music through a particular interpretation that may or may not be relative to the composer’s own intention, should there be one — to explain how forms effect the centered subjectivity of music.

Before moving on, however, it is crucial to point out that this thesis only offers one way of contextualizing the formal aspects of K. 450, using an approach that falls into the category of “social models” as observed by David Grayson. Without a historical grounding, he argues, “[these metaphorical models] are merely a way of understating the music; they are not what the music is, nor even what it is about.”

---


6 Ibid., 7.
Part 2: Movement I, Allegro

In terms of the first movement of K. 450, or any first movement of a late-eighteenth-century concerto, scholars generally agree that it is in neither ritornello form nor sonata form, but is clearly derived from both; consequently, they use the term “concerto form” to refer to this complex musical form. Various theories have been proposed to understand the interrelationship between the two constituent forms (ritornello form and sonata form) since the late eighteenth century. Therefore, it will seem redundant and pointless to reiterate a theory or propose yet another one, for many possible ones have been considered over the years and comparisons among them have been drawn as well. Instead, I shall propose a hermeneutic understanding of the irregularities of the form. To this end, I will begin this part with brief definitions of ritornello and sonata forms, then lay out the formal plan of this specific movement with comparisons to both forms, and finally attempt to understand its formal irregularities.

2.1 Ritornello Form and Sonata Form

Among the first to define ritornello form, Manfred Bukofzer observed that it is a quintessential manifestation of his principle of continuous expansion, which contains a series of reiterations of a motive followed by its continuous expansion in different keys, as demonstrated in Table 1.\(^7\) In the same source, he lists many more examples of the

---

\(^7\) Manfred F. Bukofzer, *Music in the Baroque Era: From Monteverdi to Bach* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1947), 359-360. Table 1 is adopted from Jenson, op. cit. no. 13.
principle and notes that the unique feature of ritornello form is “[t]he musical
differentiation of orchestra and solo.”

That is, at least in the Baroque era, the ritornello is
usually played by the orchestra whereas the expansions are often initiated by the soloist.
This point — the alternation of instrumental forces — is somewhat outdated when
applied in the context of late eighteenth-century music and will thus be disregarded in the
following discussion. It is important to note, however, that the ritornello, or the tutti
material, typically appears in the home key for the first and the last iteration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>X’</th>
<th>A’</th>
<th>X’’</th>
<th>…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clearly stated</td>
<td>continuous expansion of</td>
<td>motive</td>
<td>a new continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motive</td>
<td>the motive in a</td>
<td>restated</td>
<td>expansion of the motive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different key</td>
<td>in a new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Baroque principle of continuous expansion (Bukofzer, 1947)

Sonata form, on the other hand, has been accompanied with much more personal
interpretations, be they philosophical or dramatic. At this point, rather than biasing the
discussion with any of them, I shall state the basic formulaic design of sonata form
summarized by James Webster, as demonstrated in Table 2. Sonata form usually consists
of three major sections, the exposition, the development and the recapitulation, which
may be preceded by an introduction and followed by a coda. For the purpose of what

---

8 Ibid., 227-228.

music/26197.
follows, it is essential to note that the exposition must present a modulation, usually with a different theme group compared to the opening one, and the recapitulation must restore the harmonic deviation to the home key.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme Group 1</td>
<td>T. G. 2</td>
<td>in the dominant (mediant) key for major (minor) mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme Group 1</td>
<td>T. G. 2</td>
<td>in the dominant (mediant) key for major (minor) mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Classic sonata form (Webster)
### 2.2 Formal Design of Movement I

As demonstrated in Table 3, a modified version of the form diagram summarized by Arthur Hutchings, the first movement of K. 450 is formally influenced by both ritornello form and sonata form. In the table, uppercase letters represent tutti themes, and lowercase ones, solo themes. Roman numerals refer to larger sections, only three of which — Sections I, III and VI (excluding the cadenza) — are played solely by the orchestra: hence the necessity of weakening the alternation between the orchestra and the soloist as one of the characteristics of ritornello form. Since the movement possesses a set of recurring themes as well as a modulation to the dominant key followed by a return to the home key, it is clearly a hybrid of ritornello and sonata forms. The sections are thus labeled accordingly to avoid bias toward either interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D(^1)</th>
<th>D(^2)</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B(\text{b})</th>
<th>1-58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>fermata sospesa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>bravura</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>bravura</td>
<td>B(\text{b}) (\rightarrow) F</td>
<td>59-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D(^2)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>137-153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>(E) accompanied bravura</td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>154-196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>x’</td>
<td>bravura</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>bravura</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>bravura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>D(^1)</td>
<td>D(^2)</td>
<td>cadenza (D(^2) &amp; C)</td>
<td>D(^2)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B(\text{b})</td>
<td>284-308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11 Here, “tutti themes” refer to the ones first introduced by the orchestra, namely Themes A to E; even if the soloist later has a subset of them, the labels are still in uppercase.
In comparison to sonata form, Section I, the first orchestral tutti, lacks the essential harmonic motion that prepares the single-most important feature of sonata form as noted above. However, the modulation in Section II and the restoration of the home key in Section V evidently render the concerto procedure a subspecies of sonata form. Vis-à-vis ritornello form, on the other hand, the lack of an independent section of tutti material between Sections IV and V is solely responsible for creating a difficulty in identifying this movement as one in ritornello form. In a recent thesis, the author proposes that Section V may simultaneously serve as a ritornello and the recapitulation, i.e., a recapitulation of both the orchestral prelude and the sonata exposition. This rather innovative theory may have provided an explanation to the problem, but the fact that the opening orchestral prelude — or, for the sake of argument, the ritornello — is never repeated in its entirety makes it extremely difficult to hear Section V as a ritornello. For the perception of a ritornello is never established in the movement: Section III begins with Theme B instead of Theme A. In summary, this movement possesses salient features of both forms but does not strictly follow either of the compositional procedures.

---


2.3 How to Make Sense of the Concerto Form

Similar to the argument made by Carl Dahlhaus in his analyses of Ludwig van Beethoven’s finales of Quartet in E-Flat Major, Op. 127, and Quartet in C-Sharp Minor, Op. 131\(^\text{14}\) — two examples of deviant sonata-rondos\(^\text{15}\) — perhaps the formal irregularities found in the first movement of K. 450 are of importance to the concerto form itself as a “selling point.” If the “ambiguity” found in the sonata-rondo is part of its aesthetic point, then the concerto form, as a hybrid of sonata and ritornello forms, is only more ambiguous. In the case of Beethoven, Dahlhaus reads the dual function of the sonata-rondo as “one of the peculiarities of the late works that Beethoven was challenged by a form, the point of which lies in ambiguity, to undertake experiments that led him to extreme consequences.”\(^\text{16}\)

In the case of Mozart, the formal ambiguity is presented in a more transparent way, thus creating an interpretative complexity, for the five themes in the ritornello appear at different times throughout the movement, and each time they reappear in a different key area. It is not difficult to explain the shuffling of the fragmentations of themes: Mozart must have been aware of the dullness of repetition, as the concerto form threatens to present the same material three times in the course of a


\(^{15}\) The sonata rondo — a compositional technique rather than a form, according to Dahlhaus, “differs from true sonata form by inserting a ritornello between the exposition and the development, and turning the coda into a closing ritornello.” See Ibid. 9.

\(^{16}\) Dahlhaus, op. cit., 233.
movement: in the orchestral prelude, in the soloist entrance, and in the reprise section.\(^{17}\) It therefore remains to explain the formal irregularities, which, unlike the formal ambiguity — an \textit{a posteriori} perception of the form — stems from the form itself. To tackle this task, I will for a moment depart from the examination of formal design and begin from a different viewpoint with a thematic observation.

Recognized by Simon Keefe as the first of Mozart’s mature twelve “grand” concertos (K. 449-K. 503),\(^ {18}\) K. 450 has a significant amount of opening orchestral material reiterated in the recapitulation of its first movement, namely Themes A, B and C. As a result, Section I and Sections V and VI create a stylistic balance that comprises “equilibrium among grandeur, brilliance and intimacy”\(^ {19}\) found in this movement. And the reiteration of Theme A in Section V is accomplished by both the soloist and the orchestra, which is rather important because of the collaboration between the two parties. Keefe takes this observation even further in another source and argues that this “three-way dialogue [among piano, strings and woodwinds]” reinforces “the air of grateful cooperation.”\(^ {20}\) He continues by pointing out that the interactive nature of the concerto is parallel to the interactions between dramatic characters in Classical plays,\(^ {21}\) a statement similar to the one made by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in the 1820s:

\(^{17}\) Hutchings, op. cit., 91.


\(^{19}\) Ibid., 49.


\(^{21}\) Ibid.
Mozart is the great master of instrumentation … [T]he controlled passing from one class of instruments to another has often struck me as a dramatic interplay of dialogue of the most varied kind … [W]hat arises out of all of this is a truly captivating colloquy, made up of sounds, with beginnings, progressions, and completions.22

This quotation illustrates Hegel’s reaction to Mozart’s symphonies, but it applies to the concerto movement well, if not better, given the intentional separation of the soloist and the orchestra. It is reasonable to suggest that the movement envelops a philosophy analogous in the musical sense to the above ideas, which, in a highly colloquial form, could be Hegel’s dialectic. For his belief in connectedness and the interrelation of all aspects is manifested in the quoted passage as well as the music.

Particularly, Hegel’s dialectical model of subjectivity as the interpenetration between subject and object is quite applicable to revealing the implications behind the formal structure of the first movement of K. 450. In line with this theory, two principal features of a Classical-era concerto have been examined, namely the instrumentation from ritornello form’s side (soloist versus orchestra) and the tonal procedure from sonata form’s side (tonic key versus the other key area).

In her critique of the second movement of Mozart’s Piano Concerto in G Major, K. 453, Susan McClary proposes an allegory in which the soloist represents the bourgeois individual and the orchestra, the social collective. The synthesis is achieved by the

Classical tonality. And the contrast between the soloist and the orchestra thus mirrors “the
dramatic tensions between individual and society, surely one of the major problematics of
the emerging middle class.”\textsuperscript{23} On the other hand, the perception of sonata form as a
dialectic process has been so prevalent among musicologists since the nineteenth century
that it almost becomes a cliché: the conflict between the tonic key, or the thesis, and the
other key area, the antithesis, which is manifested and intensified in the development
section, is resolved to the synthesis in the recapitulation.\textsuperscript{24}

From the perspective of themes presented in the first movement of K. 450, I
propose that the soloist’s material — namely Themes $x$ and $y$ — can be seen as Self, and
the orchestra’s tutti material — namely Themes $A$ to $E$ — can be seen as Other. And it is
precisely the irregularities of the concerto form that facilitate the expression of the
centered subjectivity of Self. A closer examination of thematic materials in the following
subpart is thus necessary.

\textbf{2.4 Thematic Materials in Movement I}

In the orchestral prelude to the first movement of K. 450, or Section I, Mozart
presents five tutti themes, all of which are in the tonic key. The movement begins with a
conversation between woodwind and strings. The former iterates the interval of a minor
third between the mediant and the dominant with chromatic passing tones, while the latter

\textsuperscript{23} Susan McClary, “A Musical Dialectic from the Enlightenment: Mozart’s Piano Concerto in G

\textsuperscript{24} Leonard B. Meyer, \textit{Style and Music: Theory, History, and Ideology} (Chicago: University of
arpeggiates the tonic triad and cadences on the dominant harmony. A similar conversation leads the music back to the tonic: Theme A (Example 1), a quintessentially Classical theme, has a periodic phrase structure.

Several successive metrically shifted fragments of the theme played by the joined forces drive the music to a new theme. Theme B (Example 2), with a sentence structure that shifts toward the dominant harmony, contrasts with its precursor mainly in terms of dynamics. In fact, it is built almost entirely on the harmonic plan of Theme A, with the exception of one secondary dominant chord. Motivically, it manifests reminiscences of the previous theme with sixteenth-note triplets (written-out appoggiaturas), triadic arpeggiations, and chromatic passing tones.

Theme C (Example 3), again, is composed loosely according to the progression of Theme A. It is the newly introduced rhythmic features — offbeat beginning and syncopation — that disguise the correspondence between the two themes. Having been announced by the strings, Theme C, with underneath elaboration and slight reharmonization of itself, is restated by the woodwind, which then toss the melody back to the strings.

Theme D is divided into two parts, D\(^1\) and D\(^2\) (Example 4). It begins with a conspicuous crescendo and a tonic pedal that foreshadow the end of the orchestral prelude. The music ascends to an octave above through D\(^1\), a three-measure sequence, and then descends back to the origin through another one, D\(^2\). The two parts are united by the interval of a third, which then relates the current theme back to Theme A; both starting at the tonic and outlining a third above, D\(^1\) and D\(^2\) differ primarily in their
directions and dynamics. The two parts of Theme D are consecutive in Section I and the pre-cadenza portion of Section VI, but only D$^2$ is in Section III and the post-cadenza portion of Section VI; hence the necessity of separating the two parts.

Finally, Theme E (Example 5), a pure cadential figure, is a conversation between woodwind and strings, just like the opening theme. And similarly the two groups join together at the end of Theme E, this time to hand the music to the soloist. Each of the later themes, as discussed above, is related to Theme A in some aspect, whether it be in terms of harmonic progression, motivic expansion, or instrumentation.

“Slipping in” on the last note of the closing theme from the orchestral prelude, the soloist begins Section II with an improvisatory prolongation of the tonic harmony (fermata sospesa), rather than at once with a reiteration of the first theme. Although the passage has no harmonic function, for it connects the end of Theme E with the beginning of Theme A, both of which have a tonic function, it illustrates the brilliance of the solo part, as if the pianist was taking a bow.$^{25}$ The soloist’s first theme, Theme x (Example 6), begins in G minor, “a key unsympathetic to the mood of the movement,” observes Girdlestone.$^{26}$ The expressive leap of an octave and the sorrowful intervals of a minor second and a diminished seventh bring out the soul of the soloist, which is also the only manifestation of Mozart’s true voice in this entire composition. Before the listener has a chance to process this emotional candor, however, the soloist soon continues with more decorative passagework that moves along the music as per the harmonic regime of sonata

---

$^{25}$ Girdlestone, op. cit., 198.

$^{26}$ Ibid., 199.
form. The abundant use of half steps in this theme is reminiscent of the opening theme of the orchestra, rendering it insubstantial on the surface. However, a close comparison of measures 8 and 90 (Example 7) illustrates that the soloist takes a rather indifferent gesture from the orchestra and turns it into a main part of its own theme.

Defining the dominant key area, Theme y (Example 8), in the same manner as its predecessor, contains limited thematic material followed by an even longer bravura passage. Thematiclly governed by the interval of a third, it is written in the “poetic” style like the soloist’s first theme and yet renders itself distinct from Theme x through its thematic simplicity and isolated phrases. Following the soloist’s cadential trill, the orchestra returns with Themes B, D\(^2\) and E, cementing the dominant key area that had been introduced and defined by the soloist.

Section IV, resembling the development section of sonata form, follows the same pattern: the soloist, rather than developing the themes, takes on the final orchestral phrase and spills out yet another bravura passage full of scalar melodies. As a fantasia development in the style of Johann Schobert, this section, observes Hermann Abert, emphasizes the “harmonic writing … [which has] a constant state of flux, generally driving the same idea unaltered through the most varied keys.”\(^{27}\) He continues, “No attempt is made to gravitate towards a particular goal: instead, [section] as such is all-important here, with the motifs that are carried along by it … serving only to strengthen the work’s harmonic backbone.”\(^{28}\)

---


\(^{28}\) Ibid.
Theme x’ (Example 9) in Section V, labeled differently from its counterpart in Section II by Hutchings, is actually no more than a thematic variation of Theme x. If anything, the new theme possesses a much stronger sense of longing through more leaps and even newly added musical sighs. Harmonically, it rigidly follows Theme x so as to create a temporary tonicization of the supertonic of the home key that functions predominantly. Here Mozart utilizes the symmetrical structure of the sonata procedure to highlight the melodic changes in Theme x’ compared to its counterpart, but then ingeniously brings out the internal connections between the two. It is the formal aspects of sonata form, a Classical form characterized by Charles Rosen as “the symmetrical resolution of opposing forces,”29 that support the subjectivity of the musical content, or specifically, that of the soloist’s material.

Example 1: K. 450, Allegro, Theme A, mm. 1-8

30 The score examples throughout this thesis are taken from Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Willy Giefer, piano reduction, *Concerto in B-flat major for Piano and Orchestra* (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1991).
Example 2: K. 450, Allegro, Theme B, mm. 14-21

Example 3: K. 450, Allegro, Theme C, mm. 26-33
Example 4: K. 450, Allegro, Theme D, mm. 41-53
Example 5: K. 450, Allegro, Theme E, mm. 53-59

Example 6: K. 450, Allegro, Theme x, mm. 87-96
Example 7: K. 450, Allegro, comparison between m. 90 and m. 8

Example 8: K. 450, Allegro, Theme y, mm. 103-107
Example 9: K. 450, Allegro, Theme x’, mm. 216-224
2.5 Formal Irregularities Revisited

To recapitulate, the formal irregularities of the first movement of K. 450 lie in the following two areas. First, the orchestra fails to modulate to the dominant key in Section I, which is abnormal for sonata form, although not for a ritornello. And second, there is no orchestral interlude between Sections IV and V (except for mm. 197-198 shown in Example 10), which is abnormal for ritornello form.

Through the discussion in the previous subpart, it is clear that the Other, represented by the orchestral material, plays the dominant role in its conversation with Self, or the soloist’s material. For Themes A to E, all related to the opening theme, evidently have had a significant influence on the later Themes x and y, mainly motivically. The fact that Section I never has a modulation confirms Other’s self-containedness: this anomaly from sonata form marks Other as an organic whole through harmonic consistency, which then provides a plain canvas on which the centered subjectivity of Self is progressively painted.

Although the lack of thematic material in the fermata sospesa from Section II might set a submissive tone for its forthcoming conversation with the orchestra, the soloist manages to modulate to the expected key area through its first theme. Moreover, later in the same section, it substitutes its own second theme (Theme y) for the orchestra’s Theme C, exuding confidence. And most importantly, it is Theme x’ in Section V that brings the sonata aspect into this movement: this is where the recapitulation starts to follow the exposition rather than the orchestral prelude. Harmonically, both Theme x’ and
Its counterpart in the exposition, Theme x, serve as the executor of the tonal departure introduced by the orchestra. In other words, regarding the sonata procedure of the movement, the Self’s success to follow the normative formal design is in stark contrast to the anomaly introduced by the Other; and this comparison manifested through the form consolidates Self’s disciplined personality.

As for the anomaly from ritornello form — the absence of a ritornello between Sections IV and V — instead of looking for the missing ritornello that the orchestra should have played, I suggest a different angle: the soloist should be responsible for this “mistake.” That is, the ritornello at the beginning of Section V is thwarted by the soloist, whose entrance should have been after at least one complete iteration of an orchestral theme. This theory accords with the composer’s intention, as the soloist comes in more than a measure and a half after the orchestra’s entrance, as demonstrated by Example 10. An explanation can be thusly inferred.

Up to this point, the soloist has been following the orchestra, both in terms of harmonic development and thematic material. Through the abundance of highly virtuosic passagework found in the piano part, the soloist has accumulated unstoppable momentum, confidently presenting the synthesis that is the sharing of Theme A between the two parties. The lack of a ritornello, therefore, formally signals the culmination of the ongoing character formation of Self that starts from the soloist’s very first note. On the other hand, it also marks the last stroke of the portrait of Self, as the sonata aspect of this movement will from this point on dictate its musical content; after all, this is a work that
largely resembles a Classical-era sonata, in which “everything is resolved, all loose ends are tied up, and the work rounded off.”

Rooted in the thematic and harmonic design, the centered subjectivity of the Self, as discussed above, is cultivated through the formal procedure of the movement. The irregularities from the traditional forms in that procedure are certainly not included for the sake of compositional innovations. On the contrary, they serve as catalysts for the development of the subjectivity of music. In this view, an instrumental piece as it is, the first movement of K. 450 expresses and consequently possesses a spiritual content. To put it into the historical context of the late eighteenth century, the painstaking portrait of subjectivity of the Self through form in this movement parallels to the idea of individuality within a societal context.

---

Example 10: K. 450, Allegro, Theme A recapitulated in Section V, mm. 196-224
Part 3: Movement II, Andante

Compared to the opening Allegro, the second movement of K. 450, a set of theme and variations, follows a rigid formal plan, exhibiting a sense of mechanicalness that is in stark contrast to the inwardness associated with the chorale-like texture and the sarabande-like rhythm of the theme (Example 11). Structurally, the movement consists of two variations and a coda to the theme, which has a modulating periodic phrase structure with two eight-measure strophes. Each strophe is iterated twice by contrasting instrumental forces within the theme or a variation, creating a double variation; the entire movement thus presents a constant antiphonal exchange between the orchestra and the soloist.

As shown by the formal diagram of this movement (Table 4), both the Theme and Variation I begin with the statement of the theme by the orchestra. Variation II, however, with the soloist beginning and the orchestra answering, could initially suggest a shift of dominance toward the former, should the obligato woodwind and pizzicato strings not dramatically enter at the second strophe: at this point, the newly added instruments along with their characteristic timbre outshine the significance of this transitional event. Thus ironically, the obvious Self-Other relationship embedded in the formal design of this movement — following the thoughts from the previous part — fails to resurface under the extreme formal regularity, or as Stephen Rumph puts it, “Mechanism eventually

\[32\] A double variation is a variation in which the repeats of the two halves of the theme are themselves varied. See Tovey, op. cit., 32.
overcomes subjectivity, as the repeating phrases dismantle the surface division between instrumental ‘actors.’”

It is crucial to observe, nonetheless, that the nature of the formal design of this movement exhibits the emergence of self-consciousness from the soloist’s side, mainly through the use of chromaticism. In the Theme, the soloist’s material is no more than an embellishment of the orchestra’s statements: they almost share the exact harmonic progression. The most noticeable discrepancy occurs on the last beat of m. 3 and that of m. 11 (see Example 11), with the orchestra experimenting with a chromatic dominant-functional chord and the soloist using a diatonic predominantly-functional one. This adventurousness in the Other plants a seed in the later development of the individual consciousness of the Self.

Soon enough, in Variation I, the soloist introduces strikingly chromatic material. Although most of the chromaticism in this variation merely consists of non-chord tones that do not contribute to the overall harmony, its abundance brings out the soloist’s voice. Indeed, having found its own position in the collective effort that is this movement, the soloist starts Variation II with written-out rubato. Moreover, a comparison between the first subphrase of the first strophe in Variation II and its counterpart in the Theme shows that, at this point, the chromaticism has become part of the soloist’s identity, serving as a device for expression (Example 12). Later, in the same variation, the soloist’s characteristic trait is so convincing that the orchestra also includes chromatic passing.

---

tones in its part; and being more innovative and self-aware, the soloist is now trilling through the passage with even more dissonance (Example 13).

It should be well noted that the soloist never uses the same chord that the orchestra introduced in m. 3 to harmonize its part, at least not in an explicit way, which is to some degree even more important than the development of its own voice: the soloist’s self-awareness was triggered — not forced upon — by the orchestra. In other words, Self always possesses its centered subjectivity; it is the experience of being within a collective structure that makes the latent subjectivity gradually emerge through the four sections of the movement. The Coda — an optional “tail” to the set of theme variations — as the last section is noticeable by nature as it is the first music not based on the Theme; it comprises the most expressive solo passage in the entire movement, serving as the final stage in the process of the soloist’s self-development.

The variation form, with its rigidness, facilitates the aforementioned process in the way that it creates a constant — the invariable theme along with formal regularity — so as to highlight the progressive change in the solo part. Consequently, it depicts the emergence of individual consciousness within a collective context, one of the most preeminent ideologies in the late eighteenth century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-32</th>
<th>orchestra, then piano, in chorale style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation I</td>
<td>33-64</td>
<td>strings with piano’s arpeggiated countersubject, then homophonic piano subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation II</td>
<td>65-101</td>
<td>piano, then collaboration with strings and newly added woodwind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>102-113</td>
<td>accompanied cadential figure by piano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4**: Form diagram of Mozart’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in B-Flat Major, K. 450, second movement
Example 11: K. 450, Andante, Theme, mm. 1-32
Example 12: K. 450, Andante, mm. 65-68

Example 13: K. 450, Andante, mm. 84-88
Part 4: Movement III, Allegro

The finale of the concerto, “one of the happiest rondos” in “one of the happy keys,” observes Hutchings, is a modified sonata-rondo with a rondo theme that consists of three shorter statements, descending by thirds and outlining the subdominant harmony, which foreshadows the modulation to the same key area in Episode II. The movement begins with a solo statement of the rondo theme, Theme A\(^1\) (Example 14), followed by an answer from the orchestra, Theme A\(^2\) (Example 15). The two differ mainly on the arrival points (half cadence and perfect authentic cadence, respectively), forming a 16-measure parallel period. The orchestra then presents three additional themes that complete the “refrain complex.” Theme A\(^3\) (Example 16), an outline of the tonic triad followed by an echo from the refrain material, bridges the orchestral statement of the rodeo theme and Theme A\(^4\) (Example 17). Starting with an anacrusis and following the most common harmonic progression (I - IV - V - I), Theme A\(^4\) renders itself joyous and simple. Theme A\(^5\) (Example 18), a pure cadential figure, chromatically wanders around the dominant which then returns to the tonic.

Episode I begins with the solo re-entry theme, E (Example 19) which then leads to the three true solo themes (Themes B\(^1\), B\(^2\) and B\(^3\)) in the sense that they do come back in the recapitulation, or Episode III. Theme B\(^1\) (Example 20), through an alternation between the tonic and dominant harmonies and then a melodic sequence, hands the music

---

34 Hutchings, op. cit., 95.

35 Joel Galand, *Rondo-Form Problems in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Instrumental Music, with Reference to the Application of Schenker’s Form Theory to Historical Context* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1990), 141; quoted in Grayson, op. cit., 74.
to the orchestra in the dominant key area. Introduced by a short orchestral bridge, Theme B\textsuperscript{2} (Example 21) begins in the dominant harmony of the dominant key area, aiming to consolidate the modulation. This sequential passage is essentially a spinning out of a six-note figure — a written-out turn around the principal note — which is passed from the strings to the woodwind while climbing more than two octaves. The end of this particularly virtuosic passage settles the music into the dominant key area in which the contrasting Theme B\textsuperscript{3} (Example 22) unfolds. This theme, in the cantabile style of the re-entry theme, has an antecedent phrase stated by the soloist which is then answered by a consequent played by the flute with a piano arpeggio accompaniment. Taking over the orchestra’s cadence in F major, the soloist effects the retransition and therefore prepares for the return of the rondo theme in the home key, which follows the Eingang. Note that Theme A\textsuperscript{2} is presented as a two-part imitation (flute, oboes and violins; bassoons and lower strings) which leads to a variation of Theme A\textsuperscript{5} that agitatedly prepares the Eingang.

   Episode II, prepared by a rather abrupt transition initiated by the orchestra, modulates to the submediant key area. It starts with a highly rhythmic new theme, Theme C (Example 23), which is a close relative of Theme B\textsuperscript{2}, and then develops the motif of the rondo theme through various key areas, some of which are as distant as A major. Toward the end of the episode, a series of woodwind-piano dialogues prepares the return of Theme A\textsuperscript{1}.

   Taking up on the last note of Theme A\textsuperscript{2} from the orchestra, the soloist immediately brings back Theme B\textsuperscript{1}, leaving out the re-entry theme. In order to stay in the
home key, it departs from the tonic harmony to G minor, supertonic of the dominant, via a falling-third sequence, and then ascends stepwise to C, the dominant of the dominant, thus defining the key of F major, in which Theme B\textsuperscript{2} will occur. Following the harmonic plan in Episode I, Theme B\textsuperscript{3} is reiterated in the home key and ties into the pre-cadenza tutti which is Theme A\textsuperscript{5}. The last iteration of the rondo theme follows right after cadenza. A codetta ties Theme A\textsuperscript{1} to Theme A\textsuperscript{3}, skipping the orchestra statement, which then leads to the coda of the entire movement.

A summary of the above discussion is shown by Table 5, which also includes the sonata aspect of this movement: it is a standard sonata-rondo, with an ABACABA thematic design. In comparison to the orchestra, the soloist’s distinction as an individual is manifested through the joy, energy as well as virtuosity rooted in the brilliant piano part. Nonetheless, the soloist still strives to constantly produce new ideas. One clear example is that the four appearances of Theme A\textsuperscript{1} throughout the movement are all slightly different from each other, which is rendered transparent and intentional by the formal regularity of the movement. It is the rondo procedure that defines the refrain, which makes any deviation from its first appearance quite noticeable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B♭</th>
<th>1-42</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭→F→B♭</td>
<td>43-112</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>113-140</td>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development (A1)</td>
<td>E♭→B♭</td>
<td>141-209</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>210-224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>225-284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td>codetta</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>285-302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>303-316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5:** Form diagram of Mozart’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in B-Flat Major, K. 450, third movement
Example 14: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme A, mm. 1-8
Example 15: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme $A^2$, mm. 8-16

Example 16: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme $A^3$, mm. 16-20

Example 17: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme $A^4$, mm. 25-29
Example 18: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme A⁵, mm. 33-37

Example 19: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme E, mm. 43-50
Example 20: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme B\textsuperscript{1}, mm. 62-72
Example 21: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme B², mm. 76-78

Example 22: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme B³, mm. 93-99
Example 23: K. 450, Allegro (finale), Theme C, mm. 141-145
Part 5: Conclusion

The above analysis of Mozart’s Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in B-Flat Major, K. 450 has shown that form could largely contribute to the interpretation of the music. The three movements, through their various formal aspects, respectively paint the three stages of the formation of the Self’s centered subjectivity. From the confident presentation of itself in the first movement, to the formation of its own voice in the second, and then to the self-evolution in the finale, the Self has successfully defined its distinction in comparison to the Other and become much more conscious about individuality. This particular reading of the formal design of K. 450 highlights two of the most enduring ideologies of the Enlightenment, namely the distinction of an individual in the societal context and the emergence of individual consciousness within a collective structure. Inversely, the hermeneutic approach presented in this thesis provides a way of contextualizing the forms of individual movements. And the simultaneous manifestation of the aforementioned two complementary concepts further provides the concerto with formal stability.
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