2-23-2016

Approaches to Form in First Movements of Clarinet Concertos from Mozart to the Twentieth Century

Amy L. Schneider
aschneider@wildblue.net

Recommended Citation
Schneider, Amy L., "Approaches to Form in First Movements of Clarinet Concertos from Mozart to the Twentieth Century" (2016). Master's Theses. 871.
https://opencommons.uconn.edu/gs_theses/871
APPROVAL PAGE

Master of Arts Thesis

Approaches to Form in First Movements of Clarinet Concertos from Mozart to the Twentieth Century

Presented by

Amy Lynn Schneider

Major Advisor ____________________________________________________________
Richard Bass

Associate Advisor ________________________________________________________
Peter Kaminsky

Associate Advisor ________________________________________________________
Alain Frogley

University of Connecticut

2016
TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures v

Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology 1


Chapter 5: Alternate Approaches to Form in Twentieth-Century Clarinet Concertos 32

Chapter 6: Summary of the Influence of Classical Concerto Form on Later Works 38

Selected Bibliography 41
## LIST OF FIGURES

1. Koch’s first-movement concerto form as described in Versuch 4
2. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Formal and Tonal Structure 10
3. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Closing Material (Cl.1 and Cl.3) 11
4. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme A 12
5. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme B 12
6. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme A Variant, mm. 172-3 13
8. Weber, Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 (I): Ritornello Theme 18
13. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): First ritornello theme (R1) 26
14. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Second ritornello theme (R2) 26
15. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Theme A 27
16. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Theme B 28
I. Introduction and Methodology

The solo concerto is among the most popular and enduring genres of the Western music tradition. One of the most distinctive features of a concerto is its first-movement form that emerged in the Classical period, especially as codified in W.A. Mozart’s concertos. Indeed, both audiences and music scholars tend to regard Mozart’s concerto form as the genre’s archetype and a model to which other concertos can be compared.

Mozart inherited certain aspects of his concerto form from earlier practice dating back to the Baroque period, but he fused those characteristics with Classical formal design in a way that was particularly effective and appropriate in relation to the musical sensibilities of his time. Later composers in turn adapted this formal design to suit their own purposes. This study explores those adaptations as exhibited in solo clarinet concertos beginning with Mozart’s own K. 622 and extending into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Clarinet concertos make up a useful body of works for such a study for two general reasons. First, it was during the Classical period that the clarinet evolved into a solo instrument capable of the kind of virtuosic display characteristic of concerto writing at the time, and its popularity as an instrument well suited to solo as well as ensemble performance has continued to the present day. At the same time, because there exist only a small number of concertos for the clarinet as compared to those for piano or violin, composers were perhaps less inclined to feel bound by pre-established expectations when writing for the instrument and may have been more willing to experiment with formal designs. Nevertheless, certain characteristics of first-movement concerto form continue to be found in clarinet concertos even by some twentieth-century composers. The analytical
investigation undertaken in this study considers how these later works adhere to or depart from the conventions of Mozart’s concerto form.

The term concerto is derived from the Latin “concertare,” which contains two individual ideas that come together and form the overall textural dynamic of the concerto formal structure. The ideas are (1) to contend, dispute, debate, and (2) to work together with someone. While originally intended to be a combined vocal and instrumental work in the Renaissance, by the late seventeenth century the purely instrumental concerto began to emerge. Its development followed two different paths, the concerto grosso and the solo concerto, the latter of which is considered in this study.

Giuseppe Torelli is identified as the inventor of the concerto in the late seventeenth century with the earliest purely instrumental concertos to circulate in print. His treatment of the genre initiates its development as a virtuosic instrumental showpiece. Even in these works, however, the solo passages are still more decorative than structural.

Antonio Vivaldi’s treatment of the solo concerto introduced the Baroque ritornello form, alternating sections of orchestral tutti with sections for solo instrument with accompaniment, in the outer movements of his concertos. As described by Arthur Hutchings, the ritornello “is used to establish the opening tonality and subsequently to affirm the various other tonalities reached in the course of the movement; the alternate sections (episodes)…accomplish the structurally important modulations and supply contrasting themes or figurations.” This approach to form is a general characteristic of concertos in the mid- to late-eighteenth century. Vivaldi’s solo parts were increasingly

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
virtuosic, and allowed soloists to demonstrate their individual skills and the capabilities of their specific instrument. These solo passages became more structural in function as opposed to being merely decorative.

The ritornello organization also influenced the development of the first movement concerto form that Mozart standardized in the later eighteenth century. It was the mid-eighteenth century theorist Johann Joachim Quantz who gave the earliest complete description of a solo concerto with a fast-movement form based on an opening ritornello followed by alternating solo passages and secondary ritornellos.\(^5\) By his definition, these secondary ritornellos contained only brief statements of the opening ritornello and were used structurally to conclude the solo passages. Quantz does not specifically define the formal devices as part of a large-scale, constructive formula, but he does hint at the concerto form as an alternation of textural contrasts between the tutti and solo sections.\(^6\)

In his 1779 treatise *Betrachtungen der Mannheimer Tonschule*, Georg Joseph Vogler identifies first-movement concerto form as being derived from the first-movement form of the sonata.\(^7\) Unlike Quantz, whose definition of concerto form depends almost exclusively on the alternation of tutti and solo sections, Vogler bases his musical analysis on large-scale harmonic motion throughout the movement. Yet, according to Jane Stevens, “Even for Vogler, . . . a concerto movement is structured first of all by a division into sections of contrasting texture.”\(^8\) Thus while tonal structure plays a more important role in his musical analyses, alternating tutti and solo passages remain the principal factors in defining the form.

---


\(^6\) Ibid., 29.

\(^7\) Ibid., 31.

\(^8\) Ibid., 33.
Stevens also notes that the ideas of Quantz and Vogler come together in the theory of concerto form described in 1793 in the third volume of Heinrich Christoph Koch’s *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*. Koch compares the first movement form of a concerto to that of a symphony movement. The ritornello form is acknowledged as three solo sections enclosed within four orchestral tuttis (Figure 1), but the solo sections are more symphonic in nature and the orchestral tuttis punctuate the ends of three principal periods. Koch’s interpretation of formal structure is also more inclusive of melodic considerations than that of either Quantz or Vogler. He “synthesized the analytic perceptions” of these earlier theorists, and “presented an analysis of concerto form in which considerations of texture, harmony, and melody are more nearly balanced in structural importance than in earlier or later descriptions.”

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.** Koch’s first-movement concerto form as described in *Versuch*. 

When Koch published the third volume of *Versuch*, he had little knowledge of the works of Mozart. His theory of the structure of first-movement concerto form was based on his study of the piano concertos of C.P.E. Bach. In 1802, he published another treatise, the *Musikalisches Lexikon*, in which he praised Mozart’s consistent approach to

---

9 Ibid., 38.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid., 39.
formal structure as the standard definition of the perfect Classical concerto.\textsuperscript{12} The requisites for good formal structure in a concerto Allegro first movement changed little from the Versuch to the Lexikon, with one important exception: Koch states in the Lexikon that the third tutti (between the second and third solo sections) can be omitted, shifting the perspective of structure away from the Baroque ritornello to something more closely resembling a “three-tutti sonata form model.”\textsuperscript{13}

Mozart’s standardization of Classical concerto form was evident in the formal structure idealized by Koch in 1802. He maintained the three-movement cycle of Vivaldi with the first movement always following the ritornello arrangement, but by incorporating elements of sonata form, he also introduced a hybrid structural design that came to be known as “concerto-sonata form.”\textsuperscript{14} Mozart revolutionized the fusion of ritornello and sonata forms, likening the three solo sections of the ritornello to the exposition, development, and recapitulation divisions of sonata form. Each of the orchestral ritornellos occurring after the first solo section became de-emphasized. The second and fourth were given material presented in the immediately preceding solo sections, thus functioning as codettas that reinforced cadential areas, rather than restating the main theme as was common in the Baroque ritornello. The third ritornello was reduced to a brief interpolation or re-transition into the third solo section, or it was omitted from the form entirely.\textsuperscript{15} This leaves six distinct sections that lay the framework for the first movement concerto-sonata form. A prime example of this idealized first movement structure in Koch’s theory of concerto form is Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto in

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 41.
\textsuperscript{13} Hutchings, et al., n.p.
\textsuperscript{15} The New Harvard Dictionary of Music, s.v. “Concerto.”
A, K.622, which serves in this study as an exemplar to which later clarinet concertos can be compared.\textsuperscript{16}

In \textit{Elements of Sonata Theory}, Warren Darcy and James Hepokoski categorize the first-movement concerto form as their “Type 5” sonata, which encompasses concerto-sonata adaptations blending ritornello principles with other sonata types, especially their “Type 3” sonata, which is described as having three large sections (the exposition, development, and recapitulation) with the first theme in the tonic.\textsuperscript{17} This theory blends Koch’s 1793 and 1802 treatises with a modern interpretation of the various deformations in traditional sonata form. The development of concerto form incorporating ritornello formats and procedures passed down from earlier eighteenth-century traditions combined with aspects of sonata form are “a defining feature” of many concerto movements.\textsuperscript{18}

This thesis demonstrates how the formal structure of the standard Classical concerto as defined by Koch, and further clarified by Darcy and Hepokoski, is expressed by the first movement of Mozart’s 1791 \textit{Clarinet Concerto in A, K.622}. A formal analysis of this work considers its tonal and thematic structure in detail, along with other stylistic aspects, using diagrams and excerpts of melodic material as illustrations. A comparison is then drawn between Mozart’s concerto and the first movement structure of Carl Maria von Weber’s 1811 \textit{Concerto No. 1 in F minor}, once again using Koch’s structural design as a point of reference. Departures from Mozart’s standard form are discussed in considering how approaches to concerto form change in nineteenth-century works. The development of first-movement concerto form as it is utilized in the twentieth

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 430.
century is then addressed in an analysis of the first movement of Paul Hindemith’s
Concerto for Clarinet in A and Orchestra. These analyses demonstrate the significance
of the standard Classical concerto as an enduring influence in the nineteenth and
twentieth centuries.

Finally, there is a discussion of the similarities and differences among twentieth
century clarinet concertos that bear little structural resemblance to the Classical concerto
form, and how these differences affect the ways in which later composers reconsidered
the essential characteristics of concerto as an established genre. Brief descriptions of
clarinet concertos by Walter Piston, Aaron Copland, and Carl Nielsen offer a variety of
disparate views and illustrate some of the various ways in which these works depart from
the conventions of first-movement concerto form expressed in Classical concertos and
later works influenced by that approach. While certain stylistic and virtuosic
characteristics are retained in these works, their formal organization abandons the three-
movement structure and the internal formal designs of the movements, and all but
eliminates the alternating dialogue between the soloist and orchestra that is an essential
aspect of earlier concertos.

For those concertos by Mozart, Weber, and Hindemith that follow a plan based on
the Classical concerto first-movement design, detailed analyses and illustrative diagrams
use terms and abbreviations influenced by earlier studies, especially Darcy and
Hepokoski, but expressed in a more flexible manner that accommodates their individual
approaches to the form. The large sectional divisions are indicated as Orchestral
Introduction (referred to as “Orchestral Exposition” in some other sources), Exposition,
Development, Recapitulation, and (where applicable) Coda. Within the exposition, the
thematic contents are designated as First Theme (or A), Transition (or “transition zone”), Second Theme (or B), and Closing Theme. The principal distinction between the first theme and second theme material is one of tonality; the characteristic feature of the transition is its function in moving from the first tonality to the second, and the distinction between the second theme and closing theme is principally rhetorical, in that the closing material serves to confirm and solidify the second tonal area. Contrasting melodic materials within these thematic areas are designated as separate thematic segments, and indicated by numbers (e.g., B1, B2, etc.). References to these materials in “freer” sections (development and coda) are indicated using the same abbreviations, but placed within parentheses.

Major and minor keys in the diagrams are differentiated through the use of upper and lower case letters. Modulations are indicated with arrows connecting one key to another, and “transient” tonal areas (i.e., those in which there is neither a cadence nor a strong statement of important thematic material) are shown in parentheses. Specific harmonies and cadences are included in some locations using traditional Roman numerals and abbreviations (e.g., PAC) to emphasize important points of harmonic arrival.
II. W.A. Mozart, *Clarinet Concerto in A, K.622* (I): *Allegro*

The first movement of Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto in A clearly exhibits the characteristics of Koch’s definition of the ideal concerto form. Overall, this concerto has the three-movement organization popularized by Vivaldi, and it employs the alternation of orchestral tutti ritornello sections and solo episodes. In contrast, however, it illustrates how the concerto had evolved since Vivaldi’s time, especially in the role that the orchestral ritornello plays and in the increasing level of virtuosity in the solo part. Mozart’s incorporation of sonata form elements also reflects the standardized hybrid form that defined the Classical concerto first movement.

This movement conforms to the Baroque formal concerto principle in its alternation between the contrasting textures of orchestral tutti and solo with accompaniment. There are four tutti sections and three solo episodes, as would be expected in a Baroque concerto, but other similarities between Mozart’s standardized structure and that of earlier composers are less apparent. The diagram of this movement given in Figure 2 shows how its design expresses Koch’s ideal balance of textural, harmonic and melodic implications in the overall formal structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orchestral Intro.</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Tutti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>meas:</strong> 1 16 24 25 39 49 50 53</td>
<td>57 75 78 86 100 115 128 134 141</td>
<td>154 155 164 165 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Cl A imit. Cl</td>
<td><strong>B</strong> A imit. Cl</td>
<td><strong>Cl</strong> Cl Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 1 3</td>
<td>1 2*</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: I HC PAC PAC</td>
<td>I PAC a: --&gt; e: E: PAC (C:) PAC (V) PAC (elis.)</td>
<td>PAC PAC PAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Tutti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>meas:</strong> 172 180 200</td>
<td>227 239 246</td>
<td>251 258 269 272 282 292 303 316 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) <em>tr</em>₂ Cl₂ retrans.</td>
<td>A trans. B</td>
<td>A imit. Cl Cl Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V) (f#:) (D:) (vi)</td>
<td>(D:)</td>
<td>PAC (f#:) (elis.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Formal and Tonal Structure
The first orchestral tutti section begins with the first theme presented in the tonic (A major) and follows that with the first and third segments of the closing material (Cl. 1 and Cl. 3) that appears in full at the end of the exposition (Figure 3). Thus the first ritornello section functions more as an introduction for the solo exposition than as the “first of a series of secondary periods,” comporting with Darcy and Hepokoski’s view of the opening orchestral ritornello as an initial Anlage that provides the layout and structure of thematic material in the tonic key before presenting all the thematic ideas in the first solo section.  

![Figure 3. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Closing Material (Cl.1 and Cl.3)](image)

The first solo episode, corresponding with the exposition, introduces the clarinet at measure 57 with the first theme (A) again in the tonic (Figure 4). The first eight measures are structured in two four-measure phrases and come to a perfect authentic cadence at measure 64. Immediately following the conclusion of the first theme, the orchestra repeats theme A while the clarinet performs a virtuosic embellishment to close

---

19 Stevens, 41.
20 Hepokoski and Darcy, 345.
the first thematic area in the tonic at measure 75. The orchestra continues with an extension that arrives at the parallel minor to begin the transition. The transition zone itself subdivides into two smaller themes (tr₁ and tr₂): the first in A minor at measure 78, and the second beginning at measure 86 and tonicizing C major. The thematic material then modulates to E minor before the second theme (B) enters at measure 100 resolving harmonically in E major at measure 104 (Figure 5). B reaches a perfect authentic cadence at measure 115, after which there is a brief transient passage in C# minor as the harmony progresses to a half cadence in E at measure 127. The next measure reintroduces the first theme, now in the dominant major, but altered and in imitation between the solo and orchestra.

![Figure 4. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme A](image)

![Figure 5. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme B](image)

A perfect authentic cadence in E at measure 134 elides with an Alberti bass-style passage for the soloist, referring to the closing material presented earlier in the orchestral introduction, and concluding the first solo section at measure 154. The orchestral tutti
returns, restating additional closing material also presented in the introduction. Rather than sounding as a structurally independent section as expected in earlier concertos, however, this tutti serves to solidify the modulation to the dominant key and takes on the role of a closing theme for the exposition.

The development begins with the second solo episode in E major at measure 172, playing a variant of the first theme (Figure 6). This thematic material then dissolves into a series of authentic cadences in E featuring virtuosic figuration in the solo part. Then under a held B⁵ in the solo, the orchestral harmonies imply a tonicization of F# minor, after which measures 194-199 modulate to D major with a restatement of the second transition theme in that key at measure 200. There is a return to F# minor with a perfect authentic cadence at measure 215. Measures 215-227 affirm the modulation to F# minor and conclude the second solo episode.

![Figure 6. Mozart, Clarinet Concerto in A (I): Theme A Variant, mm. 172-3.]

Koch’s Lexikon indicates that, at this point, the third ritornello section should be reduced significantly to re-establish the tonic key, or be omitted entirely.²¹ In this movement, Mozart includes a third tutti section to bring the larger development section to a close, and the main tonality of this ritornello—the submediant—is the expected key of a perfectly structured Classical concerto as described in Koch’s 1793 volume of Versuch.²²

---

²¹ Stevens, 41.  
²² Ibid., 39.
This tutti therefore conforms to the definition of Koch’s first-movement form in that it
does little more than provide a means by which the movement can return to A major. A
restatement of closing materials is accompanied by a harmonic progression that sets up E
major as the dominant. The solo clarinet re-enters at the very end of this section in an
unaccompanied scale from E\(^3\) to E\(^5\), which it holds out in anticipation of the first note of
the main theme that occurs concomitantly with the resolution to the tonic harmony at
measure 251.

The restatement of theme A in the final solo episode marks the beginning of the
recapitulation and is identical to its appearance in the exposition. The transition also
returns nearly identically at measure 272 through the parallel minor, but in the
recapitulation there is no modulation to the dominant key. Theme B begins at measure
288 in the tonic key over dominant harmony in the orchestra, but the progression leads
back to the tonic at measure 292. At measure 304, the transient phrase within theme B
also implies the submediant key at 310 and then moves to a held V\(^7\) harmony in the
orchestra at measure 315. It is at this point that there is usually a virtuosic cadenza for
the soloist, “regarded as the central presentational event of the final ritornello… to permit
the soloist… to stand forth on his or her own terms.”\(^{23}\) However, in Mozart’s Clarinet
Concerto there is no written cadenza and no indication that one is to be included,
especially since the fermata is on a dominant seventh sonority as opposed to the typical
cadential six-four.

At measure 316, the imitative variation of theme A is included for the third time,
leading to a perfect authentic cadence in the tonic with an elision to a repetition of the
Alberti bass-style closing material at measure 322. Measures 322-343 continue to

\(^{23}\) Hepokoski and Darcy, 600.
tonicize A major while the clarinet demonstrates the virtuosic capabilities of the instrument across its full range. The final solo section concludes with a perfect authentic cadence at measure 343. The fourth and final orchestral tutti begins here, with the closing material and cadential extensions presented identically to their appearance in the first and second tutti sections. The recurring appearances of these closing materials, while secondary in importance to themes A and B, preserve the essence of the ritornello within the Classical concerto form by creating continuity within the movement as a whole.

The Clarinet Concerto expresses Mozart’s mature approach to style and formal structure within the first movement. His early concerto first movements follow the Baroque ritornello form and include a solo cadenza, placed in the fourth tutti section, to showcase the soloist separately from the orchestra. Those compositions, prominently defined by the alternation of textures, use tonal designs similar to that of the Clarinet Concerto, but each includes the solo cadenza within the fourth tutti section.

Thematically, the Clarinet Concerto departs from Mozart’s standard form by not incorporating the first and second themes in the tutti sections after the orchestral introduction, indicating a view of the tutti sections as secondary to the principal solo sections.24 Thus the clarinet solo sections are more prominent and independent from the orchestra than in earlier concertos.

---

24 Stevens, 39.
III. Carl Maria von Weber, *Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 (I): Allegro*

The opening movement of Weber’s 1811 Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 has a formal structure similar to that of Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto. It utilizes a division into three larger sections, similar to the exposition, development, and recapitulation of the Classical sonata, and resembles the Mozart concerto in thematic organization and tonal structure. A striking feature is that the second theme is not re-introduced in the recapitulation, amounting to a violation of an essential principle of sonata form, but otherwise this movement retains much of the same organizational plan as a sonata form, as illustrated in Figure 7.

This movement begins with an opening orchestral tutti in the tonic key to function as the introduction. However, where Mozart presents his entire first theme in a non-modulating introduction, Weber uses his introduction to present only the movement’s ritornello theme (Figure 8; this is indicated by “R” in Figure 7). The introduction further deviates from the Mozartean norm in utilizing the ritornello theme to briefly tonicize the key of D-flat major in measures 24-34 before returning to F minor to conclude the introduction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orchestral Intro.</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Codetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 34 38</td>
<td>48 64 73 84 110 130 145</td>
<td>170 184 186 192 198 223 231 249 277 278</td>
<td>A R (trans.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f: --&gt; Db: V I --&gt; f: V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>trans. B</td>
<td>new theme (B)</td>
<td>(R )</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v: V PAC Db: --&gt; Ab: I PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>== elision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.** Weber, Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 (I): Formal and Tonal Structure.
The exposition begins at measure 48, where the solo clarinet enters with Theme A (Figure 9) in F minor over a soft string accompaniment. As the theme progresses, a significant portion of it takes place over a dominant pedal that drives toward an arrival on a perfect authentic cadence at measure 73. Measure 74 then presents a codetta to the first theme, closing this passage in the tonic key followed by a short pause.

Immediately after this pause, the ritornello theme returns in the transition zone in D-flat major in the cello and contrabass parts and assists with the modulation to a new key. After measure 84, the bass line descends chromatically under the clarinet melody to move into the relative major tonality (A-flat) of theme B, a relationship that is typical of Classical first-movement forms. In measure 106 a perfect authentic cadence elides with a four-measure transition into the second theme. Theme B (Figure 10) begins at measure 110 in the clarinet over chords in the strings before arriving at another perfect authentic
cadence at measure 130. Once again, this cadence contains an elision into a cadential extension that showcases the clarinet’s virtuosic capabilities across its clarino range.

![Figure 10. Weber, Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 (I): Theme B](image)

Measures 143-145 present an anomaly in the first movement of this concerto. Different scores are inconsistent in the presence of a cadenza at this point in the movement, and even those that do indicate the insertion of a cadenza do not have one written out. Traditionally, student performers often omit the cadenza, whereas some professional clarinetists add an original one. As with Mozart’s Clarinet Concerto, not only does a cadenza seem optional here, it would also occur in an unusual place in the movement. While most Classical cadenzas, particularly those of Mozart, are performed at the end of the third solo section or as an interruption of the final orchestral tutti, this concerto suggests the possibility of a cadenza near the end of the first solo section within the exposition.

An elision at measure 145 connects the end of the first solo to the second orchestral tutti section. This tutti utilizes the same rhythmic motive found at measure 34 to solidify the key of A-flat major. After this repeated motive, the section moves through a period of modulation, restating the tonic key of F minor before arriving on the dominant of C minor at measure 166. A descending diminished-seventh arpeggio in the cello leads
to a perfect authentic cadence in C minor at measure 170 to begin the second solo section in the development.

The development section begins with a new theme in C minor (Figure 11) that lasts eight measures before a modulating phrase tonicizes B-flat major with a development of theme B at measure 184. A cadential extension at 192 gives the clarinet another opportunity to showcase its virtuosity in similar style as before, but in this new key. The last measure of the extension marks a modulation to G minor, with a perfect authentic cadence at measure 198. While the clarinet continues with its virtuosic scalar passages, the ritornello theme appears in the orchestral winds, first in G minor, and then modulates as the harmonic progression in the strings effects a modulation back to the original key of F minor. At measure 223, the harmony arrives at the dominant of F minor while the fragments of the ritornello theme in the horns alternate in dialogue with the clarinet’s fragments of theme B. These eight measures create a transition back to the tonic key and theme A at measure 231.

![Figure 11. Weber, Concerto No. 1 in F minor, Op. 73 (I): New theme as shown at measure 170.](image)

Weber presents this recapitulation and restatement of Theme A in a truncated version over a dominant pedal. The clarinet and cello create a dialogue in repeated motives that generate tension before a prolonged dominant pedal resolves into a perfect
authentic cadence in the tonic at measure 249. An elision at this cadence point leads to the restatement of the ritornello theme in the tonic.

Measure 258 begins a virtuosic scale-like passage reaching high into the clarinet’s range over F minor chords in the orchestra. At the end of this passage, a trilled arpeggio leads to a loud climactic trill on the leading tone in the clarinet’s altissimo range, ending in a perfect authentic cadence with the orchestra at measure 273. One final statement of the ritornello theme appears in the cellos and bassoons before the codetta from the exposition is restated at measure 278 to conclude the movement.

The first movement of Weber’s concerto No. 1 generally conforms to Baroque and Classical practice with the alternation of orchestral tutti sections and solo episodes. Texture remains a significant factor in formal design, as does the ordered presentation and restatement of thematic material to provide unity throughout the movement. The movement is organized into exposition, development, and recapitulation sections, preceded by an orchestral introduction. These sections are indicated with the solo clarinet’s entrance in contrasting texture to the tutti sections that occur immediately before each of the solos.

This movement also adheres to the Mozartean standard in its use of a recurring ritornello theme in the orchestra. The ritornello in this work has a diminished role from that in Baroque concertos in that it is clearly secondary to the solo sections, but its presence nevertheless indicates a debt to the larger concerto traditions, even while simultaneously introducing new characteristics. The clear use of two thematic divisions within the exposition along with the minor and relative major tonal contrast likewise indicates adherence to Classical sonata-form ideals.
The work’s departures from conventional Classical practice include the absence of any material from the first and second themes in the orchestral introduction, as well as the tonal content of that section, which does not remain strictly in the tonic but instead introduces a new key (the submediant major). Whereas Mozart’s concertos often introduce the first theme in its entirety in the introduction, encouraging the use of the term “double exposition,” the concerto by Weber suggests a role for the introduction that is reminiscent of the original Baroque ritornello in its independence from the thematic material of the solo episodes.

Each of the tutti sections is shorter than in a typical Mozart concerto, and the role of those sections is further diminished. The tuttis do not always contain material from the ritornello theme, sometimes serving more effectively as a codetta to a solo section than as an independent section. After the orchestral introduction, the ritornello theme does not recur until the development and recapitulation sections, and each time it is presented simultaneously with other material performed by the clarinet. Weber’s frequent use of elisions at perfect authentic cadences creates continuity in the movement that de-emphasizes aurally distinct divisions between larger sections. These elisions maintain momentum in the movement and obscure the beginnings and ends of the larger sections that follow the orchestral introduction.

The Classical standard also suggests the insertion of a cadenza in the third solo episode or in the fourth orchestral tutti/ritornello of the movement. This concerto deviates from that expectation by not specifically indicating a cadenza in the score at all. Whereas a cadenza is indicated in some editions of the score, there is no evidence that it
was Weber’s intent, and it is more of an option to showcase the soloist’s virtuosity than it is a requirement of the formal design.

As a work that reflects a nineteenth-century aesthetic, this concerto exhibits a less strict adherence to Mozart’s concerto-sonata form, reducing it to something much closer to a true sonata form and placing increased emphasis on the virtuosic solo sections. Despite these deviations, however, the overall structure continues to rely on textural contrast: whereas thematic material takes on a higher degree of importance, the alternation of tutti and solo sections remains a fundamental aspect of structure.
IV. Paul Hindemith, *Concerto for Clarinet in A* (I): *Ziemlich schnell*

Hindemith’s Concerto for Clarinet in A uses a new structural scheme in concerto-style composition for solo clarinet in the twentieth century. In the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, the concepts of tonality and key relationships in symphonic concerto-sonata form became greatly expanded. This 1947 concerto eschews the techniques of atonality and serialism popular among many composers of the time, instead opting to employ a neoclassical approach, which emphasizes a resurgence of compositional principles associate with earlier periods. The work thus follows a familiar textural and melodic structure while at the same time pursuing a more progressive approach to harmony and tonal relationships. Applying eighteenth century terminology in considering the formal and thematic aspects of the first movement reveals the influence of earlier principles of concerto writing in Hindemith’s concerto that coexist with the composer’s modern tonal language (Figure 12).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Orchestral Intro.</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Codetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>Tutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meas.</td>
<td>1 15 28</td>
<td>33 40 46 50 56 60 71</td>
<td>78 94 101 112 117 122 130</td>
<td>143 151</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2 (R1)</td>
<td>A trans.</td>
<td>B (R1)</td>
<td>(A) (A imit.) (R1) (R2) (B)</td>
<td>A (A imit.)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elis.</td>
<td>(f#:)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(f:)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Formal and Tonal Structure
The movement begins with an orchestral introduction in A major with the first ritornello theme, labeled R1 (Figure 13). The theme is passed through the orchestra in the tonic, dominant, and submediant tonalities before reaching a transitional passage at measure 11 that leads to the arrival of the second ritornello theme (R2) at measure 15 (Figure 14). Unlike the first ritornello theme, R2 is not restated in multiple tonalities but maintains the same tonal center of E major each time it is repeated. The theme is presented over dominant harmony, anticipating other harmonic events later in the movement. The statement of R2 concludes at measure 28 when a repeated segment from R1 creates the transition into the first solo section.

![Figure 13. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): First ritornello theme (R1)](image1)

![Figure 14. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Second ritornello theme (R2)](image2)

The solo exposition begins at measure 33 with the first theme (A) in the tonic (Figure 15). Unlike the Mozart and Weber movements discussed above, however, while the theme is presented in the tonic key, the orchestral accompaniment is holding a dominant harmony rather than the expected tonic. The theme crosses multiple ranges of
the clarinet from the chalumeau through the clarion for eight measures over the dominant pedal before coming to the tonic at measure 40. Even at this point, the authentic cadence is imperfect and elides with a restatement of theme A in the orchestra. The orchestra restates the theme in its entirety in the tonic, but the chromatic clarinet line above it facilitates a modulation to a new key. At measure 46, the orchestra repeatedly plays the first segment of the theme, but in E major, indicating a modulation and the beginning of a transition to the next theme.

![Figure 15. Hindemith, Concerto for Clarinet in A (I): Theme A](image)

At measure 50, a variation of the first ritornello theme appears, but rather than being performed only by the orchestra, it is presented in the solo clarinet and in the dominant key. As before, it is utilized to facilitate chromatic modulation to a new tonal center. Through measure 60, the ritornello material modulates to B minor with heavy emphasis on the dominant as in theme A at the beginning of the exposition. The entrance of theme B (Figure 16) at measure 61 makes a sharp departure from conventional expositional key relations. The tonality in theme B is centered on F, and the chromatic nature of the accompaniment creates an alternation between the major and minor modes. It is not until the solo clarinet holds an extended A-flat at measure 75 that a clearly minor modality emerges. Measures 70-77 once again utilize the repeating thematic segment from the first ritornello theme to emphasize the end of the second theme in the solo exposition.
The next orchestral tutti begins at measure 78 as a transition into the development section. An ascending unison passage leads up to the high strings playing a repeated triplet rhythmic pattern over alternating restatements of both ritornello themes. This continues through measure 92, when a final restatement of the second ritornello material is written in a unison descending passage that extends until the clarinet re-enters at measure 94 to begin the development.

The development starts with theme A presented in F# minor. Unlike the exposition, the harmony here is centered on the tonic of the key instead of the dominant. The theme is presented in its entirety, concluding at measure 101. At this point, the theme is truncated and picked up in the orchestra with alternating entrances in an imitative dialogue with the clarinet.

At measure 112, theme A ends abruptly and is replaced by a variation of the first ritornello theme, written for the clarinet rather than the orchestra, as would be expected in a conventional formal plan. At measure 117, the clarinet continues with the second ritornello theme and the orchestra picks up R1 over a low, repeated descending chromatic line. At measure 122, the clarinet drops out and only the orchestra remains, finally giving way to the proper third tutti section before again deviating from the conventions of the form. The orchestra states a variation of theme B in B-flat major at measure 130,
prefiguring another entrance of the clarinet with the same line at measure 135. The clarinet interrupts the third tutti with this statement of theme B before a brief, quiet codetta to this section begins at measure 140.

The clarinet initiates the recapitulation at 143 with a restatement of theme A similar to its presentation in the exposition with an emphasis on the dominant harmony. The tonality is more indicative of the minor mode, however, and this becomes more evident with the repetition of theme A in the orchestra at measure 151 over an A minor harmony. Measure 151 brings another presentation of the first segment of theme A sounding alternately in the orchestra and clarinet in a modulating, descending pattern. A silent eighth rest separates this passage from a short four-measure codetta in A major with a final restatement of R1 in the clarinet and a final tonic chord in the orchestra to end the movement.

Hindemith’s treatment of texture in the first movement of this concerto simultaneously allows the orchestral tutti to regain some of its lost structural importance, and creates an equal-sided dialogue between the orchestra and the solo clarinet. The movement begins as with Mozart and Weber, with an orchestral tutti section. At measure 33, the clarinet enters and begins the first solo episode. The alternation of texture continues with the Classical standard of four tutti sections encompassing three solo sections, with an adjustment in the relationship between the orchestra and the clarinet in the third tutti. This is somewhat at odds with Koch’s theory of Classical concerto form, in which the third tutti is reduced to nothing; it may have more relevance as an expression

---

of other eighteenth century theories (e.g., by Quantz, Vogler, Kollman, etc.) that debate the role of the third tutti when it is present.26

The third tutti begins at measure 122 with restatements of each of the ritornello themes that play an important part in the formal design of the movement. The clarinet re-enters at measure 135, but it is not yet the beginning of the next solo section. Instead, it is a variation of one of the primary themes, but the recapitulation is postponed until measure 143 with the prominent restatement of theme A. Thus it is the material after the third tutti, rather than the tutti itself, that serves as the retransition leading to the recapitulation, and this represents a departure from Classical formal practice.

Thematic structure in the movement is comparable to the Mozartean standard in its strengthening of the role of ritornello themes within the tutti sections. Working along with the textural contrast, the repetition of the ritornello themes, either in full or in truncated adaptations, serves as a unifying feature that occurs in all the sections. Where this work departs from Mozart’s approach to thematic structure is in its incorporation of the ritornello themes within the solo sections and in the second solo theme making an appearance in the third tutti section. These deviations are also reflected in the performance of the ritornello themes in the clarinet and the solo themes in the orchestra. The movement as a whole nevertheless alternates between the prominence of the ritornello themes and the prominence of the solo themes, exhibiting a later resurgence of the idea of alternating textures of more or less equal importance, even while the relative placements of the tutti and solo materials may not coincide with Mozartean formal practices.

26 Stevens, 38.
It is in the domain of harmonic structure and tonality that Hindemith departs most significantly from the conventions of eighteenth-century concerto writing. The Concerto for Clarinet begins in A major, but it does not stay in that tonality for long, and even with regard to types of tonal contrast, Hindemith does not follow the Classical format. A major-mode concerto movement in the Classical era nearly always modulates to the dominant key for the second solo theme in the exposition and remains in that key up to and often including the beginning of the development. In this movement however, the second solo theme is presented in a key that is not closely related to the tonic. The use of modal ambiguity of the F tonal center in the second theme is more of a twentieth-century, or at least late nineteenth-century approach to tonal contrast. The modulation to yet another key for the development is a further deviation from Classical convention. The F# tonal center at the development is more closely related to A major than the F major/minor of theme B, but even the use of the relative minor is unusual for the beginning of a major-mode concerto development.

Hindemith’s use of Mozartean standard form with regard to textural and thematic structure in the first movement of this concerto demonstrates the influence of eighteenth-century first movement concerto form on a twentieth-century neo-classical composition. At the same time, the deviations from standard practice regarding tonal contrasts and harmony distinguish this work as a modern homage to the Classical-era concerto.
V. Alternate Approaches to Form in Twentieth-Century Clarinet Concertos

Although certain works like Hindemith’s Clarinet Concerto exhibit some clear connections with earlier approaches to concerto form, the ways most twentieth-century composers understood and constructed concertos are very different from the Classical conventions. The well-established melodic and harmonic structures of the Classical era no longer apply, and often only isolated characteristics of the standardized form that was idealized by Koch in the early nineteenth century can be observed in these later works.

Few clarinet concertos were written in the late nineteenth century, but among other instrumental concertos, the structure of the first movements generally moved increasingly further from the Classical approach to form. Heightened virtuosity in concerto composition and performance became paramount and crucial for vaulting the professional careers of the soloists.27 In the mid-nineteenth century, concertos emerged that no longer utilized the traditional form, instead incorporating technical virtuosity and expression to bridge the separation between individual movements; concertos might still be written in three movements, but performed without pauses.28

The cadenza continued to play an important role within the nineteenth-century concerto, often maintaining its standard position near the end of the first movement after the orchestra pauses on a cadential six-four harmony, as in Mozart’s concertos. But while continuing to serve in its virtuosic role, the nature of the cadenza changed. Cadenzas were increasingly written out by composers and virtuosos and lost their improvisatory character. Even more concertos during this century, particularly those by Liszt, deflected the cadenza, fragmenting it and incorporating it as a part of the composition rather than as

28 Ibid.
a detached spectacle.\textsuperscript{29} The opening tutti of later nineteenth century concertos strayed further from their original purpose, as the introduction combined with the solo exposition into a single, larger section, reducing the role of ritornello themes and adopting a more sonata-like structure.

The clarinet concertos of Walter Piston, Aaron Copland, and Carl Nielsen are representative of the deviations from Mozartean formal structure that arose during the nineteenth century and increased in the twentieth century: altering the role of the accompanying ensemble, increasing the importance of solo virtuosity, and diminishing the integrity of structural divisions to create ever more flexible and individualized formal designs. A brief consideration of these works will help to explain the transformation of concerto composition and definition in the post-Romantic era.

Piston’s 1967 Concerto for Clarinet and Orchestra has more in common with the traditional Mozartean concerto form than many others composed in the twentieth century, but it also illustrates the extent to which the approach to form had changed. The first movement opens with a short, ten-measure introduction that introduces none of the thematic ideas presented and developed later in the movement. The solo section that follows at measure 11 incorporates three short thematic ideas with transitional material between, alluding to the idea of a tutti and solo section alternation, but with a reduction in the role of the tutti to simply connect the themes rather than to strengthen and prolong cadences and lead to new tonal areas. The variation on the second and third thematic ideas at measure 70 and measure 87 can be interpreted as a type of development section preceding a truncated return of the first theme that announces the beginning of a twelve-

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
measure recapitulation. The accompanying tutti appends a coda-like extension before the soloist begins its first cadenza, which serves as a transition to the second movement.

The concerto as a whole is written as a continuous performance of four movements, each of which is bridged to the next by a solo cadenza passage that showcases the performer’s virtuosity. This design also increases the level of control the soloist has over tempo and style, making the cadenza an integral part of the composition, unlike the Classical concept, which maintains the cadenza as independent improvisatory material on primary thematic ideas before concluding the movement in the same tempo and style as before.

The Concerto for Clarinet and String Orchestra by Aaron Copland contains many of the same features as Piston’s concerto. It is written as a two-movement work played without pause and containing a lengthy, virtuosic cadenza that serves as a bridge between the movements. The first movement, however, bears less resemblance to the form of a concerto, and more to that of a sonata.

While most concerto first movements are in an Allegro tempo, Copland’s concerto begins with an Adagio, which is more common for the second movement of a Classical three-movement concerto. The structure of this Adagio also resembles the Classical concerto-sonata approach. There are intermittent passages in which the accompanying string orchestra plays introductory or transitional material, but the important thematic material of the work is presented and restated in the solo part rather than recurring in tutti passages.

The bulk of the movement is an accompanied solo, with little independent material in the orchestra other than the introductory and transitional passages. The first
solo section in C major is a self-contained ABA form, closing the section with a modulation to E-flat major at measure 51. The next section is developmental, moving from E-flat through C and G minor before returning to C at measure 77. The return of the first theme occurs at measure 95, but it is no longer in the tonic. The harmony once again shifts to E-flat major to close the first theme. After this conclusion, the key shifts back to C major one more time in the coda, holding a C\(^9\) chord in the orchestra as the soloist begins the written cadenza into the second movement.

A common feature of twentieth-century clarinet concertos is that they are written to be performed as a single continuous work, without pause, and with separate movements connected by solo cadenzas. This is true of Danish composer Carl Nielsen’s 1928 Concerto for Clarinet and Orchestra, Op. 57, which retains a sense of tonality, in contrast to the atonal or serial approach to pitch organization taken by more famous composers of that time. Regarding form, this concerto is written as a continuous work divided into contrasting sections or movements, pre-dating the similar approach taken decades later by Piston’s concerto, discussed above.

The first movement expresses a type of rounded binary form, with presentations of the first theme in both the orchestra and the solo clarinet. It begins with a brief orchestral introduction without the clarinet that alludes to the solo theme that enters at measure 17. The second section, which can be interpreted as a kind of development, contains almost entirely new material, with brief rhythmic hints of the first solo theme. A frenzied technical display in the clarinet and orchestra leads to a solo cadenza, placed immediately before the return of the first theme. This cadenza displays the soloist’s virtuosity across the full range of the clarinet. The return of the first theme occurs in the
orchestra, the same as it appears in the introduction before the solo re-enters with the same theme. At the end of the theme, a coda-like passage is included, increasing in dynamic level and range to create a transition to the beginning of the second movement.

The use of the thematic material in the orchestral introduction is a formal idea that is common in Classical Mozartean concerto form. The idea of a “double exposition,” or an opening orchestral tutti that also introduces the main theme or themes of the movement, was common in Mozart’s concertos, including the clarinet concerto in A. The role of the orchestra in nineteenth- and twentieth-century concertos changes, so that it no longer serves a significant expository function in terms of thematic content, and in other cases is altogether absent. There is no recurring ritornello theme in Nielsen’s concerto, but fragments of the first theme do reappear in the orchestra throughout the movement, providing a similar sense of thematic unity. The orchestra is also not limited to an accompanying role, but instead interacts with the clarinet in a balanced dialogue. It is not until the cadenza that the solo part’s virtuosity fully establishes its primacy over the orchestra.

This use of the large, continuous work derives from the development of the concerto form in the nineteenth century, but it becomes increasingly popular in twentieth-century compositions. It provides a medium through which the soloist can demonstrate an increased level of virtuosity not only through the complexity of the solo part, but additionally through the stamina required to perform a full concerto without pause. This new formal approach also elevates the importance of the accompanying group so that its role is more nearly equal to that of the solo part. While the cadenzas still distinguish the
solo from the orchestra, the thematic ideas and structural divisions within each movement are more evenly distributed between the soloist and the orchestra.
VI. Summary of the Influence of Classical Concerto Form on Later Works

The development of first-movement concerto form in clarinet concertos from the Mozartean standard to the unconventional structures found in twentieth-century works reveals a somewhat gradual but fundamental change in the definition of a concerto. In the eighteenth century, Mozart popularized the convention of a three-movement structure with the first movement following a symphonic concerto-sonata form. With very few exceptions, each first movement used essentially the same formal design, leading Koch to describe Mozart’s work as being representative of the ideal concerto first-movement form. In Weber’s Concerto No. 1 for clarinet and orchestra, the Classical structure is retained, although the approach to harmony and thematic development indicates a shift to a more Romantic aesthetic. The unfolding of structural divisions as defined by the alternation of orchestral tutti sections and solo sections, however, remains the principal factor in determining formal design.

The relatively sparse number of clarinet concertos, in comparison to violin and piano concertos, encouraged composers to take greater license with their formal structure. A clear, progressive line of development from Mozart’s concerto in A to those of the twentieth century clarinet concertos cannot be defined, simply because there are so few examples from the Romantic era. In the twentieth century, composers were divided among different schools of thought regarding approaches to formal structure. Hindemith, for example, embraced neo-classicism, restoring the pre-Romantic ideas surrounding structural divisions determined by texture, tonal contrast, and thematic unity and
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30 Stevens, 41.
development.\textsuperscript{31} His Concerto for Clarinet adheres to the Mozartean standard in its division of the movement into alternating tutti and solo sections, with use of thematic ideas comparable to their role in Classical-era concertos. This is not to say that Hindemith was not influenced by the development of the concerto form in the nineteenth century. His use of thematic ideas in the orchestral tutti sections deviates from Koch’s idealization of Mozartean form in strengthening the dialogue between the soloist and the orchestra. The role of the orchestra is less strictly accompanimental and takes on a special importance in supporting and interacting with the clarinet in its expression of virtuosity. The presence of the main theme in the ensemble parts allows the solo clarinet to explore new melodic figurations across the range of the instrument while the orchestra provides unity.

More common in twentieth century clarinet concertos is the concept of organizing a work so that it is performed without pause, and utilizing the solo cadenzas, the vehicle for showcasing virtuosity in the eighteenth century, as bridge material that links each movement to the next. The cadenzas become longer and increasingly complex, occupying their own separate spaces within the overall form. The clarinet concertos of Piston, Copland, and Nielsen each demonstrate this organizational concept. In these concertos, the role of the orchestra also increases in thematic importance, working in dialogue with the clarinet as an equal partner. The presence of separate tutti sections to define the structural divisions of the concerto first-movement form is diminished, creating a form that more closely resembles a sonata and abandoning the concept of a recurring ritornello theme separate from the main themes in the solo clarinet.

\textsuperscript{31} The New Harvard Dictionary of Music, s.v. “Concerto.”
While the Mozartean standard prevails as the quintessential form for which the concerto is defined, the alteration to those structural norms in texture, harmony, and thematic unity redefine the meaning of concerto over time. The twentieth century concerto has thus been defined by Douglass Green as “essentially a work for a solo performer with accompaniment.”32 Some eighteenth-century ideals remain, in particular the presence of a virtuosic cadenza to showcase the soloist’s technical prowess, but the changing role of the orchestra, and differences in tonal-harmonic language, recast the twentieth-century concerto as a genre that is almost wholly unrelated to Mozart’s first-movement concerto form.

32 Green, 256.
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