

THE DEVELOPMENT SECTION IN MOZART'S PIANO SONATAS¹

By Gilead Bar-Elli

Sonata form is the great creation of the classical era, and it is the form in which many of the best products of "classical music" have been produced. There are different views among musicologists about the details of the chronology and development of the sonata form, as well as about its exact characterization. In particular musicologists have argued that the details of the introduction of the secondary theme (or group) and some features of the development section were the products of intensive and long process of development. Only at the end of this process have they reached the state in which we know them in the "high classical" style, and by which our standard conception of sonata form is shaped. Since my interest here is with Mozart's sonatas – which definitely belong to this mature phase of the high classical style – the details of this historical research need not be at the centre of our attention. This is not to deny that even in Mozart's own career, his conception of the sonata and of sonata-form changed and developed and any firm generalization about what it meant to him is dangerous.

Granted all that, I still think that our standard, somewhat schematized conception of sonata-form as consisting of an exposition, with first and secondary main subjects (or groups), a development section, and a recapitulation, with the usual harmonic structure associated with it, is a useful and adequate enough framework for my purposes.²

Now, what is the particular and characteristic function of the development section (*Durchführung* – executing of carrying through) in a sonata? Obviously, any sweeping generalization is dangerous and likely to be false here: each sonata and each development section may need a treatment of its own. Nevertheless, some such generalization may help us shape a conception that may prove fruitful in the analysis of particular works.

It has often been observed that the mature sonata form, with its opposing subjects and the characteristic tonic-dominant structure, is a formal realization of the characteristic

¹ This article was written and privately circulated in the 1990s, based on a series of private recital-lectures that I gave on the Mozart sonatas. The lack of live demonstration here is a serious limitation, and the reader is strongly advised to read the following with the score. The notes examples were copied from IMSLP site to which we must all be grateful. They are not meant to replace close reading of the score, but to give a general orientation.

² I shall not be strict in distinguishing between "theme" and "subject", and use them often interchangeably. As many musicologists have pointed out, in many contexts it is better to talk of first, second and third groups, rather than themes or subjects. I shall not be firm on that either.

polarity of diatonic music. Technically, the development section takes us from the dominant, in which the exposition usually ends, back to the tonic, in which the recapitulation starts. But the tonic-dominant polarity is manifested in many other musical forms and is not specific to the sonata. What is characteristic of sonata form is the particular way in which this polarity is handled and manifests itself in the idea of the development section. What then is this idea?

Perhaps, the most common conception of the problem – one that has been undoubtedly shaped mainly by Beethoven, and which was dominant in the 19th century, is the **dramatic conception**. The idea here, put very roughly, is that some elements that are presented in the main subjects in the exposition are taken up in the development where they are further elaborated, and "worked on" in a way that unfolds their potential, and "meaning" (as the German *Durchführung* suggests). This process is particularly dramatic when the elements in point are stated very briefly, or even embrionically in the exposition, so that unfolding their full power and significance in the development is a real "revelation", which can give a dramatic turn to the whole piece. This is a particular and quite natural way of "making things happen" in music; the dramatic character of this conception often consists of the fact that this process of revealing the hidden power of musical ideas can be naturally incorporated in a structure that builds up a climax at definite points. This conception is characteristic of many of Beethoven sonata movements and it has become, in one version or another, the standard conception of the development in a sonata. It is not my intention to discuss this conception and the above characterization; it is presented here just by way of giving a general background to an alternative conception I wish to ascribe to Mozart.³

³ In J. Cott's *Conversations with Glenn Gould* (Little Brown and Company 1984) Gould makes some remarks about Mozart's Piano sonatas, which may be worth mentioning here. Gould says that he doesn't "really like Mozart as a composer" and speaks of Mozart a "mediocre composer". He loves, he says, the "early sonatas", but loses interest in the mature Mozart when the latter "finds himself", because "what he discovered was primarily a theatrical gift which he applied ever after not only to his operas but to his instrumental works as well". Part of what Gould doesn't like about the sonatas is that he feels that "once he (Mozart) hit his stride, they are all cut from the same cookie stamp" (58). Gould then talks about developments and the idea of opposites in sonata form and claims that "These developments hadn't fully infiltrated the music Mozart wrote in mid-career ..." and "Mozart never really did learn to write a development section...". This is probably because "The development in the classical sonata was there in order to crystallize the potentialities of opposite forces, and it was precisely Beethoven, whose structural notions were based on the coalition of opposites, who wrote developments until you begged for some kind of sobering tonic reaffirmation" (58).

I'll not comment about Gould's feelings and assessments of "Mozart as a composer" (remarks in the same spirit occur also in his conversation with Bruno Monsiegeon about Mozart in

It should also be noted that in principle there is nothing in this conception that is intimately connected with the polarity idea. It could be applied, and has been applied to other forms, amongst them "one- theme" forms. Even in Beethoven's own sonatas, it often happens that where two subjects are presented in the exposition only one of them is really dealt with in the development (the other is sometimes "compensated for" in the recapitulation, or in the coda).

Without being rigid about it, it might be helpful, for the following discussion to discern, within this broad conception of the development, various kinds, or models:

- (i) There is, first, the "one-theme" model, where only one theme is really worked on in the development.
- (ii) The "two themes" model, where two (or three; I shall not deal with this separately) main themes or subjects of the exposition are dealt with in the development.

Within this broad second model we can further distinguish three sub- kinds.

- (iia) The "succession" model, where two (or more) themes are developed in succession, one after the other, with no real interconnection between them.

'Glenn Gould Reader', ed. T. Page, faber an faber, 1984). But I believe that these remarks about Mozart's development-sections deserve some attention because they are quite typical and widespread, I would almost say, commonplace. I think that if you ignore some of Gould's repugnant formulatons and try to get at the insight behind them, they are really not so shocking and original as, perhaps he thought they were.

First, his comments about the ideas of opposites as a governing idea of sonata form are in general quite right. One can also agree with Gould that Mozart was not under the spell of that idea. It is quite significant that his last two piano sonatas have first movements that are written as mono-thematic sonata movements, much like many of Haydn's. His view that it is silly to expect the masculine/feminine dualism everywhere in Mozart, with the masculine coming first, and to play him accordingly, is also right (e.g. the first movement of the B-flat sonata K.333).

But for my present concerns the most important remark is about the development sections. Again, I think that there is something right in Gould's intuition, though it is put in an appauling way. The main point is that if your ideas about sonata form and about the develoment section are ninteen-centuary ideas, ideas which were shaped mainly by Beethoven and his sucesors, it is not inappropriate, nor particularly surprising to say that Mozart seldom wrote such development sections. It simply was not his idea of a development section and of sonata form. But what was then his idea? One canot understand Mozart's sonatas without dwelling on this question. This is not to imply that there is one general answer: Mozart had many ideas of the development section and its particular function within a sonata movement, as he had many ideas about sonata form in general. In this sense it is wrong to say, as Gould does, that "they were all cut from the same fookie stamp". But with the appropriate reservations and qualification one can say some general things which are characteristic and typical of many of Mozart's development sections, as well as about some other features of his sonata-form movements, and some of these I shall try to elaborate in this article.

(iib) The "dialogic" model, where the two themes are played against each other in the development. Here a developed form of one may alternate with a development of the other, or be posed against it, etc. so that the two are interconnected.

(iic) The "synthesis" model, where the development consists of a real synthesis or fusion of the two themes or of various elements of the two themes.

I do not mean this to be a clean and sharp distinction. There are many cases that fall in between these categories and many that fall outside their scope. There are of course various compositional and stylistic considerations for preferring one of these models in each particular context. The point to notice here is that it is mainly the last two kinds – the dialogic and the synthesis models – that are intimately and conceptually related to the very idea of a development in sonata form. It is only here that we make real use of the two themes, of their polarity or of their contrasting character.

Now, these two models, though they may be the typical realization of the essential nature of the dramatic conception of the development in a sonata form, may lead us quite naturally to a totally different conception of the development and its function – a conception I would call the "**unifying synthesis**" conception. This is I believe the typical Mozartean conception, as I shall try to illustrate by numerous examples from his piano sonatas. But before turning into detailed analyses of these, let me add some more general remarks about this unifying conception. In fact, when one looks more carefully into the dialogic model and into the very idea of a dialogue, one realizes that it has some interesting dialectics behind it, which is very important for understanding its realization in music. A dialogue needs contrast, or opposition; it takes place between two (or more) parties that must retain their character and individuality. But we don't get a real dialogue just by putting two contrasting (or otherwise different) parties side by side, or one after the other. In order to get a dialogue we need some common ground, common subject or element that they both share, or exemplify, or presuppose. Moreover, a real and developed dialogue not only presupposes this common, or shared background; it also has the effect of revealing common elements of the "opposed" parties, elements that might have been hidden, or latent before. In this sense it may have a harmonizing, or unifying effect: it can reveal common features that were not noticed before, or emphasize those that were.

All this may sound wildly metaphorical and hardly relevant to musical understanding. Metaphorical it certainly is (as any talk about music is bound to be, to a lesser or greater

extent), but I believe that it is very pertinent to music, and to the understanding of various aspects of structural and compositional considerations in music. In what follows I shall try to exemplify and substantiate these claims, as well as the point of the above distinctions by analyzing some thematic features of the development sections in Mozart sonatas.

In particular I shall try to show that Mozart worked typically (though by no means exclusively) under the unifying conception of the development section in a sonata. The typical model (and again, not the only one) of his developments is the synthesis model, where a sort of fusion and integration is achieved among various constitutive elements of the main "opposing" themes of the exposition. Sometimes this is fairly straight forward (e.g. sonata in F, K. 533, 2nd movement; see also 1st movement m. 201). But often it is more latent and deserves a closer look. Such developments reveal strong (though sometimes rather abstract and hidden) interconnections between the main elements of the exposition, and thus establish a unified conception of the whole piece. I regard this to be a constitutive feature of Mozart's conception of sonata-form, and failing to realize this amounts to a failure to perceive an important feature of his compositional thought.

In the following I shall concentrate on the early sonatas, partly because I think that these marvelous pieces have received much less attention than they deserve, and partly because they contain some of the best examples of the phenomenon I am alluding to.

1) We may begin with the very well known sonata in G, K.283. The development which begins at m.54 consists of two main parts (54-62; 62-72) Here is 54-58 of the first (ex.1):

Ex.1

And here is the beginning of the second (mm.62-66, ex.2):

Ex.2

This "division" within a very short section may appear rather strange, even more so because the second part is a trivial sequence of three descending sixths, which has an obvious relaxing effect. But relaxing from what? Well, from the compressed tension of the preceding eight bars of which the real essence of the development consists. These eight bars require close attention. At first, they seem to introduce a new element, which is hardly

related to what preceded it in the exposition.⁴ But on closer inspection it becomes clear that these eight bars are a most sophisticated fusion or synthesis of the constitutive elements of the exposition's two main themes, as the right hand fills-in a rapid descending fourth within what is the essence of the main motive of the first theme, making the whole a full descending sixth like that of the opening motive. Here are the opening four bars (ex.3):



The reader is advised to compare mm.1-2 of the primary theme (Ex.3) transposed to the dominant, to 54-5 (Ex.1), and 3-4 of Ex.3 to 60-1, while noticing that the left hand (particularly, the inner voice of mm.58-62) takes up the inverse of the descending sixth, which is the essential element of the secondary theme (mm.23-4, ex.4) shown here:



The simultaneous presentation of these elements of the two main themes in the development presents a "synchronization problem", which Mozart solves by introducing the high D in m.55, which gives the whole rhythmic pattern of 55-9 a beautiful asymmetric turn (this high D, by the way, is itself a reminder of the repeated tonic (G) in mm.4-6 of the main theme of the exposition). For appreciating the affinity of the beginning of the development to the primary motive, one should also note the rhythmic ambivalence between m. 54 and m. 58, where the latter is even closer, in metric terms, to the primary theme.

This tensed passage is a compressed synthesis of the main elements of the two main themes of the exposition, and Mozart wisely relaxes the tension in the second part of the development (mm.62-72), which does not prevent him from using for that part one of the

⁴ C. Rosen, in his *Sonata Form* (W.W. Norton, 1980) writes of this section, as well as of the sonata in C, K.330: "the developments contain material that makes no direct allusion to the exposition...". This remark is quite typical, and if I am right in what follows, it expresses a deep misunderstanding of an essential feature of Mozart's conception of sonata form and of his achievement in his sonatas.

very same elements he used before in creating the tension – the descending sixth of the secondary theme.

The synthesis of the two main elements of the exposition achieved here has another characteristic feature: **it unfolds a hidden interconnection between these main themes themselves**. The descending sixth of the right hand in the beginning of the development is related not only to the first theme, but also to the descending sixth of the right hand in the beginning of the secondary theme (ex.4). In fact, one can describe this passage in the development as a **filling-in of the descending sixth of the secondary theme into the skeletal pattern of the first theme**. It is the secondary theme compressed, so to speak, into the rhythmic proportion of the first.

This, I believe, is a telling example of a characteristic recurring feature of Mozart's sophisticated manner of handling the development section in a sonata. Typically, Mozart does not pick up one of the themes and "develop" it, nor does he develop the two themes in succession (there are examples of such developments in Mozart, but they are relatively atypical). What he often does instead is to fuse, synthesize or integrate in the development the essential elements of the main themes in an organic musical unit.

2) The Andante of the sonata in C, K.279 is in sonata form. Again the development section is relatively short (mm.29-42). On first hearing it is a straightforward development of the first main theme, rich in modulations and harmonic surprises. It is centered on the minor relative key (d), and begins somewhat cunningly on the dominant. It then leads directly to d minor, but when arriving there touches it only "in passing", and turns rather drastically, through a diminished seventh of the second degree (g), to the home key of F.

But rich and clever as this section is in its harmony, its special merit lies in the subtle and sophisticated manner in which a central element of the secondary theme is integrated into it and becomes the driving force of this progression. It thus synthesizes the constitutive elements of the main themes. We can see this right at the beginning. As I have already said, it starts in what seems to be a straightforward and unproblematic development of the first theme. But right at the second bar of the section (m.30), Mozart turns the subject into a minor second, (firstly, introduced as appoggiatura on G, but later given its full harmonic significance) which is repeated over and over again throughout the development section, and becomes its driving force. Here from m.29 ex.5:

Ex.5

Now, this minor second is the constitutive element of the secondary theme, where again it is "obsessively" repeated (cf. mm.18-26, Ex.6):

Ex.6

So here again we see the manner in which Mozart handles the development section as a fusion and synthesis of the constitutive elements of the main themes.

3) The development sections of the first and last movements of the sonata in F, K.280 display a similar conception of the development as a unifying synthesis. The development of the **Presto** (mm.78-106) starts on the dotted motive of the secondary theme. Here 78-85, ex.7:

Ex.7

But it is immediately combined with the descending fourth of mm.82-5, which is taken from the descending fourth of mm.2-5 of the first theme, shown here (ex.8):

Ex.8

This becomes even more emphatic in the rest of the development, where this fourth is divided into B-flat – A (repeated, mm.90-94) and G – F (repeated, mm.94-97). Moreover, this integration in the development brings to the fore the importance of this descending fourth in the secondary theme (mm.40-1), thus revealing a unifying integration of the two themes.

4) The development of the **first movement** of that sonata is characteristic, like the G major sonata discussed above, not only in that it forms a synthesis of elements of the

exposition's main themes but also in that the achieved synthesis reveals (and in fact is the result of) an intimate interconnection between the two themes themselves.⁵

The **triad chord** in the bass of m.1, and the **chromatic progression** of m.3, are keys to whatever goes on later. Here mm. 1-6, ex. 9:

Allegro assai.

Ex.9

They both re-appear in the second part of the first theme: cf. mm.13-17 to 1-2, and 18-22, to 3-4, where the chromatic move is grandly expanded and emphasized.

And again, these two elements are constitutive of the secondary theme: the basic triad chord in mm.27, 31, (ex.10):

Ex.10

and the chromatic progression in 35-43, (ex.11):

ex.11

The listener is reminded of these two elements in the codetta, mm.54-55.

The development is an obvious play with these two elements: the triad chord in mm. 57, 59, 67, 69, 71, 73, and the chromatic theme – in 63-4, 65-6, 75-80.

Although in this movement the affinity between the constitutive elements of the main two main themes is quite clear, it is still worth noticing their subtle fusion in the development. Bars 61-66 provide an example of a beautiful synthesis of the two elements, where a subtle use of the same rhythmic pattern serves to unify two appearances of the triad (C-A-F in the bass and D-B-G in the middle voice, 61-2), followed by a double appearance of the chromatic theme in the middle voice of 63-6. Here mm. 61-66 (ex.12):

⁵ Another typical example of that is the first movement of the B-flat sonata, K.570, which is quite obvious, and I shall not discuss here in detail.



5) I shall now turn to some movements in the so-called Mannheim and Paris sonatas. The development section of the sonata in C, K.309 is a magnificent illustration of a transition **from dialogue to real synthesis**. It begins as a beautiful dialogue between a developed first theme (59-62) and a subtle variation on the secondary theme (63-6), which repeats itself in 67-72. Here 59-64, ex.13:



The constitutive element of the secondary theme on which the variation here is built is the minor second turn G – F# – G in mm.35-7, (ex.14), etc., which is inverted in forte in 49-51, (ex.15) by the high E² – F² – E²:



Ex.14.....



Ex.15

Thus relating this minor second turn of the secondary theme to the aforementioned passage in the development may seem erroneous, for in the development D² (m.64) occurs as an appoggiatura, whereas in the above place in the secondary theme it is part of a harmonic dominant progression. Yet, one should pay attention to the following. The main motive of the secondary theme, of which the minor second in question is the essential element, recurs, in a compressed form, in m.45, within a larger passage, in forte, whose essence consists of high D² (43) – high E² (44) – G – F# (45), ex.16:



This seems to me to be the source of the above passage in the development (63-4), which is even more persuasive when compared to (71). I think that when these relationships are

followed through, the above analysis, which relates the minor second turn of mm.35-6 to the turn with the appoggiatura of m.64 appears more convincing.

This dialogue between the elements of the two main themes turns in the later part of the development (mm.73-82) into a real synthesis of them, where the main motive of the first theme is modulated by emphatic repetitions of the minor second turns: D# – E (74), C# – D (76), B – C (77), G# – A (78) and D# – E (79-81). Here is its beginning, mm. 73-76 (ex.17):



6) A few months after this sonata in C was completed, Mozart wrote the sonata in A minor, K.310, and the two are as different as one can imagine. Yet, the handling of the development section in the first movement of this A minor sonata displays, once again, a similar conception of the synthetic model. The bulk of this development consists of bold modulations on the rhythmic motive of the first theme. Closer inspection reveals, however, that a somewhat hidden element of the secondary theme is integrated into the general pattern of the development and becomes its governing idea. I am referring to the recurring progression C – A – B – G# – A – F# – G# in mm. 59-62, (ex.18), which is sequenced three times in B, E, and A:



This recalls the similar progression: F – D* – E – C* – D – G*(B) – C in the bass of mm.28-31, (ex.19) of the secondary theme:



It should be also noted that the main steps of the harmonic progression of the development is a sequence of descending fifths: B(58) – E(62) – A(66) – D(70). Now, this is very much like the progression of the descending fifths in the soprano line of the secondary theme:

C(23) – F(24) – B(25) – E(26), which is itself taken from the harmonic progression of mm.6-8 (D – G – C – F – B) of the first theme.

So here again, the development, with all its dramatic force, displays a synthesizing fusion of constitutive elements of the two main themes.

7) The very same idea of the development, where an almost hidden element of one of the themes (the one that, on the surface, does not seem to be treated in the development) becomes the governing principle of the harmonic progression of the development, is found in the other and later minor sonata – the one in C minor, K.457.

Here again, the main bulk of the development consists of bold modulations on the main motive of the first theme. But studying the pattern of these modulations more carefully reveals a governing idea taken from the secondary theme. The whole progression is of the "increasingly condensed" type, which gives it a dynamic character (a typical Beethovenian move). It begins by four preparatory bars (83-86), where the last two "answer" the first. Here bars 83-88 (ex.20):



And then the real drama begins (87) by a condensed sequence with no balancing answers. Now, the key notes in this sequence are B-flat (87) – B (89) – C (91) – D (93), and these are exactly the notes so much emphasized in the secondary theme (44-5, ex.21):



What we see here is that the constitutive element of the secondary theme – the chromatic line mentioned, which is a manifest expression of the chromatic idea which governs the whole secondary theme (cf. mm. 36-7, 40-41, 48, 57, 59-62) – is integrated into the development (which superficially seems to relate only to the first theme) as the leading idea of the harmonic progression by which the first theme is developed. This, to repeat, is exactly the general pattern of the development we have found in the previous A minor

sonata, and both are of course marvelous examples of the unifying synthesis conception, which we claim to be typical of Mozart.

It should be also noticed that this thematic connection between the chromatic line of the harmonic progression in the development and the chromatic motive of the secondary theme, is manifest by a structural affinity. In both cases it is an emphatic and "tensed" figure, which comes immediately after calmer, more tranquil and perfectly symmetrical alternations of the top line and the bass. This structural affinity strengthens our suggestion that the progression of mm.87-93 in the development is derived from the chromatic motive (44-5) of the secondary theme.

8) As another example of our claim consider the first movement of the F-major sonata, K.332. The development section (mm. 94-132) seems, on first hearing, to be related only to the secondary theme: its beginning (mm.94-7, ex.22) trades on both thematic and rhythmic patterns of the beginning of the secondary theme (mm.41-4, ex.23):

Ex.22

Ex. 23

And its main part (mm.109-123) is an obvious development of the second, syncopated part of the secondary theme (mm.56-67). The first theme seems to be out of the picture.

But on a closer look it seems that the first four bars of the development, "answered" by the four bars 98-101 (Ex. 22), are related to mm. 5-8 (Ex.24) of the first theme:

Ex.24

Hence, we have here in the development a subtle "dialogue" of these elements of the main themes: in the first 4 bars – of the secondary theme, and in the following 4 – of the first. The real secret comes, however, later on. The key element in the harmonic progression of the second, syncopated, part of the development (mm.113-123) is a series of emphasized minor seconds in the bass, which support condensed transitions from diminished sevenths to six-chords of G, D and A. The same pattern, however, is the heart of the second part of

the first theme (mm.25-37), where Mozart takes us through emphatic diminished sevenths to the six-chords of D, C, and G.

Moreover, the sequence of minor seconds in the bass of this part in the development is governed by a basic motive, formed from the minor seconds of e.g. A – B-flat – F# – G in mm. 114-117, etc. This basic motive, however, is the structural hidden motive of the very beginning of the first theme. Underlying the flowing and calm melody of the first theme there is a great tension created by the minor second appoggiatura F – E of m.4. The resolving F (m.5) is then extended over the whole first part of the theme (5-22).

Ex.25

The extension is realized by repeated minor seconds, E-F, "answering" the one of m.4 (mm.8-9, 11-12, 16, 19-20). The repeated dominant cadences of mm.20-22 are sort of rhythmic preparation of the "shocking" transition to D minor of mm.22-3. Structurally we have here the skeletal motive of E – F (19-20) – C# – D (22-3), and this is exactly the basic motive we have detected as governing the harmonic progression of the main part of the development.

Thus, what we see here, is that from a subtle "dialogue" between elements of the first and secondary themes in the first part of the development Mozart creates, in the second part, a real synthesis of them, where the general texture is manifestly that of the secondary theme (second part), but the harmonic progression, which is the substance of this texture, is governed by the basic idea of the first theme.

9) The last example I will mention to illustrate this conception is the first movement of the B-flat sonata, K.333. The very beginning of the development here (mm.63-5, ex.26) consists of a combination of the main motive of the first theme (ex.27) with a dotted variation on the concluding theme of the secondary group (m.39, ex.28):

Ex.26

Ex.27

ex.28

The middle section of the development displays such a synthesis in an abstract and sophisticated manner. Whereas the fifth descent of m.72 (ex.29) is a subtle minor variation on the main motive of the secondary theme (mm.23-4), it is immediately combined with the syncopated scale of 73-4 (ex.29), which is an expansion of mm.9-10 (ex.30) of the first theme. Here mm. 71-74 (ex. 29) followed by mm.9-10 (ex.30):

Ex.29 *legato*

Ex.30

Again, the syncopated turn of mm.79-80 (ex.31), with the chromatic descent in the bass:

Ex.31

is an exemplary synthesis of the soprano line of mm.9-10, (ex.30) of the first theme, with the chromatic middle voice of 54-5, (ex.32) of the conclusion of the secondary group:

ex.32

This, I believe, is a marvelous example not only of the way Mozart integrates the constitutive elements of the main themes in the development, but also of the unifying effect achieved by this synthesis. For, although the interconnections between the two main themes are manifest in the exposition itself (the descending sixths of m.1 and of m. 23, the syncopated turns of m.5 and of m.25, 29, etc.) they become more conspicuous and gain special musical significance in the development, where these interrelated elements are integrated in one musical unit.

There are numerous other examples one can bring forth for discussing the issues we have dealt with, but the cases I have brought are sufficient, I hope, for illustrating the main point I wished to establish: that there is a characteristic way in which Mozart handles the development sections in his sonatas (which I have called the synthesis model), and that this way displays a particular conception of the development section and its function in sonata form (what I have called the unifying synthesis conception). This is accomplished, in the most typical cases, by a subtle and sophisticated integration, in the development section, of the constitutive elements of the exposition's main themes.

Throughout the discussion I used some simplified notions and distinctions: the very standard scheme of the structure of sonata form should not be taken too rigidly, for it sometimes forces a piece into a formal scheme to which it does not naturally fit. Even more arbitrary may be the distinctions between the various models of the development section, which I have roughly sketched and freely used. I am not too much troubled by these limitations, for my main purpose is to point to a characteristic and important feature of Mozart's musical thought, and for this purpose the above notions and distinctions – be they as rough and inaccurate as they may – seem to be harmless.

The unifying synthesis conception to which I have alluded is manifested not only in the particular way in which Mozart handles the development. It is also intimately tied with other features of his compositional thought, such as his use of symmetries, his conception of the relationships between the main themes, features of his codas, and more. This conception of the unifying synthesis gains special significance in light of the especially rich and multifarious character of Mozart's style: very often the richness of multifarious textures, melodies and harmonic turns in one page of Mozart's music is astounding (e.g. the beginning of the F major sonata K. 280 discussed above). And as a result various means of integration and synthesis have special significance for conferring upon it convincing coherence. The above claim about his conception of the development section in a sonata is a feature of this much wider topic.