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Abstract

This dissertation examines aspects of harmonic function in the music of Sergei Prokofiev. Chapter 1 provides a survey of music theory literature on Prokofiev’s music—including many Russian studies—and discusses the theoretical underpinnings of my analytical approach. Chapter 2 deals with Prokofiev’s uses of symmetry and inversion in tonal plans and harmonic progressions, emphasizing the importance of perfect-fifth-related harmonic alternatives and long series of perfect fifths in works in what Prokofiev called his “classical line.” The central topic of Chapter 3 is sequential harmony. This subdivides into discussions of Prokofiev’s characteristic use of brief linking chords that clearly express dominant function; long, structural, but “obscure” dominants; plagal sequential trajectories in which a written-out ritardando seems to compensate for the lack of a culminating D-T relation; and directional changes (“volte-faces”) signalling the end of sequential passages. Chapter 4 considers questions of harmonic function in light of ladovaia peremennost’ (modal variability) and tonal pairing, which for Prokofiev is typically major-third-based; the discussion extends to a variety of harmonic techniques involving reinterpretation, substitution, or redirection by major third. In Chapter 5, the focus shifts to the semitone. Investigating the harmonic-functional implications of events commonly referred to as chromatic displacements, I suggest that the concept of chromatic substitution is often of limited
value and explore some of the ways in which harmonic-functional balance and tonal closure arise in spite of (or in some sense due to) these events. Chapter 6 offers a conclusion and suggestions for future research, emphasizing the value of studying Prokofiev’s harmonic practice in relation to nineteenth-century precedents (rather than to the Classical style), highlighting some of the harmonic techniques and tonal strategies that cut across the conventional boundaries of Prokofiev’s biography and oeuvre, and re-evaluating the ways in which certain traditional tonal principles are relevant even to Prokofiev’s idiosyncratic “modern line.”
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Chapter 1: Survey of analytical literature on Prokofiev and overview of the dissertation

Compared with the music of Stravinsky and Shostakovich, Prokofiev’s music has attracted little attention from music theorists. Since the publication of a 1997 monograph by Neil Minturn, nonetheless, a considerable number of dissertations (including Rifkin 2000, Bertram 2000, Zimmerman 2002, and Harter 2003) and articles (including Rifkin 2004, 2006, 2011; Karl 1998, 2013; and Cohn 2012) have focused on Prokofiev’s music. These range from studies of phrase structure to explorations of musical narrative; harmony and motive are approached from such contrasting vantage points as Schenkerian theory and “neotonal” set theory. Many authors emphasize that, considering the richness of Prokofiev’s music (its dialogue with numerous traditions, its way of hovering between tonality and atonality), an eclectic, multifaceted analytical approach is often the most beneficial. Unfortunately, analytical studies of Prokofiev’s music have to some extent emerged in isolation from one another. This chapter presents a survey of analytical literature on Prokofiev to help remedy this problem. I begin not with Minturn’s 1997 book (the only English-language music theory monograph on Prokofiev to date), but with some Russian studies (largely from the 1960s and 1970s) with which North American scholars have seldom engaged. These writings originate, for the most part, from the journal Sovetskaia muzyka and such collections of articles as Cherty stilia S. Prokof’eva [Traits of S. Prokofiev’s style] (1962) and Voprosy teorii muzyki [Questions of music theory] (1970).1 Perhaps the most prominent of the Russian scholars is Yury Kholopov, whose 1967 book explores “contemporary traits” of Prokofiev’s harmony. The overview of music theory scholarship on Prokofiev presented in this chapter is, to be sure, far from comprehensive; I have selected writings and ideas that are particularly relevant to the largely harmonic-functional analyses offered in later chapters. Section I focuses on the early Russian writings on Prokofiev’s music, dealing with characteristic harmony and specific relationships to the classical and fantastic traditions of Russian music. Looking mainly at North American studies, Section II provides commentary on Schenkerian approaches; issues related to “wrong notes,” hypothetical prototypes, and chromatic displacement; recent set-theoretical, “neotonal,” and motivic studies; and (briefly) some approaches to irony and musical narrative. The survey is organized chiefly by topic; thus, some

1 The transliteration system used for Russian words in this dissertation is that of The Serge Prokofiev Archive: http://www.sprkfiv.net/archiveresources/translitsys.html.
North American scholarship is included in Section I, as is some Russian scholarship in Section II. Also, I point forward in several places to specific analyses later in the dissertation. The chapter concludes with an overview of subsequent chapters of the dissertation, outlining the approach I take to issues of harmonic function in Prokofiev’s music.

I. The “Prokofiev dominant” and Prokofiev’s relation to Russian musical traditions; general characteristics of Prokofiev’s harmony

One of the earliest and most influential analysts of Prokofiev’s music was Viktor Berkov, who laid the groundwork for future analytical and hermeneutic study with thirteen one-paragraph “theses” that he submitted to the Leningrad State Institute of Theatre, Music and Cinematography in 1939. In his 1945 essay on the first four piano sonatas and his 1958 article on harmony, Berkov introduces a term that would be widely adopted in Soviet music theory: the “Prokofiev dominant” (prokof’evski dominant). The piece that originally prompts Berkov’s discussion of the concept is the first movement of the D-minor Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14. Berkov observes a similarity between the harmonies leading to the recapitulation of the D-minor main theme (m. 205) and to the A-minor transition (m. 223): in mm. 197-204 and 222, the harmony could potentially be interpreted as a dominant of C♭ minor (1945, 401). Exploring comparable cases elsewhere in Prokofiev’s music, Berkov (1958) describes the typical “Prokofiev dominant”: “We are dealing with a replacement of the ordinary dominant or dominant-seventh chord on scale degree 5 with a major or minor triad lying a semitone below scale degree 1 (or scale degree 5). For example, in place of the dominant of C major, B-D♭-F♭; instead of the dominant of A minor, G♭-B-D♭” (83). Berkov invokes the opening of the “Lily Dance” for an example of a minor-mode “Prokofiev dominant” (example 1.1). Major-mode examples are more numerous. In “The Young Juliet,” Berkov points out a “Prokofiev dominant” combined with an ordinary dominant seventh in the first cadence (m. 4; example 1.2); in the answering phrase, the VII♭ “has detached itself, as it were” (m. 8; example 1.3) (84). Romeo, too, is characterized by a dominant intensified by a raised seventh and a raised fifth (example 1.4). “Prokofiev dominants” are especially characteristic of the later Soviet works, but can be found in earlier pieces as well, such as the Minuet, Op. 32, No. 2 (example 1.5). Surveying the

---

2 These are reproduced together with marginal commentary by Asafiev in the 1977 collection of Berkov’s writings (365-71). For an overview of Berkov’s writings with emphasis on his studies of Glinka’s harmonic language, see Carpenter (1988, 1316-68).
repertoire, one notices also that the “Prokofiev dominant” combines with the dominant triad or seventh chord more often than it substitutes for it, despite Berkov’s initial definition. Such combinations usually feature the dominant root in the bass, but Prokofiev occasionally entrusts the $\hat{5}$-1 motion to the upper voice instead, as in the excerpt from *Peter and the Wolf*, Op. 67, shown in example 1.6.

Expanding on Berkov’s (1958) work, Natalia Zaporozhets (1962) explores how Prokofiev “strives to maximize beauty and tension” by “leading” to each member of the tonic triad (219). A “leading” dominant (“vvodnai” $D$) and a “leading” subdominant (“vvodnai” $S$) flank the tonic triad (e.g. BM and D♭M in the key of C major). The dominant receives an analogous “leading-semitone encirclement,” with a “leading” secondary dominant (“vvodnai” $DD$; e.g. F♯M leading to GM in the key of C) and “leading” secondary subdominant (“vvodnai” $SD$; e.g. A♮M leading to GM in the key of C) (220). Among Zaporozhets’s illustrations of “leading” dominants and subdominants are a BM-CM motion in mm. 15-16 of “Promenade,” Op. 87, No. 31, and an A7-A♭M progression in m. 16 of “Fairy Winter,” Op. 87, No. 16. Examples 1.7 and 1.8 show the immediate contexts of these resolutions, with the “‘leading’ chords” indicated by asterisks. Zaporozhets’s system encourages reflection on the ambiguity that sometimes arises between tonic and dominant function. For example, the penultimate harmony in the A section of Joke, Op. 3, No. 2 (example 1.9) may be labelled as a “leading” $S$ on a dominant root or $V_{7}/9/7/5$, but the F-minor beginning of the B section (m. 11, not shown) testifies to the nature of the C-major tonic as dominant of the subdominant. Analogously, the end of the E-major second movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82 (example 1.10) features the combined resolution of a “leading” $S$ and a “leading” $D$, but the possibility of hearing a resolution of a “leading” $SD$ plus a “leading” $DD$ is also relevant. Elsewhere, “leading” dominants can contribute to the submediant-like character of a tonic; this point will be especially

---

3 As Kholopov (1967b) observes, the Lily Dance certainly begins with $\flat\text{vii}$ substituting for $V$, but ends with an authentic cadence involving $V\flat\text{7}$: thus $\flat\text{vii}$ is finally subject to a “subposed” dominant root (416-17). Chapter 2 includes a detailed analysis of harmonic function and symmetry in the Lily Dance.


5 In the harmonic analysis in example 1.10, the bullet symbol represents an absent root (as in Damschroder 2010, xi).

6 As Kiseleva (1970) points out, it is appropriate for this movement’s final E tonic to receive dominant-like treatment, since the sonata’s overall tonic is A. Meanwhile, she adds, the triadic échappée on G in the second half of the penultimate measure might hint at the C-major key of the third movement (358).
relevant in Chapter 4, where I analyze some pieces in which prominent major-third pairings go hand in hand with this kind of harmonic-functional nuance.

Discussions of “Prokofiev dominants,” “leading” chords, and Prokofiev’s harmony in general often branch out into a number of topics that are sometimes considered fundamental to Russian music, including vvodnotonnost’, tonikalnost’, plagalnost’, peremennost’, parallel perfect intervals, and polyharmony or polytonality. The idea of vvodnotonnost’ is especially strongly associated with the music and teaching of Rimsky-Korsakov. In his harmony textbook, Rimsky-Korsakov encourages the exploration of a wonderful variety of “false progressions” while stressing that “the first rule is perfect fluency of voice-leading” (1943 [1884-86], 108). Several authors point out the linear derivation of “Prokofiev dominants” and compare them to chromatic mediants and submediants—other dominant-function harmonies that resolve with chromatic voice-leading to the tonic. Antoni Poszowski (1973) observes that Prokofiev often “strengthens” the leading tone in a manner comparable to instrumental doubling (42), and Tatiana Bershadskaya (1995) explores how the harmonic-functional cogency of melodic figures often compensates for the absence or weakness of the dominant root.7 On the other hand, Skorik (1972) objects to Zaporozhets’s system in that it overlooks the importance of 7 and minor dominants in such works as the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135 and the second movement of Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80 (233-34). Conflicts between 7 and 7 often prove to be a rich source of dramatic tension in Prokofiev’s music. Ronald Woodley (1995) argues that, largely owing to its eschewal of 7, the Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80, fails to achieve true closure in its first movement, and at the heart of the second movement is a conflict between 7 (an “agent of blockage,” which can have an “ironising” effect) and 7 (the “real” leading tone, which can be a “de-ironising,” “regenerating” force).

The second recurring idea in writings on Prokofiev’s harmony mentioned above is tonikalnost’. In a 1925 essay on Prokofiev’s Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26, Asafiev expounded on the typical status of tonic harmony in Prokofiev’s music: “The tonic is impulsive, exciting, and moving. This contradicts ‘Tristanian’ precepts and ideas that evasion of the tonic will produce continuity of melodic tension. On the contrary, the supremacy of the tonic will produce

---

7 On the topic of vvodnotonnost’, see also Kholopov’s (1967a) chapter on “linear harmony” in Prokofiev’s music (116-71). Kholopov (1988) discusses the “Prokofiev dominant” in the context of “leading-tone” (vvodnotonnom) chromaticism (one of six forms of chromaticism), comparing it to the “Gothic cadence” (e.g. E-G♯-C♯ resolving to D-A-D) (141). (Kholopov could, indeed, have pointed to the G-minor ⅤⅦ6-i(add9) cadence in m. 4 of the first movement of Prokofiev’s Quintet, Op. 39.)
a healthy, natural perception of dynamics and mobility, without any suggestion of stagnation or setting” (Asafiev 1957, 110). 8 Asafiev’s reference to anti-Wagnerian (and healthy, robust) harmony is a way of connecting Prokofiev to an older (pre-Scriabin) Russian tradition. As Taruskin (1997) observes, “the most immediately striking characteristic” of Balakirev’s folksong settings of the 1860s “is the avoidance of dominant harmony,” in stark contrast to the extravagant expansions of dominant function typical of contemporary (Wagnerian) European music (133). Somewhat similarly, Prokofiev’s “impulsive tonics” allowed him to stand out early in his career as the antithesis of Scriabin. In Chapter 3, I return to this general idea in a study of some of the typical ways in which Prokofiev’s harmonic sequences gravitate to the tonic or seem unable to quit the tonic.

The topic of plagalnost’ occasionally arises as a point of comparison between Prokofiev’s harmonic style and that of earlier Russian composers. Plagal progressions have long been associated with such pillars of the Russian nationalist musical culture as the Slav’sia (Glory) chorus that concludes Glinka’s A Life for the Tsar. 9 Tarakanov (1967) tentatively connects Prokofiev to the Russian classical tradition with the suggestion that his plagal effects are reminiscent of Mussorgsky (419). Zaporozhets (1962) provides an example from Prokofiev’s Russian Overture, Op. 72, in which a root motion from F♯ to C should be considered plagal (from vvodnaia DD to tonic harmony) since the F♯ emerges as an inflection of F; she contrasts this with cases that more closely recall the Russian fantastic tradition (222-25). In general, however, plagalism is not strongly associated with Prokofiev’s music. This relates to a commonplace theoretical opposition between Prokofiev and Shostakovich. Miasoedov (1983), for example, contrasts two types of altered dominant harmonies as opposite extremes: the first is from Prokofiev’s Romeo and Juliet, Op. 64 (as in example 1.2), while the second is from mm. 103-07 of the third movement (“Eternal memory”) of Shostakovich’s Symphony No. 11, Op. 103, of 1957 (example 1.11). While the former “strengthens” the dominant tendency with upward semitone resolutions to each member of the tonic triad, the latter “weakens” it with downward resolutions (1983, 249). Similarly, Kholopov (1988) contrasts the modes “characteristic of Prokofiev (with his love for bright major colours) and Shostakovich (often preferring the

---

8 This is quoted and translated by Bakst (1962, 300). See also Skorik (1972, 227) for an elaboration of the tonikalnost’ concept.

‘superminor’ modes first described by Dolzhansky [1947], with their gloomy minor colouration)” (151). Especially if the focus is on works like Romeo and Juliet, Op. 67, and Cinderella, Op. 87, which secured Prokofiev’s reputation as a popular Soviet composer in the late 1930s and early 1940s, the generalization seems accurate enough. However, minor-mode vii and viii1-7=iv chords—as well as their abstract sum, vii7 or gvi7/5/3—are important elements of Prokofiev’s harmonic language, and his innovative uses of these harmonies surely represented for Shostakovich and others a particularly influential aspect of Prokofiev’s style.10

One of the most important topics related to Prokofiev’s harmony is ladovaia peremennost’ (modal mutability)—a concept sometimes invoked in opposition to tonikalnost’.”

A brief survey of this term’s applications in music analysis will be useful. In a memorable passage in his book On Russian Music (1939), Gerald Abraham humorously describes Russian composers’ “tendency to confuse relative major and minor” and gives an example from Borodin in which we must simply shift our perspective from the “supposed” tonic to its relative and “everything becomes clear at once” (269). In his 1983 harmony textbook, Miasoedov begins his explanation of the idiom by presenting a folksong that begins on A and ends on F♯, with a three-sharp key signature and no accidentals (31). He proceeds with general comments on diatonic harmonic ambiguity (arising partly from an avoidance of the position-finding tritone) (31-33). Providing a historical perspective as well as commentaries on individual works, Taruskin (1997) refers to the “very free, seemingly unstable interplay of relative major and minor keys” as a token of the style russe of Glinka, which reflects the “mutable mode” of Russian melismatic

10 From a harmonic perspective, the passage from Shostakovich’s Symphony No. 11 discussed by Miasoedov can be compared to the “Song of Katerina” from act I, scene 3 of Shostakovich’s Katerina Izmailova, which is cited by Dolzhansky (1947, 69). These examples are both in F♯ minor, and it is perhaps no coincidence that many similar cases in Prokofiev’s music (e.g. in Piano Concerto No. 2, Op. 16; Gavotte, Op. 32, No. 3; and Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, each of which will be discussed at various points in this dissertation) also involve F♯-minor harmony.

11 See, e.g., Kholopov’s (1967c) discussion of the “variable diatonic mode” (peremennyi diatonicheski lad) and “diatonic atonicality” (“diatonicheskai aatonikal nost”) in examples from Prokofiev’s music (272-74).
factsong (29-31). Such interplay is not always between the relative major and minor. Taruskin discusses, for example, the relationship between the tonic B♭ and the *peremennost’* tone A♭ in the opening of Balakirev’s second Overture on Russian Themes (138).

Among the earliest theorists associated with *ladovaia peremennost’* is Yavorksy, in whose work the “variability” or versatility of modes figures prominently. Yavorksky’s “first variable mode” is similar to Robert Bailey’s A-C-E-G double tonic complex (Bailey 1985, 113-46). (This relates to an underexplored field of study: the intersection between the nineteenth-century traditions of *ladovaia peremennost’* in Russia and tonal pairing outside of Russia.)

Kholopov (1988) distinguishes between *peremennye lady* and *peremennaia tonal’nost’* (the latter corresponding to directional tonality (391)). Among his examples of the former are works by Rachmaninoff (200), anticipating an important recent study by Blair Johnston (2009). Several aspects of Johnston’s dissertation on Rachmaninoff’s harmony are relevant to the present study, including his perspectives on “*peremennost’*-derived substitutions” (cases in which the dominant of one key seems to be pressed into service as the “dominant” of a *peremennost’*-related key (185)), and his explorations of harmony associated with 5-6-6-5 figures (representative of the *nega* idiom in Russian music).

The concept of *ladovaia peremennost’* is useful in studying the relation of Prokofiev’s music to the Russian classical tradition. Berkov, for example, discusses the C-major secondary theme in the first movement of the A-minor Piano Sonata No. 3, Op. 28, as an example of

---

12 Robert Oldani (2013) adds that typical minor-mode *protiazhnaia* folksongs “cadence either on the tonic or subtonic,” often with the result that “harmonic settings of such melodies move easily between the minor and relative major” (8).

13 As Carpenter (1988) explains, Yavorsky’s “variable” modes (the “chain” mode as well as the first and second variable modes) are so called “because of the presence in all three of both the major and minor modal capabilities. The ‘chain’ mode tonic contains essentially both major and minor tonic triads on the same pitch [e.g. CM and Cm], whereas tonics of the other ‘variable’ modes contain tonics of both major and minor triads on different pitches [e.g. CM and Am, or CM and Em]” (469). Thibodeau (1993) provides Yavorskian analyses of several works by Prokofiev. He applies, e.g., the “variable mode” with duplex resolutions (specifically the G, variable mode II) to Sarcasm, Op. 17, No. 3, arguing that it efficiently represents the unity of the apparently bitonal piece’s modal configuration and tonal plan (185).

14 Johnston associates three techniques with the “de-centered” harmonic structures referable to *peremennost’* in Rachmaninoff’s music: “oscillation between and/or superimposition of diatonically related triads, often with a melodic ostinato,” especially at the beginnings and endings of works; “extended tertian structures” functioning as “elaborations of the subdominant in structural plagal structures”; and “modal reharmonization” of unchanging melodies, giving rise to a “larger-scale oscillation between pitch centers” (2009, 168).

15 On the topic of *nega* (“sweet bliss”) and eroticism/orientalism in nineteenth-century Russian music, see Taruskin (1997, 165-85). An important element of this idiom is the “chromatic pass” between 5 and 6, or 5-5-6-6-5 melodic motions. A broader overview is provided by Frolova-Walker (2007, 141-60), who, refuting the claim that this figure (she calls it the Kuchka Pattern) is specifically a marker of orientalism in Russian music, discusses some of its many uses in nineteenth-century Russian music.
Prokofiev’s wholehearted adoption of the Glinkian tradition, referring in particular to the way Prokofiev varies the theme between mm. 58 and 62 simply by shifting the initial bass tone from C to A (1968, 70). But for Prokofiev, *ladovaia peremennost’* is not only a way of grounding his music in a national tradition; it is also an important area of innovation. Chapter 4 studies some harmonic-functional consequences of Prokofiev’s innovative approach to tonal pairing (especially by major third).

Another type of *peremennost’* needs to be mentioned for its relevance to the present study. Carpenter (1995) points out the “central” position in Tiulin’s *Doctrine of Harmony* (1937) of his “theory of variable functions, or the opposition of a modal function to the basic modal direction within a mode (such as a dominant taking over the function of tonic within a given mode)” (80). The “dominant mode” is the most common of what L. Adam calls the “derived modes” (or “daughter modes”) (Carpenter 1995, 98). A *locus classicus* is the fourth movement of Rimsky-Korsakov’s *Capriccio espagnol*. Incidentally, Johnston [2009] develops a concept of “Phrygian organization” in Rachmaninoff’s music to describe many scenarios for which Russian writers would invoke the term “dominant mode.” In Chapter 6, I will return to the specific topic of “dominant modes”; more generally, the notion of tonics subtly expressing other harmonic functions is pertinent to several analyses in this dissertation.

Unconventional harmonic progressions and cadences in Prokofiev’s music often seem to arise from the “simplicity” of the voice leading, i.e. Prokofiev’s characteristic usage of parallel perfect intervals. In their studies of the symphonies, Slonimsky (1964), Tarakanov (1968), and Malcolm Brown (1967) occasionally compare Prokofiev’s contrapuntal practices to traditions of Russian heterophonic folksong, particularly the notion of *podgoloski* (“undervoices”) forming intermittent parallel octaves with a main melodic line. Slonimsky (1964) describes, for example, a “splitting” (*rasshcheplenie*) of the *dolce e sognando* second theme at R12 in the first movement of Symphony No. 6, Op. 111, into “two voices, setting forth two variants of the melody” that Prokofiev presents simultaneously (184-85). Schnittke’s (1974) study of voice

---

16 Kholopov draws on Tiulin’s work in his 1962 article on Prokofiev’s harmony (255).
17 Carpenter notes (1995, 98) that the term “dominant mode” originates with Sposobin (1954, 150). On the “dominant mode,” see Adam 1960 and 1967, as well as Kholopov’s (1988, 200-01) list of modes and examples. Adam (1967) traces Rachmaninoff’s uses of the “dominant mode” to precedents in Liszt and comments on its association with orientalism (76-77). Among Soviet composers, Adam remarks, the “dominant mode” plays an especially important role in certain regional music (popularized especially by Khachaturian), but is found only rarely in Prokofiev and Shostakovich (among his examples is a passage from Prokofiev’s Symphony No. 7, Op. 131). Harmonically, the “dominant mode” features either a major triad or dominant seventh chord as “tonic” (79).
leading in Prokofiev’s symphonies addresses this (213-14) as an example of one of several types of orchestral texture. A contrasting application of the same technique, according to Brown (1967), is the gloomy harmonization of the recapitulated secondary theme in the first movement of Symphony No. 2, Op. 40 (m. 340, R60) (95). In his longer autobiography, Prokofiev briefly discusses the expressive origin of outer-voice parallel octaves in his music:

The first little song of the fifth series [(1906)] was composed in a more dramatic-lyrical style. Here I would like to remark on one device to which I would often have recourse in future: at some point in the course of an upper melodic voice, the bass voice suddenly unites with it and moves parallel with it in octaves, as if underlining it [podcherkivaet ego], and then abandons it, again becoming independent. It seemed to me that this doubling by the bass underlines and intensifies the expressiveness of the melody.

Example 1.12

The parallel octaves between the third and fourth measures were initially conceived thus:

Example 1.13

But then I became afraid and did as shown in the first example. Meanwhile precisely such motions of the outer voices by parallel octaves became a device to which I often had recourse later. (Prokofiev 1973, 326-27)

Rifkin (2004) observes that Prokofiev’s characteristic usages of both parallel octaves and parallel fifths do not necessarily rule out Schenker-style voice-leading graphs, which remain useful at least for the depiction of motives (269). In Chapter 2, I explore some aspects of harmony tied to Prokofiev’s parallel perfect intervals, particularly the interplay between perfect-fifth sequences and parallel perfect fifths in the tonal trajectories of works in a neoclassical style.

Another important topic especially in the Russian studies is “polyharmony” (poligarmoniia). Many authors have emphasized the basically triadic nature of Prokofiev’s

---

18 The verb podchérkivat’ can also be translated as “emphasize.”
harmony and the derivation of complex harmonies from the superposition of (usually two, but sometimes several) major or minor triads. Focus on individual verticalities has often been at the expense of considerations of harmonic function and tonal trajectories. In many cases, analysts have discounted the structural significance of lowest-register tones without sufficient justification. Kevin Swinden (2005) has argued persuasively against underestimating bass lines in considerations of harmonic function. Swinden prefices his own exposition of functional “collision” possibilities by distinguishing nine DP-D, six D-T, and nine S-T bass lines, drawing special attention to those belonging solely to one category (“bass lines that characterize a particular functional disposition”) (258).

To conclude this section, a general point relating to Prokofiev’s harmonic practice can be made with reference to the two pairs of chords shown in example 1.14. In both the English- and

Example 1.14: Modal and monotonarian pairing

Russian-language literature, a considerable number of authors adopt terminology and analytical approaches that emphasize the similarity or abstract equivalence of these two pairs of chords. In essence, the second pair is regarded as an innovative alternative to the first, deployed in comparable ways. Dolzhansky (1947) and Mazel’ (1957) develop an extended concept of “parallel” tonalities, arguing that for some composers (especially Shostakovich), the latter pairing generally replaces the former. Brown (1967) refers to the two pairings as exhibiting “modal” and “fundamental mutation” respectively. “Hearing through” the “semitonal clashes,” one understands the derivation of one chord from another even in vertical presentations (106). An example is at R97 in Variation 2 of the second movement of Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, where F♯/G♮M, F♯m, and FM combine to produce “a memorable sonorous effect”: the melodic F♯m is understood as a “temporary deviation” from the harmonic F♭M, and FM relates likewise to F♯m (105-06). Minturn (1997) discusses the same two types of pairing as “fifth flips” and “third flips”

---

19 See, e.g., Kholopov’s (1967a) discussion of Prokofiev’s complex (polyharmonic) chords, composed of subchords of which the lowest is “usually” the “root chord” (195-209). Related studies of polytonality and polyharmony include Skrebkov (1957), Kiseleva (1970), and Paisov (1971). In Chapter 6, I return to the question of harmonic complexes in an analysis of the main theme of Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, contrasting my perspective on harmonic function in this theme to those of Brown (1967) and Tarakanov (1968).
respectively. The focus is thus on the inversionsal relationships, as well as the sets created by the chords’ combination: [0347] (4-17) and [01478] (5-22). Zimmerman (2002) adopts Lewin’s (1987) Neo-Riemannian terminology: thus the two operations are PAR and SLIDE (the latter does not belong to any of the “families”; see the discussion of Zimmerman’s work below). By way of introduction to my analyses of “chromatic displacement” scenarios in Prokofiev’s music, Chapter 5 surveys some other literature dealing with chord pairs that are odnoimmennye (with the same name, i.e. parallel) or odnotertsovye (with the same third, monotertian)—not only Dolzhansky (1947) and Mazel’ (1957, 1962) but also Tiftikidi (1970) and Orfeev (1970). Prokofiev employs the latter chord pair in a fascinating variety of harmonic-functional contexts: it might, for instance, suggest I-ii or $\sharp$VII-i, or a chromatically shifting tonic or dominant. In this dissertation, I strive to adapt my terminology to the chords’ diverse harmonic-functional contexts rather than assume any fixed relation between the two types of pairing; in general, I refer to them in terms of modal or quality changes and monotertian relationships.

II. Schenkerian analysis, prototypes and “wrong notes,” set theory and “neotonality”

Schenkerian theoretical concepts have only rarely been applied in the analysis of Prokofiev’s music. In Structural Hearing (1962), Felix Salzer includes three Prokofiev examples: the main theme of the Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4 (178); the opening period of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84 (205); and mm. 27-58 (from the start of the main theme to the start of the secondary theme) in Piano Sonata No. 3, Op. 28 (210). From the point of view of later English-language literature on Prokofiev, Salzer’s approach is unusual. In the main theme of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84, he hears the bass G as in m. 3 as resolving to A in an inner voice (likewise the A, in m. 8), in contrast to Brown’s (1964, 11) view of the G as a substitute for a G root that moves up by fourth to C. At the end of the theme, Salzer understands the mediant chord (m. 8) as “contrapuntal-structural,” since it proceeds to I without an intervening V (205); for Harter (2003), in contrast, the F bass in m. 9 counts as a substitute for F, making the cadence to the B major tonic a “substitute authentic cadence” (52). In Sonia Vlahcevic’s (1975) and Rebecca

---

20 On monotertian relationships, see also the three-page adjunct to Zaporozhets’s 1962 article written by Berger (the editor of the collection) (250-52).

21 One example of the dominant possibility is the G7-A$\flat$m oscillation shortly after R33 in Peter and the Wolf, Op. 67, which Cohn (2012, 59) recognizes as an allusion to the Fate motive from Wagner’s Ring cycle.
Kaufman’s (1987) adaptations of Schenkerian theory to Prokofiev’s music, more flexibility is shown toward “fundamental” substitutions (e.g. Vlahcevic’s EM-B♭m-EM “fundamental progression” in the E-major second movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82 (60)) or omissions (e.g. Kaufman’s “incomplete upper fundamental lines,” 3-1, in the first two movements of Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80 (248, 276)), while nuances of harmonic function and voice leading often go unexplored. In the present study, several analyses of tonal trajectories draw at least implicitly on Schenkerian theory, particularly in Chapter 3 with regard to large-scale triadic arpeggiation.

Several studies have been devoted to phrase structure in Prokofiev’s music, including Berkov’s 1968 handbook, Harter’s 2003 dissertation, and part of Rifkin’s 2006 article. Considerable differences of interpretation emerge with respect to harmonic function and cadences. Suggesting that the “neoclassic elements” in Prokofiev’s music “lend themselves to a successful adaptation of conventional formal analysis,” Harter (2003) draws on the work of William Rothstein (1989) and William Caplin (1998) to analyze phrase structure in excerpts from almost every movement of the nine piano sonatas. Occasionally, Harter sidesteps the question of harmonic function by invoking the term “dissonant arrival,” which fits uneasily in her table of cadences (66). Another unconventional inclusion is the “plagal half cadence,” which refers, e.g., to the midpoint of the eight-measure opening theme of the finale of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84. Arguing that “the inversion of harmonies is not as important in Prokofiev’s music as other relationships” (49), Harter adopts a flexible attitude toward cadences, referring, for example, to authentic cadences that lack a bass 5-1 motion as leading-tone authentic cadences or—as mentioned above with regard to the F♭-B♭ bass motion in m. 8 of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84—as substitute authentic cadences (52).

In her 2006 article, Rifkin discusses the main themes of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, and the Waltz from Cinderella, Op. 102, No. 1 as examples of

22 Vlahcevic focuses on Piano Sonatas Nos. 6 through 9; Kaufman studies the late chamber works, Opp. 80, 92, 94, and 119.

23 Intended as a supplement to a three-volume harmony textbook (1964, 1966), Berkov’s 1968 handbook offers 72 examples of period structure in Prokofiev’s oeuvre with brief commentaries on each excerpt.

24 Harter proceeds from Douglass Green’s commentary on “less common” types of half cadence, ending on a IV or German-sixth chord that “acts as a dominant substitute” (1979, 14). (See also Harrison’s argument regarding the theoretical viability of a I-IV “half cadence” [1994, 29] and Miasoedov’s comments on the possibility [1983, 34].)

25 Harter’s assessment of Op. 84/III echoes that of Berkov (1968, 71) and Vlahcevic (1975, 169). These commentaries would be enriched by further consideration of Prokofiev’s treatment of the theme’s Mixolydian harmony later in the movement and what might be interpreted as the theme’s blossoming into a larger-scale sentence in mm. 85-100.
“moderate-modern” and “extreme-modern” neoclassicism respectively. One of her main points is that the degree of modernism depends partly on the context of a chromatic shift (or chromaticism without “loosening” consequences),\(^{26}\) which occurs near the cadence in the first case and at the cadence in the second (145). Rifkin’s discussion is reminiscent of Zaporozhets’s commentary on intracadential (\(vnutrikadansovye\)) modulations (1962, 233).\(^{27}\) The analyses of phrases in the present study, like those in the work of Harter and Rifkin, draw largely on concepts and terminology from Caplin (1998). In general, however, my objective is not so much to find adequate designations for phrase segments and cadences as to examine traits of harmonic-functional balance or imbalance. This topic will be especially important in Chapter 2 (where the focus is on inversionsal symmetry) and Section II of Chapter 5 (dealing with questions of balance in contexts of harmonic shifts by semitone).

Particularly important in much analytical work on Prokofiev are hypothetical prototypes or recompositions. A remark by Prokofiev’s son Oleg—that his father first writes music like other composers, then “Prokofievizes” it (Kholopov 1992, 61)—encourages such an approach. Referring in particular to the Classical Symphony, Op. 25, Jonathan Kramer elaborates on this idea: “We can hear a hypothetical original version lurking beneath the surface. In other words, it is as if we could remove the witticisms and discover a truly classical symphony” (1988, 518). Prokofiev himself wrote about the importance of “‘white’ themes” in some of his works (i.e. themes playable on the white notes of the piano) (1959, 58, 59), and analysts have often sought to shed light on Prokofiev’s chromatic style by positing diatonic prototypes from which Prokofiev characteristically departs not merely through occasional melodic chromatic inflections but by shifting whole harmonies or parts of phrases by semitone. To a certain extent, such prototypes have successfully been used to suggest particular environments or supposedly expected outcomes with respect to which an event in the music stands out as extraordinary. A few of the ways in which this analytical tool has been used in Prokofiev studies may be briefly surveyed. Regarding the opening phrase of March, Op. 3, No. 3, Ashley (1963) draws attention to the instability of the F-major tonic by comparing the cadence in m. 4 to a hypothetical prototype in which the bass notes are a whole step lower (41-42).\(^{28}\) I already mentioned Malcolm Brown’s (1964, 11) prototype for mm. 3-4 of the main theme of the first movement of Piano


\(^{27}\) Also cf. Brown’s (1967) overview of different kinds of “tonal dislocation” in the symphonies (489).

\(^{28}\) See also Ashley’s simplified “white-note” version of Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 2 (1963, 237).
Sonata No. 8, Op. 84. Suggesting that Prokofiev avoids dramatic “flatness” by highlighting the melodic climax with a “tonal shift up a half step,” Brown views the G♯-minor harmony in m. 3 as a substitute for a G-minor harmony (vi in B♭ major). Kholopov’s (1992) strategy is similar in an analysis of the opening of the second movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82. Envisioning the first eight measures in a pre-“Prokofievized” state, Kholopov presents a 1:2 durational reduction with a melody-plus-accompaniment texture to shed light on an underlying T-S-D motion in E major (61). 29

In rare cases, hypothetical prototypes and recompositions have also been invoked in the study of cadences and the exploration of alternative outcomes and tonal trajectories. One example is Kholopov’s (1967a, 348-49) discussion of a piece that he describes as just barely tonal: Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 13. Observing that the main theme’s concluding G♯-minor harmony (mm. 4-5) “asserts its sovereignty [gospodstvo]” over the preceding three measures, Kholopov asks the reader if the harmony could not just as convincingly have “‘gravitated’” to another tonic: Bm, B♭m, or Em. This reflection leads to a recognition of symmetrical elements that contribute to the sense of the theme as a self-enclosed unit. 30 Kholopov may have been surprised to see, several years later, an analysis of this piece that is, in fact, focused on “gravitations.” Michael Thibodeau (1993, 57-100) applies and extends the theories of Yavorsky to argue that, “given the unfolding of the systems, [the G♯-minor tonic] arrival is inevitable” (95). The question of inevitability is not fully addressed by Thibodeau. (Indeed, the G♯-minor resolution in m. 4 might be surprising from a Yavorskian perspective if one expects a G and a B♭ to complete the “subdominant system” apparently initiated by the F-B and F♯-C tritones of mm. 2-3; meanwhile, the A♯-E tritone of m. 1 hardly announces itself as a central dissonance requiring eventual resolution.) Recompositions such as those presented by Kholopov are useful in that they encourage reflection on Prokofiev’s unconventional ways of approaching conventional (especially tonic or dominant) harmonic goals.

An even more inventive recomposition is included in Rifkin’s (2006, 134-41) discussion of the main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135. According to Rifkin, the theme provides “an unusual harmonic support for an otherwise conventional melodic motion” and thus exemplifies a “moderate-modern” style of neoclassicism (141). In contrast to

29 Although he includes no Schenkerian graph, Kholopov (1992) uses the word Ursatz (for prototype) as a nod to Schenker (61-62). Cf. Kholopov’s earlier analysis of this piece (1967a, 391-93).
30 On inversional elements in this theme, see also Minturn (1997, 79-80).
the typical contexts of chromaticism in Classical practice, Prokofiev’s “chromatic gesture in m. 7 … does not have its conventional formal consequence—it does not unravel the tight-knit symmetry of the phrase structure” (140). She demonstrates the loosening effect that Prokofiev avoids with a recomposition in which the consequent is expanded internally from four to eight measures (141). In Chapter 2, I will revisit some questions of harmonic function and symmetry in this theme, but Rifkin’s analytical strategy is a useful general reminder that it can sometimes be more beneficial to regard an excerpt as a simplification of an elaborate model than as an elaboration of a simple one.

In English-language analytical studies of Prokofiev’s music, hypothetical prototypes and recompositions are often linked to some notion of “wrong notes” and “wrong-note harmonies.” The idea has long been associated with Prokofiev’s style. In his autobiography, Prokofiev tells an anecdote about the offence he took as an eleven-year-old at Sergey Taneyev’s evaluation of one of his juvenile works. Expressing reservations about the “crudeness” of his protégé’s harmonic language (“Mostly I, IV, and V,’ he said, and laughed”), Taneyev inadvertently spurs in Prokofiev what would become a longstanding interest in harmonic innovation. “And when some eight years later,” relates Prokofiev, “I played Taneyev my Etudes op. 2 and he grumbled, ‘Far too many wrong (fal’shivykh) notes,’ I reminded him of what he had said that time. Clutching his head in mock horror he exclaimed, ‘So it was I who launched you on that slippery path!’” (Prokofiev 1961, 134 [1956, 12], as translated in 1991, 232).

Taneyev referred humorously to fal’shivyye noty (“false notes”), but—considering the whole-tone and octatonic material in those etudes—he could have referred more formally to what Rimsky-Korsakov called loznye posledovatelnosti (“false progressions”). Rimsky-Korsakov’s “false progressions” include equal divisions of the octave: a “circle of major thirds” and a “circle of minor thirds.”31 Elsewhere, Rimsky-Korsakov describes the V(7)–VI progression in the major mode as a “false cadence”; in the minor mode, the “false cadence” is the resolution of V to the diminished-seventh chord built on 4 (Rimsky-Korsakov 1943, 108-09). A “false V7,” built on 2, or a “false diminished seventh,” built on 2, can progress to either I or V (Carpenter 1988, 320). Another area of interest is the “Application of false progressions to sudden modulation” (Rimsky-Korsakov 1943, 111-12). In this section, one point that is worth bringing up on account of its relevance to some findings in Chapter 5 is Rimsky-Korsakov’s

---

31 Rimsky-Korsakov’s “false progression” exercises and examples are reproduced in Taruskin (1996, 304-06).
recommendation to mitigate sudden semitonal modulations by passing immediately to a shared key (e.g. proceeding to G major after a shift from C major to B minor).

“Wrong notes” are also, of course, associated with twentieth-century neoclassicism: the term often refers to ironic intrusions or incongruities within otherwise faithfully reproduced historical styles or genres. In his 1941 autobiography, Prokofiev expressed dissatisfaction with what he perceived as Stravinsky’s overreliance on “Bachian devices—‘Bachisms with false notes (Bakhizmov s fal’shivizmami)’.” Realizing that the same charge could be made against him with reference to the Classical Symphony, Op. 25, Prokofiev stressed that it was a peripheral work in his career, written “in passing” (mimokhodom) (Prokofiev 1961, 171 [1956, 53]). In terms of popularity, of course, Prokofiev’s Op. 25 has, on the contrary, been the centrepiece of his oeuvre, and this may be one reason why many English-language commentators have approached Prokofiev in general as a master of “wrong notes.” By and large, the term is of little value. In fact, in many of its past usages with regard to Prokofiev’s music, “wrong note” could aptly be replaced by “promissory note” (after Cone 1982). Only in rare cases is it reasonable to assume that Prokofiev’s harmonic practice is primarily in dialogue with eighteenth- rather than nineteenth-century traditions; further, contrasting “families” (in Zimmerman’s [2002] sense) can form the backdrops for various kinds of outstanding harmonies and progressions.

The “wrong note” concept has been invoked in a wide variety of contexts in the analytical literature. In a 1956 article on Prokofiev’s Symphony No. 5, Op. 100, Austin uses the term to refer to the unsettling E♭ in the B♭-major main theme: the note starts out as an innocuous ornament and seems to grow out of proportion. Ashley (1963) occasionally refers to “wrong-note” procedures or tricks, e.g. a ♭bass motion in lockstep with a ♭melodic resolution in m. 32 of Joke, Op. 3, No. 2, which humorously jeopardizes the work’s concluding cadence (39). Richard Bass (1988) suggests a systematic approach to “wrong notes” in Prokofiev’s music based on a concept of chromatic displacement or substitution. Often presenting itself nonchalantly (as if “nothing were ‘wrong’ with it in the first place”), the “wrong note,” according to Bass, gives rise to a “shadow” consisting of “the diatonic note it represents” (199); for several measures, the musical surface might remain in a key semitonally related to the original key before unobtrusively returning. An innovative aspect of Bass’s approach is his use of double voice-leading graphs. In the event of a chromatic displacement, the musical surface

See, e.g., Sheinberg’s (2000) discussion of “structural distortion techniques”; she includes one Prokofiev example (from the Gavotte of the Classical Symphony, Op. 25) (100).
moves to a new graph while its supposed “shadow” is shown in the original graph. Fankhauser (2008) offers a different metaphor for the same idea: Shostakovich and Prokofiev employ a technique of “harmonic refraction.” In the analysis of such music, a “normalization” of a segment through semitone transposition can be like a realignment of a refracted image: it “clarifies regularity of underlying structure, imperfect as that recreation may be” (205). But such normalizations do not always clarify matters of harmonic function. Bass himself hints at the simplistic nature of his substitution models when he acknowledges the “cross-representation” of individual elements (1988, 203). In general, I find that the concept of semitone substitution has been applied too broadly in the analysis of Prokofiev’s music and without sufficient consideration to issues of harmonic function and modulation. In Chapter 5, I elaborate on this point, re-examining some excerpts discussed in Bass’s 1988 article as well as many comparable cases as part of a broader investigation of semitonal harmonic relations in Prokofiev’s music.

In his 1997 book on Prokofiev’s music, Minturn sheds light on the “rightness” of apparent “wrong notes” (23) mainly with the tools of set theory. Central to his analytical strategy is a “Listening model” for “wrong-note music” (58-59), i.e. for music in which a “contextual heterogeneity” causes particular elements to stand out as “bad fits” from a tonal perspective. Despite being (by definition) tonally unintegrated, the “wrong note … produces a motive—the structural set,” and “[a]s the music unfolds, it teaches us how the wrong note may be integrated into the context” (58). In my view, it is surely worthwhile to investigate motivic set classes in Prokofiev’s music, but to call them structural is dangerous, since it discourages consideration of the relevance of more traditional notions of structure. Minturn is careful to emphasize that his set-theoretical interpretations are meant to supplement rather than replace tonal perspectives (191), but in his analytical practice, “structural sets” do replace tonal structure. Typically, an analysis in Minturn’s 1997 book begins with a perfunctory acknowledgement of what he calls “tonal-interpreting gestures” or “tonal interpreters”; from there, he moves on to explore the “structural set [that] captures the peculiar and distinctive character of a piece” (65). Minturn thus leaves considerable room for elaboration along the lines of harmonic function. To take one example: in his analysis of the middle section of the fourth movement of Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55, Minturn focuses on the generation of forms of 5-21 ([01458]) through 5-6 shifts (e.g. CM-A♭,M and Dm-B♭,m). Meanwhile, he acknowledges a “bass tonal-interpreting dominant

gesture D-F♯” in m. 52, which prompts him to include in scare quotes a solitary “Gm: ‘V’-‘i’” label at that point in his reduction (175). One gets the impression of having located one of the rare, scattered tokens or vestiges of tonality. As I argue in a detailed analysis of this passage’s harmonic function in the discussion of major-third reinterpretation in Chapter 4, this is only a glimpse of a bigger picture.

Bertram’s 2000 dissertation elaborates on many ideas in Minturn’s 1997 monograph. Bertram analyzes several of the works singled out by Prokofiev as representative of his “modern line” as well as three pieces that he argues for inclusion in the line on account of their non-triadic content: Mazurka, Op. 12, No. 4, and Two Poems, Op. 9 (2000, 2). Among Prokofiev’s works, these, certainly, are exceptionally well suited to explorations of “central” tritones, augmented triads, or [0148] chords, as well as quartal structures that are to some extent “alien-sounding” (152) from a tonal vantage point. In each analysis, Bertram’s objective is to find out “how and why the piece is modern” (2-3), though he does tentatively relate Prokofiev’s uses of octatonicism to that of earlier Russian composers (with reference to the work of Taruskin). I take issue with some accounts of harmony in Bertram’s study that cover matters of harmonic function only in vague terms. For example, regarding mm. 27-34 in Diabolical Suggestion, Op. 4, No. 4, Bertram refers to a “chain of non-functional triads” (102-04), but he could instead have referred to an ascending 5-6 sequence. Chapters 3 and 4 include discussions of this piece’s innovative approach to sequential harmony and its employment of major-third harmonic relationships.

In a review of Minturn’s book, Zimmerman (1998) hints at the approach he takes in his 2002 dissertation when he suggests that “in some cases … smaller sets could be better accounted for as subsets of larger collections” (160). He demonstrates with a re-evaluation of Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 10, a work that Minturn (1997) discusses with respect to 4-19 ([0148]) representatives. Zimmerman focuses on two main collections: a hexatonic collection containing D♯ and D (representing a decorated B♯-minor tonic) and a whole-tone collection containing D♯ (representing V7); a few notes remain as “non-harmonic” (1998, 161). Like Bertram’s (2000) dissertation, Zimmerman’s (2002) dissertation is devoted to early works by Prokofiev. Focusing on “neotonal” pitch material, Zimmerman scrutinizes excerpts in terms of individual chords’ and

---

34 In the last two paragraphs of Part I of his shorter (1941) autobiography, Prokofiev analyzes his own compositional style in terms of four basic lines: classical, modern, toccata or “motor,” and lyrical; a fifth line, the “grotesque,” can be understood as “inflections [izgiby] of the other lines” (Prokofiev 1961, 148-149 [1956, 31-32]). See Prokofiev (1991, 248-49) for an English translation while referring to Zimmerman’s (1998) corrections and discussion of the translation (154-55).
bass lines’ membership to six “families” or “collections without clusters” (i.e. lacking [012]): whole-tone (6-35) [02468t], hexatonic (6-20) [014589], octatonic (8-28) [0134679t], diatonic (7-35) [013568t], acoustic (7-34) [013468t], and harmonic (7-32) [0134689]. Chords belonging to multiple collections play pivotal roles. Zimmerman also sheds light on large-scale trajectories in individual works by outlining the “gradual immersion” and “apotheosis” of particular collections. Some analyses in the present study are indebted to Zimmerman’s innovative approach. Occasionally, however, I object to what I consider inconsistent accounts of harmonic function and disputable “foreground fundamental bass lines” (see, e.g., my discussions of Etude, Op. 2, No. 2, in Chapter 3, and of the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 1, Op. 19, in Chapter 4).

As mentioned above, an important feature of Minturn’s 1997 monograph is the “structural” or motivic set. Non-tonal motives play an important role in several other studies. Kholopov (1967a) includes discussions of “thematic harmonies” (i.e. “vertical projections of melodies”), such as the B-D-A chord at the end of the exposition of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82, which recalls the C-D-F melodic incipit of the secondary theme (189-92). More recently, Rifkin has provided analytical studies of Prokofiev with motive as a primary concern. Noting that “atonal coherence can have varying levels of strength” (141), Rifkin (2000) refers to “lapses” of formal and/or harmonic function (or “wrong notes” in general) while outlining motivic connections to which the same events give rise. In her 2004 article, Rifkin employs voice-leading graphs to display three types of motive: The “systemic motive” is an instance of motivic parallelism in which the motive’s foreground presentation is “a literal figuration or diminution of a deep middleground event” (268); the second and third types are “non-functional pitch-class motives” and “functional pitch-class motives” (the latter distinguished by its ties to specific scale-degree functions) (271-74). In a 2011 essay on the first movement of the G-minor Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63, Rifkin elaborates on the role of B♭ at the centre of a “modernist narrative.” Motives based on [012] and [013] participate in an “ironic satire on sonata form” (183).

Like Rifkin 2000 and 2004, the present study draws extensively on Harrison’s 1994 theory of harmonic function as well as some related work. An important difference is that my analytical approach is geared more toward functional plurality and mixture (following Swinden 2005 and sometimes Smith 1986). Frequently, I also find the notion of functional lapses less
useful than a flexible approach to harmonic sequence. At several points in this dissertation, I offer alternative perspectives on excerpts discussed by Rifkin.

Of course, where supposed functional lapses are concerned, or where coherence derives primarily (if not purely) from motive or neotonal “family” membership, the bigger issue is the elusive line between tonality and atonality. This does not correspond easily to such dichotomies as “lyrical” and “modern,” themes and transitions, late and early music; nor is “atonal coherence” the answer to what is “new” in Prokofiev’s “new simplicity.” Marking off “individual atonal moments … used … largely to provide contrast, to throw the tonal passages into relief” is seldom an illuminating exercise. Continuously complex tonality is more often encountered than clear-cut tonal/atonal sections.

A brief look at the main theme of the Gavotte from *Cinderella*, Op. 95, No. 2 (example 1.15) is a convenient way of suggesting what I consider the usual roles of set-class equivalences

---

35 Among the relevant general studies of harmonic sequences are Harrison (2003) and Ricci (2004). Yakubov (1988) deals specifically with sequences in Prokofiev’s music, but his focus is not on harmonic sequences. Occasionally, I refer to chromaticized, underlying ascending 5-6 sequences, drawing on some terminology introduced by Damschroder (2006 and 2010).

36 Cohn offers some insights on this issue in a 2012 article on *Peter and the Wolf* and the “hexatonic uncanny.”

37 This quote is from Prokofiev’s response to the Resolution of 10 February 1948, as translated by Jonathan Walker and Marina Frolova-Walker (Prokofiev [1948] 2003).
and motive in a Prokofiev theme. According to Rifkin (2000), the theme offers an unproblematic tonal structure until mm. 13-14, where the lack of a dominant results in a lack of tonal closure; instead, the consequent relies on motivic closure, as an A-A♯-G-F melodic descent reverses the F-G-G♯-A ascent heard earlier (m. 9) (84-87). Three clarifying points can be added to this analysis. First, it is an overstatement that harmonic function dissolves in mm. 13-14: here is a case of “encirclement” with leading chords (to borrow Zaporozhets’s terminology). Second, the bass is embellished with an increasingly heavy neighbour (compare mm. 6, 10, and 13); at m. 13, one might even entertain the possibility of a cadential six-four in D♯ major (cf. m. 10 in the Gavotte from the Classical Symphony). 38 Third, while Rifkin’s identification of the tonal structure of the antecedent is correct, one can also admire the integration of three distinct representatives (refer to the brackets in example 1.15), which furnish the theme with a recurring, characteristic sonority. A motivic discussion might well focus on the roles of G♯/A♯ in this D-minor theme; meanwhile, there are no cut-off points or isolated moments where harmonic function dissolves and motive takes over.

I conclude this survey with a brief mention of some recent studies of form, irony, and narrative that are tangentially related to the present study. Concepts of irony and the grotesque are central to two recent articles on Prokofiev: Woodley’s (1995) investigation of performance practice and large-scale tonal relations in Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80, and Dimitri Shapovalov’s (2004) essay on Prokofiev’s lyricism as one of his “two voices.” 39 For Shapovalov, lyricism is an (underestimated) non-ironic, non-grotesque facet in some of Prokofiev’s early works, particularly the symbolist (Bal’mont) songs. Concerned largely with questions of form and style, Brown’s (1967) dissertation on the symphonies (as well as in Slonimsky’s [1964] and Tarakanov’s [1968] monographs) include discussions of “montage” technique or sectionalisation and the reliance on variation rather than development; Minturn’s 2009 article on the two string quartets similarly focuses on “rhetorical opulence” and synthetic rather than analytic development (262). Transitions problematized by suspension, energy-loss, and anticlimax, are also relevant to Rifkin’s (2011) study of modernism and “new simplicity” in Violin Concerto

38 I return to the Op. 25/III excerpt within Chapter 2 (example 2.27). For a more detailed discussion of heavy embellishments and what I call the technique of “overburdening,” see Chapter 5.

39 Shapovalov refers to a remark made by Nestyev. Regarding lyricism and irony as opposing aspects of Prokofiev’s musical language, Nestyev compares the composer to Mayakovsky: “‘He somehow spoke in two voices—sometimes as a pure lyricist, sometimes harshly satirically,’—these words could well have been related to Prokofiev” (Shapovalov [2004, 20], from Nestyev [1973, 94]).
No. 2, Op. 63. Other important studies of musical narrative include the essays by Gregory Karl on dialogism and non-organicism in the second movement of Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 83 (1998), and on the subversion of a heroic archetype in Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80 (2013). In this dissertation, I occasionally discuss expressive qualities alongside details of harmony (see, e.g., the concept of overburdening developed in Chapter 5) and comment on tonal trajectories in ways that impinge on musical narrative (Chapter 4, e.g., includes an argument concerning anticlimax in the second movement of Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 1).

III. Overview of the dissertation

My approach to Prokofiev’s music in this dissertation contrasts with recent analytical work in three ways. First, my focus is on harmonic function, in contrast to the recent work on motive, form, and narrative. Second, I draw on different analytical traditions that have hitherto seldom come into contact. (Among the English-language analytical writings surveyed above, the work of Malcolm Brown is almost unique in its engagement with Russian writings.) Third, I include analyses of a broad selection of Prokofiev’s works, to help shed light on aspects of harmony that are to some extent shared by works reflecting different “lines” (in Prokofiev’s formulation), styles, or “intonations.”

Chapter 2 focuses on perfect-fifth-related harmonic alternatives and long series of perfect fifths; while emphasizing the importance of these devices in works belonging to Prokofiev’s “classical line,” I also explore their relevance to a distinctly “modern” work: Sarcasm, Op. 17, No. 5. A general concern in this chapter (developed further in subsequent chapters) is the question of symmetry and balance as related to harmonic function. In Chapter 3, I study Prokofiev’s treatments of sequential harmony, including unconventional directional changes. Several of the analyses in this chapter deal with approaches to returning main themes, focusing on Prokofiev’s typical alternatives to the “standing on the dominant”: swift dominant “clarifications” or linking chords, and long “obscure” dominants. Chapter 4 explores the relevance of ladovaia peremennost’ and tonal pairing in several works. One of the main arguments is that Prokofiev characteristically employs major-third tonal pairing; this branches

As Prokofiev put it in his 1941 autobiography for Sovetskaia muzyka, the “new simplicity” for which he was striving in works like Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55, involved “new devices [novymi priënamì] and, chiefly, new intonations [novymi intonatsiami]” (Prokofiev 1991 [1941], 294, my retranslation). For an introduction to the concepts of “intonation” and musical imagery in Soviet musicology and theory, see Malcolm Brown (1974).
out into a discussion of a wide variety of techniques and strategies of reinterpretation, substitution, and redirection by major third. “Prokofiev dominants” and chromatic displacement or substitution are inevitable topics in several analyses in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, but Chapter 5 is specifically devoted to the various harmonic-functional contexts of semitonal shifts in Prokofiev’s music. Chapter 6 offers a conclusion while suggesting areas for future research. I return to some ideas that arise in the survey above (such as the “dominant mode”) and emphasize the relevance to Prokofiev’s innovative harmonic practice of techniques familiar from nineteenth-century music.
Chapter 2: Harmonic-functional balance and the “classical line”

Regarding the “classical line,” the first of the “basic lines along which [his] work had developed,” Prokofiev makes only a few general remarks: the “line takes sometimes a neo-classical form (sonatas, concertos), sometimes imitates the 18th-century classics (gavottes, the Classical Symphony, partly the Sinfonietta)”; it “could be traced back to my early childhood and the Beethoven sonatas I heard my mother play”—a time of innocence predating the start of the “modern line” (Prokofiev 2000, 36). Prokofiev’s music is well-known for its frequently strict adherence to sonata form and its mostly regular hypermetre; these features can be said to reflect the “classical line.” In this chapter, I examine what I regard as some of the other characteristic features of Prokofiev’s “classical line” (not directly related to the historical Classical style): symmetrical chord types (especially \([0358]\)), pitch-class palindromes, long series of fifths, and the balancing of authentic and plagal function both in individual progressions and in large-scale harmonic relationships.¹ The \([0358]\) chord serves as a convenient focal point in the analyses in both Sections I and II. The two excerpts discussed in Section I—the opening section of Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4, and the main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103—involve v7 chords that substitute for V7 chords. As I will argue, these substitutions occur for the benefit of a broader scheme involving harmonic-functional balance. Section II sheds light on technical similarities between two pieces in which \([0358]\) augmented-sixth chords assume an important role: Lily Dance, Op. 75, No. 9, and the third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis.² In Section III, parallel perfect intervals and series of fifths are discussed alongside questions of harmonic function in the sonata-form first movements of the Classical Symphony, Op. 25, Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, and Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135. In Section IV, I broaden the purview to consider series of fifths and palindromic schemes in an overtly modernist work: Sarcasm, Op. 17, No. 5. Finally, Section V draws some general conclusions about harmony and harmonic function in Prokofiev’s “classical line” and points ahead to related issues in later chapters.

¹ The concept of tonal and harmonic balance is developed further at later points in the dissertation (particularly in Section II of Chapter 5 and Section IV of Chapter 6).
² The Op. 94bis Sonata is the 1944 violin-and-piano arrangement of the sonata written in 1943 for flute and piano.
I. Symmetry and harmonic function in two “classical line” themes

The main theme of the E♭-major Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4 (shown in example 2.1), is a simple and elegant case of harmonic-functional balance achieved over the course of a rigidly organized A section. After a four-measure introductory dominant, the A section presents four four-measure phrases. Ending with a PAC and an HC respectively, phrases 1 and 2 offer the reverse of the usual period relationship. Meanwhile, Prokofiev diminishes the sense of tonic-dominant polarity between the E♭ and B♭ harmonic goals in mm. 8 and 12 by eschewing the dominant agent in phrase 1 and tonicizing the dominant in phrase 2.3 In this regard, it is worth bringing up a problematic detail in Salzer’s graph of the theme (1962, 208). Sketching the I-♭III-V7-I arpeggiation of mm. 5-8, Salzer includes a parenthetical D♭ on beat 4 of m. 7 as the chordal third of V7. The strength of the preceding ♭III—foreshadowed by the ♭2 (F♯) neighbour (m. 5), intensified by a surface-level descent in fifths (mm. 5-7), and occupying the downbeat of m. 7—actually ensures that D♭ is the implied third of the B♭ chord. The use of B♭m7 (equivalent to ii7 in A♭ major) helps to soften the difference between the full cadence of this phrase and the half cadence of the next. After a repetition of the first phrase, Prokofiev puts an end to what could have been a perpetual alternation between interlocked phrases. Ending the theme with an S^D^-T cadence (vii°4/2-I, mm. 19-20),4 the last phrase gives a satisfying sense of closure and overall balance: the penultimate harmony incorporates the hitherto avoided dominant agent (D) as well as the subdominant agent (C♭). In this Gavotte, Prokofiev balances harmonic-functional tendencies while delaying the sense of closure until the end of the A section.

Another situation in which v7 substitutes for V7 is in mm. 9-10 of the main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 9 in C Major, Op. 103 (example 2.2). Example 2.3 provides a preliminary analysis of the melody in the first three measures of this theme, showing an ascending-fifth series shared by the two upper voices and leading from 1 to 4 in C major: c²-g¹-d²-a¹-c²-b¹-f². Example 2.4 highlights some aspects of harmony and sonority in the opening compound basic idea (mm. 1-4). One notable feature is an inner-voice alternation of the mi-contra-fa dyads G-B and F-A. Whereas the basic idea decorates G-B with F-A, the contrasting idea does the reverse. Underscoring these neighbour motions are pairs of strong-beat sonorities

---

3 The terms base, agent, and associate are from Harrison (1994).
4 On the labeling of functionally mixed chords, see Swinden (2005). The main label is determined by a “characterizing bass line” (e.g., ♭♭1 is among the bass lines specifically characteristic of S-T), while upper-voice elements reflecting a different function (e.g., a dominant agent discharge) are indicated by a superscript label (261).
Example 2.2: Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, I, mm. 1-10

Example 2.3: Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, I, mm. 1-3: ascending-fifth series shared by upper two voices

Example 2.4: Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, I, mm. 1-4: complete diatonic collections and harmonic inversional relationship
in both two-measure groups that sum up to the complete C-major collection. Meanwhile, the C and D bass tones in the basic idea and contrasting idea respectively support a I-ii progression, as in a sequential repetition of a basic idea. Example 2.4 also shows an inversionsal relationship (I4) between the verticalities on the downbeats of mm. 1 and 4. The significance of this relationship becomes clear in example 2.5, which compares the melodic line of mm. 3-4 to a hypothetical prototype derived from an I4 transformation of the melodic line of mm. 1-2. Ending on c^2, the exact melodic inversion (shown in the upper staff in example 2.5) would preclude the harmonic I4 transformation indicated above. The harmonic inversion thus suggests itself as one reason for the inexact adherence to the melodic inversion—beyond the more obvious reason of reserving the conclusive c^2 (1) for the melodic ending of the whole sentential hybrid (m. 9).^5

Example 2.5: Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, I: a) melody from mm. 1-2 followed by hypothetical exact I4 transformation, b) actual melody from mm. 1-4

The continuation phrase features a dominant pedal and, as mentioned above, a v7-I cadence in the home key. In slight disagreement with one another, the voices present three separate arrivals on 1 (c^2 in m. 9; c^1 and C in m. 10). In mm. 7-9, in adherence to a palindromic melodic plan (c^2-f^2-e^2-a^2-f^2-a^2-e^2-f^2-[e^2]-c^2), the melody defies the loosening effect of the chromaticism of the inner voices as it drives toward the downbeat c^2 of m. 9. In mm. 8-9, a compelling D-T resolution is fulfilled by an implicit 7-5-7 chromatic motion (subtly foreshadowed by the tenor in m. 7), despite the lack of a dominant base discharge. At the start of m. 9, a common-tone diminished seventh chord embellishes the tonic harmony; this allows for the continuance of [036] sonority across the bar line (as indicated by the horizontal dotted line). The v7-I cadence in mm. 9-10 consolidates the deeper-level G-C harmonic motion of the

---

^5 Because of the complexity of the relationship shown in example 2.5, I insist on labeling mm. 3-4 a contrasting idea rather than a repetition of the basic idea. I interpret mm. 1-10 as a (highly sentential) hybrid 3 in Caplin’s (1998) classification (compound basic idea plus continuation).
continuation as a whole, figuring almost as a postscript to the phrase in the manner of a conventional plagal cadence. Standing in opposition to the bright “Prokofiev dominant” that characterized the start of the continuation (m. 6), the minor dominant seventh chord in m. 9 allows for a dim, subdued conclusion to an extended continuation. Later in the movement, the $\hat{7} \rightarrow \hat{8}$ neighbour motive is taken to a deeper level: after a wistful main-theme recollection at the end of the development, the C tonic becomes a dominant seventh (m. 142), which resolves as a dominant-function augmented-sixth chord to a B-major (VII$\flat$-key) tonic (m. 143) supporting the recapitulated main theme. The Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4, and the main theme of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, exemplify some sophisticated “balancing acts” of harmonic function that are typical of pieces in Prokofiev’s “classical line.”

II. Symmetry and harmonic function in two pieces

Minor-seventh chords and the “Prokofiev dominant” also play a central role in the A-minor Lily Dance from *Romeo and Juliet*. In particular, the Lily Dance and the other work to be discussed in this section (Op. 94bis/III) involve minor-seventh chords reinterpreted as augmented-sixth chords. Example 2.6 provides a score of the piano version of the Lily Dance, Op. 75, No. 9. The following analysis furnishes harmonic-functional comparisons between several pairs of progressions, leading to an understanding of the special potency of the authentic cadence in the last measure as a gesture that summarizes the work in several ways.

Multiple explanations could be advanced for the root-position G$\flat$-minor chord in the fifth measure of this A-minor piece. From one point of view, the motion to and from a root-position G$\flat$-minor harmony in the opening two measures of the theme presents itself as a kind of exotic swaying motion. If Bass’s (1988) “shadow” metaphor or Fankhauser’s (2008) notion of “refraction” apply, the G$\flat$-minor triad might, like the A-minor triad, carry tonic function. As mentioned in Chapter 1, however, this first G$\flat$-minor triad is a classic example of a “Prokofiev dominant” in the minor mode: $\#_{vii}$ substitutes for V6 in m. 5, foreshadowing the modulation to G$\flat$ minor in the remainder of the sentential hybrid. The harmonic trajectory of the theme could be sketched entirely in terms of root-position stabilizations: whereas the compound basic idea features a I-III tonic prolongation (in which III substitutes for i6), the continuation could be conceived as a v-$\#_{vii}$ dominant prolongation (in which $\#_{vii}$ substitutes for V6, as it did in m. 5). Such an analysis, however, is at best a partial explanation, underestimating the power of G$\flat$

*Andante con eleganza* \( \text{\textit{j} = 52} \)
minor as a key in its own right—a key that may even come close to challenging the home-key status of A minor.

Miasoedov (1983) comments on the melodic line in m. 4 in terms of neighbour motion, as F and F♯ decorate E while G decorates F♯ (219). Broadening our perspective, a better reduction involves passing motion, with an E-F-F♯-G-G♯ chromatic ascent accomplished at an even eighth pulse. Reckoning the penultimate G as a harmony tone, the resolution to the G♯-minor triad implies a retrospective reinterpretation of Am7 as a [0358] augmented-sixth chord (A-C-E-G=♯F). The beginning of the continuation phrase recalls the A-minor 5-7/1-7 outer-voice motion of mm. 4-5 by presenting what could be taken as a C-major 5-7/1-7 outer-voice motion in m. 8. To emphasize the significance of the latter outer-voice motion, example 2.7 proposes a hypothetical recomposition involving D♯ rather than D♮ in m. 8 and leading to a cadential confirmation of E minor. The D♯ that actually occurs in mm. 8-9 may, on the contrary, carry over into the E-minor harmony of m. 9, giving rise to Em7. Reinterpreted as a [0358] augmented-sixth chord, the chord on E would resolve its augmented sixth to the fifth of the G♯-minor triad (mm. 9-10). In this way, the sentential hybrid as a whole suggests a pair of roughly inversionally-related routes to #vii harmony—from Am[7] and Em[7] in turn—in both cases balancing a subdominant agent discharge against a dominant one.

A brief digression to generalize such inversional relations may be helpful as we compare the present situation to others in Prokofiev’s oeuvre. Example 2.8 charts the six possible resolutions of [0358] augmented-sixth chords to major and minor triads with root G♯ using parsimonious voice leading. Of special relevance is the inversional relationship between progressions A and F, which can be viewed as based on pairings of hexatonic poles: “Am7”-G♮
and “Em7”-G♯M. In themselves, the scale-degree contents of these progressions involve a remarkable balance of authentic and plagal forces. The augmented-sixth resolution in “Am7”-G♯m brings the dominant agent (F♯) to the fore; yet the progression leans toward the S-T side of the spectrum due to a 6-5 subdominant agent discharge bolstered by 4-3 and 2-1 accompaniments. In the hypothetical “Em7”-G♯M progression, the situation is reversed: a doubly accompanied dominant agent discharge (7-8 with 2-3 and 4-5) counteracts an augmented-sixth-empowered subdominant agent discharge. Featuring a minor-mode goal chord (G♯m) in both cases, the harmonic relationship in the Lily Dance theme is not fully inversional.

The concluding section of the Lily Dance (mm. 47-56) features a series of attempts at a PAC while using fragments of the opening theme. Harmonically, the work’s concluding measures could be compared to those of the first movement of the Classical Symphony, Op. 25: after two deceptive resolutions—to the submediant (m. 50) and to the subdominant (m. 54) in turn—the piece ends with a home-key PAC. For the sake of a cadential dominant in the last measure of the Lily Dance, a 6-5 bass motion thrusts itself beneath the G♯-minor resolution of the “Am7” augmented-sixth chord. One might thus presume an implied B on the downbeat of m. 56. However, the omission of B is felicitous, since it leaves open the possibility of an implied C, the chordal fifth of an “Fm7” augmented-sixth chord. Such a chord would resolve its augmented sixth to the fifth of the tonic triad (“Fm7”-Am), recalling the conclusion of the opening sentential hybrid (Em[7]-G♯m). (Locally, the 4-5/6-5 augmented-sixth resolution to tonic harmony also presents itself as a transposition of the second deceptive cadence’s 7-8/2-1 augmented-sixth resolution to subdominant harmony.) Featuring an A-minor 6-1 bass motion in m. 56 (unlike the G♯-minor 6-1 bass motion in mm. 9-10), the concluding home-key cadence is unequivocally a D-T resolution.

---

For a discussion of the “hexatonic uncanny” specifically with regard to Prokofiev’s Peter and the Wolf, Op. 67, see Cohn (2012).
In contrast to this functionally unambiguous ending, the sequential passage in mm. 12-19 (or 39-46) is a fascinating puzzle of functional mixture involving augmented-sixth resolutions. As indicated above, the opening sentential hybrid hinges on a pair of alternate routes to the same harmony (G\#m)—a roughly inversional relationship that preserves functional mixture. The sequence in mm. 12-19 showcases a similar pair of mirror-image resolutions. Example 2.9 provides a reduction of the passage as an A-minor model followed by an F\#-minor sequence. The progressions both traverse a tritone: an augmented fourth in the first case (A-D\#) and a diminished fifth (F\#-C) in the second. In their respective initial keys, the first progression balances a i-iv motion in the upper voices with a 1-5 bass motion; the second deploys a i-V motion in the upper voices against a 1-4 bass motion. With the collision of 4 and 5 in each case comes an enharmonic reinterpretation that triggers an augmented-sixth resolution to the root of a new triad. With respect to the local goal keys, the upper voices of the penultimate harmonies of progressions A and B form “leading” dominant and “leading” subdominant chords, while the bass provides 2-1 and 7-1 resolutions. Given that 7-1 is a “characteristically” authentic bass line, the concluding resolution may be labeled as D\#-T.7 The concluding resolutions of both progressions are basically D-T, in spite of the broader inversional scheme.

The E-major chord in m. 12 (placed in brackets in example 2.9) occurs before the sequence and outside of this inversional scheme. Not only does this dominant chord bridge the harmonic gap between the two sections; it also allows for an initial impression of a contrasting middle that will simply feature a dominant prolongation (especially considering the bass

---

7 See Swinden’s roster of “characterizing” bass lines (2005, 259).
connection between G♮ in m. 12 and E in m. 13). In m. 20, a second-inversion dominant substitutes for the tonic on the downbeat, figuring as a passing chord between III and i while intensifying the drive toward the G♮-minor harmony of m. 21. Example 2.10 highlights the potential influence of the C-major harmony over the G♮-minor neighbour chord, a palindromic arrangement in the bass line in mm. 16-21, and a powerful contrary-motion approach to the unison G♮ from a unison C. The tonal contest between A and G♮ in the Lily Dance reaches its climax in the C section (mm. 28-38), which starts with A subordinate to G♮ (second-inversion A-major chords act as neighbours in a G♮-minor prolongation) and ends with G♮ deferring to A (G♮ connects to E to produce the dominant). The cadence in the piece’s final measure seals the victory of the home key over the key of ♭vi.

Aptly designated *Andante con eleganza*, the Lily Dance relies largely on inversional relationships as it maintains a graceful tension between the tonic and a semitonally-related alternative. The F-major third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis—another *Andante* work in 2/4 time—exhibits harmonic-functional balance in similar ways. Resolutions of augmented-sixth chords and the role of a chord semitonally related to the tonic (in this case ♭i) will serve as specific points of comparison to the Lily Dance.

Standing out from a pristine F-major diatonic environment, F♯/G♭, becomes a focus of attention in the *Andante* of Op. 94bis. In the opening F-major theme (example 2.11), an F♯-

---

8 The powerful bass F on the downbeat of m. 13 seems to contradict this connection. Retrospectively, however, the scheme shown in example 2.9 consolidates the harmonic priority of E in m. 13 over its local voice-exchange partner F.
9 This question of influence—the power of C major to create a secondary meaning for the G♮-minor harmony as ♭vi—will be addressed in more detail and with reference to other works by Prokofiev in Chapter 5.
minor harmony makes for a striking climax in mm. 8-9, especially given the innocent modulation to C major that follows. The B section in this ternary-form work (mm. 35-65) prolongs the dominant harmony with which the A section ends; ultimately, however, a brief modulatory passage (mm. 61-65) secures a first-inversion dominant of ♭II, prompting the A’ section to begin in the key of G♭ rather than F. In her 2004 article on motives in Prokofiev’s music, Rifkin discusses this piece (265-66 and 278-80) with regard to three pitch-class motives in this movement (C-C♯-D, F-F♯-G, and B♭-B-C), highlighting the role of F♯/G♭ harmony as “the point
of coincidence—the ‘nexus’ between the three chromatic ideas” (279). In the following analysis, I look at the central F♯/G♭ pitch class in a different way, focusing on its harmonic-functional contexts and its role within a large-scale inversionsal harmonic relationship.

The A section divides into two statements of the main theme, led by the violin and piano in turn (mm. 1-17 and 18-34). The main theme further divides into a pair of sentential halves, the first (mm. 1-9) culminating on the F♯-minor harmony and the second (mm. 10-17) ending with a weak authentic cadence in C major. From the vantage point of the dominant key, the F♯-minor chord in mm. 8-9 becomes assimilated into a iv-ii unfolding that leads to a V-I cadence softened by stepwise motion and staggered arrivals of the tonic scale degree. The bass lags behind the melody both at the tonic beginning of the theme (furnishing F in m. 3, a measure after the violin’s f1) and at its dominant ending (reaching c in m. 17, a measure after the violin’s c2).

**Example 2.12** shows a hypothetical recomposition of the opening presentation phrase (mm. 1-5) in which the theme’s characteristic harmonic instability and functional mixture are removed: in the simplified bass line, F and C align with the first downbeats of the tonic and dominant versions of the basic idea respectively; in the simplified melody, exact transposition between the tonic and dominant versions yields f1 and c1 arrivals that coincide with the bass F and C.

![Example 2.12: Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, III: hypothetical simplification of mm. 1-5](image)

Offering another perspective on the tonal relation between the two sentential halves of the main theme, **example 2.13** sketches a perfect-fifth series spanning mm. 1-19. Anchored to a tonic prolongation, a melodic ascending-fifth series climbs from F to a1 in mm. 1-6; a register transfer from a1 to a2—reharmonized by F♯m—marks the climax of the phrase. What follows is a
descending-fifth series in which each tone serves as a root of a chord (D-G-C-F). Thus, the midpoint of the theme accords with the midpoint of a pitch-class palindrome. With the cadence on C, of course, the theme remains open-ended. The start of the second statement of the theme is then responsible for a momentary sense of fulfilment: in m. 19, F is the returning tonic and the end of the palindrome. Measure 18—the extra measure in the four-measure hypermetrical context—provides additional prolongation of the dominant while accommodating the theme’s melodic \( \frac{2}{5} \frac{5}{2} \frac{7}{1} \) anacrusis. This anacrusis can itself be viewed in terms of a melodic descent in fifths (G-C-[E]-F) that reinforces the end of the palindrome.

Turning back to the score (example 2.11), a closer examination of the harmonic and voice-leading context of the F\(_{\sharp}\)-minor focal point of the theme (mm. 8-9) might start with a consideration of the upper-voice \( a^1-a^2 \) scale in contrary motion to a bass f-F\(_{\sharp}\) scale in mm. 6-8. The chordal third of F\(_{\flat}\)m is thus anticipated, while its root seems to emerge from an upward chromatic inflection (F-F\(_{\sharp}\)). Locally, however, there is a sense of D-T resolution at the F\(_{\sharp}\)-minor harmony. Interpreting the right-hand notes in mm. 6-7 as chord tones, the harmony in mm. 6-7 can be understood as Gm7. In this way, a \( \hat{1}\hat{5}\hat{2} \) root motion (I-V-ii7) spans mm. 1-7, forming a retrograde of the \( \hat{2}\hat{5}\hat{1} \) motive. In m. 8, the resolution to F\(_{\flat}\)m would signal a retrospective reinterpretation of Gm7 as a [0358] augmented-sixth chord. This leads to an insight into the relationship between the A and B sections. Example 2.14 shows a reduction of the B section. The repeated basic idea at the start of the B section (mm. 35-42) explicitly uses the harmony
implied in mm. 5-7: V is embellished by a neighbouring ii7. As in the A section, too, the G-minor-seventh chord is reinterpreted as a [0358] augmented-sixth chord. Instead of resolving to the root of a minor triad (F#m), the G-F=E♭ augmented sixth now resolves to the fifth of a minor triad (Bm). Swapping i6-5 and i7-8 discharges between F♭ minor and B minor, the reinterpretations of the supertonic seventh chord yield similar harmonic-functional results in the two keys. Meanwhile, F♭ retains its place of privilege as the resolution of the G-E♭ augmented sixth. The manner in which these augmented-sixth resolutions characterize and distinguish the A and B sections suggests the reverse of the scenario in the Lily Dance theme. Whereas the constants in the Lily Dance theme are the i7 and i6 (F# and E) of the [0358] chords plus the entire chord of resolution (G#m), the constants here are the entire [0358] chord (Gm7) plus the root or fifth (F♭) of the chords of resolution. As in the Lily Dance theme, the second progression provides a sense of fluidity, balance, and stability: the second progression does employ a common tone; it relates inversionally to the first; and it reengages the problematic F♭ while furnishing it with a new tonal context (B minor). To bolster this last point, it is worth drawing attention to the B-minor i-V-(ii7)-V4/3-vii°6/5-i tonic prolongation in mm. 43-47: presenting a 1-5-2-5-1 root motion, the B-minor passage accommodates the formerly anomalous F♭ while recalling the main theme’s 2-5-1 motive and palindromic perfect-fifth scheme.
A reworking of example 2.8, example 2.15 sketches six triadic resolutions of a particular augmented-sixth chord (G-B-D-F=E). Like the “Am7”-G♭m and Em(7)-G♭m progressions in the Lily Dance theme, the “Gm7”-F♭m and “Gm7”-Bm progressions in the third movement of Op. 94bis involve (local) 2-1 and 6-1 bass motions respectively. In Op. 94bis/III, the establishment of CM (V) in advance of Gm7 (ii7) further softens any harmonic-functional difference between the two augmented-sixth reinterpretations. In the opening theme, the deferral of the bass C from m. 4 to m. 5 empowers C to persist as a harmony tone at the beginning of the continuation in m. 6. In mm. 35-42, similarly, the ii7 chords fall within a dominant prolongation. The harmonic influence of C in both m. 5 and mm. 39-40 might even entail the expansion of the [0358] or Gm7 chords to five-note quintal or quartal constructs (B-F-C-G-D). Such a pentachord would provide augmented-sixth resolutions to both the root and the fifth of both the F♭- and B-minor triads.

As mentioned at the outset of this discussion, the uneasy assimilation of F♭ within the F-major A section—entering as a tonic substitute (♯1) and reinterpreted as a pre-dominant (♭iv) in the key of the dominant—foretells a deeper-level idiosyncrasy: the G♭-major start of the A’ section. The A’ section (not shown) is truncated in two ways. First, the violin-led statement of the theme (corresponding to mm. 1-17) is omitted. Second (more importantly), a simplification of the harmonic path allows for a tonal realignment in the second half of the sentential theme. Instead of proceeding from Gm in m. 72 to E♭m in m. 74 to produce a ♭iv-ii motion in D♭ major, Prokofiev seizes upon Gm as ii in F major. As a result, m. 74 brings no harmonic change. Allowing for two extra measures in which to dwell on the G harmony, an F-major ii-V-I progression (offering a motivic 2-5-1 root motion as well as structural closure) spans mm. 72-81. Contributing to the sense of tranquility in the A’ section, F major’s supertonic seventh chord at last progresses normatively—not to F♭m as in m. 8 or to Bm as in m. 43, but to C7, the home-key dominant seventh (m. 80).
The coda (mm. 82-94; included in **example 2.16**) suggests a definitive overcoming of the movement’s tonal problems. Initiating a broad chromatic descent in the upper voices, F♯-minor harmony—now securely supported by an F tonic pedal—makes a final appearance in m. 82. Again, a comparison to the Lily Dance is beneficial, specifically between the cadence in the last measure of the Lily Dance and that in the last two measures of this movement (mm. 93-94). Bringing the movement to a close, C♯m7 on the downbeat of m. 93 moves to FM on the
downbeat of m. 94. Like the augmented-sixth resolution in the last measure of the Lily Dance, this one is not direct: in the bass, C=E, resolves to the dominant base C in m. 93 before progressing to the tonic base F via a downward arpeggiation (C-A-F). The C-E dyad in the left hand in m. 93 also underscores what can be heard as a subtle inclination toward the key of the dominant. A hypothetical “C#m7”-Cm rather than “Cm7”-FM conclusion to the movement—transposing but not inverting the original “Gm7”-Fm progression—would revive rather than resolve the original harmonic problem. Example 2.17 entertains this possibility, recognizing and yielding to the temptation of a C-minor conclusion. Significantly, the interpretation of the downbeat harmony in m. 92 as iiø4/3 in C minor implies an inner-voice F.

Indeed, if one hears a contrary-motion approach to a D-F dyad in mm. 90-92 (C-D-D in the violin and G-G-[F] in the piano), a triggered memory of the approach to the supertonic (D)

![Example 2.17: Op. 94bis, III: hypothetical C-minor conclusion](image)

---

10 In the Lily Dance, as we have seen, Prokofiev similarly turns what would have been an S-T-T cadence (“Fm7”-Am) into a conclusive D-T cadence by furnishing a 6-5 bass motion in advance of the tonic harmony. In both cadences, Prokofiev omits the chordal fifth of the downbeat “minor-seventh” chord (keeping G in the bass unstable) and doubles the leading tone (recalling the former strength of C, or generally the motivic semitonal play about the tonic scale degree).

11 Whether G will sound like a potential new root in m. 90 is largely the prerogative of the pianist. The G-E dyad in m. 90, of course, is part of the broad chromatic descent in the upper voices that begins in m. 82—and is thus contextualized harmonically by an F tonic pedal. Yet the pianissimo bass F fades away and drops out (m. 88), potentially clearing aural space for a new—albeit foreground-level—harmony. It is an instructive exercise to restrike the bass F on the downbeat of m. 90: while adding emphasis to the third hyperdownbeat since m. 82 and creating a sonority reminiscent of m. 4, one would (unfortunately) remove any doubt as to the superficial status of the C major/minor key here.

12 Such a segment of chromatic contrary motion can be compared to what Yavorsky called a “subdominant system.” For a similar (surface-level) segment in this work, consider the voice leading in mm. 45-46. The last dyad in m. 45 (C-G) can be said to arise from the middle (passing) tones of C-F-(C)-B and F-(G)-G. Abstractly, the resolution to the C-G dyad in m. 53 (reviving the structural dominant in the B section) is comparable to that to the G-D dyad in m. 72 (achieving the home-key supertonic in the A’ section).
harmony of m. 10 might reinforce the impression that the phrase is heading (as in mm. 10-17) toward an authentic cadence in C rather than F. In the end, however, one accepts the chord at m. 90 as a mere surface-level dominant over the conclusive F-major tonic pedal of mm. 82ff. The movement’s actual final cadence not only confirms the tonic but also—thanks to the subtle inversional relation to the original move to F♭m—contributes to the sense of overall balance. Like the Lily Dance, the third movement of Op. 94bis features a central conflict between the tonic and a chromatically related harmony accessed through the enharmonic reinterpretation of a minor-seventh chord as an augmented-sixth chord, and ends with a compelling sense of tonal closure and reconciliation.

III. Parallel perfect intervals and series of fifths in three sonata-form first movements

The next three analyses are of neoclassical sonata-form movements: the first movements of the Classical Symphony, Op. 25, Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, and Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135. In each, I focus on the harmonic-functional implications of large-scale series of fifths while examining the harmonic context of parallel perfect intervals. The first movement of the Classical Symphony is well-known for its parallel perfect intervals. In principle, Schenkerian theory permits foreground parallels, provided that they disappear in the middleground, and middleground parallels, provided that they are concealed by the foreground. As Rifkin (2004) demonstrates, a Schenkerian graph can be made of the exposition that incorporates parallel fifths and octaves (269). It may be argued that in many passages in Prokofiev’s music, what Schenker would consider the aesthetically vital condition of concealment is not fulfilled: the parallels stand out too clearly. Certainly, the exposition of the Classical Symphony is one situation in which an analyst could go even further than Rifkin in emphasizing a pristine middleground counterpoint.

Example 2.18 presents a graph of the exposition that differs considerably from that by Rifkin, especially since it opts for 3 rather than 5 as Kopfson. In the graph, a smooth outer-voice series of parallel tenths leads from I to V in mm. 1-18.

Example 2.19 shows an alternative, durational reduction to help illuminate other features of harmony and metre. In mm. 7-10, a 5-6 motion on the opening tonic seems to point upward to ii; instead, the theme shifts down to V7 in m. 11. A detail excluded from the Schenkerian reduction is the cello’s preparation for this descent, leaping down to C with a D-major
Example 2.18: Symphony No. 1 ("Classical"), Op. 25, I: voice-leading sketch of exposition

Example 2.19: Symphony No. 1, Op. 25, I, mm. 46-74: durational reduction (1:4)
arpeggiation (A-F♯-D-C in mm. 10-11). The A within this arpeggiation (shown at the end of the third hypermeasure in example 2.19) is an important detail, as it participates in a broader trajectory of parallel fifths. Above the harmonic analysis in example 2.19, I label the pitch classes that participate in a descent by fifths in which certain pairs of units are presented simultaneously: A/D-G/C-F♯/B-E-A-D. The local harmonic progression leading to the start of the transition at m. 19 (B-E-A-D, 6–2–5–1 in D major) thus presents itself as a deceleration of a longer series: now Prokofiev confers upon each unit (rather than each pair of units) its own chord. In terms of harmonic rhythm, this abstract deceleration works in conjunction with a literal acceleration. The first pair of the series (A-D) is granted ten measures (40 beats; mm. 1-10); the second (G-C), four measures (16 beats; mm. 11-14); the third (F♯-B), two and a half measures (10 beats; mm. 15-17.5); and the final (broken) pair (E-A), one and a half measures (6 beats; mm. 17.5-18). The descending-fifth series employs the scale of D Mixolydian or E natural minor.
rather than D major. One might, indeed, expect an E-minor tonicization after the third pair (F♯-B, mm. 15-17), perhaps vindicating the ii harmony for which ♯VII substituted in m. 11. In mm. 15-16, however, B7 interlocks with D7 in a neighbour decoration involving overlapping 4-3 and 7-6 resolutions, preventing the V7 of E from materializing fully.

In the transition, Prokofiev revives the original I♭-6 motion, this time leading upward to E-major harmony and giving rise to a new descending-fifth root motion (B-E-A, ii-V-I in A major) that provides the impetus for the secondary theme’s own descending-fifth series. A remarkable aspect of harmony in the transition is the inexact transposition down a third between mm. 19-26 and 28-35. The harmonic-functional transformation is underscored by a hypermetric alteration. Balanced against the four-measure hypermeasure extended by two quarter beats (mm. 23-27) is the four-measure hypermeasure contracted by two quarter beats (mm. 32-35).13 The give-and-take of 2/4 measures (mm. 27 and 35) underscores a difference of harmonic function: whereas the G-major harmony of m. 26 is a harmonic detour, delaying a local B-minor tonic, the E-major harmony of m. 35 is the prematurely arriving V/V goal of the transition.

An understanding of the descending-fifth scheme and E-minor threat within the main theme paves the way for several comparisons between the main theme and the A-major secondary theme. In this theme—with its enormous melodic leaps, unequal parallel fifths in the outer voices, and a bass-voice augmented second—the con eleganza performance indication seems charged with irony. Minturn remarks that “It is here that we can imagine the composer chuckling over traditional sonata-form etiquette and poking fun at it most vigorously” (1997, 107). Apart from the e¹ grace note in the first violin, the dominant version of the basic idea (mm. 48-49) stands awkwardly as a root-position vii° chord with an outer-voice tritone that does not even literally resolve. The G♯dim-FM-BM progression (mm. 48-53) utilizes all of the pitch classes of the octatonic collection to which the third and fifth (but not the root) of the returning tonic triad are foreign tones. Since the FM-BM progression (mm. 50-52) may initially be heard as ♯II-V in E minor (FM would act as ♯VI=♯II pivot), the secondary theme features the same empty E-minor threat as the main theme. Example 2.19 also includes an outline of the descending-fifth series in the secondary theme (shown over the harmonic analysis). In the formation of this series, the usage in mm. 48-49 of vii° (or V6/5) rather than a more mellifluous

---

13 My hypermetric interpretation accords with the first of the two outlined by Minturn (1997, 106). I understand the thematic entries in mm. 19, 23, 28, and 35 as signaling hypermetric downbeats; m. 27 is only initially interpreted as a hypermetric downbeat.
V7 proves critical. The absence of E (♯5) as a dominant base in m. 53 seems to be compensated by the melodic E of the following measure. In contrast to this realization of the B-E-A segment, mm. 65-66 not only establish all three pitch classes as chordal roots in a ii-V-I progression; they also feature a B-E melodic motion over the bass E, dispensing with the pairings and parallels of the earlier realization of the series.\(^{14}\)

As a descending-fifth root motion, this ii-V-I progression flows into the (abstract) descending-fifth series of the secondary theme restatement at m. 66. In mm. 58-65, the non-harmonic tones might allow its four chords to be understood as IV-I in C major followed by iv-I in C♯ major. At a deeper level, however, FM and F♯m represent ♯VI and vi respectively in A major, and the correction of the former to the latter in mm. 58-65 foreshadows an important change to the secondary theme in its restatement in mm. 66-74. Whereas the secondary theme’s descending-fifth series initially adheres to an A-harmonic-minor scale, the restatement in mm. 66-74 conforms to an A-major scale. The continuation phrase—beginning with a bass D that prevents outer-voice parallels and contributes to a dominant-seventh outline in the bass spanning mm. 68-73—leads to the PAC that ushers in the exposition’s closing section. The relation in mm. 66-74 between the descending-fifth series and the harmonic rhythm recalls the procedure employed within the main theme. The four pairs in the series (E-A, D-G♯, C♯-F♯, and B-E) fill two measures each; breaking the final pair into two separate harmonies (ii-V in A), Prokofiev ends the phrase with an increase in the rate of harmonic change—recalling the main theme’s own harmonic acceleration toward the transition.

Example 2.20 provides a reduction and Roman numeral analysis of the development,\(^{15}\) in which two minor key areas in particular—the supertonic (E minor) and the submediant (B minor)—seem, in turn, on the verge of blossoming. The dominant sevenths of both, however, resolve deceptively, causing these minor keys to pass by as unrealized possibilities. Recalling the empty tonal threats within both themes, the drama of the unattainable E minor is the most protracted (mm. 103-10). The victory over these “passing” minor keys\(^{16}\) is signalled by a C:PAC at the end of the development. In retrospect, the reinterpretation of VI in E minor as ♯II in B

\(^{14}\) Rifkin excludes the bass and root B of m. 65 from her Schenkerian sketch (2004, 269). As indicated above, however, the Bm chord occupies a deeper level than the preceding C♯M chord, which acts as an upper-fifth chord or back-relating dominant to Fm.

\(^{15}\) This is essentially a more detailed, slightly revised version of the harmonic sketch provided by Minturn (1997, 110).

\(^{16}\) For a discussion of the term “passing key,” see Harrison (2002, 144).
minor seems like a means of delaying the inevitable: VI of B minor soon reveals itself as V of C major. In m. 134, a deceptive resolution triggers a hypermetric reinterpretation (4=1) while launching a C-major vi-ii7-V7-I progression. As a triumphant harmonic realization of the A-D-G-C descending-fifth series encountered in the opening of the movement (mm. 1-11), the progression in mm. 134-41 abstractly compensates for the recapitulation’s deletion of the exposition’s first ten measures. The main tonal consequence of this deletion is the reservation of the D-major tonic return for m. 150, eight measures after the thematic recapitulation (m. 142).

Because mm. 142-49 literally recall mm. 11-18, an accelerating harmonic rhythm leads, in the recapitulation, to the tonic in m. 150 in the same way as to m. 19 in the exposition.

In the first movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, Prokofiev might be said to revisit the tonal world of the first movement of the Classical Symphony: the two works share an almost exclusive focus on the major mode\textsuperscript{17}—specifically, the key is D major, there is a weighty Ⅶ (CM), and the secondary theme is in the key of V—and a harmonic style characterized by

---

\textsuperscript{17} Commenting on the finale of the Classical Symphony, Prokofiev remarked that he had to discard his first attempt and write “a completely new one, endeavouring, among other things, to avoid all minor chords” (1991, 259).
long series of fifths occasionally realized as parallel fifths.\textsuperscript{18} Yet the first movement of the 1943-44 Sonata goes beyond the first movement of the 1918 Symphony in the sophistication of its tonal language, and in the following analysis, I will offer hypothetical recompositions of portions of Op. 94bis/I to suggest what I consider tantalizing alternative tonal routes subtly hinted at within the main and secondary themes as well as in the movement’s coda.

The \textit{Moderato} first movement of Op. 94bis opens with a periodic theme (\textbf{example 2.21}) involving a half cadence in the key of \(\ D\VII \) in m. 4 and a plagal cadence in the home key in m. 8. With almost every bass tone stabilized by an upper-voice perfect fifth, the voice leading exhibits a variety of ways of more or less thinly disguising parallel fifths. In m. 1, for instance, a one-beat realignment prevents \(a^2-d^3\) in the violin from forming literal parallel fifths with \(d-g\) in the bass. More thoroughly hidden by an exchange of voices are \(A/D-G/C\) fifths in the piano in m. 1. Above the Roman numeral analysis, \textbf{example 2.21} posits these tones as the starting point of a long series of descending fifths. The C-major \(vi7\-ii7\-V\) progression that concludes the antecedent can be understood as a decelerated portion of a descent of fifths that implicitly begins in m. 1 and bridges the antecedent and consequent. The pitch class G straddles the boundary of the antecedent and consequent, figuring as the last unit in the former phrase (as root of GM) and the first in the latter (as fifth of CM). Using the natural minor scales of D and C in the antecedent and consequent respectively, Prokofiev sets up the D-major ending of the consequent as an event that is both locally surprising (interrupting the flow of descending fifths to create a plagal motion) and from a broader perspective satisfying (ending the main theme with a full home-key cadence).

To explore the significance of this procedure, \textbf{example 2.22} entertains a hypothetical recomposition of mm. 7-8 that preserves the flow of descending fifths and secures an authentic cadence in the key of the consequent phrase. In this recomposition, the consequent phrase transposes the D-minor fifth-progression of the antecedent to C minor and—treating the harmony in the second half of m. 7 as a “Prokofiev dominant”—answers the antecedent’s C-major half cadence with a C-major authentic cadence. Opting for a tonally closed D-major period, Prokofiev actually allows for a retrospective understanding of the consequent’s melody as a

---

\textsuperscript{18} Perhaps more directly than the first movement, the finale of Op. 94bis also hearkens back to aspects of the Classical Symphony. Notice, in particular, the descent from I (m. 1) to \(\ D\VII \) (m. 6) in the \textit{Allegro con brio} of Op. 94bis. With an even lighter touch than in the first movement of Op. 25, a 5-6 motion in m. 5 of the \textit{Allegro con brio} breaks up the parallels. A listener might not even notice the difference in the \textit{Allegro con brio} movement between m. 5 and m. 126—where Prokofiev omits this 5-6 motion.
motion from 4 to 1 in the home key that answers the 5-1 melodic motion of the antecedent. Looked at another way, the bass 1-4 motion is transferred to the upper voice and retrograded as a 4-1 motion. The cadences reinforce this relationship: the G-D root motion of the consequent’s (strong) cadence reverses the D-G root motion of the antecedent’s (weak) cadence. As if to compensate for the opposition of the concluding D to the overall descending-fifth scheme, a brief surface-level descending-fifth motion in mm. 7-8 bolsters the status of D as goal of the phrase (V7/ii-ii-V#5-I over the deeper-level IV-I motion).

As in the first movement of Op. 25, the transition in Op. 94bis/I (not shown) features a descent in fifths that leads to the A-major key of the secondary theme (ii-V-I in A major, mm. 15-22). The secondary theme is similar to the main theme in its deceptive simplicity. Recalling the main theme’s Mixolydian inclination, the secondary theme’s opening phrase (example 2.23) is marked by an insistent G (♯7 in A major). Reinterpreted as ♯7 in G♯ minor, G=F♯ resolves upward. In the second phrase, order is restored with a downward resolution of D (♯7 in E, m. 28). An E:PAC then brings the phrase to a close (m. 29), marking the end of the first half of a larger period. In sum, mm. 25 and 28 stand out as locations of striking but transient harmonic events on the way to a predictable, self-evident goal: the dominant of the dominant (m. 29). Examples 2.24 and 2.25 suggest a couple of alternative directions in which the phrase could have gone. In example 2.24, the theme follows up on the earlier tonicization of G♯ minor with a PAC confirming that key. Example 2.25 demonstrates the potential of the B♭-minor triad of m. 28 as a tonic triad acting as a substitute for a cadential six-four. In contrast to the actual phrase’s employment of the B♭-minor triad of m. 28 as ii in E major, example 2.25 enlists the E-major

Example 2.24: A recomposition of Op. 94bis, I, mm. 26-29
Example 2.25: Another recomposition of Op. 94bis, I, mm. 26-29

Example 2.26: Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, I, mm. 35-41. Reprinted by permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
triad of m. 27 as #IV in B₉ minor. Of course, the actual lyrical theme modulates neither to G♯
minor (vi) nor to B₉ minor (ii); nor does it pursue an exact T7 sequence of mm. 22-25 to reach
E₉ minor by m. 29.¹⁹ The E-major cadence is the ironically easy outcome of a difficult tonal path.

Leading to the A:PAC (m. 38) that closes the secondary theme’s large period, Prokofiev
includes a chord enharmonically equivalent to E7 (D-C♯-F-A♯, m. 36): an augmented-sixth
chord that resolves to an E₉-minor triad (example 2.26). This E₉-minor triad resolves as a pre-
dominant (Ⅳ) in A major to a new E7 chord (with lowered fifth). The phrase thus displays a pair
of chords with almost identical pitch-class contents but contrasting harmonic function—the first
serving as an applied dominant of the pre-dominant, the second serving as the dominant. In this
respect, the excerpt may be compared to the end of the A section (mm. 9-12) of the Gavotte from
the Classical Symphony, shown in example 2.27. In this well-known ending, A7 appears twice,
resolving as a dominant seventh only after its momentary reinterpretation—or
“misinterpretation”—as an augmented-sixth chord. As a result, the D:PAC is set up as the
conclusion of a basically palindromic harmonic progression. In mm. 36-38 of the first movement
of Op. 94bis, the second E7 chord distinguishes itself from the first by virtue of its root position
and lowered fifth, but the similarity of the two E7 chords nevertheless contextualizes the
A:PAC—like the D:PAC in the Gavotte—as the product of a dazzling reversal.

Example 2.27: Symphony No. 1, Op. 25, III, mm. 9-12

D: I
C♯: Ger6
V7
V6/4
5/3
V7
Ger6

The first movement of Op. 94bis ends in a manner that recalls the plagal motion and
harmonic reversal characteristic of the main theme. Example 2.28 shows the score for the last
nine measures of the movement (mm. 122-30). In m. 123, the B₉-minor triad (vi in D major)

¹⁹ In Chapter 5, I will return to the ramifications of this T7 sequential relationship, from the perspective of which E
major replaces E₉ minor.
may initially be expected to function as in mm. 115-18 (or mm. 38-39, the codetta of the exposition), i.e. as an ephemeral alignment of the chordal third of the dominant with the upper
chromatic neighbours of the root and fifth of the dominant. Instead, a fixation on this B♭-minor harmony turns it into a local tonic, providing support for a final recollection of the main theme’s basic idea (mm. 126-27). Analyzing mm. 126-30 in the same way as the opening, the pitch classes outlined above the harmonic analysis in example 2.28 form the start of a descending-fifth series. The final cadence in D can be compared to that in m. 8: standing in opposition to a preceding descent, an ascent in fifths (C-G-D) brings the tonic harmony. In a manner analogous to example 2.22 (my recomposition of m. 8), example 2.29 imagines an alternative final measure for the movement. Yielding to the flow of descending fifths, the recomposition ends in F major instead of D major. As indicated in the harmonic analysis, m. 129 is now understood wholly as a C harmony (without a C-G root motion). From the vantage point of the hypothetical F tonic, my alternative ending completes a superficial F-F circle of fifths in the form of a iv-♭II-V-I progression in mm. 126-30. Like the rejection of C minor in the final measures of the F-major third movement, Prokofiev’s “turning away” from a possible F-major ending in the D-major first movement has motivic significance, as it recalls the flatward tendency and minor dominant agent of the opening of the work. There is also an inter-movement logic at work here: rejected in the coda of the first movement, F major becomes the key of the third movement; and in the coda of the third movement, the inclination toward C prepares for the renewed D Mixolydian of the finale.

Example 2.29: Op. 94bis, I: hypothetical F-major ending

Characterized by Mixolydian chromaticism and parallel perfect intervals, the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, bears an immediately perceptible affinity to Op.
25 and Op. 94bis. Surface-level series of fifths, [0358] augmented sixth chords, and unconventional tritone relations play a central role in the harmonic language of the work.

The exposition of the first movement of this C-major sonata can be heard as a series of attempts, both after and—remarkably—before the entrance of the E-minor second theme (m. 26), to secure a conclusive cadence in the key of the submediant. Prior to the exposition’s final outer-voice resolution on A in m. 57 (echoed in m. 61), similar outer-voice resolutions punctuate the downbeats of mm. 18, 20, 34, and 45. The power of the submediant as an irresistible tonal goal—not only of the exposition but throughout it—is presaged within the main theme itself (example 2.30). Recalling the A-minor triad within m. 1, the A-minor triad in m. 4 takes part in a C-major I⁶-⁵ (vi-I) motion that mirrors the I⁵-⁶ of m. 1. At the same time, the unique weight of the A-minor triad in m. 4—in root position and with its root in both outer voices—establishes it as the first of a series of special landmarks on the road to the exposition’s concluding A-minor cadence. From a harmonic-functional perspective, the exposition’s multiple outer-voice arrivals on A vary greatly. Examining each in turn, I will offer comparisons between particular pairs of resolutions in the course of the exposition.

In the main theme, the antecedent concludes with a ⁵-⁶-⁷-⁸ bass ascent (leading to I, mm. 3-4), whereas the consequent concludes with a ¹-²-³-⁴-⁵ bass ascent (leading to V, mm. 7-
Like phrases 1 and 2 in the Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4 (discussed in Section I), these phrases reverse the usual period relationship: a I-V motion at the end of the consequent answers a V-I motion at the end of the antecedent. Meanwhile, the use of B♭ instead of B♮ in the antecedent opens up the possibility of hearing mm. 3-4 as ii7-(iii)-V in F major (preparing for the F-major start of the consequent). Moreover, the use of F♯ instead of F♮ in m. 7 ensures a V-key dominant agent discharge (F♯-G). The period’s apparent strong-weak cadence pairing (V-I, I-V) thus takes on the character of a weak-strong cadence pairing, colouring the tonic in m. 4 as a local dominant and the dominant in m. 8 as a local tonic. The similarity between the Am and G(♯7-7) chords in mm. 4 and 8—both root-position chords with the root in the outer voices, situated on the final downbeats of their respective phrases, and locally approached by root motion upward by step—further mitigates the harmonic-functional contrast between the cadences, contributing to the sense of delicate balance between the period’s two halves.

From a broader perspective, mm. 1-8 act as an antecedent in a larger period. Beginning in m. 9, the large consequent leads to what can be heard as an A-minor authentic cadence (resolving a 7-♯7 augmented sixth) in m. 20. The score excerpt in example 2.31 begins with the large consequent and proceeds to the first two measures of the E-minor secondary theme (mm. 26-27). Starting an octave higher than the large antecedent, the large consequent features a broad melodic descent, reaching a2 in m. 12, a1 in m. 18, and a in m. 20, each time supported by A in the bass. In mm. 16 and 18, fourths and sevenths without immediate resolutions lend the chords a quartal sound; in m. 20, similarly, the lack of a 2-3 resolution turns the inner-voice B into a fixture of the A chord. A more nuanced understanding of harmony and formal function in the passage can be gained by considering the sequence that drives the internal phrase expansion (preceding m. 20) as well as some aspects of the external phrase expansion (following m. 20) that prepare for the secondary theme.

As indicated below the score in example 2.31, a descending-third sequence is initiated in mm. 14-16: E♭-(B♭)-C-(G)-A-(E)-F♯-(C♯)-D. Proceeding at a pace eight times slower, the sequence can be understood as continuing to (A) in m. 18 and concluding on B in m. 20. The stability of A in m. 20 undermines the root status to B. If B were the root, however, it would contextualize the ensuing E-D♯ motions as 4-3 resolutions within a V7 of E minor, thus preparing

---

20 In my view, a problem arises in the analyses of both Harter (2003, 109-11) and Rifkin (2006, 134-41) when they reduce m. 4 as an A-minor harmony and label it as a deceptive cadence.

21 Within mm. 14-15, this sequence adheres to an octatonic collection. For a discussion of the role of octatonic and whole-tone collections in the exposition of Op. 38/I, see Bianchi (2010, 149-51).
for the E-minor secondary theme. On the surface, quintal relations come into play in mm. 20-26: D♯ sinks to D♯, triggering a scalar ascent that outlines a quintal framework in which the pitch e is central: D-A-e-b-f♯. The D at the bottom of this framework assumes a multivalent role, at once suggesting the subdominant of the current key of A minor, the minor dominant agent of the future E minor, and the dominant of G major—the most traditional key for a secondary theme in a C-major sonata.

Example 2.32 shows the score of the remainder of the exposition (mm. 24-62). In m. 34, the chord from m. 20 returns and works in the same way: although A is a local tonic, an inner-voice B looks forward to the restatement of the E-minor secondary theme (m. 37). The procedure is comparable to what Caplin calls a reinterpreted half cadence (1998, 57), except that two keys are involved: an authentic cadence in A minor is reinterpreted as a half cadence in E minor. There are at least two ways of regarding the root motion involved in the E-minor theme’s modulation to A minor (mm. 31-34). From one point of view, outer-voice octaves on B (beat 1 of m. 31), E (the last eighth of m. 32), and A (beat 1 of m. 34) suggest a root motion that foretells the pitch-class contents of the chord on beat 1 of m. 34. The metric weakness of E, however, draws attention in m. 33 to Fm7 and GM—chords which might suggest iv7 and V in C. In a sense, home-key harmonic material has been pressed into the service of the vi-key—contributing to what can be viewed as a ladovaia peremennost’ relationship in this movement between C and A. By the same token, the Bm-GM motion in m. 44 could signify an unfolding of V in C rather than VII in A; this will prove important later in the movement (as I will be argue in Chapter 4).

The closing section of the exposition (mm. 46-62) confirms the A-minor tonic by means of a pedal and a surface-level ascending-fifth sequence that leads to A. Two harmonic features of the model (mm. 46-50) recur untransposed in the sequence (mm. 51-55), keeping the passage’s formal function as a closing section clear: an A tonic pedal (struck in mm. 46 and 51) and a third-inversion E♭-major-seventh chord on the third downbeat (mm. 48 and 53). Melodically, the model leads to G in m. 48 (in the surface G key, E♭M7 would be iV17); the first sequential unit leads to D in m. 53 (in the surface D key, E♭M7 would be iI7); and the second sequential unit leads to A in m. 57 (by means of a D♯-T resolution).

---

22 At the start of the secondary theme, a melodic e² (G in E minor) puts an end to this perfect-fifth series while acting as incomplete upper neighbour to b³ (♯5).

23 Refer to Chapter 1 for a general discussion of ladovaia peremennost’ and to Chapter 4 for a detailed study of associated techniques in Prokofiev’s harmony.
Although I will postpone detailed analysis of later portions of the movement until Chapter 4, one excerpt near the end of the movement is worth bringing up here, considering its relevance to the topic of harmonic-functional balance. **Example 2.33** shows the score of mm. 184-88, a prolongation of the C tonic that includes a rapid motion to and from a neighbour F#-major chord (analogous to the E♭ neighbour decoration of the exposition’s concluding A-minor tonic). Like the tritone progressions in mm. 12-19 of the Lily Dance, those in this excerpt differ from one another with respect to harmonic function. **Example 2.34** suggests idealized four-voice representations of the motion into and out of the F# harmony. The two different voicings shown in **example 2.34** reflect the fact that, together, the inner voices of Progression B can derive from either T6 or R operations on those of Progression A. The retrograde relation in what **example 2.34** arbitrarily depicts as the bass line—rendered salient in the music by a pitch identity (b♭-b-a♭ in mm. 185-86 and a♭-b-c♭ in mm. 187-88)—is responsible for the functional difference between the two progressions. This voice supplies a subdominant agent discharge in F# in Progression A and a dominant agent discharge in C in Progression B, both bolstered by augmented-sixth projections. The main source of tonal imbalance in the exposition—the persistent inclination
toward the submediant—has at last been overcome; at the same time, the swift motion to and from the tritone pole recalls the original dominant-like character of the C tonic (since F♭M=G♮M could signify ♭II in F).

IV. Palindromic schemes and series of fifths in a “modernist” work

Earlier than any of the works hitherto discussed, the Sarcasms, Op. 17 (1912-14) are among the works listed by Prokofiev as reflecting his “modern line.” In the C-major Sarcasm No. 5, palindromic schemes and fifth series present themselves in a way that invites comparison to a well-known work by an earlier composer. At the end of the Precipitosissimo A section of the Sarcasm (example 2.35), a sudden halting of the tempo signals the arrival of a melody that, I will argue, alludes ironically to the Love Theme in Chaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet (1869).

Example 2.36 places the melody of mm. 20-24 from the Sarcasm alongside a sketch of an F♯-major transposition of the melody of the Love Theme. One way of exploring the relation between the two themes is by means of Sheinberg’s (2000) “satirical distortion techniques,” particularly the removal of essential characteristics. Decidedly missing from Prokofiev’s caricature is a ♫-♭♫-♭♫-♭♫ nega motion, which, as Taruskin (1994) points out, characterizes the famous Love Theme (81-82). Instead of serving as an expansive beginning, Prokofiev’s “sarcastic” version figures as a choked-off ending. Pared down from eight measures to four, Prokofiev’s theme seems to end with a brutal curtain fall—a cadence in C (the home key, related by tritone to the key of the melody). The concluding melodic E-C descent (♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭ in C major) takes the place of a downward leap from E to an appoggiatura A♭ (the one melodic tritone in the Love Theme). The C♭ in m. 21 (spelled as D in the score) can be heard as a distortion of the corresponding C♯ in the Love Theme; the subsequent grace-note “swoop” to F♯ exacerbates the effect of the mistuning. Rhythmically, the accompaniment chords in the Sarcasm crudely mimic the bass line of the Love Theme by striking during the melody’s long notes. In contrast to the cyclical, palpitating 2-4-2 rhythmic pattern (in eighth-note pulses) of the accompaniment in the Love Theme, the attack points of the accompaniment in the Sarcasm form a 6-4-2 rhythmic pattern, impatiently accelerating toward the low C conclusion.

Interpreting mm. 20-24 as a grotesquely unfaithful reproduction of the Love Theme, the above discussion accounts for these measures purely in negative terms—in terms of distortions and excisions. From another perspective, however, Prokofiev’s “sarcastic” version brings out and
Example 2.35: Sarcasm, Op. 17, No. 5, mm. 1-24
expands upon a somewhat hidden beauty of the Love Theme.

Prokofiev’s melody excludes notes 2 and 3 of the original melody, leaving a C-F-G-D ascending-fifth series formed by notes 1, 4, and 5 of the Love Theme. Leading into the theme, Prokofiev sets up these pitch classes as the continuation of a longer series: E-B-F-C-A-E (mm. 20-21). In so doing, he foregrounds an aspect of Chaikovsky’s Love Theme that is somewhat concealed. Example 2.37 shows a piano reduction of the Love Theme in F major. Following an initial tonic prolongation, Chaikovsky launches a root motion in descending fifths that employs the full F-major scale excluding 4. Leading from 7 to 1, the root motion restricts itself to perfect fifths: [V7]-[V7]-[V9]-ii7-V7-I. The melodic c-g-d-a-E selected by Prokofiev figures within another more subtly expressed perfect-fifth series in the Love Theme that connects the opening melodic c to the bass E in the first four measures: c-g-d-a-E. It is worth
emphasizing that the d♯ in this series is not a harmony tone; the series is hidden within a I-V4/2-I6 tonic prolongation. Thanks to the delayed entrance of the melodic c♯1 (on beat 3 of m. 1), the opening bass F♯ might even be interpreted as the true beginning of the series. As a whole, the theme would thus harbour a pitch-class palindrome: (F♯-C♯-G♯-D♯-A♯)-E♯-A♯-D♯-G♯-C♯-F♯. The 5-6-5-6-5 motion pointed out by Taruskin is an additional aspect of the theme’s symmetrical design.

Marked *Meno mosso subito* and *con grand espressione*, the end of the A section in the last Sarcasm presents a near quotation of a satirical target that is, in subtler ways, alluded to throughout the whole work.24 Beneath the spiraling melody in the opening of the piece, a pair of voices in contrary motion suggests an overall palindrome spanning mm. 1-8. **Example 2.38** clarifies this palindrome by altering the register of some pitch classes in mm. 1-5. In mm. 1-4, this contrapuntal design is accompanied by the strong suggestion of an ascending-perfect-fifth root motion (C-G-D-A) over a C tonic pedal. The continuation of the abstract contrary motion to the unison A♭ in m. 5 distorts what could have been an exact perfect-fifth palindrome.

**Example 2.39** provides a closer look at the chromatic contrary motion in mm. 5-6. Picking up where the left hand leaves off in mm. 1-4, the upper voices in mm. 5-6 ascend chromatically in parallel major thirds in contrary motion with the chromatically descending parallel minor thirds of the lower voices. As a result of this contrary motion, a C/G (1/5) voice exchange (**example 2.40**) contributes to the prolongation of tonic harmony. For the sake of comparison, **example 2.41** shows the two-voice framework of the conventional five-chord

---

24 In this respect, the last Sarcasm (written in 1912-14) is comparable to the last piece in Debussy’s *Children’s Corner* (1906-08). In the middle section of Golliwogg’s Cake-Walk, Debussy uses equivalent performance indications (*Cédez* and *avec une grande émotion*) at the entrance of his near quotation of another iconic 19th-century love theme—from the Prelude of Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde* (1860). For a discussion of Golliwogg’s Cake-Walk and its allusions to that love theme, see Sheinberg (2000, 142-47).
omnibus progression, which typically prolongs dominant harmony.

Some aspects of the Love Theme also resonate in the B section (mm. 25-58; not shown). In mm. 30-33, a four-note pattern (D♭-E♭-G♭-A♭) forms part of an obsessively repetitive accompaniment to a lamentevole melody that enters in m. 40. As a collection of four pitch classes, this figure may suggest a corrected version of the first four melodic notes of the theme from m. 21 (“tuning” the D to D♭), or represent a transposition of the C-G-D-A root motion of mm. 1-4, or even recall the first four and last four pitch classes in the Love Theme’s palindrome. The notion of this four-note pattern as a rearranged perfect-fifth series finds support in the lamentevole melody, which apparently continues from this E♭-A♭-D♭-G♭ descending-perfect-fifth series to outline a G♭-B-E descent. As if in response to this descent, the accompaniment is transposed down by a semitone in m. 45. In its second appearance (m. 51), the lamentevole melody—abstractly picking up where the accompaniment’s new D-G-C-F series leaves off—descends beyond the expected F-B♭-E♭ to reach the “abyss” of A♭ in m. 53 before settling on a lower E♭.

At least in its broad harmonic outlines, the remainder of the piece is simple. Measures 59-73 present a retransitional passage over a dominant pedal, softly recalling the repeated chords and e♭-g♭ melodic third of mm. 1-2 against a new (con duolo) melody. What follows is a strangely subdued A’ section over a tonic pedal (mm. 74-109). Like the A section, the A’ section concludes with the satirized Love Theme. Marked lugubre, transferred to the piano’s lowest register, anchored by a tonic pedal, and stretched to fill twenty measures, the theme undergoes a radical transformation. In his “programme” for Op. 17, No. 5, Prokofiev commented on this about-face in psychological attitude, the path from a raucous beginning to an introspective ending:

[T]here are occasions when the evil, coarse side of our nature leads us to poke callous fun at something or other, but closer inspection shows us that the object of our ridicule is so pitiful, so wretched in its utter
insignificance, so touching, that we are frightened by our laughter, it rings louder and louder in our ears, and then we hear that our own laughter has turned itself on us. (Prokofiev 2008, 146)

As Shapovalov observes, the staccato chords of the A section may be interpreted as a musical representation of mocking laughter, stylistically similar to the sung laughter of the Prince in *The Love for Three Oranges*, Op. 33, Act II, Tableau 2 (21-22). The Sarcasm also calls to mind Prokofiev’s notion of bending or inflecting a “line” to suggest *shutka, smekh, or nasmeshka* [joking, laughter, mockery] (1956, 31-32). Commenting on the fourth of the basic lines, the “lyrical,” Prokofiev reflected that “For a long time, I was given no credit for any lyrical gift whatever” (32), and he would rejoice when a critic like V. G. Karatygin would “discover a lyrical moment” in the middle of an aggressive modernist piece like Sarcasm No. 3 (37). In a way, Sarcasm No. 5 is about lyricism: there is a lyrical moment, but it is within quotation marks. The lyrical voice is quoted derisively at first (perhaps *zakhlëbyvait’, or suffocant de rire*, to transfer a performance indication from R209 of Op. 33) and pensively later; laughter in the A section gives way to haunting echoes of laughter in the A’ section. The work is much more than a commentary on a specific work of a celebrated predecessor; it eloquently sets forth a modernist perspective on “old” classicism and lyricism, while exploring the empowering/demeaning “essence” of laughter (to borrow Baudelaire’s phrase).

V. Conclusion

In most of the works discussed in this chapter, the “classical line” especially is evident. Prokofiev’s version of the classical style does not necessarily confine the members of series of

---

25 This passage is from the composer’s diary entry for 28 October 1916. Prokofiev also includes the Fifth Sarcasm’s “programme” in his 1941 autobiography: “‘Sometimes we callously laugh at someone or something, but when we look more closely we see how pathetic and wretched is the object of our ridicule; then we feel uneasy, we hear the laughter in our ears, but now it is laughing at us.’ The other Sarcasms had no programme.” Translations by Anthony Phillips (Prokofiev 2008, 146-47).

26 An interesting study could be made of the similarly regrettable laughter in Op. 33, especially how, after watching the Prince’s mirth spread to the entire assembly, Fata Morgana draws on the melodic material of the silenced laughers while invoking the humiliating curse.

27 Translation from Prokofiev 1991, 249.

28 Prokofiev’s own comments on Op. 17, No. 5 are also somewhat reminiscent of what Hyde calls “dialectical imitation” in neoclassic music: while “exposing in its model a defect, irresolution or naivety,” the imitation “risks reciprocal treatment”; as a result, “exchange or contest” takes place between imitation and model (2003, 122; see also Hyde 1996).

29 A final comment regarding Op. 17, No. 5: my point regarding this piece’s attack on a certain kind of sentimental 19th-century lyricism does not really contradict the point made by N. Zhiliaev in a 1922 essay that the Sarcasms owe a debt to the 19th-century Russian “fantastic” tradition (the “fantastic” side of Chaikovsky in particular, according to Zhiliaev!). Zhiliaev’s argument is cited by Orelovich (1962, 132-33).
fifths to the bass or demand consistent root status. Melodies employ underlying 5-cycles and perfect fourths or fifths are sometimes stacked to produce quartal or quintal sonorities. In works like the first movements of Op. 25 and Op. 94bis, series of parallel fifths often form components of longer descending-fifth trajectories or 5-cycles. Sometimes, cadences or other remarkable harmonic progressions seem specially designed to suggest pairs of alternative destinations that are related by fifths. Thus, for instance, the A and B sections in Op. 94bis/III are characterized by perfect-fifth-related resolutions of a [0358] augmented-sixth chord, and the coda seems to point toward C while heading toward F.

In Prokofiev’s “classical line” works, one can usually count on the successful accomplishment of particular tonal goals that are apparently predetermined by the “first-level defaults” of conventional form and tonality. In several cases in this chapter, I explored sinuous, unconventional routes to conventional tonal goals (e.g. the D-major endings of the main theme in Op. 94/I and of the movement as a whole; the E-major ending of the large antecedent of the secondary theme in Op. 94/I; or the F-major ending of Op. 94/III) to shed light on harmonic-functional nuances. Hypothetical prototypes or recompositions are useful to suggest how the phrase might have followed through with or yielded to the temptation of a particular alternative trajectory.

In the analyses in this chapter, I have also pointed out instances of inversional relationships, emphasizing the special significance of balancing events that coincide with or give rise to concluding tonic harmonies. On a small scale, this technique is relevant to the main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103. Balance and tonal closure are withheld from the contrasting idea, which deviates from the goal projected by the melodic inversion; instead, one is compelled to wait until the end of the theme, where the melodic is dictated and obtained through a retrograde rather than inversional scheme. On larger scales, the Lily Dance and the third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, provide a sense of balance in the ways in which they lead to their concluding tonic harmonies. In the Gavotte, Op. 77, No. 4, one encounters a delicate balancing or equalization of a pair of cadences, and the main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, offers a more sophisticated instance of the same technique.

In subsequent chapters, I will return frequently to matters of harmonic-functional balance and the implications of inversional schemes, whether between adjacent harmonies or abstractly
related events. Certainly, my conception of series of fifths has included some passages that are, in a perfectly conventional sense, descending-fifth sequences. The topic of sequences is expanded upon in the next chapter. In particular, the discussion of the main theme of Op. 94bis/I in this chapter anticipates the discussion of directional changes at the ends of sequences (in the last section of the next chapter).
Chapter 3: Sequential harmony and harmonic function

In Prokofiev’s music, dominant harmony is often ephemeral, appearing just before the tonic harmony that supports a thematic return. Especially if the norms of the Classical style are otherwise strongly invoked, Prokofiev’s characteristic “touching” rather than standing on a dominant might seem ironic: for example, what shrinks or even disappears from a middle section, as it were in the name of streamlining, may be precisely the harmony on which it could rely entirely. More generally, Prokofiev’s fleeting dominants reflect a trend that can be traced back through the Moguchaia kuchka to Schubert, in much of whose music, as Taruskin (1996) points out, “the dominant … has been demoted to the level of a linking device, a mere accessory” (259). Notwithstanding the influence of Wagner on many nineteenth-century Russian composers, plagalism and marginalized dominants remain basically definitive of their style. For Prokofiev’s music, plagalism is perhaps not of such general importance as what Asafiev called tonikalnost’—the trait on account of which the early Prokofiev was received as the antithesis of Scriabin. Prokofiev’s characteristic tonikalnost’ is evident in many of the works analyzed in this chapter, certainly where sequential harmony leads directly to the firm tonic of a coda-like A’ section or where the gravity of a tonic hinders a sequential trajectory.

To be sure, the use of the dominant as a linking device is not unfamiliar throughout the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature. More specifically, Prokofiev seldom uses linking dominants to turn back or away from a key prepared by a longer, more stable dominant. In a traditional scenario, a fleeting V4/3 or V6(/5) chord effectively absorbs transitional or retransitional formal function in the wake of a powerful “misleading” dominant (i.e. a dominant of another key). More relevant to Prokofiev’s harmonic practice are those precedents in which

---

1 The term standing on the dominant (das Stehen auf der Dominante) originates in Ratz (1973, 25). See Caplin (1998), especially regarding the contrasting middle of a Classical small ternary form (75-81). As Caplin observes, it is worth making the distinction between dominant prolongation, which just refers to harmony, and standing on the dominant, which represents a formal function (268n.18).

2 On this point, see Taruskin (1997, 133).

3 For example, V6 briefly intercedes between a standing on V of ii and the start of the A’ section in mm. 14-15 of the F-major second movement of Mozart’s String Quartet in D minor, K. 421; Caplin discusses this retransitional V6 and cites a couple of similar examples (1998, 79 and 269n. 28). A similar sense of swift redirection may be afforded by a brief home-key dominant after a lengthy V7 of III in the minor mode (see, e.g., the excerpt from the Prelude of Handel’s D-minor Harpsichord Suite No. 3, included in Aldwell and Schachter 2003, 414-15) or V7 of iii in the major mode (e.g. leading to the third refrain in the finale of Weber’s Piano Sonata No. 1 in C, Op. 24), although as subtonics these chords tend to be subsumed retrospectively by the home-key dominant. In the major mode, V4/3 can link to a returning tonic after a standing on V of vi (e.g. in mm. 40-61 of Chopin’s Etude, Op. 10, No. 8), and Romantic composers sometimes approach new major keys analogously; see, for example, the approach to the D-
the lengthy harmony that precedes the linking dominant lacks (clear) dominant function. One example from Schubert that must have impressed Prokofiev is the end of the development in the first movement of Piano Sonata in B♭, D. 960, where a D-minor harmony captures our attention for many measures before yielding, via a fleeting home-key dominant, to the B♭-major recapitulation. (I will return to this example tangentially in an analysis below of a passage in the first movement of Prokofiev’s Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63.) Instead of using the dominant of one key to “correct” that of another, Prokofiev typically entrusts dominant function only to a middle section’s final, fleeting chord. Frequently, this literal dominant prompts a retrospective appreciation of latent dominant elements (particularly the home-key dominant agent) in a preceding chord or series of chords. In several of the analyses below, I will refer to the “clarification” of dominant function, or to brief local dominants that, from a broader perspective, clarify a harmonic function that has (perhaps only retrospectively) been operative for a longer span.

For some simple examples of linking dominants benefiting from an established dominant agent, one might consider the end of the B section in the “Harp” Prelude, Op. 12, No. 7, where a V4/3 chord (m. 54) leads from iii to the tonic harmony of the A’ section; or Mercutio, Op. 75, No. 8, in which a V6 chord (m.64) plays an analogous role between the ♭vi on which the middle section is based and the tonic that supports the thematic return.

In this chapter, I examine the phenomenon of marginalized, ephemeral, or omitted dominants from a particular angle: my focus is on the formal roles and harmonic-functional implications of sequential harmony. In the pieces and excerpts analyzed in Section I, the sequences mostly involve root motion by perfect fifth, recalling some scenarios from Chapter 2. In each analysis, I examine the clarity or obscurity of dominants and the typical differences of realization between authentic and plagal sequential approaches to tonics. Major- and minor-third sequences are reserved for Section II. While true harmonic major-third equal division is often found in Prokofiev’s music (certainly in a handful of very well-known themes), minor-third equal division generally remains incipient, and triadic arpeggiation—sometimes complicated by

---

4 In the first movement of his Symphony No. 8 in B Minor, “Unfinished,” D. 759, Schubert employs a similar harmonic strategy in a different formal context. Hepokoski and Darcy refer to the event at m. 38 in this movement as a i:AC MC, following which a “modulatory caesura-fill” leads to the G-major secondary theme in m. 42 (2006, 29).

5 Indebted to the analytical approach of Harrison (1994), my use of the term clarification refers to changes of scale-degree contents from one chord to another (or between an expected and an actual chord) that make for clearer communication of dominant function in a particular key.
characteristic chromatic devices—is of paramount importance. In Section III, I discuss the harmonic-functional implications of a sequential technique that I refer to as a volte-face (a directional change that ends a sequence).

I. Sequential approaches to the tonic harmony of returning main themes

In a 1918 interview, Prokofiev talked about the importance of “clarity and laconicism” in his style (Blok 1978, 27). The topic of this section might be regarded as an aspect of Prokofiev’s musical laconicism. At the ends of middle sections, Prokofiev often employs sequential harmony to flow directly to the tonic that supports a returning main theme. Rather than somehow amplify the dominant and thereby distinguish it from its sequential surroundings, Prokofiev often distinguishes the dominant on the contrary as the most fleeting of the pre-tonic harmonies. In general, Prokofiev’s sequentially contextualized dominants tend to be clarified but not amplified or vice versa.

To help illustrate this idea, example 3.1 shows a reduction of the sequential approach to the A’ section of a nineteenth-century ternary-form work: Grieg’s C-major Notturno, Op. 54, No. 4. The B section not only begins on the dominant but also ends on it. If the harmonic sequence were pursued strictly in mm. 18ff, the last chord of the B section would be G,9 in second inversion. Instead, Grieg both clarifies home-key dominant function at this point (hence the root-position G harmony) and amplifies the chord itself (employing a written-out ritardando and an expansion of range). In general, Prokofiev has a different attitude toward the home-key

---

6 The distinction between “incipient” and “true” equal division and the “evolution” from one to the other is discussed by Cinnamon in a 1986 article on arpeggiation in Liszt’s music.

7 The <6-4> root motion of this sequence makes it comparable to the “stormy sequence” cited in Prokofiev (1973, 324).
dominant in such contexts. A specific comparison to a passage in the C-major Humorous Scherzo, Op. 12, No. 9 is revealing.\textsuperscript{8} \textbf{Examples 3.2} and 3.3 show a score and reduction of the retransition between the D-major B section to the C-major A’ section of Op. 12, No. 9. In a manner reminiscent of the Grieg piece, Prokofiev alters the penultimate chord in the sequence for the benefit of a $D$-$T$ relationship: the chord’s implicit root is $G$ rather than $F\#$/G$. On the other hand, Prokofiev denies a ritardando of any kind; the dominant retains the character of a passing chord. Focusing attention on the stepwise bass connection, the procedure seems well suited to the piece, especially considering the modulation and displacement between C, $C\#$/D, and D major.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Example 3.2: Humorous Scherzo, Op. 12, No. 9, mm. 51-59
  \item Example 3.3: Op. 12, No. 9, mm. 51-59: durational reduction (1:4)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{8} It might seem unfair to compare one composer’s nocturne to another’s humorous scherzo. But Prokofiev, especially in his younger years, seems to have identified the former genre especially with his mother; meanwhile, partly in reaction to certain emotional or sentimental strains of late nineteenth-century amateur piano music, his \textit{scherzando} style developed as a basic component of his musical personality.
within the main theme (in which there is almost the impression that these keys are interchangeable).

Prokofiev treats an ascending sequence somewhat similarly in the C section of the C-major rondo finale of Piano Sonata No. 4, Op. 29.\(^9\) \textbf{Examples 3.4} and \textbf{3.5} show a score and reduction of the end of the C section (mm. 118-33) and the beginning of the A’’ section (mm. 134-37). The \textit{dolce e semplice} episode relates in at least two basic ways to the main theme: its

---

\(^9\) For a typical Romantic counterexample of an ascending 5-6 sequence leading to a double return (\textit{with} written-out ritardando), see Schumann’s “Ich grolle nicht” from \textit{Dichterliebe}, Op. 48.
A♭-major key recalls the obstreperous ♯6 neighbour in the main theme, and its Lydian character relates to the substitution of ♯4 for 4 within the main theme (m. 136). As shown in the root analysis below the reduction, the theme of the C section begins with a descending-third sequence: A♭-(E♭)-F-(C). This harmonic sequence appears to reach D in m. 126, but a broader sequential relationship contradicts this reading: mm. 118-25 coalesce retrospectively as an A♭,5-6 harmonic unit that is sequenced up a step in the next two hypermeasures. Sustaining D throughout mm. 126-33, Prokofiev creates an overall stepwise descent to the tonic in mm. 118-34: A♭-G-F-E♭-D-C. Helping to signal the thematic return are an A♭-G inner-voice resolution in m. 133 (foreshadowing the ♯6-5 neighbour that characterizes the main theme) and stepwise ascents to 1 and 3 in mm. 129-34. Above all, Prokofiev departs from the model in ways that clarify dominant function in C major. Prokofiev thus saves the G chord in mm. 130-33 from being mistaken as the mere submediant of a passing key of B♭ major, but refrains from elevating it above 6-phase status in relation to the B♭ harmony of m. 126.

The delicate nature of the dominant that precedes the A’’ section precludes any sense of an inevitable tonic return; it rather contributes to the motivic idea of ♯VI and I as almost interchangeable harmonies. In the first part of the C section, the ascending 5-6 sequence of the dolce e semplice theme is harmonically blocked by the A♭-major start of the contrasting middle (m. 100, not shown), which reasserts the ♯VI-key tonic that would have been reached had the descending-minor-third sequence proceeded throughout its third and fourth hypermeasures. As if to compensate for checking the C-major home key in this way, Prokofiev bases the contrasting middle on a first-inversion A♭-major harmony and proceeds with an arpeggiation that incorporates C-major harmony (A♭-C-E♭). At the start of the A’’ section, finally, the ascending 5-6 sequence is permitted to flow into the C-major tonic.

In some cases, Prokofiev not only eliminates the written-out ritardando but actually accelerates the harmonic rhythm in preparation for a tonal and/or thematic return. Élan, Op. 4, No. 2 is a bravado E-minor work in which the B section hurtles toward the tonic in this way. Example 3.6 shows a reduction of the A and B sections, omitting the coda-like A’ section (mm. 49-64) based on a tonic pedal. The piece is a virtuosic exercise in sequential repetition. Out of just two distinct hypermeasures, Prokofiev contrives an eight-hypermeasure A section consisting essentially of a i-III-V7-I arpeggiation and its ♯ii-key transposition. The B section (mm. 33-48) begins with an upward major-third sequence (E9-B♭; A♭9-D) and leads to a climactic G9 harmony (m. 41).
Between mm. 37 and 49, the tonic is gained by means of a root descent by fifths: A↓-D-G-C↓-F↓-B-E. Rather than slow down the harmonic rhythm to create a platform for the dominant, the B section ends with a whirlwind acceleration. Measure 48 might, indeed, look like a perfect opportunity to hold onto the dominant, deferring its resolution to the hyperdownbeat of m. 49. Instead, the definitive V9-i progression is a harmonic and rhythmic copy of the preceding [V9]-ii progression. It remains for the sixteen-measure coda to release nervous energy (and confirm that E is indeed the tonic).

Another instance of an accelerating descending-fifth sequence toward a double return can be found in the E-minor (or Phrygian) Scherzo, Op. 52, No. 6. This pertains to the B’ section but not the B section of this rondo-form (ABA’CB’A’’) work. Examples 3.7 through 3.10 provide score excerpts and reductions of the approaches to the A’ and A’’ sections. In the B section (examples 3.7 and 3.8), a descending-fifth sequence of first-inversion minor triads forms an
almost leisurely C-F-Bb root motion. Rather than proceed to a first-inversion E♭-minor chord at m. 38, Prokofiev stabilizes a Gb (=Fz) bass as a root-position seventh chord. The V7/V-i progression between the sections finds its justification in the harmonic trajectory of the main theme (not shown), in which the tonic seems almost to be left behind by the minor dominant from the fourth measure onward (as if demoting the tonic retrospectively to subdominant status). Approaching the final iteration of the main theme (examples 3.9 and 3.10), Prokofiev contributes to the overall sense of E-minor closure by providing a genuine D-T resolution. As in Élan, however, this involves a headlong rush into the tonic. As shown in the root analysis below the reduction, an implied F in m. 126 permits the end of the B section to be interpreted as an acceleration of the descending-fifth sequence (with F and B accommodated by the weak hyperbeat, m. 126). Meanwhile, i(F) in m. 126 anticipates the Phrygian mode of the returning main theme.

Example 3.7: Scherzo, Op. 52, No. 6, mm. 32-41

Example 3.8: Scherzo, Op. 52, No. 6, mm. 32-41: durational reduction (1:4)
In the approach to the A’’ section of the Scherzo, the harmonic acceleration is such that the sequence may be regarded as disrupted. Repentance, from *Children’s Music*, Op. 65, No. 5, provides another example in which the home-key dominant produces, locally, the impression of being inserted retransitionally. **Example 3.11** shows the last measure of the A section, the entire B section, and the first two measures of the A’ section of this D-minor ternary-form piece. The B section consists basically of a four-measure model (B-D) and its transposition up by perfect fourth (E-G). In mm. 24-25, the bass appears to initiate a passing motion in an expansion of V7/c, but a new harmony—the home-key dominant—soon materializes. The dominant’s situation seems appropriate to the depiction of the child’s chagrin. In m. 25, the memory of m. 16 (the dominant conclusion of the A section) is forcefully revived, and the passage as a whole (mm. 16-25) coalesces as a rather unusually realized bass 8-progression—“deceptively” prolonging dominant harmony. At last, the strong F in m. 25 is understood as part of an ephemeral augmented triad, pointing inexorably forward to the lugubrious main theme, which is itself characterized by a heavy-handed melodic ♩ and a ♩ sigh figure.
One could, perhaps, regard it as a principle of laconicism that harmonic acceleration—or at least a strict abnegation of ritardando—be associated with clear dominants that immediately precede double returns. (To a listener with knowledge of a particular style, the sustaining of an ostensibly clear and active dominant for too long might be a negative hint about its functional integrity.) I will return below to the idea of “deceptively” prolonging a dominant or sustaining an “obscure” dominant. First, we may consider that, while clear dominants may render written-out ritardandi inappropriate or unnecessary, the device remains practically indispensable to Prokofiev in plagal sequential approaches. In this connection, the middle section of Repentance (discussed above) might be contrasted with that of Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 1, shown in examples 3.12 and 3.13. The sequences in these two D-minor pieces are inversionally related: whereas the former employs a <4-1> sequence (B<sub>7</sub>-D; E<sub>7</sub>-G), the latter features an <8-11> sequence (B-G; F<sub>7</sub>-D). As implied by my annotations in example 3.13, a chord with bass D would be sequentially expected halfway through the fourth hypermeasure (m. 43). As if running out of energy, the pulsating bass pauses on E, contributing to a mysterious whole-tone sonority. At last, E falls to D at the next hyperdownbeat (m. 45) to support the D-minor tonic ninth chord of the returning main theme. Comparing this idiosyncratic tonic to the G9 chord with which the
B section’s eight-measure model ended (mm. 35-36), one realizes that the sequential trajectory accommodates the chordal seventh and ninth of the D chord at m. 45 but leaves its minor quality as a mild surprise. Not only is the harmony’s minor quality an important factor in its unequivocal tonic status; the conspicuous denial of F♯ also helps to motivate the upper-chromatic-neighbour decoration of F within the main theme. (At the same time, the use of B and B♭ in the middle section relate to the playfully alternating ♯6 and ♭6 neighbours of ♯5 in the main section.) While in Repentance, Op. 65, No. 5, Prokofiev marginalizes the dominant at the end of the B section as a sort of painful afterthought or memory, here he eschews it altogether. In both works, the
hypermeter remains regular, but the accommodation of the dominant in the former involves harmonic acceleration while the absence of the dominant in the latter is compensated for by harmonic deceleration. The A’ section of Op. 31, No. 1 (mm. 45-52) maintains the plagal orientation, bringing the piece to a close with an $S^D-T$ cadence.

In Humorous Scherzo, Op. 12, No. 9 (discussed above), the sequential retransition features a $2\downarrow2\uparrow$ bass descent, and Prokofiev subtly alters the immediate approach to the tonic to foster a $D-T$ relation. Leading to the A’ section of the rondo finale of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84, Prokofiev features a similar sequential approach but eschews dominant clarification; a written-out ritardando compensates for the lack of a dominant. Example 3.14 shows a reduction of this chromatic descent to the $B\flat$-major tonic. The intermediate chords relate to their preceding harmonies as ii4/2 chords. To read the passage as a uniform root descent in fifths, these intervening chords would need to be interpreted as added-sixth chords: CM-$F^{\text{add6}}$-$Bm$-$E=F^{\text{add6}}$-$B\flat\text{M}$. One advantage of this descending-fifth interpretation is that it predicts, roughly, the first harmonic move of the refrain—down a fifth to $E\flat$ major. The main theme plays with the ambiguity between I-IV-I in $B\flat$ and V-I-V in $E\flat$, and the notion that the local progression between the $B$ and $A'$ sections may represent $\text{II}^{\text{add6}}$-$V$ in $E\flat$ resonates with the theme’s Mixolydian character. While the metric and phrase-structural organization clearly establishes $B\flat$ as the tonic, the persistent use of $A\flat$ (throughout the opening eight measures of the refrain and anticipated by the sustained $G\sharp$ in mm. 79-84) gives it a dominant-like character—with important ramifications elsewhere in the movement.

The $\hat{1}$ ($A\flat$) gains an especially imposing status in the middle (C) section of the movement (beginning in m. 107), where it serves as a local dominant pedal. Example 3.15
shows a reduction of the passage leading to the A’’ section at m. 380. In m. 359, the staccato theme from m. 9 returns in G♯ minor. After an ascent by semitone to an A-minor cadential six-four, mm. 371-79 proceed as a transposition up by perfect fourth of mm. 13-21. In glorious contrast to the tenuous D♯ bass of mm. 359-366, E♭-major harmony bursts onto the scene in m. 377. Its metric strength and thematic material (cf. m. 19) inform our functional understanding: it is the triumphant (tonic-like) subdominant of the (dominant-like) B♭, tonic, which in m. 380 supports the return of the main theme. As in the approach to the previous entrance of the refrain, Prokofiev eschews home-key dominant function.

Descending chromatically to the tonic harmonies that support the A’ sections in Op. 12, No. 9, and Op. 84/III, Prokofiev gently breaks up the parallels between the semitonally related harmonies. In the approach to the A’ section in the C-major rondo-form second movement of String Quartet No. 1, Op. 50 (shown in example 3.16), Prokofiev eliminates the intervening chords altogether. The B section (mm. 120-214; not shown) opens with a large-scale descending-minor-third sequence from E minor (m. 120) through C♯ minor (m. 161) to B♭ minor (m. 177). Dramatically abandoning this key in favour of F minor (m. 178), the passage descends to the D-major harmony (m. 192) with which example 3.16 begins. In mm. 195-200, a more rapid minor-third sequence (C-D♯-F♯; E♭-F♯-A) incorporates the type of progression (V7/V-i or V7-iv) that marked changes of key earlier in the B section. Example 3.17 shows a reduction of the passage that follows (mm. 200-18). In mm. 207-15, a chromatic descent in parallel major triads leads

---

10 Minturn (2009, 262-66) provides an analytical overview of this movement. In addition to discussing the influence of (and possible allusions to) Beethoven, Minturn provides valuable insights on the motivic significance of set classes [036] and [0369] (an outline in the main theme and a tonal plan in the B and C sections) and on some tonal relations in the introduction (especially the conflict, central to the quartet as a whole, between B minor and C major).

11 Considering the normative nature of this progression type in this section, I recommend two typographical corrections in the score: in m. 196, the second eighth note in the second violin should read e♭, not e, and in m. 197, the first eighth note in the viola should read c♯, not c.
directly to the C-major arrival that marks the beginning of the A’ section. Overlapping 4-3 resolutions and contrary motion somewhat conceal the parallel perfect intervals. Example 3.18 sheds light on another element of the harmony: the starting notes in the violins in mm. 204-07 (E-C-A♭) and 208-09 (B♭-F♯) hint at a potential <6> sequence—a tantalizing escape route from the inexorable <11> sequence. In addition to lengthening the D♯ harmony, Prokofiev inserts a moment of questioning silence (a familiar gesture in Classical rondo episodes) before falling to the C-major tonic that launches the A’ section.

The avoidance of dominant harmony is also a feature of later sectional boundaries in the movement. The C section ends placidly on an F-major tonic, making the F♯-minor harmony in the fourth measure of the A’” section (m. 372) all the more striking. The coda (shown in reduction in example 3.19), while recalling the scalar figuration that characterizes the approach to A’, also focuses on plagal relationships, employing an ascending-fifth sequence (B♭-[C]-F-[G]-C) followed by a I-iii-iv-I progression. The emphasis on 4 (F) in all of these cases throws into relief and ultimately ensures a sense of overcoming the main theme’s characteristically strong tendency toward 5 (which is, of course, 5 in the quartet’s overall B-minor tonality).


---

12 Among the examples of a literal sequence by tritone is the core (to borrow Caplin’s [1998] terminology) of the development of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135. In the model (mm. 78-81), Prokofiev pits two tritone-related triads (B♭M and EM) against each other, ensuring that every sequential unit (not just every other one) will reproduce the pitch-class contents of the model. Ultimately, the conflict between the B♭ and E roots is resolved by means of a modulation to D minor (what can be heard as a B♭-E-[A]-D root motion, mm. 88-89).
The descending sequential approaches to the A’ sections of Op. 31, No. 1, Op. 84/III, and Op. 50/II are similar in a basic way: in each case, various features concomitant with a registral descent (written-out ritardandi, textural reduction, and standstills on functionally vague sonorities) suggest an energy loss—almost al niente—before the main theme re-establishes the tonic and original tempo. Many works by Prokofiev feature a compelling contrast between irresistible, onrushing (♯7-♭8 resolutions and almost unmanageable, gapped (♭2-1 resolutions. In terms of harmonic function, the situation may be more complicated: a large-scale descending-fifth root motion might be realized with a stepwise bass and adventurous local harmonies; further, Prokofiev sometimes seems to justify standing on a dominant by keeping home-key dominant function obscure.\(^{13}\) The main theme and the approach to the A’ section in the A♭-major third movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, illustrate some sophisticated realizations of perfect-fifth sequential approaches to tonic harmony. In her analysis of this movement, Rifkin (2000) traces the main theme’s progressively weaker authentic cadences and the investment of a C-C♭=D♭-C neighbour motive with increasing coherence-creating power (130-34). In the following, I re-examine certain questions of harmonic function and the relation between the A and B sections.

**Example 3.20** shows a score and analysis of the main theme of Op. 103/III. At the beginning of the piece, the A♭-major tonic is serenely established with a tonic pedal. Diatonic purity is compromised at the end of the compound basic idea, as V4/2 of V appears to promise a move to V6 (and a bass imitation of the A♭-G descent from m. 1). At the start of the continuation, however, V4/2/V darkens to ii4/2, and substituting for V6 in the second half of m. 5 is ♭vii. In Rifkin’s view, this F♭-minor chord figures as a “wrong-note harmony” subordinate to an overall I-II6-V-I progression (2000, 131). As indicated above, however, the chord enters as a dominant substitute. In the course of the continuation, an ascending-fifth sequential plan becomes relevant: ♭vii acts as iv of iv in a new plagal route to the tonic, G♭-D♭-A♭. As part of a written-out ritardando, ♭II arises in m. 7 from a 5-6 shift on iv. In the final statement of the main theme in the A section, the concluding tonic becomes a sort of receding target, as V is prolonged backwards by VII in a manner that corresponds nicely to the prolongation forwards of iv by ♭II (mm. 25-26; not shown). Further, this VII-V motion may be heard as compensating for the unrealized ♭vii-V motion earlier in the phrase. Near the end of the movement, ♭II undergoes a bold chromatic

\(^{13}\) A straightforward example that comes to mind is the middle section of Waltz, Op. 32, No. 4, in which a bass tritone oscillation (♯5-♭2) obscures the home-key dominant (mm. 41-56).
expansion (mm. 104-06) before resolving to the tonic (m. 107) via a passing dominant-function augmented-sixth. Rifkin is correct in her evaluation of a progressive weakening of dominant function, but it is worth emphasizing that the dominant is in various ways weak in every main theme statement—including the first. Particularly fascinating in this theme is the tension between what can be regarded as a “desired” I-V-I structure and a iv/iv-iv-I plan that tends to demote the dominant to a parenthetical role.

As mentioned above, the cadence that ends the A section incorporates a VII-V motion (mm. 25-26). The G chord (m. 25) in this progression looks forward to the key of the Allegro sostenuto B section: C major. Reversing the ascending-fifth approach to the tonic of the main theme, the B section ends with a root descent by fifths to the tonic. Omitting the opening vamp (m. 27), example 3.21 presents a reduction of the B section (mm. 28-53) and the first hypermeasure of the A’ section (mm. 54-57). According to Harter, mm. 28-31 constitute an antecedent, and in m. 32, a consequent begins but is led astray to a deceptive cadence at m. 35 (labelled as such on account of the inner-voice A<sub>3</sub>); this elides with the start of a continuation phrase (mm. 35-46) (120-23). Leaving aside some questions of labelling (mm. 28-31 are surely better regarded as a compound basic idea, and the arrival in m. 35 is not cadential in a usual sense), one objectionable element in Harter’s bass-voice sketch is an unstemmed B<sub>3</sub> in m. 37 (122). The C-F-B<sub>3</sub> descent in mm. 35-37 is especially significant with regards to its harmonic-
functional ramifications. As implied in the harmonic analysis in example 3.21, the phrase heads for a half cadence in D minor. In mm. 39-40, the dominant briefly appears, only to assume passing status within a broader pre-dominant prolongation. Instead of resolving, this pre-dominant seems to increase tension up to a breaking point. In m. 44, the seventh of iv7 rises by semitone, and at m. 47, the passage collapses into a rhapsodic and (at first) tonally mysterious standstill in the original tempo (*Andante tranquillo, come prima*). Example 3.22 emphasizes how mm. 47-53 can retrospectively be grasped as an obscure home-key dominant connected by a stepwise bass (and perhaps parallel tenths) to the tonic at m. 54. As a whole, the harmonic trajectory of the B section suggests a descent in fifths, C-F-B♭-(G)-E♭-(C)-A♭, possibly reduced further as C-(F)-B♭-(E♭)-A♭. At the centre is the B♭-major harmony of mm. 37-46, which relates
backwards as IV of IV in C and forwards as V of V in A\#. (Abstractly, its role is the reverse of that of the F#-G\#-minor harmony in the main theme, which relates forwards as iv of iv in A\#.)

In general, the conventional manner of standing on a dominant is incompatible with Prokofiev’s laconic style. In a sequential approach to a tonic harmony, a penultimate dominant may be clarified with a light touch, while “superfluous” amplification is typically withheld. Conversely, if a sequence is not capped a $D-T$ discharge, written-out ritardandi and associated effects are typically invoked in the approach to the tonic. Occasionally, a brief dominant may be inserted in the manner of a retransition between a sequential passage and a returning tonic, but such dominants often serve to clarify a larger-scale dominant that is already in place. More complex cases include standings on obscure dominants and conflicts between authentic and plagal tendencies.

II. Triadic arpeggiation and equal division

1. Introduction

Major- and minor-third sequences—and incidentally whole-tone and octatonic scales—are hallmarks of the Russian fantastic tradition, particularly the music of Rimsky-Korsakov.\(^{14}\) When Taneyev pointed “in mock horror” at the “slippery path” taken by Prokofiev in his Etudes, Op. 2 (see the anecdote in Chapter 1), he was surely referring in part to these devices. In general, however, Prokofiev’s approach to equal division is essentially different from that of the older Russian composers, and a brief examination of the second of the two Etudes can serve as an introduction to what can be regarded as some of the basic ways in which Prokofiev treats equal division.

For the pianist, the main focus of study in the E-minor Etude, Op. 2, No. 2 may be the polyrhythmic problem: the coordination of eighteen flowing sixteenths per measure against a dotted rhythm in common time. From a harmonic perspective, the piece is a study in contrasting forms of arpeggiation. Prokofiev’s approach in this regard is quite systematic. Zimmerman offers a useful discussion concerning the “composing out the augmented triad” in this piece (2002, 142-50); my purpose here is to explore the ways in which dominant harmony is contextualized within equal-division schemes.

\(^{14}\) As illustrated by Taruskin (1985), passing-tone connections of roots in (especially descending) major- and minor-third sequences are the main historical and conceptual origin of these scales.
The Etude, Op. 2, No. 2 is in rondo form: ABA’B’CA’’. The A section includes both a I-VI-III-i motion (mm. 1-4) and a primary-chord recomposition i-IV-V-i (mm. 6-9). The B and C sections are similar in a number of ways, one of which is their treatment of equal division.

Examples 3.23 and 3.24 show a score and durational reduction of mm. 17-24 (the B section and the beginning of the A’ section), while examples 3.25 and 3.26 show a score and harmonic reduction of mm. 37-45 (the C section and the beginning of the A’’ section). The B section presents a major-third root motion: B-(G)-D♭-(B)-G. In mm. 21-22, the shift in the bass represents not so much a disruption as an acceleration of the sequence—furnishing a B root one measure early. Anticipating the C, D♭, and G of the dominant in m. 22, the harmony on (B♭=A♭) in m. 21 conveys pre-dominant function only locally and in a weak sense. As a whole, the B-D♭-G(=F♭)-B arpeggiation is effectively a prolongation of the dominant; what m. 22


contributes is a clarification of this dominant (especially through root-position stabilization).\textsuperscript{15}

Based on an ascending-minor-third sequence (E-[F♯-D]-G-[A]), the C section (examples 3.25 and 3.26) enters in m. 37 as if to replace the A” section but actually just delays its arrival.

Preventing the sequence from proceeding to B♭, a B harmony intervenes in m. 44. As a result, the passage coalesces as an E-minor i-iii-V-i arpeggiation.

The two subsections that follow are devoted to major- and minor-third sequences respectively. I begin with examples that are closely comparable to what one encounters in Etude, Op. 2, No. 2 and proceed to ones that are less so.

\textsuperscript{15} The “composed out augmented triad” in Zimmerman’s “fundamental bass line” for this passage (E, m. 17; G♯, m. 19; C, m. 21; E, m. 23; A♭, m. 25; C, m. 26; E, m. 27) (2002, 146) is objectionable in that it neglects the role of the dominant.
2. Major-third sequences

In Prokofiev’s music, equal division by major third is often true rather than merely incipient. The speed and functional clarity of such progressions is often striking. In many nineteenth-century examples of major-third sequences, an awe-inspiring, mystical, or perhaps triumphant effect often derives partly from a slow tempo and a strong sense of symmetry. Frequently, one encounters only one quality of triad throughout, a measured tread from one harmony to the next, a conspicuous bass-voice whole-tone scale, and a linear intervallic pattern (often 10-8 with contrary motion). With respect to its descending-major-third cycle of root-position major triads, the main theme of The Young Juliet, Op. 75, No. 4, is abstractly comparable to many Romantic examples, but Prokofiev lends the progression a very different effect. Prokofiev employs descending-major-third sequences as the harmonic core of his best-known themes in striking contrast to the traditional role of such progressions as extraordinary, perhaps climactic transformations of conventional asymmetrical progressions (cf., for example, the diatonic harmonizations of descending bass lines that lead up to a concluding I-VI-III-I progression in the Overture to Glinka’s Ruslan i Liudmila). Such playful reversals of tradition are essential to some of Prokofiev’s celebrated miniatures, but in larger works descending-major-third sequences retain their relevance as climactic closing progressions. In this subsection, I will focus on two other contexts for major-third sequences: first, in dominant prolongations, and second, in ascents from initial tonic harmonies.

We have already seen one example of a major-third sequence that outlines an augmented-triad dominant—in the B section of Etude, Op. 2, No. 2. In this case, a harmonic acceleration helps to clarify a dominant that is abstractly present throughout the sequential passage. A similar treatment of a descending major-third sequence is in Scherzino, Op. 52, No. 4. Example 3.27 shows the main theme of this A-major work. In the one-measure introduction, added sixths and

---

16 A few examples appear in Taruskin (1985): the motto in Liszt’s Piano Concerto No. 1 (90); the alternate ending of Liszt’s Un sospiro (91); and Glinka’s Overture to Ruslan i Liudmila, mm. 350-58 (87).

17 Numerous authors point out the role of the 8-7-8 line in contributing to the clarity of T-S-D-T function (among them Bershadskaya 1995, 131). Prokofiev could actually have learned this voice leading from Rimsky-Korsakov’s textbook (see No. 295, first system, reproduced in Taruskin 1985, 136).

18 Besides The Young Juliet, consider Masqueraders, Op. 75, No. 5, where a I-vi-iii-I progression hides then gradually reveals the tonic (in terms of common-tone relations). Another example of VI-iii-I in a theme is the end of Peter’s theme in Peter and the Wolf, Op. 67. Prokofiev employs only minor triads in a descending-major-third sequence in the introduction of The Field of the Dead (No. 6 in Alexander Nevsky, Op. 78).

19 Examples include the D-major VI-iii-I progression in mm. 119-22 of the finale of Op. 94, and the C-minor i-vi-i progression in mm. 126-35 of the finale of Op. 26 (though Prokofiev evades closure in the latter case to lead to the espressivo C section).

20 This is the piano solo version of Melody, Op. 35, No. 4.
ninths establish the sonic atmosphere of this charming piece. At the end of the presentation, a motion to ii9 is realized as a downward arpeggiation (through VI7 and IV9, mm. 7-8). In m. 9, the continuation begins on a chord of striking complexity: CM with a bass-voice added ninth and an embellishing common-tone German sixth. In mm. 11-12, the harmony moves down by major third. With the gentlest possible touch, the harmonic-functional significance of the whole passage is rendered clear on the last beat of m. 12. In contrast to the whole-tone 5-6 motion (G-A) of m. 10, m. 12 presents a semitonal 5-6 motion (D-E) that secures the root of the home-key dominant (E). Measures 9-12 thus come into focus as downward arpeggiation of an augmented-triad dominant. The literal dominant lasts for only a beat (m. 12, beat 3) and seems tailored to the theme’s idiosyncratic (pentatonic) tonic, to which it resolves with parsimonious voice leading. In
this theme, the role of the literal dominant as a symbol of simplicity is underscored by the brevity of the continuation relative to the presentation.

Evening, Op. 65, No. 11, the penultimate piece in *Children’s Music*, provides another example of a major-third sequence outlining VⅭ5. **Example 3.28** shows a reduction of mm. 29-74, the B section and the A’ section of this ternary-form F-major miniature. Following the dominant conclusion of the A section, the B section begins in the key of ♯III (m. 29). In the second hypermeasure of the B section, C harmony returns (m. 37), but the potential significance of Gø7 as iiø7 in F (m. 36) seems insufficient to imbue the C chord with dominant status.

Example 3.28: Evening, Op. 65, No. 11: mm. 29-74: durational reduction (1:4)

Instead, an ascending-major-third sequence gets underway, allowing C major to become a local tonic. As expected, the sequence proceeds to an E chord at m. 47. Reinterpreted as VIIⅭ in the home key, however, it leads directly to the A’ section (m. 48). In a sense, the entrance of A’ is harmonically overdue (a C harmony has already come and gone); in compensation, the thematic return is hypermetrically premature, cutting short an expected five-measure hypermeasure and reinstituting the piece’s original four-measure hypermeter. The bass E seems slow to recognize this event: persisting throughout the first hypermeasure of the A’ section, it creates I4/2 as a substitute for I.
In the A’ section, Prokofiev continues to minimize the tension between the tonic and dominant by treating C as a tonic itself. There is no real F:PAC—neither at m. 64, where the F tonic enters almost as if it were the subdominant of C, nor at m. 72, where a potential cadence is undermined by staggered resolutions and a deeper-level tonic pedal. Above all, Prokofiev depicts this “evening” as a tranquil time for looking back, and a critical factor of the harmony is the almost total avoidance of clearly forward-relating dominant function. In the wake of the back-relating dominant with which the A section ends, the A$\flat$-major harmony in m. 29 might seem to present the $\flat$III in a broad I-$\flat$III-V-I arpeggiation. The ensuing augmented-triad root trajectory, however, allows for a “soft” presence of the dominant throughout the B section—even, in retrospect, at its beginning, as at the beginning of the continuation in the Scherzino theme.

The main theme of the first movement of the Symphony No. 5 in B$\flat$ Major, Op. 100, includes an augmented-triad dominant arpeggiation beginning on the root of the dominant. **Example 3.29** provides a piano reduction of mm. 1-30. As several commentators observe, the main theme includes a $\sharp(A)(E)$ ornament that seems to accrue progressively greater tonal influence. Beginning as an innocuous sixteenth-note ornament (mm. 3 and 5), E is quitted by leap in m.7; and in m. 12, E gains root status, compelling a midstream transposition downward by semitone in the melody. This serves as the starting point of an upward-major-third sequence: F-(E)-A-(A$\flat$)-D$\flat$ (mm. 1-17). As Minturn explains, the completion of the $<11, 5>$ cycle can be discerned in the C and F of mm. 28-29, but these notes lack root status (1997, 113). Instead, $\flat$III (D$\flat$ major) stands triumphant as a local key in mm. 17-28 until A$\flat$ moves to A and D$\flat$ moves to C (m. 28)—forming a brief home-key dominant and facilitating a tonic return at m. 29.

The context of $\flat$III (D$\flat$M) in this theme is abstractly equivalent to that in Scherzino (CM), except that the harmony’s situation in the symphonic theme is reversed: it is not the initial harmony in an arpeggiation down to $\flat$ but rather the goal harmony of an arpeggiation up from $\flat$. A further harmonic-functional comparison can also be made between the $\flat$III of this theme and that in Evening (A$\flat$M). In m. 36 of the latter work, a G half-diminished seventh chord stands out as a non-major-quality sonority. Entering as viio7 of $\flat$III, it resolves as iiø7 to a V that is treated as a local tonic. In mm. 8-11 of Op. 100/I, Cø7 acts locally as a iiø7 chord embellishing V. Meanwhile, by virtue of its potential significance as viiø7 of $\flat$III (D$\flat$ major), Cø7 looks forward to that (apparently) triumphant mediant borrowed from the minor mode (m. 17). Again, like the home-key dominant in Evening, the home-key dominant in this theme receives a very tonic-like

---

21 See Austin (1956, 205-06), Minturn (1997, 112), and Morrison (2009, 251).
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treatment. Prokofiev exploits this aspect of the harmony near the end of the movement. In mm. 253-56 (not shown), the material from mm. 8-11 returns transposed down a fifth. For Gregory Karl, mm. 8-11 constitute a “focal passage” in the movement, and the return in mm. 253-56 problematizes the “triumphant display of the preceding passage,” proclaiming it “empty and
Indeed, the Fø7 (m. 256) seems momentarily to call into question the successful Bø-major ending of the movement as a whole. Forced to operate as vø7, the half-diminished seventh chord resolves indirectly to the movement’s concluding tonic four measures later, and—as if through heroic willpower alone—a dominant-like ending on Bø-major harmony is definitively rejected.

In the three examples above, ascending-major-third sequences outline augmented-triad dominants. Ascending-major-third sequences that depart from a tonic conventionally come to an impasse after just two units, necessitating the replacement of ÔV by V. The result is a major-triad arpeggiation: I-IIIø-V-I.22 A fact with far-reaching ramifications is that a major or minor triad built on the major-mode 3 contains the leading tone as its chordal fifth; this makes the V redundant in a crucial sense, and is one reason why dominants in such contexts tend to be abbreviated, rendered less stable (often assuming the form of V4/3)—or even omitted.23 In general, Prokofiev’s harmonic practice reflects these principles. But while the natural habitat of such sequences or arpeggiations is the major mode, Prokofiev employs them to great expressive effect in the minor mode in the three examples discussed below. As a result, there are what can be heard as attempts at upward triadic arpeggiations of the parallel-major tonic, and struggles between modally contrasting forms of 3.

In the third movement of Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, the pre-eminence of the minor-mode 3 in such a struggle contributes to an extremely gloomy atmosphere. Examples 3.30 and 3.31 present a score and reduction of the B section and the start of the A’ section in this Gø-minor movement. Sustained from the end of the A section, the Gø-minor tonic lingers as a pedal in the beginning of the B section, refusing to relinquish control. In the upper voices, the Gø harmony is treated as a Neapolitan, allowing a G-major idea to blossom above the grimly held pedal. Yet G major proves unable to throw off its dependence on Gø minor: in m. 24, V7 of G resolves deceptively to IV6 with added sixth, a chord instantly reinterpreted as a dominant-function augmented-sixth in Gø-minor. A simpler version of the same progression would be V7-3VI (D7-EøM) followed by a 3VI=>V reinterpretation. One advantage of Prokofiev’s unusual

22 Among the well-known sequential realizations of such an arpeggiation is the A section of Grieg’s Morning Mood, Op. 46, No. 1. On the relative structural strengths of mediant and dominant harmony in many late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century examples of triadic arpeggations, see Krebs (1980).
23 In the A section of Morning Mood, Op. 46, No. 1, for example, Grieg tastefully limits the V to half the duration of the preceding I and IIIø. Referring to Schenker 1979 figs. 7b and 131.2, cf. the IIIø in Chopin’s F-major Etude, Op. 10, No. 8 (m. 40), after which a weak V4/3 fills out a I-IIIø-V7-I arpeggiation, and the IIIø in his Gø-major Etude, Op. 10, No. 5 (m. 8), which Schenker refers to as an example of a third-divider.
deceptive resolution is that it creates a smooth path for the ascending-major-third sequence. Thus IV (CM) emerges as a stable harmony at the end of m. 26 before establishing itself as the new pedal (with B-major material in the upper voices).

An alteration to the sequence comes in m. 30, as the resolution of the dominant of B major is delayed. In m. 31, F#7 resolves to a B-major tonic, thus succeeding where the dominant of G had failed. The B-major harmony then supports the beginning of a recomposition of the introduction. Whereas the original introduction (mm. 1-4) presents an undulating eighth-note figure over a G# tonic pedal, the new introduction (mm. 31-34) entrusts this figure to the bass in quadrupled note values, leading smoothly from B major to G# minor by means of a diatonic sequence. The introductory 3-2-1 bass descent flows into the 8-7-6-5 bass descent with which the returning main theme begins. The B-major start in m. 31 only weakly compensates for the bleak G#-minor surroundings. Locally, the home key of G# minor poignantly reuses the dominant of III in m. 34 as its own dominant (a diatonic VII7 or VII9). In a sense, the gravitational pull of G# minor seems too strong for the middle section’s ascending-major-third sequence to progress further than a single step, and even this step must be retracted as the diatonic mediant (III) overwhelms the chromatic mediant (♯III=♭IV) to lead decisively back down to the tonic. In the manner of a coda, the middle section material returns at the end of the movement (not shown), shunning model-sequence technique in favour of simple repetition and bringing the work to a close with a plagal cadence.

In the main theme of the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 2 in G Minor, Op. 63, a sequential ascent to a major-mode 3 instigates a modal conflict with a different outcome. 

**Example 3.32** gives a harmonic sketch of mm. 1-18 of Op. 63/I. Introduced by the solo violin, the main theme undergoes a subtle change in m. 7: instead of G-minor harmony with an embellishing E♭ comes E♭-major harmony with an embellishing D. In m. 8, the diminished-
seventh leap E♭-F♯ might seem to imply vii’7—which is indeed the explicit harmonization at this spot later (m. 23)—but here it implies E♭m, creating a local major-third link to the ensuing B-minor harmony. This surface-level descent by major thirds (G-E♭-C♭=B) facilitates a deeper-level ascent (G-B) as the orchestra takes up the theme in the key of ♯iii at m. 9.

At m. 13, an incursion of continuation traits signals what I consider a contrasting middle. For Rifkin (2011), the excerpt suggests a modernist outburst in which “tonal momentum stalls”; her analytical perspective shifts toward melodic [012] and [013] motives that inform a modernist narrative (187-88). As indicated in examples 3.32 and 3.33, the passage is based roughly on a harmonic sequence, specifically a descending-minor-third sequence from G. At m. 13, the deeper-level status of GM as tonic is doubtful, since it emerges from a 5-6 shift on iii♯ (recalling the 5-6 shift on i that produces E♭M in m. 7). The second staff of example 3.33 entertains a hypothetical prototype in which the descending-minor-third sequence G-E-D♭ (mm. 13-15) continues to B♭. In the actual passage, the inner-voice E-E♭-D descent might be regarded as a vestige of this prototype. Reinterpreting these tones as ♯♭6-♭5 in the home key, the descent continues in mm. 17-18 with ♯♭4-♭3 in an inner voice. The B root of m. 9 is regained in m. 15, and in m. 17, a weak dominant helps to lead back to the tonic. On the last beat of m. 17, however, the harmony is literally ♯iii. The literal V chord is marginalized, allotted the smallest possible space (m. 17, with dominant root in the bass on beat 3 only). When this material returns
near the end of the movement (m. 251, not shown), m. 17 is effectively expanded into three measures (mm. 255-57), but Prokofiev refrains from elevating the dominant above passing status between a first-inversion major tonic (mm. 241, 251) and the root-position minor tonic that initiates the coda (m. 258).

Within the main theme of Op. 63/I, the major-mode $\hat{3}$ trumps the minor-mode $\hat{3}$, resulting in a i-iiii-(V7)-i arpeggiation. The next example—from the third theme of the first movement of Symphony No. 6 in E♭ Minor, Op. 111\textsuperscript{24}—is closer to the scenario in Op. 14/III. The exposition in this Allegro moderato movement features a large-scale descent through vi, (B minor) for the dolce e sognando second theme to iii (G minor) for the lugubre third theme. **Example 3.34** shows a piano reduction of the third theme; a portion of the theme is further reduced in **example 3.35**. After lifting itself from an E♭-minor introduction to the key of G minor, the theme harbours its own (concealed) ascending-major-third sequence. In the basic idea (mm. 217-18), a 5-6 shift on G yields a sonority that Prokofiev revives near the end of the theme within a 5-6 shift on B♭ (in **example 3.35**, asterisks indicate enharmonically equivalent verticalities in mm. 226 and 228). As if based on a downward sequential repetition of the G-minor basic idea, the contrasting idea begins in F♯ minor and moves to its major subdominant harmony (BM). The theme proceeds with an implicit reinterpretation of B as C♭, leading to the diatonic mediant B♭M, whence the G-minor tonic soon re-emerges. Shifting our perspective back to the E♭-minor introduction (m. 211) (or even back to the B-minor dolce theme), the end of the exposition can be heard in terms of an indefinite upward striving by major third ((B)-E♭-[D]-G-[F♯]-B-[B♭])—a tendency counteracted by the gloomy focus on G minor in the lugubre theme. As in the B section of Op. 14/III, gravity seems to prevent an ascent beyond III (whether to V or to $½$V). Dominant function arises only superficially and in passing (over the B♭ pedal, between iii, and i6).

\textsuperscript{24} See Minturn (1997, 120-32) for an overview of this movement, including some commentary on the ascending-major-third sequence in the third theme.
Example 3.34: Symphony No. 6, Op. 111, I, mm. 211-29: piano reduction
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Example 3.35: Symphony No. 6, Op. 111, I, mm. 217-28: durational reduction (1:2)
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i5 6  iiIII  iii7  (b)III  iii> i6  iii> i6
3. Minor-third sequences

In nineteenth-century music, complete minor-third cycles are certainly not unique to the Russian fantastic tradition. A couple of examples from the mid-nineteenth-century repertoire, one dominant-prolongational and one tonic-prolongational, may be briefly considered. Schumann’s Novellette, Op. 21, No. 2 (1838) includes a dominant seventh transposed up by minor third until the return of its pitch classes prompts a resolution to the tonic (mm. 83-91; see Aldwell and Schachter 2003, 587). Near the end of Chopin’s Nocturne in G Major, Op. 37, No. 2 (1839), a tonic is prolonged by similar means. I include the Chopin excerpt in example 3.36 to invoke a general point of contrast to Prokofiev’s harmonic practice. In mm. 130-33 of this Nocturne, the tension of the ascending-minor-third sequence accumulates until vii°7/V—the abstract sum of the main roots of the preceding sequence—prevents the progression from coming full circle (m. 133); the ensuing V resolves gently to the concluding tonic. In Prokofiev’s style, the sound of the diminished-seventh chord is almost foreign in itself. By the same token, horizontal organization is rare, though outlines are not; and generally remains subordinate to [037]. Thus minor-third equal division usually remains incipient, while triadic arpeggiation is of great importance. With a characteristically fleeting dominant, Prokofiev cuts short an ascending-minor-third sequence in the C section of Etude, Op. 2, No. 2: completing a minor-triad arpeggiation, V enters just in time to pre-empt V. As an alternative to substituting

---

25 For the remainder of this paragraph, the Roman numerals do not specify the quality of the triads.
V for V, Prokofiev sometimes moves from V(=IV) to V. Occasionally, Prokofiev transposes such minor-mode I-III-V=IV-V schemes to approach the tonic rather than the dominant, forming a minor-mode IV-VI-I=VII-I progression. Inversion provides other options, such as leading from the dominant to the tonic by means of what amounts to a downward major-triad arpeggiation (V-III-I=II-I in the major mode). I will refer to such progressions as driving to the “brink” or—after Zaporozhets (1962)—the “leading’ chord” of a goal harmony.

Before proceeding to such cases, we may examine another in which—as in the C section of Etude, Op. 2, No. 2—the third unit in an ascending-minor-third sequence is prevented from appearing. **Example 3.37** shows a reduction of the B and A’ sections of the ternary-form Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 3. In this case, the tonic starting point of the ascending-minor-third sequence is actually the dominant in the piece as a whole. This dominant takes the form of Bm in deference to the main theme’s E-Aeolian mode. The B section’s opening nine-measure model leads to a dominant of F♭ minor. Accordingly, one might expect the sequence in mm. 35ff to lead to V of A minor—which momentarily seems to occur at m. 39. In a manner comparable to Op. 65, No. 5, m. 23 (discussed in Section I), and Op. 31, No. 2, m. 13 (to be discussed in Section III), Prokofiev bypasses this potential dominant while briefly leaving open the possibility that it is merely being expanded or embellished. With a surprising upward resolution in the bass from F to F♭, iiø7 enters in m. 41. Finally, a v-i resolution elides with the start of a purely diatonic (E-Aeolian), coda-like A’ section (mm. 45-52). As a whole, the B

---

26 For a Classical example to which the examples from Prokofiev can be compared, consider the context of D-major harmony—at the “brink” of the dominant of A♭ minor—in m. 16 of the *Marcia funebre* third movement of Beethoven’s Sonata in A♭ major, Op. 26. Schenker (1979) provides a graph of the excerpt (fig. 40.6); see also the discussion by Matthew Brown et al. (1997, 166-67). A similar tonal plan can be heard in the Prelude to Act I of Wagner’s *Parsifal*, mm. 39-78 and 78ff; refer to the analysis by McCreless (1983, 62-64).
section completes a large-scale arpeggiation of the minor dominant triad. Critical to the success of this arpeggiation is the climactic F-F♯ bass ascent in m. 41, which signals the definitive end of the incipient equal division.

Minor-third sequences that lead to the brink of a harmonic goal outline a triad of diminished quality that awaits adjustment either to minor quality (in ascending sequences) or major quality (in descending sequences). Among the simplest illustrations of the former is Joke, Op. 3, No. 2. In this case, the brink is the leading tone itself and the goal is the tonic that supports the thematic return. Example 3.38 shows the B section and the start of the A’ section of this ternary-form C-major piece. Perhaps depicting someone ill-humoured or overly serious, the B section begins on the minor subdominant and embarks on an ascending-minor-third sequence: F-(D♯)-G♯-(F♯)-B, mm. 11-19. Having traversed this tritone, the sequence encounters an

Example 3.38: Joke, Op. 3, No. 2, mm. 11-26

27 As mentioned in Chapter 1, the dominant-like character of the A section’s concluding C-major tonic (embellished by D♭M, which is diatonic within F minor), prepares for the minor subdominant start of the B section.
apparent impasse: throughout mm. 19-24, a local B-minor tonic simply alternates with its neighbouring subdominant (with the harmonic rhythm slowed to two chords per three measures). While the E-minor chord could be labeled as a iv=iii pivot, it figures from a voice-leading perspective as a momentary 6/4 on B between #5/3 (the B-minor triad) and 6/#5/3 (the home-key dominant seventh in first inversion). The B section as a whole suggests an F-A♭-B root motion, and as B resolves to C to trigger the thematic return, an abstract minor subdominant arpeggiation is complete.

In Joke, the harmony built on 7 (mm. 18-23) serves as a dramatic focal point in the piece. In an upward minor tonic arpeggiation, 4 can occupy an analogous position. Such is the case in the coda of the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63. In the main theme of this G-minor work, the orchestra’s incisive B-minor harmony at m. 9 initiates a i-♭iii-(V7)-i arpeggiation (as discussed above). In the movement’s coda (mm. 258-73), Prokofiev furnishes an ostensibly corrected arpeggiation using a sequential ascent by minor third. Example 3.39 shows a harmonic sketch in which the first three harmonies stand for main-theme entrances. After G minor (m. 258) and B♭ minor (m. 261), C♯ minor arrives at m. 265, but a delayed 6-5 resolution keeps its function ambiguous. Tension builds until the fortissimo first-inversion C-minor chord at m. 269, the bass of which is soon stabilized by an E♭-minor harmony. In an almost whimsical gesture, a V-i resolution brings the movement to a close. Like the first eight measures, the last sixteen eschew B natural; the implied tone in the final G-D fifth is, presumably, B flat. As a whole, the coda effectively composes out the melody of the basic idea (G-B♭-D-E♭-C♯-D).

Treated as chordal roots, these tones are rearranged in the coda in such a way as to build up maximum tension and delay the sense of release: G-B♭-C♯-E♭-D-G. The literal dominant lasts for only an instant (the last eighth of the penultimate measure) and is not even a triad (G is a built-in anticipation). Being “crowded out” by accented embellishments (neighbour chords built on 4 and 6), the dominant harmony is treated almost in the manner of a melodic tone.
For an example of a downward minor-third sequence culminating on $\hat{1}$, we may turn to the last movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103. **Example 3.40** shows a reduction of the C section (mm. 54-87) and the start of the A'' section (mm. 88-91). Although the reduction shows the harmonies in the episode’s *dolce* theme (mm. 54-60) as triads in root position, one of the theme’s characteristics is an almost total avoidance of bass-voice roots on strong beats, contributing to a floating feeling in contrast to the heavy tread of the main theme. In mm. 61-69, an ascending-minor-third sequence leads to a dominant of D, preparing a reiteration of the *dolce* theme in that key (mm. 70-75). At last, the meditative mood is broken by a familiar *scherzando* idea in m. 76. As if conveying us backwards in time, m. 76 features a recomposition of material from the B section, m. 80 presents transition material, and m. 88 brings the refrain. Harmonically, the C section is unified by a chromatic descent: E₃M (m. 54) turns into E₃m (m. 59), which shifts to DM (m. 61); in the same way, D₃M (m. 70) changes to D₃m (m. 72), and C₃m (m. 84) indirectly proceeds to CM (m. 88). The whimsical G-E-c♯ descent by minor-thirds

---

**Example 3.40:** Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, IV, mm. 61-91: durational reduction (1:4)
in mm. 76-85 stands in opposition to the earlier lugubrious D-F-A, ascent (mm. 61-69). Further, the chromatic plan allows the C goal of the embellished downward tonic arpeggiation (G-E-cz-C) to correspond sequentially to the gloomy D-major harmony at m. 61. In this way, the brilliant C-major harmony is set up as a transformation of (or replacement for) that harmony at the dark, pensive core of the C section.

In what can be regarded as an advanced application of these techniques, Prokofiev occasionally employs minor-third sequences to lead to the brink of a harmony only to hover there indefinitely. As a result, special attention is drawn to the tritone traversed by the horizontal [036]. One fascinating example (into which I will not go in detail) is the A’ section of the F-major third movement of Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80.28

In Prokofiev’s music, minor- and major-third sequences often initiate equal divisions of the octave, but these are usually interrupted or disrupted in such a way as to establish a triadic arpeggiation. Often realized as very swift events, such a disruption can produce a sense of sudden clarity and release: a deeper-level triad crystallizes, a middle section ends, and a theme and tonic soon successfully return. Characteristically, Prokofiev sometimes complicates triadic arpeggiation by means of temporary semitonal impasses. Hovering on the semitonal “brink” or “‘leading’ chord” of a sequential goal is a way of delaying the completion of a triadic arpeggiation. Where a deeper-level minor or major triad does not emerge, it is often pertinent to consider how the critical third member of the triad has been suppressed, displaced, or rendered inaccessible, while recognizing the tension between equal division and an incipient arpeggiation of a major or minor triad.

III. The volte-face technique

One important technique with regards to sequential harmony in Prokofiev’s music is what I will term the volte-face: after pursuing a sequential route for several chords, a single “backward” step is taken, allowing the passage to come to rest on the penultimate unit of the sequence (or a harmony abstractly equivalent to it). At its simplest, this strategy may recall a typical context for plagal cadences. The effect, however, is usually quite different. In a conventional ii-V-I-IV-I ending, the authentic cadence establishes the finality of the closing tonic

28 I am thinking of the large-scale motion from I (m. 63) to III (m. 72) and the augmented-sixth reinterpretation of V9 (m. 83). The ensuing rhapsodic B harmony (m. 84) delays the arrival of the concluding F tonic (m. 90). Woodley’s (1995, 187-89) discussion of this movement includes commentary on bass structure and inter-movement motivic relationships.
in advance of the plagal cadence (to borrow an apt phrase from Aldwell and Schachter (2003, 193)). In Prokofiev’s music, a volte-face may serve as a point of tonal closure, leaving the penultimate harmony bound sequentially to several preceding harmonies. In a sense, the danger of this strategy is redundancy: the efficacy of a concluding tonic might be weakened by a premature tonic arrival two chords earlier. It is largely to a similar tonal problem that some of Prokofiev’s miniature harmonic palindromes owe their delightfully ironic effect. In the examples I discuss below, Prokofiev employs a variety of means of avoiding or mitigating an impression of ironic familiarity or, for that matter, prolongation between an apparent tonic and the goal tonic. I discuss one example each of volte-faces at the ends of descending and ascending perfect-fifth and major-third sequences. In a fifth and final example, the procedure is complicated by a chromatic discrepancy.

The B♭-major main theme of the Larghetto fourth movement of Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55, exhibits the volte-face technique in a simple and effective form. Example 3.41 presents an outer-voice reduction with harmonic and phrase-structural analysis. In the basic idea, C is an accented passing tone in an initial ascent B♭-C-D. (By itself, this is hardly striking, but the B♭-C relationship proves to be important.) The continuation, which begins by inverting material from the basic idea (originally, B♭ supports B♭-C-G-D; now, G supports G-F-B♭-[E♭]), features a harmonic descent by fifths toward an F7 chord of surprising minor quality (m. 11). The modal alteration prepares the listener for a reinterpretation of harmonic function: v7 in B♭ becomes iv7 in C, which resolves to a C-major tonic in m. 13, ending the phrase with a volte-face. In this way, the surface-level vertical relationship between B♭ and C in the presentation (in the outer voices on the downbeats of mm. 5 and 7) foretells a deeper-level horizontal one in the course of the antecedent (a modulation from B♭ major to C major). After a brief linking passage (mm. 15-17), the consequent begins in the key of IV (E♭ major). In a process that brings the theme to a plagal close in the home key, the interior minor-mode descending-fifth series in the continuation grows from four to five chords (vi-ii-v7-i7=iv7). At the end of the movement, the A’ section, too, achieves a B♭-major plagal cadence, but does so by simpler means: the phrase that served originally as an antecedent is transposed to A♭ major and thus modulates to B♭ major (after which a five-measure codetta confirms the B♭ tonic).

As a concluding remark on this Larghetto theme, it is worth emphasizing that the period-structure labels in example 3.41 are somewhat misleading, given that the cadences are transpositionally related. While I regard these cadences as plagal, Minturn’s half-cadence label at m. 13 (1997, 169-70) has its merits: the B♭-B-C bass gesture in mm. 12-13 is subtly suggestive of 4-5. At the end of the movement, the five-measure codetta feels quite indispensable—if only to preclude a forward motion into D♭ major (a treatment of B♭M as V/V/V in D♭; cf. CM in m. 15) and to gainsay the V/V identity that B♭ major could suggest in relation to the A’ section’s A♭ major beginning.

A piece that exhibits the same technique in reverse—an ascending-fifth sequence capped by a solitary descending fifth—is Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 2. If in Op. 55/IV a volte-face yields a tonic that is faintly dominant-like, in this piece the procedure helps to produce
one that is slightly subdominant-like. **Example 3.42** shows the score of this ternary-form F♯-minor piece. **Example 3.43** focuses on the end of the sequential B section, showing two triads per measure in mm. 13-16: FM-Am-CM-Em-Gm-Bm-Dm-F♯m. Recognizing a slower harmonic rhythm and observing that the final eighth notes in each measure in mm. 13-15 reiterate the apparent root of the preceding downbeat triads, an alternative analysis involves major-seventh chords: FM7-CM7-GM7-DM7. However, because these eighth notes can be accounted for as non-harmonic tones (imitating the sigh figures in the uppermost line), it is preferable to regard the progression beginning in m. 13 as an ascending-fifth sequence starting with an A-minor triad: Am-Em-Bm-F♯m-C♯m (mm. 13-18). This sequence flows smoothly into the returning F♯-minor main theme (mm. 17ff), which begins with a root motion upward by fifth in a palindromic series of minor triads: i-v(6)-iv(6)-v6-i.

Unlike the A section, the A’ section features the melody in the bass voice. As a result, the C♯-minor goal of the sequence (m. 18) assumes a powerful role within the returning main theme, outweighing the non-root-position tonic triad. The beginning of the B section foretells this critical alteration to the main theme by prolonging the dominant of C♯ minor (see the four-voice reduction of mm. 9-12 in **example 3.44**). In this tonal context, the A-minor triad in m. 13 figures as a deceptive resolution that initiates a new (plagal) approach to the C♯-minor “tonic.” This is, to be sure, a retrospective understanding of the harmony in m. 13. The 9-8 and 6-5 resolutions indicated in **example 3.44** give rise to a “chord” in mm. 9 and 11 that abstractly anticipates the A-minor triad. As a result, m. 13 may initially be interpreted in terms of a further neighbour decoration of the dominant seventh of C♯ minor. The pitch identity between the low B♯ in mm. 9 and 11 (doubling what **example 3.44** depicts as the alto) and the low C of m. 13 contributes to the compelling though short-lived illusion of such a dominant being prolonged into m. 13. In the end of the A’ section, the nearly literal return of mm. 5-8 in mm. 21-24 allows the piece to conclude with an F♯ tonic pedal. Given the absence, however, of either an F♯-minor authentic cadence or an F♯ in the bass lower than the pitch f♯, the C♯ “tonic” remains a destabilizing influence in the work’s F♯-minor conclusion. In the opening measures, an Aeolian environment imbues the F♯ tonic with a sense of delicateness; in the course of the B and A’ sections, it accrues a new, vaguely troubling kind of instability, becoming subdominant-like vis-à-vis C♯ minor.

---

30 The relevance of such major-third relations as that between C♯ minor and A minor here will be further explored in Chapter 4.
Example 3.42: Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 2

Andantino

Music notation image
Volte-face procedures are by no means restricted to sequences by fifths. For such a treatment of a major-third sequence, we may turn to Diabolical Suggestion, Op. 4, No. 4. This is a work with a clear A♭-C-E complex; in Chapter 4, I will return to this piece to consider more closely some ramifications of its major-third relations. Here, my focus is on the B section (mm. 52-69) and the way it leads to the A’ section (m. 70). Example 3.45 shows a reduction of the excerpt as well as a hypothetical triadic prototype. Following the bombastic G♭-minor arrival in m. 52, an ascending sequence gets underway with hyperdownbeat arrivals on roots C (m. 56), D (m. 60), and E (m. 64). A possible interpretation of the passage is as an ascending 5-6 sequence with rather extravagant 6-phase chords (C♭-D♭-E, mm. 56-64). Yet the clear G♭=A♭-C root motion in mm. 52-56 will likely predispose a listener to hear the subsequent root motion similarly, i.e. in terms of a <4-10> sequence: G♭=A♭-C-B♭-D-C-E. The triadic prototype in example 3.45b reflects this hearing. The transformation of the E harmony in mm. 64-69 as a dominant-function harmony in C major—hinted at by a violent E-G-E oscillation in the bass—prompts a volte-face. Some of the sense of glorious vindication at m. 70 surely derives from the contrast between this treatment of a C root and the two previous ones within the sequence (mm. 56 and 63)—as well as the fact that, calling a halt to a sequence that seemed intent on bypassing it, the C tonic completes both a local III♭-I progression and a deeper-level vi-I progression, heralding its victory over the “alternative” E and G♭ tonics.

31 See Bribitzer-Stull (2006). In the list with which he concludes his article (186-87), Bribitzer-Stull includes just one Prokofiev example (the second movement of Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 83), but such complexes are certainly among the specialties of Prokofiev. (I will elaborate on this point in Chapter 4.)

32 Bertram (2000, 96) incorrectly marks m. 70 as the start of the B section.
At the end of the third movement (*Tempo di valzer lentissimo*) of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82, a volte-face puts a stop to a similar sequence in the other direction (an \<8-2>\ sequence rather than a \<4-10>\ one). To explore the significance of this event, I begin with an overview of the harmonic and motivic content of the A section of this ternary-form C-major work. Example 3.46 provides a reduction of the A section. Incorporating a main-theme statement in the key of \ßVI\ (m. 21) and concluding with a deceptive resolution to \ßVI\ (m. 38), the opening section’s harmonic trajectory pays homage to a striking idiosyncrasy within the theme—a \ßvi7\ neighbour chord in m. 1 (omitted from the reduction). In mm. 4-5, the boundary between the first two hypermeasures is marked by a modal rather than harmonic change, as a tenacious bass \(\hat{2}\) (D) effectively delays dominant harmony until the end of the third hypermeasure (m. 12, beat 3). The A section includes only one expanded hypermeasure (mm. 21-25); this expansion comes about when the main theme’s \(A_\beta\)-major version fails to lead to a corresponding “bursting into light” on the supertonic (\(B_\beta\))—a failure that necessitates a dramatic journey through minor triads (mm. 26-29) that ends in the safety of DM in m. 30 (exactly recalling material from m. 5). Substituting \ßVI\ for I in m. 38, the A section ends by setting the stage for the \(A_\beta\)-major theme with which the B section begins in m. 42.
Example 3.47 shows a reduction of the last three hypermeasures of the B section as well as the complete A’ section. Transposing the D₇-minor material from mm. 26-29 to D minor, mm. 91-94 include a Dm7 chord, which—reinterpreted as a [0358] augmented-sixth chord—resolves to C⁷m. At this point, a listener might expect a major-mode breakthrough as in m. 30—a resolution to E₇M via an applied French-sixth chord. Instead, the passage becomes “stuck,” with a Bm-Dm progression initiating a repeat of the four-measure model in m. 95. On the last beat of m. 96, the “insertion” of a home-key dominant substitute (EM, III₃ in C major) cuts short this repetition, triggering the muted beginning of the A’ section at m. 97.

In mm. 91-96, the recollection of material from mm. 26-29 and the emphasis on Dm intensify the effect of the resplendent DM arrival in m. 101. As if to compensate for the lack of sequential design leading to the A’ section—and, perhaps, within the A section—the A’ section is governed by model-sequence technique. The Roman numeral analysis in example 3.47 highlights the reinterpretation of the III₃-I progression in A₉ as a I-VI motion in the home key, precipitating a volte-face. Recalling the lugubrious βVI end of the A section, the A₉-major harmony in mm. 113-16 refuses to submit to a 5-6 destabilization. In m. 117, the modal change
from VI to vi ushers in a minor-mode version of the B section theme. Featuring outer-voice resolutions of 6 and 7, the concluding 5\textsuperscript{D} - T resolution recalls the chromatic neighbour decorations that characterize the opening two measures of the movement.

As implied in the Roman numeral analysis of the A’ section’s descending-major-third sequence, one may retrospectively recognize the special significance of the “inserted” III\textsuperscript{a} dominant in m. 96—beyond the fact of its direct anticipation of the motivic 6-5 and 7-8 resolutions in the opening two measures of the returning main theme. The V/V=III\textsuperscript{a} pivot in mm. 96-97 foretells those that ensue, fitting in harmonically with the A’ section’s sequential plan.

Related to this is a surface detail that example 3.47 leaves out. Among the memorable aspects of the climactic D-major and C-major harmonies in mm. 101 and 109 is the use of dominant-function neighbour III\textsuperscript{a} chords (beat 1, pulse 3 in mm. 101-02 and 109-10). Absent from the A section, these ornamental chords enrich the passage with surface-level echoes of the harmonic (and motivic) idea that the A’ section exploits sequentially. The sequential scheme and volte-face in this example are inversionally related to those in Diabolical Suggestion, Op. 4, No. 4. Whereas the excerpt from Op. 4, No. 4 withholds tonic status from C until its critical third appearance, where a volte-face in the form of a III\textsuperscript{a}-I progression launches the A’ section, in this movement a III\textsuperscript{a}-I progression establishes the C tonic that begins the A’ section, leaving it to the C-major.
harmonies in mm. 109 and 120 to confirm the tonic again and again. The volte-face from $\flat$VI (modified as $\flat$vi) to the tonic in m. 120 contributes to the firm sense of tonal closure.

Only the last of the volte-faces examined above can be described effectively as a step backward to a harmony already attained. In general, the similarity between the tonic produced by the volte-face and the antepenultimate chord does not go much further than a common root. Indeed, the volte-face technique can be regarded as extending even to cases in which there is a chromatic discrepancy between these roots. This, I will argue, is the case in the transition to the secondary theme in the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63.

**Example 3.48** provides a reduction of the transition as well as the first harmony of the secondary theme of Op. 63/I. In the course of mm. 28-36, an ascending-minor-third sequence involving major triads unfolds: F-$C^{-}A_{\flat}^{-}(E_{\flat})$. At m. 37, a B root appears as expected, but considering the chord’s minor quality, the suddenly sparse texture, and the now descending scalar motion in the violin, this is an arresting event. Rifkin (2011) goes so far as to suggest that the B-minor passage quenches the energy gain in the transition, casting doubt on the sonata trajectory itself (189). Recalling the sinister $\flat$iii harmony of m. 9, the B-minor entrance at m. 37 is a sort of turning point, but it succeeds only in slowing down—not in stopping—the ascending-minor-third sequence. In the second half of m. 40, a back-relating dominant of B minor fleetingly appears, and in mm. 41-43, the passage succumbs to the gravitational pull of D minor. **Example 3.49** shows this immediate approach to D minor (mm. 41-43), marking a surface-level descending-minor-third sequence coordinated with a chromatically ascending bass.\(^{33}\)

As part of a broader argument concerning chromatic motives as vehicles for a modernist narrative, Rifkin suggests a [012] descending bass connection: C (m. 30), B (m. 37), $B_{\flat}$ (m. 52) (2011, 193). As indicated in **example 3.48**, however, it is preferable to regard the transition in terms of an ascending-minor-third sequence that sums up to a minor-third descent F-D (mm. 28-43). The ensuing major-third descent D-$B_{\flat}$ (mm. 43-52) completes a downward triadic arpeggiation (F-D-$B_{\flat}$) to the $B_{\flat}$-major tonic of the secondary theme. It is especially significant that the D harmony in mm. 43ff is minor, and thus represents not V (as in a i:HC MC) but rather the diatonic mediant of the diatonic mediant. In some ways—and this, to be sure, does not necessarily discredit a modernist interpretation—the context of the D-minor passage can fruitfully be compared to the end of the development in the first movement of Schubert’s Piano

\(^{33}\) This octatonic form of a descending-minor-third sequence is known in transformational theory as an RP- (or PR-) cycle. Some Schubert examples are discussed by Richard Cohn (1997, 35) and Michael Siciliano (2005, 91-100).
Sonata in B♭, D. 960. Example 3.50 shows mm. 159-73 of this work in a reduction adapted from Adam Ricci (2004, 264-72). As indicated by the brackets, the triple grouping of roots in a descending-fifth sequence forms an ascending-minor-third sequence ending on a D-minor harmony in m. 171. In the final portions of both the Schubert development and the Prokofiev transition, the D-minor harmony figures as a wonderfully calm, stretched-out “moment,” delaying the ascent of A to B♭ (the finishing touch, as it were, to the B♭ tonic triad). 34 Rifkin’s apt

34 Prokofiev brilliantly takes this idea further at the end of the exposition. Leading to the codetta, Prokofiev recomposes the material from mm. 43-51 in mm. 69-77. Apparently as a result of a violent outer-voice misalignment—the upper-voice (A-B♭) resolutions in mm. 75 and 91 are too early then too late to align with that of the bass in m. 78—a tonic major-seventh sonority governs most of the con brio closing theme.
description of mm. 43-49 of Prokofiev’s Op. 63/I as a “tranquil pool” (2011, 189) might, perhaps, be applied with equal justice to the celebrated composing-out of iii-I in mm. 174-216 of the Schubert work.  

Within the ascending-minor-third sequence in the transition in Prokofiev’s Op. 63/I, the B-minor arrival at m. 37 already signals the beginning, in a sense, of the building of new tonic triad: it includes D; the D-minor harmony will add F; then only B♭ is required. As mentioned above, the B-minor harmony of mm. 37-39 recalls that within the main theme; it also looks forward to the B♭-B/C♭ relationship within the secondary theme (not shown), which starts by moving from the B♭-major tonic to a German sixth instantly reinterpreted as a dominant seventh of B/C♭ major. In view of the central importance of the B♭-B/C♭ conflict in this work, the combination of a volte-face with chromatic displacement—the fall from the sequentially attained peak of D to B♭ as an alternative to B—seems eminently appropriate. 

---

35 On this passage in Schubert’s D. 960/I, see Cohn (1999, 226) and Ricci (2004, 264-72).
36 If this ascending-minor-third sequence were to consist of dominant seventh chords (e.g. F7-A♭7-C♭=B7-D7-F7-B♭M), there would likely be no difficulty in hearing an extended V7 resolving to I. The use of triadic harmony and the effect of a directional change at D lessen the predictability of the passage, but it remains tonally unified as a V-iii-I arpeggiation. Intriguingly, a retrograde version of this plan (B♭M-Dm-Bm-A♭M-FM) would come quite close to that in, for instance, the B section of Grieg’s Morning Mood, Op. 46, No. 1: EM-G♭M=A♭M-FM-DM-BM-EM (with
At the beginning of this section, I introduced the volte-face concept with a comparison to a conventional plagal “afterthought” to an authentic cadence. In that familiar scenario, there is both a sense of functional balance (a horizontally realized dual discharge of $D$ and $S$) and a clear confirmation of normative tonal hierarchy. In volte-face progressions, these qualities may be lacking. Prokofiev exploits to great effect the lingering doubts that may arise as to the integrity of a tonic. There is always the possibility that the last harmony of the sequence will outshine the tonic that ensues from a volte-face—rendering the tonic, for instance, mildly dominant-like as in Op. 55/IV, subdominant-like as in Op. 31, No. 2, or submediant-like as in Op. 63/I. If a sense of balance and closure is desired, other factors must come into play. Perhaps the most effective illustration of this is the end of Op. 82/III, in which the concluding tonic is imbued with a sense of unequivocal finality. The transition of Op. 63/I illustrates how the volte-face principle might be extended in a way that not only defers closure but even promotes conflict (in this case between $B$ and $B_b$).

**IV. Conclusion**

Prokofiev’s music is well-known for its general adherence to strict four-measure hypermetre. This metric conventionality often goes hand in hand with a harmonic idiosyncrasy—in particular, the “insertion” of a home-key dominant very near the end of the last hypermeasure of a middle section. Prokofiev’s ephemeral home-key dominants can often be regarded as symbols of simplicity: their marked brevity allows for the preservation of hypermetrical regularity; they stand in the way of equal division and “errant” sequential schemes; and they restore the tonic and main theme with impressive swiftness. The brevity and simplicity of such chords often belies the broader importance of dominant function in a middle section, which may—if only in a retrospective understanding—anticipate the dominant or establish it in advance. Further, the characteristic brevity of Prokofiev’s dominants does not necessarily signify a lack of structural importance; on the contrary, they often figure as harmonic linchpins, as in traditional tonality. The absence of a dominant also does not necessarily render it irrelevant, since it may, in various creative ways, be substituted for, striven for in vain, or implied. Written-passing $6/4$ between $D$ and $B$, and with $B$ realized as a cadential six-four that actually arpeggiates down into the tonic).

37 The local key of $D$ minor within the transition of Op. 63/I creates an environment conducive to chromatic displacement and/or juxtaposition of $B$, and $B$ (which could represent contrasting forms of submediant harmony in D).
out ritardandi and associated effects of declining energy generally characterize sequential passages in which the last two chords lack a $D-T$ relation.

With regard to large-scale third relations and sequences by third, it is rewarding to start from the assumption that triadic arpeggiation, rather than equal division, is truly basic. Some of Prokofiev’s most striking and innovative effects derive from techniques that are, in themselves, quite traditional, such as modal contrariety (e.g. ascending sequentially by major third from a minor tonic). Many passages can be heard in terms of deep-level horizontal triads, albeit with chromatic complications. Prokofiev was often celebrated (especially by Soviet writers) for a style that was not “mystical,” and Prokofiev’s aversion to certain devices that are prominent in the music of the Russian fantastic tradition and Scriabin supports such an argument. Related to this is Asafiev’s notion of strong, impulsive tonics. But in several analyses (especially in Section III), I have drawn attention to many places where this concept falls short: some of the most fascinating of Prokofiev’s themes are those in which a tonic seems gently to express some other harmonic function. In the next chapter, which looks further into matters of peremennost’ and tonal pairing, the discussions in this chapter concerning functional ambiguity and sequences by major third are particularly relevant.
Chapter 4: Harmonic function in the context of ladovaia peremennost’ and tonal pairing

The focus of this chapter is on questions of harmonic function in pieces or passages by Prokofiev in which a pair of third-related roots or tonalities assumes a central role. Section I deals with minor-third pairings, relating the technique to Russian traditions of ladovaia peremennost’ (modal mutability) and scrutinizing one example from a Prokofiev work: the theme of the central episode of the third movement of Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26. Considering the traditional basis of this procedure, it is a testament to Prokofiev’s commitment to innovation that major-third peremennost’ is by far more common in his music. Section II includes harmonic-functional analyses of several themes and works in which pairs of major-third-related roots govern the harmony. Section III broadens the discussion of major-third harmonic relations to consider reinterpretation, substitution, and redirection by major third; in this regard, upward major-third shifts are particularly characteristic of the composer. A central concern in several analyses is the “mutability” of harmonic functions—the tendency in a particular piece, for instance, for a dominant agent to become a dominant base—and the notion of particular progressions as “deceptive” in an extended sense or anticlimactic with respect to a preceding tonal trajectory. I also explore the question of balance between pairs of major-third-related alternatives in several pieces.

I. Minor-third peremennost’ and tonal pairing

Minor-third peremennost’, or more precisely ladovaia peremennost’ between a minor key and its relative major or vice versa, is the most basic type in nineteenth-century art music in the Russian folk style.¹ In minor-mode works in this style, the subtonic enjoys special prominence, as it tends to suggest dominant function in the key of the relative major. The term peremennost’ often refers to a free-flowing interchange, oscillation, and sharing of elements between keys, but in practice—particularly in the art music of this tradition—one can usually point to a clear main key. The literature is rich in examples of both “weightings”: the central minor-third root relation

¹ Refer to Chapter 1 for a brief discussion of ladovaia peremennost’ as it is variously defined in Russian theoretical writings.
may chiefly signify either I-vi in major or i-III in minor. Chromaticism may arise in the harmony, but the style is essentially defined by melodies that exhibit pure diatonicism and an eschewal of key-defining tritones.

In his shorter autobiography, Prokofiev discussed a point in his career (1916-17) when he became particularly interested in purely diatonic or—as he liked to call them—“white’ themes.” While in the early stages of composing Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26, Prokofiev “contemplated writing a ‘white quartet’, i.e., an absolutely diatonic string quartet that would be played only on the white keys of the piano.” The projected two-movement work remained unrealized:

…I found the task too difficult, I was afraid it would prove too monotonous, and now in 1921 I decided to split up the material: the subordinate theme became the theme of Renata in *The Flaming Angel*: the principal theme I used for the monastery; the first and second themes of the finale went into the finale of the Third Concerto. Thus, when I began working on the latter, I already had the entire thematic material with the exception of the subordinate theme of the first movement and the third theme of the finale. (Prokofiev 1959, 58-59)

For that last-named theme—the theme of the *meno mosso* C section of Op. 26/III—Prokofiev employs chromaticism to great expressive effect. Yet it fits well in the company of the movement’s two “white’ themes.” Indeed, the *espressivo* theme exhibits the most basic type of *peremennost’* in a creative way. Whereas the A and B sections—and the movement as a whole—exhibit tonal directionality from A minor to C major, the C section presents a C♯-major theme characterized by a strong tendency toward E major, the relative major of the parallel minor.

**Example 4.1** shows a reduction of this theme. In striking contrast to the boisterous main theme, this *espressivo* theme is characterized by harmonic instability and ambiguity. Appearing in first inversion at the beginning and ending of the theme, the C♯-major tonic never emerges in root position; meanwhile, the E-major tonic is nothing but a tantalizing object, never to be achieved even in first inversion. As indicated by the diagonal lines in example 4.1, the C♯ tonic is prolonged initially through an inexact voice exchange; the modal shift prepares for the motion toward III. My (preliminary) Roman numeral analysis of mm. 149-52 reflects a “longing” for an E-major tonic: in m. 149, the harmony potentially represents a cadential six-four, and one might hope in m. 152 for an E-major V4/2-I6 resolution. Instead of an E-major triad comes a C♯-major one in m. 153. As a six-four chord on a third hyperbeat, the harmony of m. 153 is analogous to

---


3 While Prokofiev’s notation freely shifts between C♯ major and D♯ major, my reduction is consistently in C♯ major (and it is to this C♯-major respelling that my discussion will refer).
that of m. 149, and the phrase proceeds accordingly with a 4-3 (but no 6-5) resolution on the next hyperdownbeat (m. 155; cf. m. 151). Unlike the “fruitless” V of E (subject to the unusual deceptive resolution in m. 153), the dominant of C♯ major in mm. 155-58 gradually crystallizes as V⊕7/5, ending the first half of the theme and leading to the opening I6 of the consequent.

The rich harmonic-functional ambiguity of the theme can hardly be conveyed by Roman numeral analysis. In mm. 153-54, the six-four chord apparently ends a phrase—thus acting as I6/4 rather than as a cadential six-four; yet the theme proceeds in such a way as to validate the bass G♯ as a true dominant base. Even more problematic is the cadential six-four label for m. 149. Judging from the harmonic rhythm, the four-measure hypermeter may actually be regarded as “artificial”—i.e. as an expansion of an underlying three-measure hypermeter. Measure 149 thus presents itself as a weak hyperbeat (ill-suited for a cadential six-four). Example 4.2 expands on these insights, offering two hypothetical prototypes for the first two hypermeasures. In the first hypothetical prototype, an ascending-minor-third sequence is realized in triple meter. ⁴ In the

---

⁴ To take yet another step backward (creating an even more primitive prototype), one might eliminate the anticipatory six-four chords, leaving a duple-meter ascending-minor-third sequence.
second, the sequence is modified: instead of leading to a second-inversion G-major harmony, the phrase tonicizes E major. The tonal confirmation of E major in this second hypothetical prototype precludes a sequential ascent to G major. In the actual presentation, Prokofiev goes further: denying an E-major resting point, the C♯-major tonic re-establishes itself.

At the end of the antecedent, the “Prokofiev dominant” (V♯7/♯5) seems appropriate, not only for its inherent intensity (or for its recollection of the movement’s overall tonic triad, CM), but also because the prominent raised fifth (D♯), lending itself as a pickup in m. 158 in the high strings and bass, anticipates the consequent’s redoubled effort to reach an E-major tonic. With a sense of urgency enhanced by the “restoration” of triple hypermeter, the theme reaches a climax in mm. 163-65 on V of E (with Neapolitan elements in the upper voices). In m. 166, the dominant agent of E appears for the first time, but an E-major tonic resolution already seems beyond hope. Instead, the theme comes to a close in its original key (and on its opening chord).

In this C♯-major theme, the absence of a stable E-major harmony is designed to be conspicuous—even agonizing. The common-time piano-solo theme that follows (m. 170, not shown) is gentle, but rather ironic—not only because of its prosaic, un-Romantic style, but also because the thin chord on which it is based (D-B-E-B, with perpetual E-F-E neighbour motion) could signify an E harmony (with third omitted). Returning in m. 200, the espressivo theme adopts E major as its key (not shown). The manner of returning to C♯ major for the final statement of the theme (m. 257) may also briefly be mentioned for the relevance of minor-third peremennost’. The theme’s last sequential statement is in B♭ major, but its final two measures are modified harmonically to lead back to the C♯-major tonic at m. 257. As a tonal goal, C♯ major replaces B♭ major—vindicating the harmony that it would have replaced in an unaltered B♭-major transposition of the theme. The espressivo theme of Op. 26/III exhibits a chromaticized
form of relative-key *ladovaia peremennost’*; elsewhere, diatonic realizations can also occasionally be found (see, e.g., the C/a pairing in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, discussed in Chapter 2).  

II. Major-third *peremennost’* and tonal pairing

In his seminal 1947 article on Shostakovich’s innovative approach to mode, Dolzhansky suggests that Shostakovich’s characteristic chromatic inflections and key relations effectively allow the diminished fourth to replace the minor third as the interval separating the tonics of relative tonalities (71). Dolzhansky’s main example is the first movement of Shostakovich’s Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 61, of 1943. In the exposition of this B-minor piece, the secondary theme is in E♭ major; in the recapitulation, Shostakovich does not transpose the secondary theme but rather superposes it on a bass statement of the B-minor main theme. In my view, Dolzhansky’s modal system is misleading in a basic way: it obscures the structural similarity between, for instance, that Shostakovich movement and the first movement of Prokofiev’s C-major Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38, of 1923. In the Prokofiev work, an E-minor secondary theme undergoes a C-major reharmonization in the recapitulation. The i-Ⅲ relation in Shostakovich’s Op. 61/I is a “forceful” minor-mode adaptation (or defamiliarization) of a root relation indigenous to the major mode as I-Ⅲ. In some cases, compelling insights into tonal structure can indeed be gained from a consideration of a major-third key relation—or a major-second one, for that matter—as a chromatic departure from an expected minor-third key relation (some examples will arise in the next chapter, which concerns chromatic displacement), but traditional (minor-third-based) relative-key relationships remain important in Prokofiev’s music. At their most basic (and sometimes most compelling), major-third pairings in this repertoire quite strongly reflect a tradition that goes back to the early nineteenth century, outside of Russia. At the same time, the exposition of Op. 38/135/I is, to be sure, a problematic example of C/a pairing. At the outset of the sonata, CM-Am establishes I-vi in C while suggesting, as a strong secondary meaning, V-Ⅲ in F. Meanwhile, the Ⅲ key of the secondary theme creates a major-third (I-Ⅲ) relationship with important ramifications later in the movement (as I will argue later in the present chapter).

6 Dolzhansky’s related concept of extended “parallel” tonalities will be addressed in Chapter 5.

7 Among the Schubert exemplars is “Meeres Stille,” D. 216, a song in which, as Krebs illustrates, both C major and E major emerge as viable overall tonics; the submediant nature of C vis-à-vis a “desired” E-major goal makes for an “unstable” C-major conclusion in spite of the song’s C-major beginning (1996, 30). For an overview of hexatonic poles (including i-Ⅲ relations) in a wide variety of repertoire, see Cohn (2004).
time, *peremennost‘* and a great variety of harmonic techniques based on the interval of the major third constitute an area of brilliant innovation in Prokofiev’s music.

As with minor-third *peremennost‘*, major-third *peremennost‘* generally allows for a clear hierarchy. In the same way that relative-key *peremennost‘* can usually be described principally as either a major-mode I-vi relation or a minor-mode i-III relation, so diatonic major-third *peremennost‘* is mainly oriented either as I-iii in the major mode or i-VI in the minor mode. A common result of chromaticizing these schemes is that the major-third-related keys will contain each other’s dominant agent in their tonic triad. Often, hexatonic relations come to the fore—particularly in major-mode I-½vi and minor-mode i-½III pairings (hexatonic polar relations).

Another consideration is that, whereas minor-mode i-III pairings (and themes characterized by i7 harmony) often use V/III or VII7 as a specialized (or dual-purpose) dominant, major-mode I-iii pairings (and themes characterized by I7 harmony) require non-diatonic elements for an analogous “appropriate” dominant. The V/iii or VII7 harmony incorporates the well-known chromatic ingredients of the “Prokofiev dominant”: ½2 and ½4.

In the simplest cases, diatonic or chromatic major-third pairings inform rigid periodic themes in Prokofiev’s “classical line.” A neat comparison can be made between a diatonic major-third pair (with two common tones) and a chromatic one (with no common tones) in the main themes of March, Op. 12, No. 1 and Gavotte, Op. 32, No. 3 (examples 4.3 and 4.4). Both are minor-mode pieces (in F minor and F½ minor); the major-third pairings are with one of two major-quality alternatives: VI or ½III. As Zimmerman observes, the March, Op. 12, No. 1 reiterates but reconfigures four pitch classes (F, A½, C, D½) in mm. 1, 4, and 8 (2002, 100-01). In mm. 1 and 8, D½ embellishes C, the fifth of the tonic triad; in m. 4, C embellishes D½, the root of the submediant triad. Instead of descending from i to VI as in the March, the antecedent of the Gavotte ascends from i to ½III, the hexatonic pole. At the cadences in mm. 3-4 and 7-8 of the

---

8 Skrebkov (1957a) argues that clear hierarchy is a *sine qua non* of good polytonality. To get his point across, he contrasts some positive examples from Prokofiev and Shostakovich with some negative ones from their contemporaries; the negative ones, according to him, mechanically superimpose tonalities without regard for *osnova* (fundamental) vs. *peremennaia* (variable, secondary) hierarchy, with results as unrealistic and therefore reprehensible as cubism in visual art (83). Skrebkov makes some perceptive comments regarding Sarcasm, Op. 17, No. 3, pointing out a clear hierarchy and compelling ties between the left-hand *fundamental* key of B½ minor and the right-hand *variable* key of F½ minor. He notices that, far from simply contracting the F octave in the bass, the tones of the F½-minor triad in m. 7 have the potential of functioning as part of V of B½ (80).

9 This exploitation of the symmetry of the major seventh chord is among the new features of the March in its 1913 version (as Op. 12, No. 1); in its original 1906 version (series 5, piece 6), the downbeats of mm. 1, 4, and 8 feature i6, VI, and i6 respectively. Orelovich (1962, 118-19) provides a score excerpt and discussion of the early version.
Gavotte, V♮5 enharmonic equivalence facilitates the major-third harmonic relation. (Compare the verticalities marked by asterisks in example 4.3 and 4.4.) In both themes, a major-third relation furnishes the structural basis of the first half of a strict, unbending periodic structure.

In the F-major secondary theme of the first movement of Symphony No. 5 in B♭ Major, Op. 100, Prokofiev employs the basic (diatonic) major-mode type of major-third peremennost’, namely between I and iii. To appreciate some nuances of the harmony, it is necessary to return for a moment to the B♭-major main theme. As discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 97-99), the main theme area includes an ascending-major-third sequence. A chromatic embellishment provides the initial impetus for this sequence: as ♯4 (E) accrues ♯5 status, B♭ major yields to A major in m. 13. Example 4.5 shows a reduction of the dolce secondary theme, several features of which directly recall the main theme. Austin (1956, 207) and Minturn (1997, 114) suggest that, roughly, B♭ is to A in the main theme as F is to E in the secondary theme. Included in Austin’s analysis are some one-beat pivots (F:V=E:VI at m. 56, beat 4, and E:VI=F:V at m. 63, beat 4) that are too simplistic to reflect the harmonic contour of the theme. What is missing is recognition of I-iii tonal pairing. In example 4.5, I include an alternative A-minor or Phrygian analysis above the
basic F-major analysis. Now, as Abraham would say, everything becomes clear at once:\textsuperscript{10} B-
major harmony results in m. 57 from a 5-6 shift on iv in A minor and V/V-V-i follows (mm. 57-64).\textsuperscript{11} In this theme, A minor serves as iii substituting for I6 in F major, and F major represents V in B♭ major; a special reason for A minor’s appropriateness in this theme is its recollection of the main theme’s glide from B♭ down to A (m. 13).

The I-iii tonal pairing in the secondary theme has ramifications later in the movement. After culminating on V6 of A minor in mm. 72-73, the secondary theme yields to a closing theme characterized by FM7 harmony (in other words “I plus iii” in F major).\textsuperscript{12} In the exposition,

\textsuperscript{10} See the quote from Abraham (1939, 269) in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{11} Notice the passing status of C in m. 56, beat 4. In light of this, Austin’s (1956, 207) placement of a pivot at this point is inappropriate; so is Minturn’s (1997, 115-16) inclusion of this C as part of a horizontal [015] motive (C-B-E, mm. 56-62).

\textsuperscript{12} Compare the closing theme in the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63. In that work, Prokofiev approaches the B♭-major tonic (m. 78) via a D-minor harmony (m. 69) that prepares the upper voices of a climactic B♭M7.

---

**Example 4.5: Symphony No. 5, Op. 100, I, secondary theme (mm. 54-64): piano reduction**
the mediant-key aspect of the secondary theme remains superficial, but the development includes a recomposition of the secondary theme in which what would have been the corresponding superficial key manifests itself as a tonal goal. **Example 4.6** shows a two-voice reduction of the end of the development and the beginning of the recapitulation. In this excerpt, the secondary theme is rendered *forte* and without a trace of its earlier intimacy. Beginning in E$b$ major (m. 137), the theme leads as expected to V/V in G (m. 140), but from here the bass ascent is broader—and more majestic—than before. By m. 147, it seems clear that C has replaced G as the superficial mediant key in this thematic statement; accordingly, we would seem to be heading for a new A$b$-major statement. Instead, Prokofiev extends the passage still further while turning the

**Example 4.6: Symphony No. 5, Op. 100, I, mm. 137-166: piano reduction**

![Example 4.6: Symphony No. 5, Op. 100, I, mm. 137-166: piano reduction](image-url)
C-major tonic into an actual tonal goal (mm. 150-52). The key within which C would have been “hidden”—A♭ major—is now absent itself.\(^{13}\) For the final statement of the secondary theme in the development, Prokofiev continues in C major (m. 153), eventually leading to the dominant that supports the start of the recapitulation (m. 165).

In the secondary theme of Op. 100/I, an I-iii (F-a) pairing informs our understanding of a VII♭ (E) harmony not only as V/a but also—especially as it resolves to the FM7 of the closing theme—as an eminently appropriate “Prokofiev dominant” of F. In the next two works to be discussed, major-third pairings exert a subtler mitigating influence on chromatic or whole-tone relations. The “I” harmonies of the “I-iii” pairings with which we will now be dealing are not real tonics but rather competitors for tonic status. Composed in 1911-12, the Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 10, is among the earliest of Prokofiev’s pieces with such a tonal network. Prokofiev gives a formal overview in his diary entry for 18 August 1912:

> The canvas on which the basic formal design is drawn is sonata form, but I so far departed from it that my Concerto cannot possibly be described as being in sonata form.

> A massive Introduction in D flat major, which by virtue of its material is of great importance in itself, moves into C major [m. 45] and is then followed by a transition [m. 67] from C major to the main subject, which is of course also in D flat major [m. 92]. This is extended and leads to the second subject, in E minor [m. 156/163]. A short cadenza for the solo piano [m. 189] introduces a new theme in E minor [m. 199], which has some of the characteristics of a concluding section and may be thought of as the first concluding section. This is followed by a second concluding episode in E major [m. 217]. Although it too has a feeling of cadence about it, it does not in fact bring the exposition to a close but modulates back to the theme of the introduction [m. 235], and it is this which concludes the exposition section of the work. (Prokofiev 2006, 236)\(^{14}\)

A detail left out is that the transition culminates with a C:PAC at m. 148. A caesura separates this C-major ending from the E-minor start of the secondary theme (m. 156) (like the one between D♭ major and C major in mm. 44-45). Example 4.7 shows the entrance (mm. 163-67) of the E-minor secondary theme proper, where a prominent \(^{5}\)6\(^{3}\) neighbour motive recalls the C harmony that prepared the theme. Related to this is the theme’s concluding plagal cadence (m. 199), which employs an A♭-C-E augmented triad (example 4.8). Finally, the D♭-major return in m. 235 emerges as a glorious “alternative” tonal destination thanks to a reappearance of the A♭-C-E augmented triad. As part of a conventional home-key dominant seventh with raised fifth,

\(^{13}\) In Chapter 5, I will discuss a similar phenomenon of revelation (but involving a semitone rather than major-third relation) with regards to main-theme appearances in the development of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84.

\(^{14}\) Prokofiev points out the first movement of Beethoven’s ‘Pathétique’ Sonata as a precedent for this procedure. He proceeds with an overview of the rest of the work and comments on how the work balances expectations of sonata form and multi-movement form, emerging as an “integrated whole” (not a “series of fragments,” as one critic had it) owing to the threefold repetition of the introductory theme (Prokofiev 2006, 234-237).
it prepares the $2\hat{7}$ and $7\hat{8}$ decorations that characterize the returning introductory theme (example 4.9). The resolution of the A♭-C-E augmented triad (plus G♭ seventh) to the D♭-major tonic (m. 235) represents an inversion of its resolution to the E- minor tonic (m. 199), accomplishing a dominant agent discharge ($7\hat{8}$ accompanied by $2\hat{3}$) in place of the earlier subdominant agent discharge ($6\hat{5}$ accompanied by $4\hat{3}$). Despite the heavy melodic $7$ in the introductory theme, there is no D♭-major I-iii pairing rendering C-major harmony dominant-like in mm. 45ff. Instead, C major is a tonic competitor that allows the E-minor key of the secondary theme to assume the innocent guise of a diatonic mediant (iii in C) while operating at a deeper
level as a chromatic mediant ( iii in D♭).\textsuperscript{15}


Example 4.10 shows a reduction of the second half of the transition and the first measure of the introduction to the secondary theme. Each sequential unit of an ascending-fifth sequence incorporates a pair of chromatically related major-seventh chords and an augmented-sixth resolution to the chordal seventh of the second chord. At the end of the eighth measure, the

\textsuperscript{15} Certainly, this analysis could have been included in Section I, considering that E/F, minor represents the parallel minor of the relative major of the parallel minor of D, major. It is in consideration of the influence of C major that I discuss it here.
sequence reaches D₉M7, which—acting as a Neapolitan seventh—leads to a dominant arrival in C major (m. 47). An eight-measure standing on the dominant follows. In mm. 49 and 53, the ascents to B in the bass mildly hint at the actual key of the secondary theme: E minor. Supporting vii⁰Ø in C major, however, they conform to a V/C prolongation. The justification for this peculiar dominant preparation is soon apparent: at the outset of the E-minor secondary theme (m. 55), a neighbouring 6 (C) in the tenor clashes against the melodic 5 (B) in the soprano, creating what could literally be labelled as a first-inversion C major seventh chord. In the closing section of the exposition (mm. 79-92; not shown), C returns as an obdurate upper neighbour of B (and finally as the root of VI in a concluding VI-i resolution).

Turning back to the main theme, example 4.11 shows mm. 13-21, a passage in which the
main theme modulates from D major to C major. In m. 20, the G root of m. 18 returns but acts as V/C rather than as IV/D. Retrospectively (at least), the harmony in m. 19 suggests pre-dominant function in C. In mm. 35-39 (not shown), a D-major V7→III7 deceptive resolution produces another F chord, which—in initiating the sequence that leads to the C-major \( \text{II4/2-V7} \) resolution in mm. 46-47 (see example 4.10)—also can be heard as a (deeper-level) pre-dominant (IV7) in C.

In the tonally closed recomposition of the main theme at the end of the movement (partly included in example 4.12), G harmony (m. 183) assumes its original subdominant function.16 The multiple functional meanings of G harmony are among the most fascinating aspects of this piece. Leading to the secondary theme in the exposition, G harmony acts as a special dominant of E minor rather than as a normal dominant of C major; and in the final statement of the main theme, G harmony resolves plagally in D major rather than authentically in C major.

Example 4.12: Op. 19, I, mm. 176-88, reduction of orchestral part only

In Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3 (1933-34), Prokofiev uses a partly chromatic network comparable to that in the Allegro brioso of Op. 10. In this sophisticated, introverted piece, however, the tonic is minor, and the first two sections reverse the relative structural importance

---

16 In the broad descending octave-progression that begins in m. 166, subdominant harmony overshadows dominant harmony (observe the G bass in mm. 172-75, 180-81, and 183). A grand plagal resolution also brings the Concerto as a whole to a close: the final movement begins in G minor and resolves G to D in mm. 125. What ensues is a final recollection of the Concerto’s main theme (mm. 125-57), in which—in contrast to the concluding measures of the first movement—the bass F natural is normalized as F♯ (mm. 144-45). As Zimmerman observes, this D-major (diatonic) transformation of a bass line that previously adhered to a G acoustic (or D melodic minor) scale contributes to the sense of large-scale resolution at the end of Op. 19 (2002, 135-36).
Example 4.13 shows the score of mm. 1-32 of this E-minor work (the ABA’ portion of an ABA’CB’A’’ rondo form). The opening theme features a monotertian pairing, Em and E♭M. The latter chord seems to straddle the line between a V6 substitute and a shifted tonic. As a whole, the A section (mm. 1-15) can be understood as a motion from i to iii, connected by an underlying ascending 5-6 sequence: E♭5-6-F5-6-G. Example 4.14 sketches the harmony in a way that highlights this sequential scheme. In mm. 10-11, the 6 phase of E (C major) stands out as a dominant arrival in F minor. The 6 phase of F (m. 12, beat 4) is enharmonically equivalent to III6/4 of G minor. The section comes to a close with a plagal confirmation of G minor (mm. 14-15). The A’ section (mm. 24-32) is more tight-knit: E♭5-6 is accomplished within mm. 24-28 (cf. mm. 1-11).

In the B section (mm. 16-23), Prokofiev departs from the sequential prototype. Treating the G-minor goal harmony of m. 15 as a diatonic mediant, E♭-major harmony furnishes tonic support for a new cantabile theme in m. 16. Looking back at m. 2, it can be said that the weight of the E♭ chord there (where its stability belies an implied root B) presages its tonal power in the cantabile theme (where, throwing off its dependence on G, it becomes a local tonic). In mm. 18-20, an E♭-minor i6-vii°6-i progression precludes the establishment of an A♭-major 5 phase. Instead, a 5-6 shift on E♭ permits a B-major restatement of the cantabile theme in m. 21. When this restatement reaches its IV harmony, Prokofiev seizes the opportunity for a thematic and tonal return (simply recognizing the E as the tonic). In a manner that recalls the key of the contrasting theme in Op. 10/I, G-minor harmony in m. 15 of Op. 62, No. 3 helps to bind two chromatically related keys: the home key of E minor and the “competing” key of E♭ major. In this case, the central harmonic event is a “i-VI = iii-I” progression (mm. 15-16)—the opposite of the “I-iii = VI-i” progression familiar from the juncture between the transition and the secondary theme in Op. 10/I.

Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3 ends by reversing the original forward-driving 5-6 impulse. Since mm. 66-78 (not shown) essentially consist of a T1 reiteration of mm. 16-28, the B’ section begins in the tonic major and leads to a truncated version of the main theme. In a striking manner, Prokofiev leaves the ascending 5-6 sequence hanging: preventing an ascent to F♭-minor harmony, the E-minor tonic reasserts itself in m. 79, initiating the coda. As indicated in example 4.15, the moves to passing or neighbouring E chords in mm. 61 and 74 foreshadow the return of

---

17 This chord can be understood as the hexatonic complement of Gm or as an applied dominant ninth of G minor with lowered seventh and with root D omitted. Accordingly, I respell it in example 4.14 as F♭-C♭-E♭.

Andante

Meno mosso
Example 4.13 (cont'd)

Tempo I

mp espress.
Example 4.14: Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3: harmonic reduction of mm. 1-32, showing underlying ascending 5-6 sequence

Example 4.15: Op. 62, No. 3: foreshadowing the tonal return at m. 79: a) reduction of mm. 61-62; b) reduction of mm. 74-75; c) reduction of mm. 77-79

Example 4.16: Op. 62, No. 3: reduction of mm. 82-88
the E-minor tonic in m. 79. This return owes some of its effectiveness as a closing gesture to a
sense of reconciliation between the tonic and its competitor (the 5/3 stabilization of $\check{7}$): the true
tonic assumes a position originally associated with the false tonic. In example 4.16, I include a
reduction of mm. 82-88, where a descending-minor-third sequence accommodates a main theme
fragment. (The 6 phase of E is now Cm7, a chord that incorporates $E_{b}$M.) Ultimately, a major-
third plagal resolution (from VI with split third to i in E minor) abstractly opposes the major-
third relation central to the A and B sections (between iii and I in $E_{b}$ major). This is the last of
three $6\check{5}$ resolutions with which Op. 62, No. 3 peacefully unwinds (C-B in mm. 65-66, C$\check{b}$-B in
mm. 78-79, and C-B in mm. 86-88).

A central feature of works like Op. 10/I and Op. 62, No. 3 is that minor-third pairing is
not really replaced by major-third pairing. Indeed, much of the chromatic richness of Prokofiev’s
music—and some striking chromatic displacement events—can be said to derive from conflicts
between such pairings. I will return to this topic in more detail in the next chapter, but a few
observations are in order at this point. Critical to the tonal trajectory of some works is a sort of
contest between two forms of mediant harmony. In the first movement of the G-minor Violin
Concerto No. 2, Op. 63, for example, an early move to the ominous key of $\#iii$ (B minor) creates
a foil for the blissful secondary-theme key of III (B$_{b}$ major). Along similar lines, the last
movement of the G-major Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 2, juxtaposes an F-major version of a
consequent phrase (mm. 14-18) with an F$\check{b}$-major version (mm. 25-28)—and concludes both with
D-major PACs. Reinterpreting the final D harmony itself as III$\check{b}$, a B$_{b}$-major Poco più tranquillo
theme follows (m. 29). The ambiguity between $\check{III}$ and III$\check{b}$ is exploited to delightful effect in the
coda: in mm. 152-55, F$\check{b}$ major proves to be III$\check{b}$ in D major, but V in D resolves deceptively to
$\check{VI}$; retrospectively, this $\check{VI}$ is reinterpreted as a mediant itself, specifically $\check{III}$ in G major (the
home key).

The first movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103, features a similar strategy. The score
excerpt in example 4.17 includes the transition and the beginning of the secondary theme in the
exposition. Given the sequential context, one might expect the B-major harmony of m. 31 to
initiate a III-(V4/3)-i progression in G$\check{b}$ minor (as T10 of mm. 24-26). Instead, this B-major
harmony serves as III$\check{b}$ in G major, the key of the secondary theme. Underscoring the difference
between the two mediant-tonic relationships (D$\check{b}$M-B$\check{b}$m and BM-GM), Prokofiev expands the
three-measure hypermeasure of mm. 24-26 into a six-measure hypermeasure in mm. 31-36. B-
major harmony could express dominant function as III$\sharp$ in G major, but a G/B voice exchange in mm. 32-37 and a lingering F$\sharp$ colour tone in the G-major secondary theme efface the D-T relation. Representing V of the home key, the G-major key of this secondary theme and the D-major harmony in m. 28 of the third movement of Op. 54, No. 2 may be considered products, locally, of downward chromatic displacements (emerging from reinterpretations of minor-mode III chords as major-mode III$\sharp$ chords). In Chapter 5, I will address in more detail how third-relations impinge on chromatic displacement in Prokofiev’s music, returning to the question of chromatic conflicts that suggest two tonics of a mediant rather than two mediants of a tonic.

III. Reinterpretation, substitution, and redirection upward by major third

In general, displacement by major third conforms to the same tendency as sequences by major third: downward seems “easier,” or more natural, than upward. The minor-mode V-VI deceptive resolution is the conventional tonal context for substitution downward by major third. Augmented triads, too, are particularly susceptible to enharmonic reinterpretation by major third downward (see, for instance, m. 14 of Liszt’s Faust Symphony).  

18 Similar events are often encountered in Prokofiev’s music. The B section of March, Op. 33ter (example 4.18) ends with a rapid course adjustment downward by major third, as it plunges into the A$\flat$-major tonic of the A’ section (rather than proceeding sequentially to a C chord). 

19 In previous chapters, several comparable cases have been discussed. The B section of Scherzino, Op. 52, No. 4 also ends with a quick 5-6 shift producing the home-key dominant. At the start of the contrasting middle within the C section of the third movement of Piano Sonata No. 4, Op. 29, the A$\flat$-major tonic enters to preclude a sequential flow into C major. In the B section of Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 2, a dominant of C$\sharp$ looks forward to the strong presence of C$\sharp$ in the A’ section, but locally it is neutralized by an A-minor “resolution” that initiates a plagal ascent to the F$\sharp$ tonic. 

The C-major reharmonization of the E-minor theme in the recapitulation of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135 is a related case of downward major-third recomposition.

Even more important and characteristic in Prokofiev’s music are displacements upward by major third. The bulk of this section is devoted to the exploration of some instances of this technique in Prokofiev’s music.

---

18 See Todd’s (1996, 166) discussion of the introduction of the Faust Symphony.
19 Orelovich (1962, 122) points out that this approach to A$\flat$, major at m. 19 (where, “at the last moment, C major fails to materialize”) foreshadows the end of the march (where the tonality is redirected from A$\flat$, major to C major).
A discussion of Diabolical Suggestion, Op. 4, No. 4 can serve as an effective general introduction to Prokofiev’s practice of juxtaposing and balancing major-third-related harmonic alternatives. In this piece, the keys of C major (the overall key), E minor (the key of the main theme, m. 27), and G♯=A♭ minor (the key of the B section, m. 52) are intertwined. Chapter 3 included a discussion of the B section and the manner in which it leads to the A’ section (pp. 115-16); here, I focus on the contrasting harmonic trajectories of the A, A’, and A’’ sections. Bertram makes an important point in this regard: the main theme involves a descending-fifth sequence, and in the course of the piece, this sequence has three different outcomes (2000, 96-98). Example 4.19 presents reductions of three excerpts that include these events. In the A section, the E-minor main theme travels from i to ♯III via an ascending 5-6 sequence (mm. 27-31). A slower descending-fifth sequence then leads back to i (mm. 31-39). The A’ section begins on what corresponds to the ♯III peak (or the start of the continuation) of the A section, transposed up a major third. The sequence therefore seems to drive toward an A♭/G♯-minor tonic. In m. 78, however, the local V/9 of A♭ resolves deceptively to E-minor harmony, triggering a revival of material from the original presentation.20 Thus far, we have heard a deep bass C (the

---

20 In example 4.19b, mm. 78-80 is reduced as a three-voice texture. Omitted from the reduction is a striking D♯ on the downbeat of m. 78. This D♯ is the goal of the chromatic descent in the soprano (G-G♯-F♯-D♯, mm. 70-78). The vertical sonority on the downbeat of m. 78 (E-G-B-D♯) reuses the pitch classes of that of m. 27 (D♯-E-G-B),
introduction, m. 1) overruled by the E-minor main theme (m. 27); the B section’s G♯-minor key (m. 52) enters as iii of E minor but proceeds as vi to the C-major A’ section (m. 70); and in mm. 78ff, E minor tries in vain to regain its tonic status. In the A’/coda section, C confirms its supremacy over both E and A♭/G♯. Again, the sequence appears to promise an A♭ harmony at m. 118. This time, however, the substitution is by upward major third: C replaces A♭. Prokofiev realizes the C-F-B♭-E♭ sequence in mm. 110-17 with a subtle difference to accommodate this third and final outcome. Instead of applied V♭9 chords, Prokofiev opts for applied V♮7/♯5 chords—local “Prokofiev dominants.” An important result of this is that the prospective dominant of A♭ in m. 117 is more readily reinterpretable as a dominant of C, as it contains the
dominant agent and associate of C. Finally, echoing III\#7-I resolutions fade into the distance (mm. 118-25), contributing to the sense of convergence on C (especially since III\#7 can be regarded as a combination of III\# and \(\text{vi}\)). To be sure, the event at m. 118 is by no means an authentic cadence in the home key. Rather, the C-major tonic is revived in such a way as to stop short the preceding sequence away from C. As the last of the three possible major-third-related outcomes and as a symbol of the victory of C over its major-third relatives, the upward-major-third substitution at m. 118 is critical to the achievement of tonal closure.

In a downward major-third root reinterpretation of a dominant, a dominant base becomes a dominant agent; in an upward reinterpretation, the reverse occurs, and a dominant agent of the new key might not appear even in passing. Such is the case at the thematic return in Paysage, Op. 59, No. 2. In this piece, the A and B sections are both in the home key of G major; beginning and ending with \(\hat{G}\) in the bass, the A section is actually less stable harmonically than the B section. The B section (m. 24) includes two statements of its theme, the second transposed to the dominant (m. 35). Characterized by dolce arpeggios and ending on V6/5 of D, the transitional passage to this D-major statement (mm. 30-34) reappears at the end of the B section, transposed up a semitone (mm. 46-50; example 4.20). We are now apparently headed for an E\(\flat\)-major tonic to support a third statement of the B theme. In m. 51, however, G-major harmony substitutes for E\(\flat\)-major harmony, signaling the start of the A’ section. Modifying the main theme to begin with a root-position tonic, Prokofiev ensures a home-key dominant base discharge (D-G) between the sections. In contrast to the approach to the C\(\sharp\)-bass of mm. 33-34, Prokofiev carefully prepares us to accept the bass D in mm. 49-50 as a root rather than as a chordal third. D-major harmony (m. 39) descends through C-major harmony (m. 43) to the B-major harmony with which example 4.20 begins, encouraging a hearing of the ensuing bass ascent to D (mm. 46-49) as a restoration of the D root. The harmonic trajectory of the returning main theme also confirms the appropriateness of a home-key dominant that could be V6/5 of \(\text{vi}\). In the main theme’s first phrase, an E\(\flat\)-major scale leads downward to a unison E\(\flat\) resting point (m. 54).

At the thematic return in Masqueraders, Op. 75, No. 5, the returning B\(\flat\)-major tonic is staged as a replacement for \(\text{vi}\). The main theme is harmonically based on a downward major-

---

21 In this respect, the entrance of C-major harmony in m. 118 can be compared to that in m. 85 (included in example 4.19b). In mm. 81-84, Prokofiev similarly designs a descending-fifth sequence so as to ensure a home-key D-T relationship at the point of exit. (At m. 85, C replaces F.)

22 See Rifkin (2004, 284-88) for a discussion of B\(\flat\)-C-C\(\sharp\)-D as a pitch-class motive in Masqueraders. A score of the whole piece is included in that article (285-87).
third cycle: I-vi-iii-I. The B section (example 4.21) revisits this scheme: after a four-measure model in B♭ major, an F♭-minor sequential statement begins. Offsetting the sequential relationship are not only the modal difference and hexatonic complementarity but also an expansion of range and a new accompaniment figure. Further, whereas the B♭-major tune
innocently visits its subdominant over a tonic pedal (m. 25), its F♯-minor double takes the
opposite route and lands heavily on its dominant (m. 28). If the move into ⁵vi (m. 26) symbolizes
the playful donning of a mask, then the B/A’ sectional juncture brings the delightful moment of
unmasking. Balanced against the downward dual German-sixth resolution in F♯ minor (mm. 27-28)²³ is an upward German-sixth resolution in B♭ major (m. 29), and—in a maneuver facilitated
by V♯5 enharmonic equivalence between major-third-related keys—the strange V/⁵vi moves
aside to uncover the familiar home-key dominant. The middle section thus points ominously to
F♯ minor but leads charmingly to B♭ major.

In Dance, Op. 32, No. 1, ambiguity about the identity of a chord as a home-key dominant
or as a dominant of ⁵iii is a crucial factor in the buildup of tension in long ostinato passages.
Example 4.22 shows the opening four-measure introduction and the first two measures of the
main theme. Whereas the introduction establishes a stable F♯-Aeolian tonic, the main theme
introduces a hypnotic swaying motion with E♯ (♯⁷) and D♯ (♯⁶) in the outer voices on the
downbeats. Owing to their agogic and metric emphases, these pitches provide the harmonic
outline of a home-key dominant (with root omitted). An appropriate harmonic label is ♯VII9; an
alternative is V9 of ⁵iii. Yet a ♯iii harmony is not forthcoming. The harmony on E♯ eventually
receives a weak tonic resolution in the second half of m. 24 and a recomposition of the
introductory material based on V of III ensues in m. 25 (example 4.23). Transposed up a
semitone (thereby allowing F♯ to be the main bass tone), the next main-theme statement (m. 33,
example 4.24) resolves the main bass tone’s ambiguous status as dominant agent or base in
favour of the latter. Stabilized as V of B minor, the harmony on F♯ (m. 33) represents the
culmination of a large-scale root ascent in fifths—from E (m. 25), through B (m. 29), to F♯ (m.
33). Instead of resolving, it proceeds yet another fifth upward to ii° (C♯dim), on which harmony
the B section begins (m. 41). In the A’ section, again, tension builds and doubt may arise as to
whether the bass E♯ constitutes a dominant agent or a dominant base. Like the climactic chord at
m. 23, that at m. 71 reveals itself to be a first-inversion home-key dominant (example 4.25). This
time, its resolution is the conclusive D-T progression of the piece: entering in m. 77, root-
position tonic harmony is sustained throughout the coda-like B’ section. From a harmonic
perspective, the B’ section (m. 77) is indeed a striking recomposition of the B section (m. 41);
the implicit C♯-F♯ root motion leading to the B’ section also suggests a neat reversal of the

²³ The term “dual German sixth” is introduced by Harrison (1995, 183). My symbol for it is dGer6.
Example 4.22: Dance, Op. 32, No. 1, mm. 1-6

Intro

Allegretto Con eleganza

Example 4.23: Dance, Op. 32, No. 1, mm. 19-26

Example 4.24: Dance, Op. 32, No. 1, mm. 31-41

Example 4.25: Dance, Op. 32, No. 1, mm. 71-77

\(V^{9/III}\)
cryptic F♯-C♯ root motion that led to the B section.

Near the end of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 135, the conclusive establishment of the C-major tonic involves a pair of major-third substitutions, the first upward and the second downward. In a sense, the first becomes necessary as a result of another (above-mentioned) major-third substitution in the recapitulation: the C-major reharmonization of the originally E-minor secondary theme. Example 4.26 shows the score of mm. 176-85. Relinquishing the C tonic pedal in m. 177, the passage in mm. 177-79 essentially replicates mm. 42-44, putting us on route to an A-minor cadence as at m. 45 (refer to the score excerpt in Chapter 2, example 2.32). What prevents this outcome is an upward major-third substitution: at
m. 180, C♯-minor harmony takes the place of the expected A-minor harmony. In the wake of this climactic event, a recomposition of expositional codetta material appears (mm. 180-83). Considering the B harmony in m. 182 and the T5 associations between mm. 49-50 and mm. 182-83 (in particular, the transposition down by fourth of the F-E-D-C-C♯=B figure), the passage can be heard as promising an E harmony at m. 184. Instead, C arrives, re-enacting the downward major-third substitution that transformed the secondary theme earlier in the recapitulation.

The A-minor second movement of Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 1, ends with a comparable two-step process of reinstating the tonic. The A section (mm. 1-9, example 4.27) consists of a compound basic idea (mm. 1-5) followed by a consequent phrase (mm. 6-9) that ends with a PAC in the home key. Departing from the two-voice counterpoint of mm. 1-7, m. 8 brings an augmented triad. Retrospectively, one grasps this chord’s contrapuntal significance as a decoration of V (supporting 2). An elegant parallelism relates this ornamented dominant to the ornamented tonic with which the basic idea begins: in the same way that a 7−1 bass motion supports 5 in mm. 1 and 6, a 7−5 bass motion supports 2 in m. 8. This is indeed an A-minor work in which G♯/A♭ assumes considerable power: the opening bass tone is not A but G♯ (supporting V6 with an implied B); in m. 3, an E♭ harmony fleetingly suggests of V/A♭; in m. 5, one finds an A♭-major arpeggiation in the bass; and in the cadence in mm. 8-9, one might initially interpret the augmented triad as V♯5 in G♯/A♭.

The B section begins in the tonic major and ends with a home-key half cadence (resolving to V from a German sixth in m. 17). Example 4.28 shows a harmonic reduction of the more complex C section (mm. 18-28) as well as the first measure of the A’ section (m. 29). Beginning and ending on dominant harmony, the C section features bass-voice fragments of the main theme and incorporates a couple of inexact sequential units (starting at mm. 24 and 27). Major-third root relations guide the harmonic trajectory: at the start of the section, V6 of A leads via a descending chain of six-three chords to V6 of F, and at the end of the section, V6 of C♯ moves similarly to V6 of A (bringing in the A’ section). The modified sequential unit in mm. 24ff suggests upward chromatic displacement: instead of forming what could retrospectively be

---

24 The situation is, in fact, more complicated. In light of the C/a tonal pairing in the exposition, the original A-minor resolution of this progression can be regarded as a substitution for a C-major tonic. In the recapitulation, C♯-minor harmony (m. 180) substitutes for that substitute.

25 Cf. Lily Dance, Op. 75, No. 9, discussed in Chapter 2. With regard to the bass 7-1 neighbour figure in the initial minor-mode tonic prolongation and the idea of nearly crushing weight that it can express, an apt comparison can also be made to such works as Schubert’s “Der Atlas” (No. 8 from Schwanengesang). In Chapter 5, I will return to this and comparable examples, focusing on semitonal harmonic relationships.

Adagietto (\( \text{d} \approx 54 \))

Example 4.28: Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 1, II, mm. 18-29: harmonic reduction

C 18

\begin{align*}
\text{a: V6} & \quad \text{iv6} & \quad \text{III6} \\
\text{F: VII6} & \quad \text{vi6} & \quad \text{V6} & \quad (\text{dGer6}) & \quad V & \quad (\text{ii6}) & \quad V6 \\
\text{Ex: V6/V/V Ger6}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(Ex) V6} & \quad \text{iv6} \\
\text{C: bVII6} & \quad \text{vi6 (or V[7 - 6])} & \quad I \\
\text{(toward C, not C!)} & \quad \text{c# Ger6} & \quad V6 & \quad \text{iv6} & \quad \text{III6} \\
\text{A: VII6} & \quad \text{vi6} & \quad V6 & \quad i
\end{align*}
interpreted in C major (VII6-vi6-V6; as T6 of mm. 18-19), mm. 24-25 opt for C major (VII6-vi6-V7-6#3-I). Entering pianissimo, with no harmonic change, within a sequential unit, and—in contrast to that central sequential unit—with a minor-mode tonic and with no upward chromatic displacement, the start of the A’ section is imbued with a sense of anticlimax.

If the A section were brought back intact, its a:PAC would signal a subdued and tranquil close to a rather tonally uneventful movement. What prevents this outcome is not a spectacular tonal crisis, but rather a subtle subversion of the home key: the consequent phrase in the A’ section (not shown) is transposed down a semitone. This is an event foretold at the beginning of the piece. As if through the influence of ubiquitous lower chromatic neighbours in the bass, the tonic itself sinks by a semitone. (Contributing to this effect of overwhelming weight, Prokofiev begins the melody of the basic idea an octave too high [mm. 29-30], reproduces the contrasting idea at pitch [mm. 31-32], and brings the right hand in the consequent down an octave [mm. 33-36].) As the B’ section proceeds calmly in the key of A major (m. 37), it becomes the task of the A’’ section (a recomposition of the consequent alone) to solve this tonal problem.

**Example 4.29** shows the score of mm. 41-49 (the end of the B’ section and the complete A’’ section), indicating the two critical moments of “decision” between major-third related keys. The first occurs in mm. 44-45. If the B’ section were to end as a faithful A major transposition of the A-major B section, m. 44 would feature a Ger6-V half cadence in A6. However, Prokofiev subtly modifies the harmony in m. 44 to form a “Prokofiev dominant” of A6, then compels a reinterpretation of the inner-voice B and D as the dominant agent and associate respectively in C.\(^{26}\) In relation to the local C-major tonic of m. 45, the preceding E5 chord is a V/i6VI interpreted as the dominant (of C).

Almost immediately, however, the claim of C to the status of a key comes into question as the material in mm. 45-46 unfolds as a recomposed C6-minor transposition of the basic idea. One may thus retrospectively rationalize C major in m. 45 as the off-kilter beginning of a C6-minor phrase—a temporary downward chromatic displacement by means of reharmonization, “exaggerating” the original lower chromatic neighbour bass decoration (granting the lower neighbour of C6 a lower neighbour of its own). As in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, a restoration of the tonic requires a second major-third substitution, this time downward. In m. 47, the augmented triad that would have decorated the dominant of C6 minor

\(^{26}\) Cf. the usage of the “Prokofiev dominant” near the end of Diabolical Suggestion, Op. 4, No. 4 (example 4.19).
(Fx-B-D♯) becomes reinterpreted in terms of A minor (D♯-G-B), permitting the consequent smoothly to correct its tonal aim. In place of the perfunctory two-beat A-minor tonic of m. 9, Prokofiev provides in mm. 48-49 some invaluable extra space for the listener to resettle in the home key. The sense of equilibrium is enhanced by a conventional deceptive resolution to F (the other—diatonic—major-third relative of the tonic), countering the recent influence of C♯. By inverting and transposing the augmented-triad decoration of the dominant in m. 47, the downbeat of m. 48 also furnishes an “answering” augmented triad that decorates the tonic (F-D♯-A). At the end of the Adagietto, A minor is a place of peace and safety, a comforting negation of various errant possibilities.

The “rediscovery” of the tonic at the end of the second movement of the other Sonatina of Op. 54 (Andante amabile, in B minor) is similar in that it also hinges on a major-third substitution upward. Considering this event’s critical position within large-scale tonal
relationships, a brief account of the beginnings of the A and B sections is necessary. **Example 4.30** provides the score of the opening (mm. 1-11) of this B-minor movement. The antecedent in the main theme is composed of a compound basic idea (mm. 1-4) and a continuation (mm. 5-10). In the basic idea (mm. 1-2), $\flat A$ ($E\flat$) and $\flat G$ ($G\flat$) decorate $\flat B$ ($F\flat$). The contrasting idea (mm. 3-4) begins on iii (a D-minor harmony) and ends by tonicizing $b\;II$ (C major). In the melody, the $E\flat-G\flat$ ($\flat A-G\flat$ in B minor) motion from m. 1 comes back in m. 4 as $F-G$ ($G-F$ in C major). In the bass, $C\flat$ ($=D_{\flat}$) and $B$ encircle $C$ in m. 4 to suggest a C-major $b\;II-V6-I$ resolution. Because it visits $b\;II$, the contrasting idea harmonically resembles a sequential repetition of a basic idea. Meanwhile, an inversional relationship emerges between the (plagal) chromatic decoration of a minor triad’s fifth in the basic idea and the (authentic) chromatic decoration of a major triad’s root in the
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Contrasting idea. Example 4.31 shows a harmonic sketch of these relationships as well as some that emerge in the remainder of the antecedent. The sequential continuation consists of a three-measure model (mm. 5-7) and a modified three-measure sequence (mm. 8-10). Whereas the model begins with C-minor harmony (decorated plagally with F-minor arpeggios) and concludes with a $\flat$II-V6-i resolution, the sequence begins with G-minor harmony (decorated plagally with a C-minor arpeggio) and concludes with a “vi7”-V half cadence (i.e. Gm7 resolves as a predominant [0358] augmented-sixth chord). Below the staff in example 4.31, I point out two connections that are intrinsic to the antecedent’s sentential form: a harmonic-sequential and inversional relation between the basic idea and the contrasting idea, and a sequential relation between the two halves of the continuation. An additional pair of connections is indicated above the staff in example 4.31: a harmonic-sequential relation between the contrasting idea and the first half of the continuation, and an inversional relation between the basic idea and the second half of the continuation.

Example 4.31: Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 2, II: harmonic sketch of opening antecedent (mm. 1-10)

Rather than providing the A section with tonal closure, the consequent (beginning in m. 11) dissolves: F# in the bass (supporting V, mm. 18-23) passes through E# (supporting V6/V, m. 24) to E (supporting iv, m. 25). Example 4.32 shows the last measure of the A section (m. 24) and the opening theme of the B section, which starts in the key of iv (E minor, m. 25) and modulates to its own subdominant (A minor, m. 34). In terms of phrase structure, this theme
divides into a two-measure introduction that establishes the E-minor tonic (mm. 25-26), a four-measure compound basic idea that accomplishes a 5/3-#6/#3 shift (mm. 27-30), and a four-measure continuation that leads to an A-minor cadence (mm. 31-34). Example 4.33, a voice-leading reduction of the B (mm. 25-60) and A’ sections (mm. 61-64), illustrates the harmonic derivation of this whole sentence (mm. 25-34) from an ascending 5-6 sequence. Most striking in this sequential scheme’s realization are the roles of two C♯ chords (recalling the C♯ chord with which the A section concludes). Asterisks in the example indicate, first, a C♯-minor triad (mm. 29-30) that represents the 6 phase of E and resolves to an F-minor triad; and second, a chord
enharmonically equivalent to C#7 (m. 33) that functions as the 6 phase of G and resolves to an A-minor triad. The relation between these resolutions is roughly inversional: a dominant agent discharge becomes a subdominant one (E-F, F-E) and vice versa (D♭-C, G#-A). From a
retrospective A-minor vantage point, the F-minor and A-minor resolutions of these C7 chords can be reckoned as deceptive and authentic respectively. The phrase-structural context underscores the cadential significance of the latter resolution.\(^{27}\)

Transposed to C minor, the B section’s opening theme returns in m. 43. Instead of proceeding to F minor, however, the theme realigns itself at the end of the continuation according to its original tonal goal of A minor. To understand how this happens, one may begin by scrutinizing the melodic \(d^4_1=e^1_1\) on the downbeats of mm. 33 and 49. A negligible upper chromatic neighbour of the fifth of a G chord in the former case, \(E^1_3\) is a reiterated chordal root in the latter. As shown in example 4.33, a G-B-E\(_3\) augmented triad may be conceived as a pivot in m. 49 (even though this triad has no vertical presence in the music). Hindering the sequential ascent and reviving the old (A-minor) tonal goal, the C-minor sentence draws to an anticlimactic close. To be sure, a hypothetical F-minor arrival at m. 50 would ensure a certain sense of symmetry: locally, an A7-Fm progression in mm. 49-50 might suggest an inversion of the Am-C\(_7\)m progression in mm. 46-47; more broadly, a C-F ascending-fourth progression in mm. 43-50 could be heard as reversing the F-C descending-fourth progression of mm. 36-42. What the C\(_7\)-Am cadence at m. 50 instead provides locally is a reversal of the root motion of the Am-C\(_7\)m progression (mm. 46-47).\(^{28}\) Having regained A minor—the subdominant of the subdominant of B minor—the movement achieves tonal closure by means of a root ascent in fifths (mm. 51-64): A-(B)-E-(F\(_7\))-B. Abstractly, this A-E-B ascent retraces the steps of the preceding broad B-E-A descent—i.e. the tonal journey from B minor (in the A section) to E minor (at the beginning of the B section) to A minor (the tonal goal in the B section). This tonal scheme makes the second movement of Op. 54, No. 2 abstractly comparable to Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 2; in that earlier work, though, it is a downward major-third substitution (A replacing C\(_7\) in m. 13) that signals the start of a minor-mode plagal route to the (F\(_7\)-minor) tonic, and the route is one step longer (iv/iv/iv/iv/iv-i).

\(^{27}\) Setting forth a sequential prototype for mm. 25-33, example 4.33 does not show this cadence. In the reduction, the “C\(_7\)” chord at m. 33, beat 3, assumes the guise of a 6 phase of G, a first-inversion dominant ninth of A minor with root (E) omitted and seventh flattened (D\(_b\)). On the musical surface, there is no smooth passing D\(_b\). Instead, a bass C\(_7\) (m. 33, beat 3) falls to A (m. 34, beat 1). Abstractly, the \(\hat{A}\)-\(\hat{E}\)-\(\hat{B}\) descent may be, as Swinden explains (2005, 259), a “plagal bass line” though not a “characterizing” one. Here, \(\hat{E}\)-\(\hat{A}\) may be conceived in inversional opposition to (a characteristically plagal) \(\hat{A}\)-\(\hat{E}\).

\(^{28}\) In addition to the notion of harmonic redundancy, a hampered ascending sequence, and “disappointingly” unrealized inversionsal schemes, the minor mode of the A tonic in m. 50 (to which the C\(_7\)/C cross-relation in the “C\(_7\)-Am” progression draws special attention) contributes to the sense of anticlimax.
The B section of the ternary-form B♭-major fourth movement of Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55, presents a fascinating web of major-third relations. The focus of the present discussion is on a mid-phrase redirection upward by major third near the end of the B section. To understand this event, an examination of the B section as a whole (shown in reduction in example 4.34) is necessary. The transition (mm. 30-46) in this B♭-major movement culminates on V7/V (m. 47), a harmony that—as one soon realizes—does not lead to but rather itself initiates the B section. The C7 harmony at the start of the B section suggests a reversal of the outer-voice B♭-C configuration familiar from the B♭-major main theme (in which an accented passing C is a conspicuous feature). In fact, the upper-voice B♭ now exhibits a rather terrifying tenacity. In isolation, the melody even suggests the key of B♭ minor (it seems only to release its grip on that key in m. 53 with the arrival of G and D).\(^{29}\) Indirectly, B♭ resolves to an inner-voice A♭ in m. 50, but the melody’s upward thrust maintains tension until the deeper-level melodic resolution to A in m. 62.

\[\text{Example 4.34: Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55, IV, mm. 47-90: harmonic reduction}\]

\(^{29}\) In the second statement of the theme, Prokofiev exacerbates this inherent tension between the harmony and the melody. In m. 64, the melody simply materializes in the orchestral strings, relying on the solo pianist to provide preparation for the chordal seventh A and harmonic support for the ensuing arduous upward path.
The contrast within the compound basic idea is extreme: the contrasting idea (mm. 51-54) breaks free from the imposing basic idea (mm. 47-50) and tonicizes G minor. **Example 4.35** suggests two interpretations of the harmony in mm. 51-57, the second of which is preferable. The first interpretation involves a descending chain of six-three chords; this pattern is broken by the root-position E-minor chord in the last measure of the excerpt. The second involves a pair of
sequentially related three-chord progressions (essentially \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{II-V-i} \text{ in G minor and E minor} \) that occupy a total of eight beats each. As confirmed by melodic features, these progressions support, respectively, a contrasting idea (mm. 51-54) and its modified sequential (T9) repetition (mm. 55-57). The theme’s final six measures (mm. 58-63) feature yet another version of that three-chord progression: ii-v-i in A minor. Example 4.36 illustrates the progression’s unusual realization: 8-7-6-5 and 5-\( \text{\textcopyright} \text{5-4-3} \) descents bind the contents of mm. 58-59 and 60-61 as single harmonies (ii-\( \text{\textcopyright} \text{iii} \) and v-\( \text{\textcopyright} \text{v} \)). Throughout mm. 58-61, continuation traits are prominent: model-sequence technique, a brisk harmonic rhythm, and a flow of eighth notes in the melody.\(^\text{30}\) At m. 62, the theme ends with an A-minor authentic cadence thoroughly obscured not only by the \( \text{\textcopyright} \text{v} \) harmony but also by the bass B at m. 62, an upper neighbour to A that points urgently forward to B7 harmony (the start of a T11 restatement of the theme at m. 64).

\(^{30}\) Given its phrase-structural significance, “transitional passage” is a misnomer for mm. 58-63, \textit{pace} Minturn (1997, 175).
Treating the root-position E♭-minor harmony in m. 74 as a passing chord, the incomplete second thematic statement pushes forward to a third statement beginning on G7 in m. 76. In this third statement, Prokofiev accomplishes the upward major-third substitution. If m. 84 were to represent T7 of m. 55, then a first-inversion B♭-major harmony would mark the start of the modified sequential repetition of the contrasting idea. Instead, m. 84 brings a first-inversion B♭-minor harmony, permitting the theme to skip forward to the continuation while switching from T7 to T11. (Prokofiev artfully conceals the modal discrepancy on the surface: observe the F♯ appoggiatura in the bass on the downbeat of m. 55, which produces a fleeting sound of minor quality.) In its original form, the theme already undergoes a sort of redirection upward by major third as it begins on C7 (m. 47) leads not to an F-minor tonic but an A-minor one (mm. 62-63). Due to the midcourse shift of transposition level up by major third in the B3 statement, the theme ultimately reaches the tonic to which the B2 statement would have headed, had it been complete: G♯/A♭, minor. In example 4.37, I include a reduction of the retransition (mm. 91-107), a passage that leads from B7 to EM. At the end of this excerpt, a literal progression up by major third
(EM=F₃M-A₀M, mm. 107-08) reinstates the A₃ tonic for the return of the main theme.³¹

To conclude this study of the roles of upward major-third redirection and reinterpretation in Prokofiev’s music, let us briefly recall from Chapter 2 the discussion of the F-major third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis. The tonal strategy in that Andante loosely resembles that in the B section of Paysage, Op. 59, No. 2, where an upward major-third substitution interrupts a T1 sequence. More closely, Op. 94bis/III can be compared to Op. 55/IV, despite vast differences of expressive effect. In the main theme of Op. 94bis/III, as in the B theme of Op. 55/IV, a continuation based on a three-chord descending-fifth progression (locally, ii-V-I or ii-v-i) brings the theme to a close in a new key. In the A’ section of Op. 94bis/III, as in the last thematic statement in the B section of Op. 55/IV, a subtle redirection upward by major third takes place at the start of the continuation. These works exhibit two very different realizations of a particular tonal scheme. In Op. 94bis/III, the emphasis is not on major-third relationships as in the passionate B section of Op. 55/IV, but on a perfect-fifth relationship—specifically the F-major V-I relationship between the ends of the A and A’ sections (made possible by an upward-major-third redirection from a D₃ goal projected by the A’ section’s G₃-major beginning). Both the 1932 Concerto movement and the 1943 Sonata movement exemplify, to some extent, Prokofiev’s “new simplicity,”³² but the manner in which major-third relations are subordinated to perfect-fifth relations in the latter may, perhaps, make it seem simpler than the former.

IV. Conclusion

The analytical approach I have adopted in this chapter emphasizes continuity across the conventional boundaries of Prokofiev’s biography and oeuvre. Included here are early Russian works such as Piano Concerto No. 1 (1911-12), so-called formalist works from his international middle period such as the Sonatinas (1931-32), and later Soviet works such as Symphony No. 5 (1944). After examining a creative implementation of traditional minor-third peremennost’ (Section I), I discussed a great variety of harmonic procedures and tonal strategies under the

³¹ The A’ section modulates from A₃ major to B₃ major (as a T10 version of the movement’s opening sentence). The first downbeat passing tone in the melody of the main theme is a clue to the sentence’s harmonic destination. See the discussion of the main theme of Op. 55/IV in Chapter 3 (pp. 111-12).

general rubric of displacement or pairing by major third (Sections II and III). A natural starting point in an evolutionary schematization of these harmonic techniques is the minor-mode deceptive cadence.\textsuperscript{33} In such a scenario, VI substitutes for i, but if VI is regarded instantly as a new I, then VII may be an appropriate label for the preceding harmony. If the $\frac{6}{6}$ of a 5-$\frac{6}{6}$ shift is a dominant root, then we are not dealing with substitution, but when this shift occurs as a rapid modification of a harmony (as at the end of the B section of Op. 33ter), then it makes sense to speak of redirection downward by major third. Among the fascinating aspects of Prokofiev’s harmonic practice is the variety of ways in which he reverses the conventional (or natural!) downward direction of major-third redirection. With regards to dominant harmony, this means the reinterpretation of a dominant agent as a dominant base (rather than vice versa as in a downward major-third reinterpretation). The absence or passing-tone status of the dominant agent of a goal key (or the diminishment of intensity in the reinterpretation of a “Prokofiev dominant,” VII*, as an ordinary dominant, V) often contributes to a sense of anticlimax at cadences or tonal returns.

Like chromatic displacement, major-third displacement is a basic means of introducing imbalance (or even derailing a tonal trajectory), and in several of the analyses in this chapter, I have explored some of the means by which Prokofiev restores a sense of balance. We have seen, for example, swift downward major-third substitutions in the wake of upward ones (Op. 135/I and Op. 54, No. 1/II); reinterpretation of subdominant agents as dominant agents or vice versa in several works (including Op. 10/I and Op. 54, No. 2/II); and broad plagal journeys that compensate for deceptive resolutions of dominants (Op. 31, No. 2 and Op. 54, No. 2/II).\textsuperscript{34} Invoking the concepts of \textit{ladovaia peremennost’} and tonal pairing, I have stressed the importance of major-third relations that envelop and to varying degrees justify salient secundal relations. In particular, I-iii pairings and I7 harmony often carry basic repercussions for dominant harmony, making the “Prokofiev dominant” an appropriate dual-purpose dominant (pointing to both iii and I). The ramifications of this last point will an important concern in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{33} Ashley makes a similar point in her discussion of Piano Sonata No. 1, Op. 1 (1963, 14-19).
\textsuperscript{34} Op. 31, No. 2 was, of course, discussed only briefly in this chapter; for a more detailed analysis of this piece, refer back to Chapter 3 (pp. 112-15).
Chapter 5: Semitone relations and harmonic function

In this chapter, I explore some of the ways in which Prokofiev juxtaposes semitonally related harmonies and keys and how semitonal substitution and neighbour motion relate to harmonic function. I expand on some of the ideas introduced in Chapter 4 concerning semitone relations deriving from conflicts between major- and minor-third peremennost’ (or major and minor tonic-mediant relations) and place the examples encountered there into a broader context. Before presenting my analyses, I revisit some of the lesser-known previous literature on the topic of chromatic relations in Prokofiev’s music and survey some nineteenth-century traditions of chromaticism that have been too seldom invoked for points of comparison in studies of Prokofiev’s techniques of chromatic displacement. In general, I argue against an overly broad application of the concept of chromatic substitution\(^1\) and examine the variety of harmonic-functional meanings of chords associated with semitonal shifts.

I. Prokofiev’s relation to nineteenth-century chromatic traditions and the interpretation of chromatic displacement in his music

Among the authors of Russian-language music theory articles dealing specifically with chromatic and monotertian relations are Dolzhansky, Mazel’, Tiftikidi, and Orfeev.\(^2\) Perhaps the most attractive aspect of Dolzhansky’s 1947 article “On the modal basis of Shostakovich’s compositions” is the flexibility of his approach. Rather than insist on the relevance in Shostakovich’s music of intrinsically new modes, Dolzhansky stresses the importance of a general tendency of lowering the tones of a scale, which “strive … toward the lower tonic and away from the higher tonic; therein lies the fundamental structural principle of these modes” (70). As Dolzhansky implies, the “possibilities of enormous tragic tension” (70) harboured by such ostensibly new modes derive from what can be thought of as a downward pressure on a key or an uncomfortable position between two chromatically related keys. In Chapter 4, I brought up Dolzhansky’s notion of relative keys with tonics allegedly separated by a diminished fourth. More directly relevant to the present chapter is Dolzhansky’s notion of “parallel” (odnoimennoye)

---

1 See the discussion in Chapter 1 (pp. 17-18) of some recent theoretical approaches based on chromatic substitution (especially Bass 1988).
2 Carpenter (1995) provides an overview of the work of these and other Russian music theorists (especially their writings on modality in Shostakovich’s music).
keys. Thanks to certain chromatic inflections that are characteristic of Shostakovich, the keys of, for example, B minor and B♭ major can gradually gain in similarity to one another, “appearing in this modulatory system ‘more parallel’” (bolee odnoimennymi) to one another than to their conventional parallel keys (73).

In his 1957 article “On the expansion of the concept of parallel tonality,” Mazel’ embraces Dolzhansky’s extended sense of parallel keys as an important current issue in contemporary Soviet music. Before delving into such recent cases as the C-c♯ oscillation in the finale of Shostakovich’s Symphony No. 8 (1943), Mazel’ touches on two works by Liszt: Valse Oubliée No. 1 (1881) and Funérailles (1853). As the Valse Oubliée No. 1 in particular is relevant to some of the ideas that I will develop in my Prokofiev analyses in this chapter, I will consider its tonal plan in some detail. In the A’ section, Liszt presents a G-minor recomposition of the originally F♯-major main theme (compare examples 5.1 and 5.2). Minimizing the disorienting effect of the harmonic discrepancy, downbeats remain empty in the left hand; the spotlight is on the melody, in which the ponderous pickup figure (D-D♯-E♭ = D-E♭-F) and emphatic upper neighbours (D♯=E♭) of the fifth degree remain intact in the G-minor recomposition. Preceding the start of the A’ section with a literal recall of introductory material based on vii°7 of F♯ (mm. 107-21), Liszt sets up the G-minor entrance as an upward chromatic displacement. Subtle foreshadowing of this event may be detected in the approach to the C♯-major B section (m. 89),
where a dominant-function diminished seventh (vii°7 of F) is similarly defused as a common-tone diminished seventh. For the real tonal return, one must wait for the transition to the coda-like B’ section, where Liszt delicately converts an E♭-D trill to D♯-C♯ after lowering the bass G to F♯ (mm. 140-52). A fascinating aspect of the piece is the ambiguity and variety of sonorities associated with 6-5 and 6-6-5 motions—especially but not exclusively the reinterpretation between sections A and A’ of D♯/E♭ as ♯ in F♯ major and G minor.

Mazel’ compares the *odnoimennyi* relationship in Valse Oubliée No. 1 to one in Liszt’s Funérailles (1853), observing that the originally A♭-major contrasting theme in this F-minor work makes an E♭=F♭ major appearance in the coda (m. 177). According to Mazel’, Liszt compellingly presents E♭=F♭ major as a modified form of F minor by focusing melodic attention on the ♯3 and ♯6 that these keys share; meanwhile, the tonal and formal context lends this thematic appearance a sense of “‘illusoriness’, conversion to the ‘shade’, reminiscence” (143). Mazel’ describes the example as structurally analogous to the Valse Oubliée, but it is important to observe the differences. In mm. 177ff of Funérailles, the *dolce* theme is not only transposed, but recomposed, erected on a cadential six-four rather than on a stable tonic in E♭=F♭ major. Filling the anguished silence left by the V9 of mm. 174-76, the E♭=F♭-major cadential six-four seems to suggest a peaceful (chromatically lower, major-mode) escape route—perhaps death tempts the mourner with the prospect of reunion—which the protagonist bypasses, pursuing a stepwise path downward that connects the V9 of m. 174 to a conclusive major-mode I (mm. 185-92). The feint toward the ♯VII=♭I key in the coda seems especially poignant if one remembers the feint toward a ♯i=♭ii key in the main theme (which stands for, perhaps, a temptation to violence rather than resignation). As Damschroder (1987, 55-58) illustrates: despite the dramatic force of the F♭-minor cadential six-four of mm. 48-51, its potential as a dominant evaporates as it takes on passing function between the F-minor tonic and the ♯II6 (m. 54) of the A♭-major goal key (m. 56). In Funérailles, chromatic displacement (from F minor to F♭-minor and from F minor to F♭ major) is dramatized as a dangerous possibility that requires effort to avoid.

Mazel’ (1957) includes just one Prokofiev example. Approached as if it were a C♯-minor theme, the secondary theme of the A-minor Piano Sonata No. 3, Op. 28, enters in C major. Salzer’s graph (1962, 220-21) is more precise: the transition sequentially reaches what could be a cadential six-four in C♭ minor only to turn it into a cadential six-four in C major; a D-T resolution then brings in the III-key secondary theme. Mazel’ compares the “effect of ‘sliding down’ [sokal’zyvanie] to the corresponding major tonality” to the more traditional technique of...
staging a “bright modal shift” at the point of entry of a major-mode secondary theme by preparing for it with parallel-minor elements (1957, 144).

Tiftikidi (1970) takes up the challenge of finding and categorizing a large number of repertory examples. The first half of Tiftikidi’s essay deals with what he calls the “monotertian (odnotertsovyi) system,” in which the traditional harmonic vocabulary is enriched through monotertian relatives substituting for primary triads. After a brief list of monotertian relations in historical examples (24) comes a longer list of works or passages by Prokofiev and Shostakovich of “modulations and tonicizations” in six categories: from major or from minor to monotertian tonic, dominant and subdominant. The result is a great variety of harmonic possibilities.

Commenting on Prokofiev’s style in particular, Tiftikidi observes that contrasts between CM and C#m, F#m, or G#m (the monotertian substitutes for the primary triads in C major) have a “brightening” effect similar to that of the “Prokofiev dominant” (or the raising of the fifth and seventh of V7), making the tonic seem brighter (like making white seem whiter through contrast with black) (34). In the second half of his essay, Tiftikidi envisions an analogous fully chromatic system, beginning with a historical list (40) and following up with a more copious list of passages in Prokofiev and Shostakovich (45-46). Tiftikidi’s article is a valuable resource, but the predictable danger of his survey is that it pays too little attention to the ubiquitous problem of functional ambiguity in chromatic harmony and the importance of broader tonal contexts.

Orfeev’s (1970) article in the same book touches on a broad array of repertoire examples of monotertian relations (his focus is not Prokofiev and Shostakovich, so his article rarely overlaps with Tiftikidi’s). Orfeev makes a general argument—difficult to accept as a fixed rule—that not only are tonal motions between monotertian pairs equivalent to conventional parallel relations in that they do not count as modulations (the terminology emphasizes this analogy, with the odno-[mono-] prefix shared by odnotersovyi and odnoimennyi), but that combinations of the two transformations (SLIDE+PAR in Lewinian terms) also generally do not merit the term modulation (65-66). Although an exploration of the historical roots of Prokofiev’s techniques of chromatic displacement is not my main purpose here, it will prove expedient to invoke a few touchstone examples from the Romantic literature as an aid to developing some principles to which pieces by Prokofiev can be said to adhere to varying degrees.

In the Romantic literature, monotertian pairs frequently reflect modally contrasting forms of mediant or submediant harmony. A concise illustration of oscillation between monotertian forms of mediant harmony can be found in Liszt’s Consolation No. 1 in E major (1844-50), at
the heart of which is an alternation between G major and G♭ minor (mm. 9-16)—two forms of mediant harmony figuring within an overarching I-III-V-I arpeggiation. (The main theme itself involves melodic stasis against kaleidoscopic harmonic changes.) More complex but structurally similar is Liszt’s song *Freudvoll und leidvoll* (1860), a work in which modal shifts take on explicit word-painting significance as vacillations between joy and sorrow. As in Consolation No. 1, Liszt divides the mediant into a monotertian pair (♭III and iii) and contextualizes it as part of a large-scale arpeggiation (within which an ascending 5-6 sequence connects ♭III [m. 14] to V [m. 26, regained in m. 32]).³ For one of the many cases of monotertian pairs of submediants, we may turn to Chopin’s Waltz in A♭ Major, Op. 64, No. 3. Included in the main theme of this work is a brief vi-key (F minor) version of the A♭-major basic idea (mm. 9-12). In the final statement of the main theme, a downward chromatic displacement provides the impetus for a *brillante* conclusion from which all minor-quality chords are banished: V6/5 of vi resolves surprisingly to ♭VI (m. 133), from which point an ascending 5-6 sequence regains the tonic (F♭5-G♭5-A♭5, mm. 133-46) and a ♭II6-V7-I cadence (m. 149) brings in the coda (mm. 149-71).⁴

In rare cases in the Romantic literature, monotertian pairing sustains more compelling illusions of diverging forms of tonic harmony. However disorienting a “♭I” may sound at first (or upon later revival), it is often rewarding to hope—especially in minor-mode works—for a “redeeming” reinterpretation of the chord as a submediant in the key of the mediant. An illustration of this can be found in the A section of Schubert’s song “In der Ferne” (1828), of which example 5.3 shows mm. 17-29 (the continuation phrase that follows the compound basic idea of mm. 8-16). In m. 18, the substitution of a solid B♭-major triad (♯VII) for the more usual V6 (or V4/3 as in m. 9) contributes to the song’s central idea of being severed from one’s home or homeland. An unusual realization of a descending 5-6 sequence, the path along which the poet trudges seems instantly to bring frighteningly unfamiliar territory. Yet Schubert leaves room for hope or yearning by carving out a new context for the B♭-major chord, namely as ♭VI in the key of III (D major). All the more tragic, then, is the *pianissimo* ii⁹6/5 in m. 25 that points the way to the B-minor conclusion of the phrase; the B♭-major (or A♭-major) chord of m. 18 is agonizingly far from being fully assimilated by a III-key context. In the tonally adventurous concluding

---

³ Krebs’s (1980) dissertation includes Schenkerian analyses of this and many other nineteenth-century examples of what he describes as third-related triads temporarily (73-124) or permanently (125-69) independent of a dominant-tonic axis.

⁴ In the fifth section (58-61) of his 1962 article “Discussing Contemporary Harmony,” Mazel’ touches on some historical precedents of current harmonic practices such as monotertian pairing. This Chopin example comes up there (59n.1).
phrase of the A section of Chopin’s Fantaisie, Op. 49 (1841) (mm. 15-20), a shift from F-minor to E=Fⁿ-major harmony similarly affords a brief glimpse of a foreign land. Like the Ⅱ chord in the Schubert, the Fⁿ chord of m. 18 justifies itself as Ⅵ (or more precisely a German sixth) in the key of III, but III proves unable to materialize as a tonal goal (as it will at the end of the work); instead, the “dutiful” marching key of F minor reasserts itself.

In Valse Oubliée No. 1, Liszt offers a starker juxtaposition of chromatically related forms of a tonic, though the effect is softened by the theme’s dominant start. An earlier example along the same lines (with an upward chromatic displacement at the point of thematic return) is Glinka’s “Pesn’ Margarity” (1848). In this song, an upward chromatic displacement brings back the tonic that supports the thematic return. Example 5.4 shows the juncture between the B and A’ sections. As the B section reaches a standing on the dominant of Bⁿ major, Gretchen, envisioning her lover, reaches an apex of excitement at the thought of his kiss. At last, a cadential six-four in Bⁿ transforms into an augmented-triad home-key dominant through a simple

---

5 Alternatively referred to by its first line, “Tiazhka pechal’ i grusten svet” [Heavy sorrow and sad world], Glinka’s “Pesn’ Margarity” [Margaret’s Song] is a voice-and-piano setting of a Russian translation by Eduard Guber of “Meine Ruh’ ist hin” from Goethe’s Faust.
F-F♯ inflection (m. 77), and the girl is thrust back into B minor and the miserable monotony of her spinning wheel. The B♭-major cadential six-four can thus loosely be compared to the fruitless F♯-minor and F♯-major cadential six-fours of Liszt’s Funérailles. Tiftikidi lists “Pesn’ Margarity” for a monotertian relation “B♭-♭” (24), which is accurate in an abstract sense, but it is worth emphasizing that the low B♭ of m. 76 by no means resolves the ♯VII-key dominant. At the point of thematic return, the B-minor tonic (Gretchen’s inescapable current circumstances) prevents and replaces a desired B♭-major tonic (the fulfillment of the love-dream). As a whole, the B section takes shape harmonically as a downward arpeggiation of an augmented-triad dominant (D in m. 50, B♭ in m. 60, and the brief F♯ in m. 77). Within the returning main theme, the ♯7-♯8 figures (mm. 79-80 and 81-82) accrue new significance, recalling the ♯VII key that sadly could not come to fruition.

At the thematic return in “Pesn’ Margarity,” a prospective major-mode tonic is replaced by a minor-mode tonic a semitone higher. More traditional is the opposite modal relationship—moving to the key of what would, from the perspective of the first key, be ♯II. We find this, for instance, in the first movement of Haydn’s Symphony No. 55 in E♭ major (“Der Schulmeister”) (1774). Coming in the wake of an ominous German sixth in D minor, the recapitulation compels a retrospective reinterpretation of that harmony as a dominant seventh in E♭ major. As Poundie Burstein observes, Haydn’s comic strategy here involves a “contrast in purpose”: a very low-level chord (the D-minor German sixth) gets promoted to the very highest level (as a structural dominant), allowing the returning main theme to “[make] sport of the more somber outcome
suggested by the previous harmonies” (77). The vast expressive differences between these Glinka and Haydn examples should remind us of the shortcomings of such a general term as upward semitone displacement. Skrebkov (1965) touches on this general point: in contrast to such clear cases of “retention” (sokhranenie) or “recolouring” (pereokraska) of a tonic as in the D-major fourteenth variation in Rachmaninoff’s D-minor Variations on a theme of Corelli, Op. 42 (1931), it would be difficult if not impossible to move upward by a semitone while changing the mode from minor to major and make it not sound like a modulation to the key of the Neapolitan (1965, 38) (or i−ii; or a return to a major tonic from a vii key).

These overviews of a few earlier treatments of semitonal and monotertian relations lead to some basic points of comparison and contrast that will inform the following analyses of works by Prokofiev. Prokofiev avoids the weightless accompaniment texture of Consolation No. 1 and Valse Oubliée No. 1,6 tending to draw greater attention to semitone displacements as harmonic events. Especially in upward semitone displacements, Prokofiev often prefers fully chromatic (T1) relationships to such modally contrasting relationships as the displacement of a prospective minor key by a higher major key in “Der Schulmeister” or vice versa in “Pesn’ Margarity.” One aspect of the celebrated laconicism of Prokofiev’s style (certainly against the grain of Schoenberg’s musical aesthetics7) is that short modulatory routes are often favoured: Prokofiev frequently adopts the conventional short routes downward (reinterpreting a dominant as a pre-dominant in a key a semitone lower [V7=>Gr6]) and upward (reinterpreting a pre-dominant as a dominant in a key a semitone higher [Gr6=>V7]), often realizing them in unconventional ways (e.g. reinterpreting ii7 as an augmented-sixth chord of dominant function) or shortening them still further (e.g. moving from a dominant directly to the tonic of a chromatically related key). In his own ways, Prokofiev does employ the “familiar technique” of foreshadowing later deeper-level chromatic displacements with early surface-level ones,8 but this often means no more than a moment’s notice (for instance, the extreme weight of a lower chromatic neighbour of 5 often tells us that it will itself become 5 quite soon).

---

6 In those Liszt works, first-inversion harmony and empty left-hand downbeats minimize the difference between monotertian relatives.
7 Schoenberg’s passionate argument that “the shortest way is the worst” can be found in his Theory of Harmony (1978 [1911], 165). See Kopp’s discussion of the views of Schoenberg and others on modulation and chromatic third relations (2002, 121).
8 McCreless (1996) points out this “familiar technique” (101) in several examples within his article on semitone relations in nineteenth-century music.
Nevertheless, a central point in this chapter will be that previous authors have often overstated the case for chromatic shifts in Prokofiev’s music as generally being—at least from a tonal rather than motivic or set-theory perspective—sudden, unprepared, and unintegrated.9 In particular, I take issue with the idea that harmonies resulting from chromatic shifts in Prokofiev’s music can fully or as a general rule be explained as genuine substitutes in terms of harmonic function. Looking at the many cases in Prokofiev’s music in which monotertian or fully chromatic pairs offer two forms of a tonic, it will often be helpful to envision a spectrum of possible treatments. Approaching one end of the spectrum, third- and fifth-relations increasingly mitigate or even render moot the semitonal relation (encouraging the perception or even confirming that a supposed split between forms of tonic harmony really just reflects, e.g., contrasting submediants in the mediant key); near the other end are cases in which such justification is withheld (the dramatic effects of this are diverse: there may be a violent struggle between tonic contenders or a whimsical dance between ostensibly equal partners; the decisive outcome of a particular tonic can sound like tragic fate, as in the Glinka song, or a comic switch, as in the Haydn symphony). Prokofiev frequently uses harmonies that can justifiably be labeled as displaced tonics (♭I, ♭i, ♭♭I, ♭♭i), yet it is vital to consider the more or less strongly defined secondary meanings of such harmonies.

Section II of this chapter focuses on the notion of overall balance in a few themes that include a conspicuous semitone motion from the tonic. Sections III and IV study aspects of harmonic function in several works characterized by chromatic displacement upward and downward respectively. The division between Sections III and IV is for several reasons somewhat artificial. The notion of balance between upward and downward chromatic tendencies remains relevant in many examples throughout this chapter. Further, harmonic ambiguity sometimes makes precise description difficult, particularly in cases of tritone-related roots. Barring the obvious possibility of a ♭II-V interpretation, tritone relations may variously be explained in terms of local downward chromatic displacement (before resolving, V has been inflected as ♭V) or local upward chromatic displacement (before resolving, IV has been inflected to ♭IV); alternatively, the situation may involve deeper-level chromatic displacement, in which case the priority of dominant function makes upward likelier than downward (a projected tonic is replaced by one a semitone higher).

---

9 This point is related to an observation I made in Chapter 1: the tendency in recent studies has been to compare Prokofiev’s style more with Beethoven (Bass 1988, 199) or the Classical style in general (Harter 2003, Rifkin 2006) than with that of Schubert, Glinka, Liszt, Rimsky-Korsakov, and other composers closer to Prokofiev’s own time.
Another issue that will be of concern in this chapter is the employment of “heaviness” or “overburdening” as an expressive type. Among the most compelling of Prokofiev’s works in this vein is the Adagietto second movement of Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 1. As I suggested in Chapter 4, the $\hat{1}$-$\hat{7}$-$\hat{1}$ neighbour figure in the bass within the initial minor-mode tonic prolongation and the expressive idea of nearly crushing weight make the opening of the work loosely comparable to Schubert’s “Der Atlas” from Schwanengesang. Later in that song, $\hat{7}$ does not grow into a local key as it does in Prokofiev’s Adagietto, but it does attain root status as a local dominant, since the B section is in the key of $\hat{III}$ instead of the usual III. Glinka’s “Pesn’ Margarity” is another song in which the idea of weight is important from an interpretive standpoint. Glinka redirects us from B major to B minor at the thematic return with a very light touch—a $\hat{4}$-$\hat{5}$ (F=Ez-F) ascent that produces the home-key dominant. As we saw in Chapter 3, such rapid $\hat{4}$-$\hat{5}$ adjustments are sometimes responsible for producing fleeting dominants in Prokofiev’s music (e.g. in the B section of Etude, Op. 2, No. 2; see p. 92). In “Pesn’ Margarity,” the swiftness of the upward shift makes it feel almost like a betrayal: a performer might, perhaps, inject a hint of rage into the returning words Tiazhka pechal’ (Heavy sorrow) in consideration of the ease with which the vision of love has been brushed away. In some works characterized by overburdening, Prokofiev dramatizes a point of thematic and tonal return by requiring a sort of muscular effort for the achievement of an upward chromatic displacement that restores the home key. We will see other cases—typically entrances of refrains in jubilant major-mode rondo-form works—where it is precisely the effortless accomplishment of similar tasks that gives a cheerful, bouncy effect. (In such cases, one experiences, perhaps, the delightful surprise of finding what one feared would be a burden to be actually a trifle, or the fun of pretending that something is more serious than it really is.) With regards to upward chromatic displacement, a pertinent interpretive question will frequently be: how much effort is required? Throughout my analyses of semitone relations in this chapter, I discuss expressive qualities alongside issues of harmonic function.

II. The idea of balance: semitonal shifts within four tonally closed periods

As we broaden our perspective to consider the context or consequences of a particular semitonal displacement, the notion of balance gains relevance: does the event seem effectively counteracted—and if not, does it pass by with ironic nonchalance (perhaps with repercussions much later) or initiate a broader trend? In the simplest cases, balance means local tonal closure;
the basic tools are semitone transposition (sequencing I-VII by T1 to produce I-VII-II-I or sequencing I-II by T11 to produce I-II-VII-I) and reversal (e.g. answering I-VII with VII-I). In this section, I restrict the purview to individual themes, specifically the opening themes of four works: Allemande, Op. 12, No. 8; the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 2, Op. 16; Melody, Op. 35, No. 1; and Waltz, Op. 102, No. 1. Each of these themes is a tonally closed period in which the antecedent features a move toward a harmony related by semitone to the tonic. I focus on aspects of harmonic function and the question of how a sense of balance and elegance arises despite—or in some sense due to—conspicuous semitonal harmonic relationships.

In the opening theme of the F major Allemande, Op. 12, No. 8 (example 5.5), the antecedent (mm. 1-4) concludes with a cadence that brilliantly defies conventional labeling. In m. 3, the apparent stability of the bass C as the root of a dominant of F casts doubt on the successful outcome of an F-major i-III-V arpeggiation. In m. 4, C moves to F—asserting, ostensibly, a dominant base discharge in F or a 2-5 motion in B♭. If the cadence is reckoned in F, a D/F voice exchange lends it a deceptive quality (a D chord could be a submediant substitute for an F tonic). At a deeper level, an F-major i-III-V arpeggiation with f♯:HC may be considered successful in m. 4 on the condition of an implied C root (as shown in the voice leading sketch in example 5.6). Considering the harmonic strength of C and the C-F bass motion mm. 3-4, it nevertheless seems fair to say that the antecedent quite narrowly avoids an authentic cadence in F.

Example 5.5: Allemande, Op. 12, No. 8, mm. 1-8

Antecedent

Consequent

---

10 Thus, vii’7/V in m. 3 resolves in m. 4 to an inversion of vii’7, i.e. V9 with missing root.
From F at the end of the antecedent (m. 4, beat 1), the bass descends by step to B at the start of the consequent (m. 5, beat 1). Meanwhile, the starting point for the melody in the consequent is a transposition up by minor third of the opening material. Now, looking back at the second half of m. 2, it is important to notice the whole-tone-collection membership of the pitch-class contents of the dominant of F. Exploiting this aspect of the harmony, Prokofiev brings about a major-second substitution: where a T3 restatement of the antecedent would feature a dominant of G♯/A♭ (in the second half of m. 6), the consequent instead features a dominant of F♯. Unlike the dominant of F in the antecedent, the dominant of F♯ in the consequent enjoys a true authentic resolution (f♯:IAC). Locally, an upward chromatic substitution may also be pinpointed within the prolongation of the home-key dominant in m. 7. Instead of the E♭-major chord that would—according to a T3 prototype—be expected on the downbeat of m. 7, an E-minor chord appears. Serving within the home key as vii (or an upper-third chord of V), this chord participates in a prolongation of the home-key dominant. Confirming the home key of F♯, the consequent stands in opposition to an antecedent that inclines toward the key of F. The gravitation toward F in the antecedent surely contributes to the general feeling of brutal heaviness for which this Allemande is known. Yet the successful adjustment to F♯ minor in the consequent imbues the period as a whole with the sense of balance that is essential to Prokofiev’s “classical line.”


---

11 See, e.g. Ashley (1963, 77), who interprets in satirical terms the “heavy and ungainly” successions of parallel root-position harmonies.
neighbours G♯ minor and F♯ minor. The phrase in mm. 5-8 ascends, in Bass’s view, from a G-
minor tonic to a subdominant borrowed from G♯ minor. The phrase in mm. 9-12 begins anew in
G minor, but soon moves into F♯ minor (m. 10). Since the ♭ii key of this ♭vii key is the home key
itself, the harmonic goal of this phrase brings about a tonal return (m. 12). Retaining its
“controlling power” (210), G minor becomes a shadow key for a brief G♯-minor moment in the
first phrase (m. 8) and throughout a longer F♯-minor interior stretch in the second (mm. 10-11)
(212).

Taking a closer look at the theme, it is important to observe the half cadence that takes
place in m. 8. Related to this is a misleading detail in Bass’s voice-leading sketch of the phrase:
his inclusion of a passing bass B in m. 7, beat 4. In fact, an A bass supports root-position
supertonic harmony throughout the second half of m. 7. The progression up to this point—i-III-
iv6-ii9 in G minor—ostensibly heads for V on the downbeat of m. 8. In this light, the C♯ root in
m. 8 figures locally as a downward chromatic displacement—substituting for a D root and
encouraging a retrospective reinterpretation of the preceding A harmony as a plagal augmented-
sixth chord in C♯ (cf. the A-C♯ root motion in Op. 43bis/IV, m. 9). This displacement, of course,
proves temporary: C♯ decorates D, figuring as a ♭4 of such heanness that a downward chromatic
displacement very early in the next phrase (F♯ replaces G in m. 10) feels quite inevitable. In the
consequent, the displacement in m. 12 is not transient like that in m. 8. Framed as the point of
furthest remove, the C harmony in m. 12 represents a home-key subdominant that resolves to the
tonic after being inflected as an S° harmony. The achievement of balance in this period can
profitably be compared with that in Allemande, Op. 12, No. 8. In both periods, the antecedent
features a downward chromatic displacement that is rendered superficial or temporary through
the assertion of half-cadential home-key dominant harmony; the consequent then distinguishes
itself partly by following through with what was merely incipient in the antecedent. In the
Allemande, the bass C♯ of m. 6 establishes itself as true ♯5 rather than as a mere ♯5♭4 like the
corresponding bass C of m. 2; in Op. 16/I, the bass C of m. 12 establishes itself as a true ♯4 rather
than as a mere ♯5♭4 like the corresponding bass C♯ of m. 8.

The A section of Melody, Op. 35, No. 1 is another beautifully balanced period in which a
semitonal harmonic relation is of paramount importance. This example also demonstrates how
the concepts of expectation and substitution can become complex as a result of the involvement
of third relations mitigating semitonal relations. Example 5.8 shows the score of mm. 1-6 (the A
section and the first measure of the B section). According to Lewin, the work’s basically diatonic
context ensures that “some harmonic events stand out as ‘strange’. Foremost among these are the cadence harmonies, E minor over the last half of measure 2 and E♭ minor over the last half of measure 5. At both of these cadences we expect E♭-major harmony” (2007 [1987], 227). Lewin goes on to discuss a network of “Klang-transformations”: SLIDE between the expected E♭M and actual Em in m. 2, PAR between the expected E♭M and actual E♭m in m. 5, and SLIDE between DM and E♭m in the ostinato pattern in m. 6. Shifting his perspective to pitch-class sets, Lewin points out an IG/G relation between Em in m. 2 and the expected E♭M; IG/F♯ between E♭m in m. 5 and the expected E♭M; and IF♯/F♯ not only between E♭m and DM but also between CM and Fm in the B section ostinato (m. 6). The inversional centrality of F♯, Lewin adds, “recalls the melodic position of F♯ in measure 1, where it is mediated between a preceding melodic G and a subsequent melodic F” (230).

Example 5.8: Melody, Op. 35, No. 1, mm. 1-6

Most listeners would surely agree that the E-minor harmony in m. 2 can justifiably be described as deriving from a chromatic shift from E♭-major harmony. Especially considering the coordination of this harmonic arrival with the melodic apex on G, the common tone between
Em and the presumed tonic triad E\(_{\flat}\)M, the main theme can be compared to those of Op. 94/III (where F\(_{\flat}\)m [\(\sharp i\)] supports an A melodic apex; see Chapter 2, p. 37) or, more directly, Op. 102, No. 1 (where E\(_{\flat}\)M [\(\flat I\)] supports a G melodic apex; see the analysis below). It is, however, somewhat problematic to say that E\(_{\flat}\)-major harmony is expected in m. 2, beat 3, or that the E- minor harmony can be fully explained as a substitute for it. If E\(_{\flat}\)M were actually to occur there, then the passage would change utterly: there would no longer be a cadence there (even in an extended sense of the term), and one would no longer be able to ascribe local dominant function to the second-beat chord of m. 2.

In example 5.9, I show a four-voice reduction of the theme in which I add to the inversional relationships discussed by Lewin. One such relationship is between beats 3 and 4 of m. 1. Although the progression may look like a case of pure transposition (T2), the voice leading

![Example 5.9: Melody, Op. 35, No. 1, mm. 1-5: harmonic reduction](image)

and the preference for descending-fifth root motion argue for inversion (I8 or IB\(_{\flat}\)/B\(_{\flat}\)) B\(_{\flat}\)m7 in third inversion resolves to E\(_{\flat}\)M in first inversion with added sixth. The first half of m. 2 initially sounds like a modified repeat of the second half of m. 1. Retrospectively, however, the chord in m. 2, beat 2 may be ascribed an implied B root as a dominant-function augmented-sixth chord in E minor. If, as I said above, it seems insufficient to explain E minor here solely through its monotertian relation to E\(_{\flat}\) major, this is largely because of what Lewin himself describes as the Mixolydian character of the theme (231). The bass descents from A\(_{\flat}\), the use of D\(_{\flat}\) rather than D (in m. 1, beat 3 and m. 2, beat 1), and indeed the potential for the downbeat chord of m. 2 to be interpreted as viio7 of A\(_{\flat}\), all contribute to the mitigation of the I-\(\sharp i\) (or I-\(\flat ii\)) relationship between E\(_{\flat}\)M and Em by imbuing Em with a secondary meaning as \(\flat vi\) in A\(_{\flat}\) major. From this perspective, if Em substitutes for anything, it is A\(_{\flat}\)M—although, to be sure, the bass descent to F
in m. 2, beat 2 seems already to rule out A♭M by forming an outer-voice augmented sixth with E♭=D♯.

In the consequent, Prokofiev balances out the period by completing the bass A♭-E♭ descent and cadencing on an E♭ rather than E harmony. The choice of E♭m can be understood as a neat compromise between Em and E♭M. More importantly, the minor mode renders the tonic status of the concluding E♭ harmony unequivocal (avoiding the dominant-like ending that could result from the Mixolydian environment). In example 5.9, I also label an I7 relation between the two chords of the first half of m. 5, which together work essentially as a V4/3 chord in E♭. Between the two dominant-function augmented-sixth chords (m. 2, beat 2, and m. 5, beat 2), there is, superficially, a transpositional relationship (T9), but—as with the B♭m7 and E♭M with added sixth in the basic idea—a consideration of chordal roots (B and B♭) reveals a more complex relationship. As [0247] chords, the two dominants have two possible 4-3 augmented sixths; Prokofiev activates a different one in each. This brings us back to the central point—the mitigation of the semitonal harmonic relationship and the fostering of periodic balance. Perhaps the first thing one notices about the theme is the (purely chromatic) T11 relation between the concluding harmonies of its two halves (Em and E♭m), but on closer examination one perceives such features as the “deceptive cadence” quality of the Em arrival in m. 2 (its alternate identity as vi in A♭) and the question-and-answer (rather than purely sequential) relationship between the two cadences.

The Waltz, Op. 102, No. 1 (“Cinderella and the Prince”) is another E-minor work featuring a i--vi motion, but here Prokofiev secures a sense of balance by different means. Example 5.10 shows the score of the mm. 17-33 (the first half and the beginning of the second half of the double period that makes up the A section). As Rifkin observes, the opening phrase drives toward a half cadence in mm. 23-24 “in the highly unexpected key of i” (2006, 146). To be sure, the E♭ harmony is not wholly unprepared. If it sounds logical here (where it would certainly sound like a non sequitur in a conventional Viennese waltz), this is due to such features as the melodic D♭ approached and left by leap in m. 17 and the inner-voice Em-D♭m-Em neighbour motion in mm. 17-19, which can even be heard as strong encouragement for a deeper-level downward chromatic shift. In the melody, rather than render the 5--6--5 nega figure in a square one-measure-per-tone layout, Prokofiev employs hemiola, conferring not three but four beats on each of the first three tones. As a result, the 5 and E-minor harmony that complete the nega pattern arrive one measure late—at m. 22, a weak hyperbeat. Hypermetrical regularity and
the momentum of the chromatic figure thus seem to compel the shift to E♭ major—attaching to the E-minor 6-5 (C-B) descent (mm. 21-22) a further E♭-major 6-5 (B=C♭-B♭) descent (mm. 22-23). This C-B-B♭ motion forms part of a broader chromatic descent that helps to connect this phrase to the following A-minor phrase (consider the C♭-c♭-b♭-a♭-g♭ line in mm. 20-26).

Regarding the A-minor phrase, Rifkin comments on its “ambiguous harmonic ending” and remarks that “the D♭-C bass line suggests a half cadence in F minor” in mm. 29-32 (2006, 146). It is interesting to compare the tonal trajectory of the Waltz up to m. 33 to the opening of Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3: in that work too (also in E minor), a thematic restatement in the key of iv (A minor) prompts a visit to the diatonic mediant of that key (C major), which functions as the dominant of ii (F minor). In the Waltz, however, the F-minor harmony in m. 33 brings a T1 reiteration of the theme (and not the second 5 phase in an ascending 5-6 sequential plan). As for the C-major harmony in the Waltz, Prokofiev imbues it with a special quality of brightness by framing it as an upward chromatic displacement from B harmony. In mm. 25-28, Prokofiev launches an A-minor nega figure only to pause ecstatically on the (F♭) apex. As if reinterpreting this as the initial 5 of a new nega figure, faster circular motions follow (F♭-G♭-A♭-G-F♭ potentially equals F♭-F♮-G♭-G-F♭). At last, F♭ acts not as 5 in B but as 5 in C, resolving
upward to G (m. 31). The melody thus begins in A minor, struggles momentarily to legitimize B minor, and comes through pleasantly to an “even better” (higher, diatonic) solution: C major.

If the C goal in mm. 31-32 is heard as resulting from a chromatic shift upward, then the ensuing key of F minor can more readily be appreciated as a key that will soon yield to E minor. In other words, the feeling of having been artificially lifted up makes it even easier to recognize E as the returning tonic (even though, as Rifkin says, E figures in m. 39 as “an exceptional excursion in relation to its local [F-minor] context” [2006, 146]). Finally, the confirmation of the tonic at the end of the theme requires subtle downward pressure: in place of B♭ minor in m. 41 (iv of F minor), A minor (iv of E minor) begins the phrase, and from there we find a smooth path to a conclusive e:PAC (m. 48) (not shown).

In her discussion of the Waltz as “an example of the extreme-modern-style” of neoclassicism (145), Rifkin sheds light on how the work “challenges conventions of phrase structure” (including cadential closure, linear flow, and goal-directedness) (146). Rifkin interprets the work as a “garish satire of the waltz genre” that hints at a modernist rereading of the fairy tale (“From a modernist perspective,” Rifkin notes, “the prince would represent the pinnacle of abused power, corruption, and greed of patriarchal and aristocratic hierarchies”) (146). This, I think, is a point that can easily be taken too far. The piece is, above all, a showy dance between two lovers; there is sensuality in its whirling figures and elegance in its balancing tendencies. Suggesting, perhaps, a graceful answer by Cinderella to a bold figure by the prince, the $\hat{5}=\hat{4}$ melodic reinterpretation at the end of the second phrase (the inclination upward to C major) counterbalances the $\hat{5}=\hat{6}$ melodic reinterpretation at the end of the first phrase (the inclination downward to E♭ major). Further, the broader circle completed by the third phrase’s f-E counterpart to the first phrase’s e-E♭ shift might look dizzying rather than exhilarating, but Prokofiev prepares us to accept the returning tonic through preceding tonal events and confirms the tonic status of E by means of the i:PAC of the fourth and final phrase. In this way, Op. 102, No. 1 does not really satirize but certainly breathes new life into the waltz genre, finding creative ways of bringing out the brilliance, elegance, and excitement of the fairy-tale ballroom.

**III. Upward chromatic displacement**

In many cases, chromatic displacement upward can have the peculiar expressive effect of adjustment, correction, or retuning. We encounter this in the Gavotte from the Classical
Symphony, where—as if through the intervention of a gentle teacher—a phrase enthusiastically pointing to C♯ major is guided toward the real home key of D major (see the score excerpt in Chapter 2, p. 55). The commonplace formula for speaking of events such as this phrase’s momentary inclination toward C♯ major is that they represent ironic, witty departures from an otherwise very classical style; to paraphrase Jonathan Kramer (1988): if we could remove them, something truly classical might lie underneath (518). Examples like “Der Schulmeister” remind us that certain kinds of upward chromatic displacement are part and parcel of the historical classical style. My bigger point, though, is that in Prokofiev’s classical line, one finds much more than an old style uprooted from its historical context and supplemented with quirky asides and ironic intrusions. Prokofiev’s neoclassical style extends certain strands of historical galant and classical style. As I said in Chapter 2, the con eleganza performance indication invoked so frequently by Prokofiev can be considered partly but never exclusively in an ironic light. It often feels more accurate to say that a sense of elegance arises partly due to an upward chromatic displacement than in spite of it.

Many cases of upward chromatic displacement in Prokofiev’s music are at points of thematic return, where the move is usually from minor to minor or from major to major in contrast to such typical historical examples as “Der Schulmeister” (from minor to major) and “Pesn’ Margarity” (from major to minor). More generally, a gradual ascent through keys or prospective keys characterizes many approaches to returning main themes. As we have seen, the B section in Joke, Op. 3, No. 2 concludes with a i-iv oscillation in B minor brought to an end when iv in B minor is reinterpreted as iii in C major.12 The development in the first movement of the Classical Symphony, somewhat similarly, ends with a move from V in B to V in C, and an ascent from C major to D major (the real home key) becomes the first tonal task of the recapitulation. Later in this section, I examine a more complex example of climbing back to the tonic in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84.

I divide the works analyzed in this Section into four groups. First are examples featuring literal upward chromatic progressions (I→i): the third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis; Lullaby, Op. 76, No. 6; March, Op. 12, No. 1; and the finale of Divertimento, Op. 43bis. Second, I discuss abstract upward chromatic displacement in some dominant- or tonic-key authentic cadences in Peter and the Wolf, Op. 67, the first movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, and Tale, Op. 3, No. 1. Third, I look at a few works in which certain sectional boundaries

---

12 Refer to Chapter 3 (pp. 107-10) for related examples of sequences leading to the “brink” of a harmonic goal.

Fourth, I consider some works in which expressive overburdening is more pronounced—environments of continuous downward pressure that seem to necessitate a powerful intervention: Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 12; the second movement of Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80; and the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84.

The *Andante* third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis and Lullaby from *Songs of Our Days*, Op. 76, No. 6 are overtly similar as soft, peaceful major-mode pieces that include a prominent I-iii motion, but they contrast with one another in regards to the treatment of the chromatic relation. Regarding the *Andante* (already encountered in Chapters 2 and 4), a brief sketch will suffice as a reminder. In this F-major movement, a (pre-dominant) ii7 chord becomes reinterpreted in the A section as a (dominant) “vii7” chord in F♯ minor. In the B section, Gm7 reappears only to be reinterpreted as a (subdominant) “vi7” chord in B minor. Beginning in G, major and thus recalling the central ii event of the opening, the A’ section provides a satisfying sense of closure by allowing Gm7 to resolve as a conventional ii7 pre-dominant in F. (Leading to the concluding F:PAC, the subtle suggestion of a home-key “vi7” augmented sixth is another balancing touch.) As for a secondary meaning in the ii chord in m. 8, the A section provides an exceptionally uncomfortable one: it is viiv in C, resolving to V through a 5-6 shift. As if purporting to solve the crucial tonal problem by means of a C:PAC, the A section is imbued with a deep sense of irony.

A very different treatment of ii can be heard in the G-major Lullaby, Op. 76, No. 6 (1937). As we have seen, it is conventional for I to take on a secondary or new meaning as a submediant of the mediant; the Lullaby features ii in this guise. *Example 5.11* shows a piano reduction of the A section. As the contrasting idea visits the key of ii (G♯ minor), iii in G becomes reinterpreted as iii in g♯. In the third four-measure phrase, Prokofiev returns to the G tonic by the same route—through B minor (m. 15). Nothing prepares us for F♯ minor in Op. 94bis/III, but in m. 6 of the Lullaby, a common-tone German sixth foreshadows G♯ minor (given the chord’s enharmonic equivalence to V7/i). A mediant shared by chromatically related forms of tonic harmony prevents a direct chromatic relation (G♯ minor justifies itself as vi of iii); yet

---

13 The Lullaby is among the examples of monotertian relations listed by Tiftikidi (1970, 30).
the prompt return of the true tonic (iii yields to I without demanding a iii:PAC) keeps the relationship between the tonic and its other form (or, in view of the text, between peaceful comfort and what lurks in the recent past or just outside) central to the song. Whereas Op. 94bis/III presents \( \text{vi} \) as a tonal problem to be solved through later events, the Lullaby both foreshadows and deals immediately with its \( \text{vi} \) (as it were embracing it protectively—like the baby).

As discussed in Chapter 4, while it is a conventional option in the \textit{peremennost’} tradition to characterize a theme with i7 harmony, Prokofiev’s preference is for I7 harmony, resulting in a semitone rather than whole-tone relationship between I and the harmony Johnston terms a \textit{peremennost’}-derived substitute (V/iii or VII as a dual-purpose dominant). More conducive to upward chromatic displacement is the inversion of this procedure: a \textit{peremennost’} relationship involving \( i^{\text{add6}} \) and VI7. Perhaps the clearest example is the F-minor March, Op. 12, No. 1, the main theme of which I touched on in Chapter 4 (pp. 129-30). At the climax of this work, the bass
in m. 80 includes both A\textsubscript{♭} (the dominant base in D\textsubscript{♭} major) and C (the dominant base in F minor), and the F-minor D-T resolution produces a D\textsubscript{♭}M7 chord (m. 81) in which the thunderous power of D\textsubscript{♭} belies its status as 6 in the home key of F minor.\textsuperscript{14} Even at the outset of the piece, the strength of 6 predicts chromatic displacement upward (in the same way that 4 often predicts chromatic displacement downward). Prokofiev employs upward chromatic displacement as part of a strategy of withholding the F-minor tonic from the interior sections of the rondo form. The B section, shown in example 5.12, presents a remarkably unstable standing on the dominant: instead of root position, the dominant is in first inversion, and embellishing it is a VI6 chord that apparently outweighs it by occupying a lower register. Soon, VI6 becomes reinterpreted as V6 in F\textsubscript{♭}=G\textsubscript{♭} minor (the key of \textsubscript{♭}ii). As a chromatic descent in the bass produces an outer-voice augmented sixth, the passage culminates with a resolution to DM7 (m. 25), a VI7 chord that softens the F\textsubscript{♭}-minor entrance of the A’ section. The context of F\textsubscript{♭} minor as a replacement for F minor imbues the IV9 chord (m. 31) within the returning main theme with special poignancy (example 5.13). While serving as a pre-dominant built on 4, its enharmonic equivalence to V9 of F allows it to act as a reminder of that key. The return of F minor, however, is not immediate: in m. 32, F\textsubscript{♭} minor becomes reinterpreted as iv in the key of F minor’s peremennost’ partner D\textsubscript{♭} major. In an obvious way, F\textsubscript{♭} minor does substitute for F minor in the A’ and A’’ sections of this rondo-form march, but by going into the \#i key via D (5 in F minor equals 6 in F\textsubscript{♭} minor) and leaving it via D\textsubscript{♭} (5 in F\textsubscript{♭} minor equals 6 in F minor), Prokofiev effectively renders the

\textsuperscript{14} See Zimmerman (2002, 103) on the significance of m. 80 as the “apotheosis of Acousticism” in the work (an interpretation for which the bass A\textsubscript{♭} in m. 80 is critical).
relationship less mechanical.\textsuperscript{15}

The refrain of the C-major finale of Divertimento, Op. 43bis, is another work that features a literal I-\(\text{ii}\) motion. The movement as a whole is characterized by an irresistible upward thrust and a tonal environment in which a variety of minor- and major-second-related roots compete for attention. \textbf{Example 5.14} shows a reduction of the A section and the beginning of the B section, excluding the opening pickup measure (mm. 2-17). In the first hypermeasure, a striking chromatic neighbour motion surrounds the tonic. Supporting the tonic and dominant

\begin{example}
\end{example}

versions of the basic idea respectively are I-\(\text{ii}\) and \(\text{\sharp VII}-\text{I}\) ascents (mm. 2-3 and 4-5). The second hypermeasure presents a modified repeat of this phrase ending with a \(\text{\sharp ii6}-\text{V7}\) progression in D. In spite of the chordal seventh of A7 in m. 9, the harmony’s position in the phrase permits it to suggest a D:HC. Insomuch as it represents a resolution of the A7 chord, C\(\sharp\) minor in m. 10 (launching the B section) may sound locally like a downward chromatic displacement of D while

\textsuperscript{15} Regarding the term mechanical, I have in mind the usage by Ernst Kurth as quoted and translated by McCreless (1996, 91).
completing an enlargement of the I-\textit{ii}\textendash\textit{vi} progression with which the work began. In contrast, the A’ section (shown in reduction in example 5.15) realizes the potential for a D tonic on hyperdownbeat 3 (m. 50). The A\textsubscript{b} (i\textsuperscript{iv}) neighbour chord in mm. 50-53 is a clever touch: an A\textsubscript{b} chord would, after all, be the conventional V of D\textsubscript{b}/C\textsubscript{b}, the key by which D now refuses to be displaced. Tonally balancing this refrain is the final refrain (not shown), which Prokofiev transposes to B\textsubscript{b} major—the supertonic of which is, of course, the parallel minor of the home key.\textsuperscript{16} The final refrain accordingly climbs to a C:HC (with C\textsuperscript{##}=D\textsubscript{b} minor serving as predominant) and concludes with a C-minor codetta (whimsically corrected, eventually, to major).

In this irrepressibly buoyant work, an upward tendency unequivocally wins out against the downward one associated with the start of the B section (m. 10).

The preceding examples in this section have all featured literal I-\textit{ii}\textendash\textit{vi} motions. I turn now to abstract upward chromatic displacement—cases in which a key or harmony substitutes for one lying a semitone lower. In general, I emphasize again, it will not be fully explainable as a substitute, and there will often be many reasons against calling the theoretically replaced key or harmony a thing that could truly or reasonably have been expected. The first two examples, involving dominant goals that can be thought of abstractly as products of upward chromatic displacement, are cases in point. In Peter and the Wolf, Op. 67, the main character’s theme (example 5.16) begins innocuously in C major and—after a bold harmonic journey—ends safely

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\begin{musicstaff}
\begin{musicnote}
\chord{C: i ii bVII i} \chord{D: \text{c#} i i6 \text{G6} V7 i} \chord{iv7 \text{Bb: vi7}}
\end{musicnote}
\end{musicstaff}
\end{music}
\end{example}

\textsuperscript{16}This “I-\textit{ii}; \, i\textsuperscript{vii}-i” tonal plan loosely recalls the opening harmonic progression. Prokofiev deploys a similar scheme between the A and A’ sections in the fourth movement of Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55.
in the key of the dominant.\(^{17}\) If mm. 6-9 were to present a pure T3 sequence of mm. 2-5, then the excerpt would conclude on F\(^\#\)-major harmony (i.e. F\(^\#\):PC or B:HC, if regarded as a cadence). In a sense, a successful outcome—the achievement of the dominant goal G, a I-\(\flat\)III-\(\flat\)V arpeggiation, and as a corollary the change of resolution to authentic—can be said to depend on an upward chromatic displacement from that projected F\(^\#\) harmony. In m. 8, substituting for \(\flat\)VI (C\(^\#\) major) is \(\flat\)vi (C\(^\#\)=B minor) (the hexatonic pole of E\(^\flat\)M, a chord unique in the theme for its minor quality); reinterpreted as iii in G rather than as iv in F\(^\#\), it leads gently to a G tonic via a passing V4/3. As Robinson suggests, the moral of the story, if there is one, seems to be that the young must find their own way, must be resourceful and courageous even if it means disobeying their elders (1987, 322). Deviating from the sequential route by means of upward chromatic displacement to “find” the dominant, the consequent relates to the antecedent in a manner that portrays pioneer Peter’s character.

The dominant goal in the middle of the secondary theme of the first movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, can be described in similar terms.\(^{18}\) In mm. 22-25, the move to G\(^\#\) minor implies a reinterpretation of the tonic of A major as \(\flat\)II. Beginning with a transposition up

\(^{17}\) This paraphrases a comment made by Zaporozhets regarding the codetta of the theme (mm. 18-21). That phrase, she remarks, suggests the essence of the whole fairy tale: “the carefree beginning (C major), the ‘awful’ adventure (C\(^\#\) minor), and the safe happy end (C major)” (1962, 237). For a Tonnetz analysis of Peter’s theme, see Cohn (2012, 53-55).

\(^{18}\) For a score and preliminary discussion of this theme, see Chapter 2, pp. 52-55.
by perfect fifth of the basic idea, the next phrase provisionally restores order by retrospectively reinterpreting that vii key (G♭ minor) as iii in the key of V (E major). Like the T3 prospect in the Op. 67 example, a T7 sequence of those first four measures would bring us a tritone from our starting point by m. 29. As illustrated in Chapter 2 (pp. 53-54), a number of other modulations can certainly be imagined; yet the context of the dominant goal (mm. 28-29) is abstractly similar to that in Peter’s theme.19

In the main theme of the C-major Tale, Op. 3, No. 1, an abstract upward chromatic displacement provides a context for an authentic cadence not in the key of V but in the home key. This piano miniature features two alternating sections: A (m. 1), B (m. 4), A’ (m. 12), B’ (m. 18), A” (m. 26). Examples 5.17 and 5.18 show the B and B’ sections respectively.

Beginning on supertonic harmony, the B section presents an eight-measure period in C major. In the harmonically more elaborate B’ section, e♭:HC replaces C:HC in m. 21, leading to a consequent that begins as a T1 reiteration of the antecedent (starting in m. 22 on ii in D♭ major). In the course of the phrase, Prokofiev breaks the sequence by very subtle means: in m. 24, the bass descends chromatically not from A but from B♭ (as T2 rather than T1 of m. 20). Accordingly, m. 24 takes shape as a home-key i–vii–V unfolding, and the phrase concludes on C

---

19 For another example of an upward chromatic displacement that ensures a dominant ending in a main theme, see the E-minor Scherzo, Op. 52, No. 6. Compare the local treatment of B♭M in m. 5 (as VI♯ of D♭ major) to that of G♯M in m. 15 (as ♯VI of B♭ major). A cadence on the minor dominant (B minor) brings the main theme to a close at m. 19.
harmony rather than B harmony—or, to be more precise, with a C:¹A instead of an e:²C.²⁰ As a whole, the consequent in the B’ section features a relaxing tonal descent to the C tonic in m. 25 from an apex on ii in the key of bII (m. 22). Meanwhile, the context of the C tonic as a replacement of a projected B harmony contributes to the sense of overall balance.

²⁰ For a similar procedure without chromatic displacement, consider the ending of Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 3 (discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 106-07), where an authentic resolution in E minor (m. 45) may be regarded as replacing a sequentially projected half cadence on E harmony (avoided at m. 39).
In Rigaudon, Op. 12, No. 3, an amply foreshadowed upward chromatic displacement characterizes a thematic and tonal return. **Example 5.19** shows the C section and the beginning of the A'' section of this C-major work. The C section opens with a four-measure model (mm. 29-32) that features an intriguing modulation. Considering the minor ninth in the V9 chord in mm. 29-30, the local key is B minor; thus, the G♯-minor harmony to which this dominant deceptively resolves is likely to be heard not simply as a tonic substitute (♯vi for i) but also as a monotertian substitute (♯vi for VI). In m. 32, a passing chord between G♭m and Em implies a similar local chromatic displacement upward: if this whole-tone sonority is heard as an applied dominant with raised fifth, then Em presents itself as a monotertian substitute for E♭M. These harmonic peculiarities foreshadow the tonal trajectory. Having initiated an ascending-major-third sequence in mm. 35-36, Prokofiev departs from the model by means of an upward chromatic displacement: ♯vi in E♭ minor (m. 35) becomes not iii of A♭ major as expected but rather iii, of A
minor, leading in m. 36 to an A rather than A♭ tonic. While the chromatic “decision” here is between competing forms of a surface-level tonic (A versus A♭), the overall key of C (reinforced by the C-minor presence at m. 35) contextualizes these options as contrasting forms of submediant harmony.

At m. 37, the C section reverts to its harmonic starting point: V9 in B minor. As in the first presentation of the material (the recomposed version of the compound basic idea, mm. 9-12, not shown), there is ambiguity as to whether F♯ or C is the true root. The home key, nonetheless, is within reach: acting as #IV9 in C major, the apparent polychord resolves indirectly to the home-key dominant in mm. 43-44 through a string of parallel triads that form a surface-level descending-minor-third sequence. The long-awaited leading tone of the V chord on beat 4 of m. 44 carries a sort of exclamation mark as a disruption of this sequence: the sequentially expected harmony would be Gm, not GM. In sum, Prokofiev stages the returning C major as a joyful alternative to B minor (even if one does not seriously expect that key to materialize), and forewarns the listener of this upward chromatic displacement by means of several earlier ones: the local substitutions of G♭m for GM (m. 31) and Em for E♭M (m. 32), the surprising Am rather than A♭m outcome of the ascending-major-third sequence (m. 36), and the local substitution of B for B♭ (or GM for Gm) at the end of the downward-minor-third sequence (m. 44).

In Section I, I pointed out one of Prokofiev’s adaptations of the conventional technique of reinterpreting a pre-dominant as a dominant in a key a semitone higher: ii7 becomes “♯ii7,” a dominant-function [0358] augmented-sixth chord. Prokofiev adopts this strategy in the C-major Pastoral Sonatina, Op. 59, No. 3 in the approach to the secondary theme. Example 5.20 shows the score of mm. 40-52, where the transition modulates to the key of the secondary theme (B♭ major). At first, it might seem reasonable to assume that the Bm7 chord of m. 44 will serve as ii7 in A major. However, Prokofiev creates a standstill on this chord, giving the listener ample time to clue in to its change to dominant status. The transition thus leads not to A major but to B♭ major (m. 52). As if compensating for the failure of A to materialize as a tonic, the consequent phrase (not shown) begins in A minor (m. 58) and concludes with a Phrygian cadence on AM (m. 63). At the end of the secondary theme, the rule of balance comes into effect: standing in

Prior to its sequential treatment, the material appears (with upward chromatic displacement intact) in a passage involving simple repetition (mm. 17-24). In mm. 17-20, Prokofiev presents an A♭-minor i-vi♭-III-i progression; in mm. 21-24, the passage repeats, only to substitute #vi (Fm) for the expected vi♭ (F♭=Em) and to reinterpret that chord as vi♭ of A minor, thus leading toward an A-minor tonic.
opposition to the B♭-A tonal motion of mm. 52-63 is a B= C♭-B♭ tonal motion in mm. 70-88 (a B-major restatement of the secondary theme leading to a B♭-major closing theme).

In the E-major second movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82, upward chromatic displacements characterize refrain entrances. The harmony in the C-major theme in mm. 30-36 (shown in example 5.21) can be heard as foreshadowing the uplifting techniques to be employed later. The Gavotte from the Classical Symphony, it will be remembered, includes an “attempt” at downward chromatic displacement in the last phrase of its A section; reversing the tonal direction of that procedure, this theme feigns an upward chromatic displacement to C♭-minor only to restore the key of C major. In retrospect, one recognizes the ephemeral C♭-minor material of m. 35 as an inflection of the supertonic (♭ii).
Example 5.22 shows the approach to the refrain at m. 79. The C-minor harmony in m. 71, which figures as the culmination of a descent in thirds (D-B♭-G-E-C, mm. 57-71), resolves to an F-minor seventh chord in m. 73. A likely interpretation of the progression is as vi-ii7 in E♭ major. However, the F-minor seventh chord—like the B-minor seventh chord in the excerpt from Pastoral Sonatina, Op. 59, No. 3—serves instead as a dominant-function augmented-sixth chord and resolves directly (after a standstill) to the E-major tonic that supports the thematic return (m. 79). This unusual dominant meets the special needs of the main theme. Containing E♭ (A♭=G♯), it allows for an upward chromatic resolution to the added fourth (A) that colours the opening tonic of the main theme. (In the initial presentation of the main theme, Prokofiev eliminates this dissonance in the contrasting idea [mm. 4-8]; shifting the characteristic opening chord to beat 2 of m. 4, the contrasting idea makes room for a proper tonic triad on the downbeat and thus clarifies the passing-tone status of A.)

Example 5.22: Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82, ii, mm. 71-79

In the approach to the last refrain, Prokofiev creates a still more palpable sense of E major replacing E♭ major. Example 5.23 shows the last four measures of the C section and the first of the A’” section. In m. 128, a seventh (A♭) appears above a B♭ tonic pedal, turning the chord into a V7 of E♭. As it joins the chord, E♭ ostensibly initiates a 4-3 appoggiatura in m. 129. Refusing to resolve downward, E♭ implicitly becomes D♯, the dominant agent of the home key. In conjunction with the discharge of the dominant agent, a stepwise chromatic descent in the bass produces an augmented-sixth resolution to E in m. 131. This dominant (literally a [0257]
augmented-sixth chord, m. 130, beat 4) resolves with pure chromatic motion to the idiosyncratic tonic (literally a [027] chord). Adding to the impression of this dominant’s appropriateness, Prokofiev modifies the right-hand chords of the returning main theme to suggest a three-voice parallel ascent from the A-B-E trichord of mm. 129-30. The upward chromatic displacement at this sectional boundary contributes to the effect of pleasant surprise at the moment of thematic return. Converting a standard V of E into a special V of E, Prokofiev leads to the pianissimo refrain as it were through a secret door.  

The A-minor scherzo of Op. 94bis is another work in which upward chromatic displacement adds to the buoyancy of a major-mode theme at its point of entrance. In this case, however, it is the B theme that is so characterized. Example 5.24 shows a reduction of mm. 69-106 of Op. 94bis/II, an excerpt that includes the beginning of the B section (m. 83). In mm. 58-74, the A section comes to a harmonic standstill on a D-minor tonic embellished by an unusual neighbour chord (Cø7 or E₄m₃⁶). In m. 75, a breakthrough occurs as this chord resolves as a conventional viiø4/3 of D₃. In m. 81, a new viiø4/3 seems to promise an A₃-major tonic. Instead, it resolves to an A-major tonic, recalling the harmonic relationship between Dm and its neighbour chord. Like the A-minor key in the secondary theme of Pastoral Sonatina, Op. 59, No. 3, the A₃-major key here does not remain suppressed for long. In mm. 93-102, G-major harmony points toward C major but resolves deceptively to A₃ major (m. 103)—the key that “should” have appeared at m. 83.

22 The B₃-E relationship might also subtly underscore the fact that E is the dominant in the sonata as a whole; see the remark in Chapter 1 (p. 4) concerning the end of this movement.
Leading to a coda based on both the main and the secondary themes, Prokofiev expands the material from mm. 75-82 to contextualize the tonic in m. 348 as a still more dramatic upward chromatic displacement. **Example 5.25** presents a reduction of mm. 336-51. Beginning on G♭-major harmony in m. 340, an ascending-fifth sequence gets underway: G♭M-(Cø7)-D♭M-(Gø7). The opening harmony of the coda disrupts this 7-cycle: A major substitutes for A♭ major at m. 348, as at m. 83. As in some examples from Chapter 3, the tonal returns at mm. 83 and 348 seem to occur too rapidly (or certain ostinato elements preceding them yield too slowly) for home-key dominant function to assert itself fully. On the last beat of a hypermeasure, the melody just manages to fall from F to E, furnishing an anacrustic 5. The B theme itself seems to comment on
this unusual approach: as if in response to the (implied) G-B♭-D♭-E diminished-seventh of m. 82, the A-major theme pays a visit to the two other diminished-seventh chord possibilities: a common-tone diminished seventh (mm. 85-86) and the proper vii°7 (implied above a tonic pedal in m. 89).

As a final pair of examples in this subsection, let us consider the secondary themes of Piano Concertos No. 2, Op. 16, and No. 3, Op. 26. These themes are similar not only in their key (A minor) and in their inclusion of vamp introductions, but also in their peculiar mixture of intense strength and elegant restraint—characteristics related to their employment of upward chromatic displacement. The first movement of Piano Concerto No. 2, Op. 16, can also be compared in an obvious way to a work that I will discuss in the next section—the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14: both are minor-mode works in which the secondary theme is not in the traditional key of III but rather in the key of ii. A listener familiar with the earlier work—in which, I will argue, the secondary theme can be heard as ending with a sadly unsuccessful attempt at a III:PAC—might expect something similar in the later one. Remarkably, however, Prokofiev contextualizes the A-minor key of the con eleganza secondary theme of Op. 16/I not as a low substitute for B♭ major but as a high substitute for A♭ major.

**Example 5.26** shows the last two measures of the transition and the first thirteen of the secondary theme of Op. 16/I (mm. 43-57). Within the sequence in mm. 43-44, each pair of chords in the right hand generates an octatonic collection. Prokofiev transposes each pair of chords by T2 within mm. 43-44 and uses T1 to mark the downbeat of m. 44. According to this sequential plan, the expected downbeat harmony in m. 45 would be A♭7. In the second half of m. 44, Prokofiev modifies the bass line in such a way as to promise not just an A♭ root but an A♭:PAC. Instead of A♭ major, however, comes A minor in m. 45. Retrospectively, the last chord in m. 44 can be interpreted in A minor either as V9 or—considering the continuous chromatic ascent in the melody—as a dominant-function “ii♭7” augmented-sixth chord over a b♭ bass.

In the continuation phrase (mm. 53-57) of the A-minor secondary theme, Prokofiev employs a bass ostinato similar to that in the main theme of Dance, Op. 32, No. 1 (discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 149-51). Suggesting a bass 5 6 5 neighbour motion in A♭ minor, the phrase seems to drive toward a PAC in the key that “should” have arrived at m. 45. In the upper voices, an inexact downward sequence contributes to the impression of a dominant prolongation in A♭ minor: over an E♭ bass, 6/4 (m. 54) yields to 5/3 (m. 56), and to this a seventh (D♭) is added (beat 4 of m. 56). In m. 57, however, E♭7 resolves octatonically, bringing back the A-minor tonic.
Perhaps emblematic of the theme is the discrepancy between the position of A minor as an upward displacement locally (replacing A\textsubscript{♯} major or minor in mm. 45 and 57) and a downward displacement more broadly (if B\textsubscript{♭} major is the theme’s expected key). This con eleganza theme is indeed elegant, with its staccato accompaniment, sparse texture, attractive melodic angularity, and slurs to strong beats. At the same time, there is a sense of proud strength that manifests itself in various ways—one of which is a steadfast resistance to a tendency downward (toward A\textsubscript{♭}).

The secondary theme of the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 3 in C Major, Op. 26, provides a similar local context for the key of A minor. Example 5.27 shows a score of mm. 56-83, an excerpt that includes the immediate approach (mm. 56-60), the introduction (mm. 61-68), and the sentential antecedent with which the secondary theme proper begins (mm. 69-76). (To save space, the orchestral part is shown only where it assumes leadership, i.e. in mm. 69-76.) In
m. 54 (not shown), an E₃ harmony arrives; as in m. 56, a G chord appears above it, but as B falls to B₃ in mm. 54–55, it seems clear that the harmony is V/A₃. In mm. 56-57, a surface-level sequence consisting of major triads takes place above the E₃ pedal: G-A-D-E. Instead of proceeding to an A-major chord in m. 58, the upper voices reaffirm E₃ harmony. Finally, with seventh and flattened fifth added, the E₃ chord resolves—but to A minor rather than A₃ major (m. 61). Compensating for the lack of an A-minor dominant agent within the penultimate harmony, a G♯ grace note decorates the melodic A in m. 61.

The apparent preparation for an A₃/G♯ rather than A tonic has ramifications within the theme. The introduction itself betrays a downward chromatic inclination (mm. 61-68). In the
basic idea (mm. 69-70), a G♭-minor melodic arpeggiation contributes to the lower neighbour decoration of the tonic triad, and in m. 70, G♭ even gets its own lower neighbour decoration (the harmony in that measure could, in isolation, be labeled as D-T in G♭ minor). At the start of the continuation, the move to B♭ suggests a striving for balance: if the basic idea were subjected to T1, then it would enclose A-minor harmony just as the original basic idea encloses G♭-minor harmony. Yet the potential interpretation of the harmony in mm. 73-74 as viiø6/5 in A♭ is also significant, given the apparent preparation for that key before the thematic entrance. Assuming dominant function in B♭ minor, the “vi7” chord in m. 75 effectively signals a half cadence. In the consequent (not shown), the continuation (mm. 81-84) begins with the same pitch-class material as in m. 75 but leads to the A-minor tonic by means of a vi-vi♭5-i plagal progression. The avoidance of the dominant base E is characteristic of this theme.

The final three examples in this section involve very pronounced states of overburdening that seem to turn upward chromatic displacement into a tonal, formal, and dramatic necessity. From a certain perspective, Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 12 (example 5.28) is an essay in bitonality. Jarring with the A-minor tonic established by the left hand in the three-measure introduction, the right hand seems to enter in the key of G♭ minor with a presentation phrase that spans mm. 4-7. In mm. 8-11, a continuation phrase leads to an E♭7 chord. At a deeper level, this E♭7 chord assumes passing function within a bass fifth-progression (5-4-3-2-1) that supports a v-i motion (mm. 8-12). Measure 12 provides the resolutions of both a surface-level dominant of G♭/A♭ and a deeper-level dominant of A minor. (We have here an apparent reversal of the conventional hierarchy: if m. 11 presents an A♭:HC, that would be the deeper-level event; yet an appreciation of B♭ as the main bass tone in m. 11 and of the E♭ chord as subordinate to the earlier E harmony negates that cadence retroactively.) Preparing the pitch-class contents of the returning main theme, the B section (mm. 16-19) features an upper-voice D♭ against upward chromatic lines in the inner voices. Ashley claims that the bass D is a tone that is, from a harmonic point of view, “completely extraneous” (1963, 124-25). Considered, however, as the root of a dominant ninth chord, the bass D allows the listener to entertain the possibility of a tonic even lower than A or A♭/G♭, namely G. While it is reasonable to consider the D harmony of the B section as a subdominant (of A), its potential dominant status (of G) is more pertinent: pointing to G, it yields to a right-hand pickup that looks toward G♭; finally, as A enters, one can visualize a traveller resuming a wearisome journey while adjusting an almost slipping, almost unmanageable burden. As in Schubert’s “Der Atlas,” no remission from the burden occurs at the end of the piece; what

Весьма умеренно [Assai moderato]

\[ \text{Sheet music image} \]
Prokofiev offers is a glimpse—indeed, a fugitive vision—of a musical persona in the unfortunate state (or under the eternal sentence) of carrying an almost overwhelming load.

The Allegro brusco second movement of Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80 is a work in which the victory over an almost devastating downward pressure contributes to the sense of tremendous power. Example 5.29 shows the score of mm. 1-34 of this C-major movement. Woodley (1995) describes a “Manichean-dualist struggle” encapsulated in the opening conflict between flatward and sharpward elements; in particular, the flattened leading tone, \( \sqrt{7} \), arduously lifted in mm. 4-7 through \( \hat{7} \) to \( \hat{8} \), will have far-reaching motivic and narrative ramifications (183). Following the initial statement of the main theme, a \( \flat \)II-key restatement (m. 14) comes to an impasse at its own \( \sqrt{7} \) (C\#, m. 18), which—obstinately repeated and eventually combined with F—successfully transforms itself into \( \hat{7} \) in C major. Yet the tonic does not immediately return: first, F\# and A\# combine with E to form V7 of B (mm. 27-29)—as if attempting to push still further downward. This harmonic context enhances the impression of great strength in the returning C-major main theme (m. 30), which holds the line at C in spite of downward pressure. The V7 of B prior to the returning main theme necessitates an upward chromatic displacement while calling attention to

Example 5.29: Violin Sonata No. 1, Op. 80, II, mm. 1-34. Copyright 1985 by Belwin Music. All rights reserved. Used by permission of Alfred Music.
the $f$ within the main theme. To succeed where its $D$-major version failed, the returning C-major theme must staunchly rebuff the demand by $f$ for reinterpretation as $g$.

It might seem strange to turn now to the “tender and dreamlike”\(^{23}\) first movement of Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84. But overburdening is an issue here too, and an upward chromatic displacement at the point of recapitulation contributes to the sense of quiet heroism in the piece. Example 5.30 shows the opening period (mm. 1-9). As Kholopov points out, the theme covers a vast tonal distance in a short time: within the opening five-measure antecedent, the $B$-major theme visits the tritone pole $E$ major in m. 3 before making its way to a conventional half cadence (1967a, 298). At the same time, as Malcolm Brown observes, the harmony can be heard in terms of departures from a diatonic prototype: thus, e.g., $G$ minor replaces $G$ minor in m. 3, intensifying the emotional impact of the melodic apex of the antecedent (1964, 11). At that high point in m. 3, Salzer’s graph shows $E$ acting as upper neighbour of $E_b$, which is itself a neighbour of the Kopfton $D$ (1962, 205, 208).


\(^{23}\) Conceiving Piano Sonatas Nos. 6, 7, and 8 in the fall of 1939, Prokofiev informed Mira that the first two would be “restless and stormlike” and the last “tender and dreamlike” (Morrison 2009, 162; for the original, see Mendel'son-Prokof'eva 1991, 247).
For the purposes of the present discussion, I focus on what can be regarded as a hidden A-minor aspect of this B♭-major theme. As indicated below the score in example 5.30, two G♯⁵-⁶-A⁵-⁶ ascents appear within the theme. The first is confined to the surface, occurring above the B♭ tonic pedal in the basic idea. The second controls the harmony in the contrasting idea, generating the F chord with which the antecedent concludes and leading to the B♭ tonic with which the consequent begins (B♭ would be the third 5-phase harmony after G♯ and A). If one were to isolate the opening melody of the theme, an A-minor harmonization would be plausible: in m. 1, ⁴ (E♭) would become ⁴ (D♯), which would—unlike the actual ⁴ (E) of beat 4—resolve upward directly. The most significant repercussions of the theme’s hidden A-minor aspect are in the development, which—paying tribute to the vii-key elements within the theme—ends on E⁷ harmony (Ⅳ/V or VII/vii).

**Example 5.31** shows the first twelve measures of the G-minor secondary theme (mm. 61-72). Several features of the secondary theme recall the main theme. In their use of a D Kopfson
and in their harmonic outlines and basic periodic structure (i-V; i-V-i), the two themes are similar. They also share an emphasis on $\hat{4}$ in their respective keys, and the original $\hat{4}$ of B major (E) retains considerable weight as $\hat{6}$ in the G-minor theme. Another point of comparison is particularly relevant to the topic of this chapter. In example 5.31, I have marked in brackets a melodic augmented second in m. 61, C$\hat{2}$-B$\hat{b}$ ($\hat{4}$-$\hat{3}$). This feature relates to the main theme’s hidden vii-key aspect. If the melody of the main theme were isolated and thought of in A minor, then its second and third notes (C-E=D$\hat{2}$) would, like those of the secondary theme melody, represent a minor-mode $\hat{3}$-$\hat{4}$ motion.

In the development, Prokofiev brings to the fore this hidden chromatic relationship between the main and secondary themes. Example 5.32 shows a reduction of a central portion of the development (mm. 141-72). As indicated by the brackets in the example, mm. 141-48 constitute a model that is sequenced by tritone in m. 149. Interrupting the second hypermeasure of this sequence is a quotation of the main theme (m. 155). Judging from the melody alone, it is
an A♭-major transposition of the main theme. Exploiting what I call its vii-key aspect, Prokofiev harmonizes it in G minor. Reinforcing this implicit downward chromatic displacement (G replacing A♭) is the role of G-minor harmony as a disruption of the sequence: had the sequence in mm. 149ff proceeded normally, its fifth hyperdownbeat would have yielded G♭ harmony (bringing the sequence full circle and replicating m. 141).

Incorporating the main-theme quotation in mm. 155-58 into a new, longer model (mm. 149-58), the development proceeds by sequencing this material up by major third (mm. 159-68). Accordingly, the sequentially expected harmony in m. 169 is B♭ major. Interpreting the harmony in m. 168 as a V7 chord rather than as a German sixth, the passage leads instead to a powerful E-major tonic that supports a fortissimo recomposition of the secondary theme. Essentially, E harmony governs the remainder of the development, eventually assuming dominant status (mm. 169-206). **Example 5.33** shows the last ten measures of the development and the first measure of the recapitulation (mm. 196-206). As indicated by the Roman numeral analysis, the passage can be heard as suggesting dominant function in a gradually ascending series of surface keys (F♯ minor, G major, A minor); finally, a second-inversion dominant seventh of A acts as a thematically appropriate dominant of a still higher key: B♭ major.

---

**Example 5.33**: Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84, I, mm. 196-206. Reprinted by permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
From the perspective of tonal design, it is instructive to compare the approach to the recapitulation in this movement to the approach to the secondary theme in the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26. As discussed above, that excerpt involves a two-step harmonic process. In m. 58, a local tritone substitution takes place (E♭ replaces A), and in m. 61, the goal tonic asserts itself by means of an upward semitone substitution (A replaces A♭). Analogously, in Op. 84/I, E replaces B♭ near the end of the development (m. 169), delaying the tonal return while establishing a powerful V/♭vii harmony; at the point of recapitulation (m. 206), B♭ replaces A.

Regarding the sonata example, it is worth emphasizing that an F chord—an ordinary dominant of B♭—does not even have a surface appearance in the development. The harmony in mm. 165-68 is a B chord which one expects will be reinterpreted as an F chord (i.e. as a predominant augmented-sixth chord in E♭) but which surprisingly does not do so; thenceforth, E harmony supports the retransition.

IV. Downward chromatic displacement

Many cases of downward chromatic motion involve the restoration of a previously established tonic and can be described as relaxing, tranquil events. Especially in minor-mode double returns, a downward chromatic displacement can have a melancholy and, in a sense, disappointing effect: despite the comforting sense of return, the tonic, contextualized as a tonal goal that seems too low, may curtail a potentially rewarding tonal journey or prevent a joyful alternative (a ♭II key) from coming to fruition. The first example in this section, from the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, involves not so much a downward chromatic displacement as a successfully overcome temptation to modulate up to a local ♭II key. Next, I discuss a couple of works featuring the commonplace phenomenon of purely localized downward chromatic displacements that create unusual contexts for dominant harmonies: Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 4; and Romeo and Juliet, Op. 64, No. 41 (“Juliet refuses to marry Paris”). Finally, I consider four pieces involving a downward semitonal “slant” that introduces a new key or contributes to a contest or dialogue between two keys: “Farewell before parting” from Romeo and Juliet, Op. 64, No. 39; Lily Dance from Romeo and Juliet, Op. 75, No. 9 (briefly recalled from Chapter 2); the A section of March, Op. 33ter; and the last movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82.
The exposition of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, ends with an expressive abnegation of a cadence in a local bII key. As mentioned above, this movement employs an unusual key relationship: while the main theme is in D minor, the secondary theme is in E minor. The latter is vigorously prophesied by V7 of E within the main theme (mm. 8 and 16-20). (This harmony acts as a sort of stumbling block on the way down to the home-key dominant, which is reached successfully—if only momentarily—at m. 28.) Further, as Kholopov (1967a) observes, the quality of plagality (plagalnost’) associated with E minor in the secondary theme offsets the somewhat harsh key relationship (322-23). What Kholopov no doubt refers to is the usage of applied IV chords in the secondary theme’s descending-third sequence (example 5.34). At the end of this sequence, F major seems almost to shed its bII status and become a tonic. Preceded by its own IV (B♭M) and followed by its own V7 (C7), it offers the possibility of an F:PAC—a confirmation of the key in which the secondary theme “should” have appeared. In a melancholy moment intensified by a breath mark and an eighth rest on the downbeat of m. 82, the key of E minor proves impossible to forget: C7 resolves as a German sixth and F major is confined to ornamental status above the V of E minor (m. 82). The local harmonic context of this E-minor goal (denying a desired F-major goal) calls attention to the broader significance of the

Example 5.34: Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, I, mm. 72-85
key of ii as a low substitute for the traditional secondary-theme key of III.

In Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 4, an ephemeral downward chromatic displacement leads to an initially unrecognizable minor dominant harmony. **Example 5.35** shows a harmonic and metric reduction of the E-minor B section (excluding its initial vamp, mm. 22-24) and the B-minor A’ sections. The first hypermeasure (mm. 25-29) of the B section involves a 5-6 shift on E-minor harmony. The second hypermeasure (mm. 29-32) abandons C major in favour of C₇ minor and drives to a root-position confirmation of the latter on the next hyperdownbeat (m. 33). Greeted with celebratory arpeggios, C-major harmony (m. 33) simultaneously suggests a i-VI enlargement of the i⁵-6 shift of the first hypermeasure and a local downward chromatic displacement (CM substituting for C₇m). In m. 37, the three-hypermeasure model of mm. 25-36 begins to sequence downward by major third. Accordingly, in m. 45, the A₇-major harmony represents at once i-VI in C minor and a monotertian substitute for A-minor harmony. Although its meaning is not likely to be grasped immediately, the shocking F₇-minor harmony of m. 47, cutting short the jubilant arpeggiation, relates to the previous harmony by means of a third relation: in the overall key of B minor, i₇-VI-V acts as a sort of defamiliarized i₇-V unfolding.²⁴ The local context of the A₇ root as a downward displacement from A helps us

---

²⁴ This recalls the idea in Chapter 3 of standing on an obscure dominant.
to understand this third relation and precludes reinterpretation of the A₆ chord as V/ii in B.

Measure 47 is the crux of this Tale: like a dash of cold reality dispelling the foolish aspirations of a misguided youth, the minor dominant interrupts the hypermeasure and major-third sequence, recalls the B-Aeolian mode of the A section, and leads to a subdued, coda-like A’ section.²⁵

An example of an unusual dominant resulting from (rather than bringing an end to) a local downward chromatic displacement can be found in the ballet *Romeo and Juliet*, Op. 64. **Example 5.36** shows an excerpt from Act III, specifically mm. 27-39 of Op. 64, No. 41 (“Juliet refuses to marry Paris”).²⁶ The theme that enters in m. 31 normally appears in the major mode

---

²⁵ To be more precise regarding modal characteristics: in mm. 59-62, the neighbour six-four allows for an E-Aeolian statement of the originally B-Aeolian main theme (not shown in the reduction), and the resulting B-C-B neighbour motion, while reminiscent of the start of the B section, hints at B Phrygian (perhaps as a sort of compromise between E and B Aeolian).

²⁶ Cf. Act III, scene 5 in the play.
(see “The Young Juliet,” Op. 64, No. 10, R55). As Juliet disobeys her parents by refusing to marry Paris, the theme appears in the minor mode. At m. 36, the phrase proceeds to a chilling E-minor harmony before concluding on a B♭-major tonic (mm. 38-39). The harmony in the excerpt can be understood in terms of temporary downward chromatic displacement: mm. 27-39 coalesce as a I-iv-I2-I7-v-I progression in B♭. Because we know what Juliet is normally like, the B♭: iv-I7 (or e: i-V17) motion presents itself as a modified (overburdened, depressed) IV-ii (or I-vi) motion. By extension, the ensuing E-F♭-minor chord is a depressed home-key dominant (♭v, not Ⅴ as spelled), a chord deriving from downward chromatic displacement. To be sure, the E-F♭-minor chord bears a secondary meaning as ⅽ if an E♭-minor key is established in m. 31; in this way, the progression weakens Juliet’s concluding B♭ tonic by rendering it almost dominant-like. If Juliet’s pitiful situation is summed up by that penultimate E-F♭-♭Ⅽ chord, the contempt and fury of her parents is communicated by their reinterpretation of it as a new tonic (m. 40)—suggesting a tritone relation with B♭ major (or an upward chromatic shift from E♭ minor). 28

While some Russian commentators suggest intonational similarities to lyrical Russian folk songs (Yakubov 1988, 90), it seems likely that Prokofiev drew inspiration for this theme from the finale of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 21 in C major, Op. 53 (“Waldstein”). Incidentally, there is a happy congruence between the nickname for that sonata in Russia and in some other countries, “Aurora,” and the dawn symbolism in the play (e.g. Romeo’s exclamation in Act II, scene 2: “But, soft! what light through yonder window breaks? / It is the east, and Juliet is the sun”). This analysis is, to be sure, not quite transferrable to the piano piece Op. 75, No. 4, even though that piece incorporates some of this musical material. At the end of Op. 75, No. 4, a listener familiar with Op. 64, No. 41 can simply imagine an ensuing “reproach by Juliet’s parents” (who would seize Juliet’s penultimate Ⅴ harmony as a new tonic).

28 My analysis of Op. 64, No. 39 is transferable in almost all its details to Op. 75, No. 10, the piano solo based on this scene.

29 Zaporozhets (1962) discusses this theme as an example of a modulation to the key of the “leading dominant,” observing that “the new key of B major does not appear until the moment of cadencing” (234).
former $\flat$ (G) just as the downbeat of m. 12 featured the future $\flat$ (F♯). Moving into the B section, the downward chromatic displacement from C major to B major begets another—from B major to B♭ major. In the introduction (mm. 1-5; see example 5.37), Prokofiev balances the tonal descent from C through B to B♭ by means of an ascent through the same span. The descent to B♭ is therefore not really a descent to a new key, but neither is it a restoration of the true tonic (which is unequivocally C).

In some pieces, an early harmonic stabilization of the leading tone leads to a contest between the tonic and its lower form; the drama ends when the true tonic triumphs over the false key.

---

31 Some of the thematic material in Op. 64, No. 39 is heard first in the Introduction, Op. 64, No. 1. The Introduction, which gives a preview of some of the main themes of the ballet, begins with the continuation/cadential material (mm. 10-13) of the love theme featured here, then repeats the phrase using the alternative B-major ending.
tonic while averring the dominant agent status of the (♯)₇ pitch class. In this connection, it is worth briefly recalling the A-minor Lily Dance, Op. 75, No. 9 (discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 30-36). The E-G♯ root motion in mm. 9-11 can be heard in terms of downward chromatic displacement (G♯ replacing A), even though the minor quality of the E chord arguably rules out an A-minor cadence. The result is an incipient equal division of the octave, as the harmony in the continuation phrase (mm. 8-11) forms an ascending-major-third trajectory from which the dominant of G♯ is omitted: C-(B)-E-[D♯]-G♯. A 5-6 motion then turns G♯m into EM, the dominant basis of the B section. Leading to the A’ section, Prokofiev also mitigates the i-⅞vii relation by means of a major-third root relation, creating a secondary meaning for G♯m as ⅟vi of C.³²

Normally, a downward chromatic inclination early in a piece or theme sets the stage for a later balancing event. Occasionally, however, a downward semitonal slant can produce an impression of incorrigible eccentricity. Such is the case in the main theme of the March, Op. 33ter, which modulates from A, major to G minor. Example 5.39 shows this theme (excluding the introductory repeated D, mm. 1-4, which actually points forward to the G-minor key). On the downbeat of m. 6, the dominant arrives; surprisingly, however, it is the minor dominant. This allows it to be reinterpreted as a dominant-function chord in G minor: a ⅟vi-i progression in the

³² See the discussion surrounding example 2.10.
new key roughly reverses the I\(^\flat\),VI\(^7\) alternation that hitherto characterized the theme. In the continuation, it might be presumed that the home-key dominant is being expanded by an equal interval progression, but the key of G minor reasserts itself. In relation to what follows, the E\(^\flat\)-minor chord of m. 8 acts as a pre-dominant rather than dominant chord in G, and in m. 10, the theme ends with a half cadence in the new, lower key—on a harmony related by tritone to the original tonic harmony. (Ultimately, the keys of A\(^\flat\) and G will be left behind, contextualized in C major as submediant and dominant retrospectively.)

The rondo finale of Piano Sonata No. 6 in A Minor, Op. 82, shares with Op. 33ter and Op. 75, No. 9 the tonal strategy of reinterpreting a minor dominant as a vi\(^\flat\) dominant of a new (lower) key. Example 5.40 shows a reduction of the A section and the beginning of the B section. In the A section, a pair of downward chromatic displacements unexpectedly sums up to a predictable diatonic harmonic goal: the mediant basis of the B section. In the opening hypermeasure, \(\hat{A}\) (D\(^\flat\)) enjoys melodic prominence,\(^{33}\) and in the middle of the second, a powerful E\(^\flat\)-minor chord stands out as a strong-beat \(v\) chord between \(v\) and IV. Thus, when the weight of \(\hat{A}\) proves too much to bear—i.e. when G\(^\flat\) minor takes over in m. 21—it is not wholly

---

Example 5.40: Piano Sonata No. 6, IV, mm. 1-32: durational reduction (1:2)

---

\(^{33}\) Bass (1988) comments on the role of “partial displacements” as means of generating polychords in this movement and aptly describes them “outgrowths of the displaced note (D\(^\flat\)) in the first bar” (209-10, 214).
unexpected. Locally, a second downward chromatic displacement appears in m. 25: decorating the dominant of G♯ minor is not a C♯-minor chord but a C-major chord. Reinterpreted as a harmony of deeper-level significance, C becomes the tonic of an innocently playful B theme (m. 29).

Prokofiev’s employment of downward chromatic displacements in the remainder of the movement can be sketched in a few words. In the same way that the A section modulates from A minor to G♯ minor in mm. 1-24, the A’ section modulates from B, minor to A minor in mm. 85-98 (not shown). Following a transitional passage (mm. 99-126) that features a standing on the dominant of A minor, a downward chromatic displacement marks the G♯-minor start of the C section (m. 127). At last, upward semitone displacement provides a sense of balance: a downward scale apparently headed for G♯ ends on A instead in m. 158, ushering in the A-minor A’’ section. Similarly, in the measures leading to the tonic-major B section in m. 341, what can be interpreted as V7 of A, (with bass E, established in m. 320) resolves to an unexpectedly joyful A-major tonic.

Conclusion

The music of Prokofiev is full of salient chromatic relationships. Examples are easy to find of juxtapositions or neighbour motions involving semitonally related chords; transpositions of parts of phrases, entire phrases, or entire sections by semitone; and even polychords generated by the stacking of monotonetarian or T1-related triads. Central to the analytical approach of Richard Bass and others is the concept of substitution: on the surface of Prokofiev’s music, the original key is liable to become—usually during some middle portion of a theme—the shadow of a semitonally related key. Bass introduces the term “cross-representation” (1988, 203) to hint at how substitution by itself can fall short of fully explaining harmonic function in such passages. In this chapter, I have taken this point further, exploring the functional significance of harmonies that can perhaps best but not purely be described as shifted tonics. Particularly important are submediant secondary meanings. This usually involves ˌI, but we hear ♯i treated this way in Op. 76, No. 6; and it usually means of the mediant, but Op. 35, No. 1 includes a ♯i harmony with a secondary meaning as submediant of the subdominant. Above all, it is helpful to bear in mind a spectrum of “tonicness” when dealing with (apparent) ˌI, ˌi, ˌI, and ♯i harmonies and to consider
the contrast between the manner in which such harmonies are foreshadowed/introduced (often they very clearly represent shifted tonics) and the manner in which they are reinterpreted.

For Prokofiev, the conventional “abrupt modulation” upward by semitone through reinterpretation of a German sixth as a dominant seventh remains very useful. A three-chord triadic monotonal schematization of this would be I-\(\flat\)VI-\(\sharp\)II in the old key or VII\(\flat\)-V-I in the new key. Reversing this procedure to travel downward by semitone is common in the Romantic literature, but generally calls for a lengthier tonal plan: V7 becomes reinterpreted as a German sixth, and the German sixth is more likely to serve as a pre-dominant than as a plagal augmented-sixth chord. In Prokofiev’s harmonic style, pithiness demands that the German sixth in such cases resolve directly to the new tonic (e.g. at m. 10 in Op. 43bis/IV). However, a special advantage of the I-\(\flat\)VI-\(\sharp\)II scheme is that the last two chords can be heard as a D-T resolution in the “new key,” and this is lost when the scheme is retrograded. A retrograde involving minor-quality chords is a solution that preserves the concluding D-T effect: thus, e.g., CM-A\(\flat\)M-D\(\flat\)M becomes Am-Em-Gm, and in place of the usual VI\(\flat\)=V reinterpretation of the interior chord is a v\(\flat\)=vi\(\flat\) reinterpretation. The importance of such reinterpretations of the minor dominant is especially apparent in several examples in Section IV (though Prokofiev does reinterpret the minor-mode III and i7 elsewhere). Prokofiev’s characteristically speedy motion between very stable semitonally related keys is often remarked upon, but it is generally only speedy when it relies on the above-mentioned schemes, viz. reinterpretation between Ger6 and V7 or a derivation of this familiar device. For many other harmonic routes, such as the reinterpretation of ii7 as “\(\flat\)ii7,” Prokofiev often provides space to hear an actual reinterpretation within the chord (rather than compelling a purely retrospective reinterpretation).

In many themes and pieces, the early occurrence of some salient “unbalancing” gesture—even something as simple as an accented lower chromatic neighbour in the bass—sets up a later event that restores a sense of balance. Prokofiev’s means of suggesting balance are very sophisticated, and it is owing to the rich ambiguity and artful concealment of many of the devices discussed in this chapter that some terminological challenges arise. A case in point is the Tale, Op. 3, No. 1, which ends with a downward chromatic slope from the key of \(\flat\)II (beginning on ii in that key) to the tonic. As discussed in Section III, the tonic at the bottom of this trajectory can actually be understood as the product of an upward semitone displacement. Frequently, a

\[34\] For example, an instantaneous Ger6=V7 reinterpretation is implied in m. 8 of the second movement of Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 83. For some other examples, consider the E-minor theme in the middle of Op. 80/III and the secondary theme of Op. 63/I.
harmonic outcome that is, for various reasons, appropriate, expected, or productive of tonal closure and balance may be describable as a chromatic displacement in comparison with another event in the piece. Before—or even instead of—labeling particular events as chromatic displacements of other events, I have scrutinized semitonal discrepancies between pairs of harmonic outcomes (sometimes purely hypothetical ones) and evaluated their relation to one another. Discussing concepts such as overburdening and adjustment, I have also endeavoured throughout this chapter to draw attention to recurring expressive effects and how they relate to the direction, speed, and various contextual factors of chromatic displacements. One can easily call to mind many instances of pesante or tiazhelo performance indications in Prokofiev’s music, but a distinction is surely necessary between this idea (often associated with forte, low register, thick textures, and the march genre) and the tonal concept of overburdening.\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) For an example (not discussed above) in which the conceptual difference is quite evident, consider Montagues and Capulets, Op. 75, No. 6: the notion of tonal overburdening is actually more applicable to the dolce B section than to the pesante A section.
Chapter 6: Conclusion and suggestions for future research

In this chapter, I review some of the findings from previous chapters, elaborate on topics that were discussed only in passing in those chapters, and suggest directions for future research. On several occasions, I refer back to some general conclusions about pieces discussed in earlier chapters, but a few analyses of other works are also included. Reviewing the analytical strategies adopted in this dissertation, Section I underscores some differences between my approach and that of other analysts of Prokofiev’s music. Section II focuses on questions of modality from a harmonic-functional perspective and revisits the concept of the “dominant mode” as one way of comparing Prokofiev’s harmonic practice to that of other Russian composers (in particular, Rimsky-Korsakov). In Section III, some generalizations are made about inversion and symmetry as they relate to harmonic function and tonal trajectories in Prokofiev’s music. The concepts of tonal imbalance and “lost” tonics—particularly as applied to the main themes of the Second and Sixth Symphonies—are the focus of Section IV. Section V brings together some ideas on unresolving suspensions, reconsidering their relation to both quartal harmony and chromatic displacement. Finally, Section VI offers some concluding thoughts on the analysis of Prokofiev’s music in this dissertation.

I. General comments on analytical approaches to Prokofiev’s music

One of the aims in this dissertation has been to analyze works by Prokofiev in ways that minimize the theoretical divide between tonality and “other” elements—“wrong” notes, “neotonal” environments, “structural sets,” non-tonal motives, modernist gestures, and so on. One advantage of maintaining a strong division of this kind is that it may offer insights into Prokofiev’s dialogue with or ironic commentary on tradition, the nature of Prokofiev’s innovations, and his identity as a modernist and/or neoclassical composer. Problems arise, however, when tradition is simplistically associated with functional harmony, and innovation with non-functional harmony. Further, analysts have sometimes not gone far enough in questioning what tradition(s) Prokofiev is supposedly in dialogue with in a given piece, and how narrowly tonality or “right” notes are to be defined.

Sometimes, the term “wrong note” or “wrong-note harmony” does seem appropriate, but only with respect to a particular framework or convention, and only to the extent that three stages
are felt to occur: a passage (a) begins “ordinarily,” (b) encounters something “extraordinary,” and (c) moves on as if nothing extraordinary had occurred. Rifkin (2004, 265-67) chooses an excellent piece to illustrate the concept: in the main theme of the third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis, F-major diatonicism precedes an outstanding F♯-minor harmony, and C-major diatonicism ensues. This, however, is quite an exceptional case: Prokofiev seldom abandons a displaced (♯i) tonic to such an uncomfortable situation (accommodated as ♭iv in the new key); in fact (as we saw in Chapter 2, and as Rifkin shows in a different way), Prokofiev is setting up a larger-scale strategy of integration that depends on harmonic events in the B and A’ sections. To be sure, it has not been customary to pinpoint “wrong notes” or “wrong-note harmonies” except in the way of preliminary analyses of Prokofiev’s works, but even so, the shift of vantage point that such efforts are customarily supposed to necessitate—whether to “structural sets,” non-tonal motivic coherence, or a neotonal framework—has often resulted in a simplistic view of harmonic function.

In Chapter 1, I expressed some reservations about Minturn’s “Listening model” and “structural sets” (1997, 58-59), stressing that investigations into motivic sets or set classes should not be at the expense of considerations of tonal structure. Zimmerman’s (2002) concept of “foreground fundamental bass lines” (92) can be equally problematic if conventional hierarchical distinctions are not duly considered and if “fundamental” material is drawn as a rule from particular “collections without clusters.” In general, I have avoided drawing a sharp line between (traditional) coherence deriving from structure especially as defined by Schenker and (modernist) coherence deriving from non-tonal motives. Rifkin has written about the value of such a dichotomy, arguing that Prokofiev’s music often features shifts from the former to the latter type of coherence, whether sudden (e.g. at m. 13 in Op. 63/1; Rifkin 2011, 187-88) or gradual (e.g. in the course of Op. 103/III; Rifkin 2000, 130-34). The dichotomy, however, can often be misleading. After all, motives, despite their theoretical separateness from tonality, tend to accrue harmonic-functional significance; and with Prokofiev, we are generally dealing with a more “advanced” kind of tonality than that for which the Schenkerian analytical apparatus is best suited. Prokofiev’s reputation as a neoclassical composer has often meant that the bold new norms of harmonic function and structure established in the late nineteenth century by Liszt, Rimsky-Korsakov and others are not adequately taken into account. Certainly, it is with Haydn that Prokofiev is chiefly in dialogue in Op. 25, but as he pointed out himself, this work is in many ways exceptional in his oeuvre (written “in passing”). In future studies, it will be
worthwhile to reconsider the relevance of nineteenth-century “second-practice” principles of
tonality and harmonic function, which Prokofiev often adopted and extended in idiosyncratic
ways.

Above all, I have endeavoured in this dissertation to avoid the dangers of isolating or
spotlighting particular notes or harmonies as tonal “bad fits” that are explainable chiefly or solely
through motive as opposed to tonality.¹ Examining the harmonic-functional contexts of
particular chords, I have emphasized the importance of broader tonal schemes or environments.
Some prominent techniques are third-based ladovaia peremennost’ (e.g. in the secondary theme
of Op. 100/I, F/a tonal pairing smoothly accommodates the B-E root motion in mm. 57-63; see
Chapter 4, pp. 130-33); conflicts between plagal and authentic tendencies (e.g. contextualizing
the ,vii harmony in the main theme of Op. 103/III; see Chapter 3, pp. 88-91); and sequential
plans, often thoroughly concealed and deployed against the grain of a prevailing mode (e.g. an
ascending-major-third sequential tendency creates a chromatic hurdle for the mediant in the G-
minor i-III trajectory of the third theme of Op. 111/I; see Chapter 3, pp. 103-04). I have also
avoided such terms as “central element” (Kholopov) or “tonic complex” (Malcolm Brown),
which I consider unhelpful in an exploration of nuances of harmonic function and tonal
hierarchy. Certainly, Prokofiev’s innovative harmonic language frequently defies conventional
terminology and the rules of “textbook” tonality—and it is in such cases that Prokofiev’s
handling of harmonic-functional balance and plurality is most fascinating.

II. Modality from a harmonic-functional perspective; the “dominant mode”
concept and other Russian music

In general, tonics in Prokofiev’s music are very stable. The beginnings of pieces usually
leave no doubt as to the overall key; auxiliary cadences are rare; and tritone oscillations are
usually reserved for transitional passages. Yet questions of modality and related nuances of
harmonic function often prove vital. It is often appropriate to refer, for example, either to
Mixolydian characteristics or to a particular tonic as dominant-like. We have encountered several
cases where particular harmonic procedures render a tonic locally submediant-like (e.g. the F-
major key of the secondary theme in Op. 100/I) or subdominant-like (e.g. the F-major tonic of

¹ As I pointed out in Chapter 1, Zimmerman (2002) offers a very different, “neotonal” approach to the same
problem, examining how Prokofiev’s unconventional harmonies participate in the ebb and flow of various cluster-
free collections.
Evening, Op. 65, No. 11; see Chapter 3, pp. 96-97). In this section, I focus on cases of dominant-like tonics, if only because—as mentioned in Chapter 1—the Russian music-theoretical concept of the “dominant mode” offers an avenue of research into the relations between Prokofiev’s music and that of his Soviet/Russian contemporaries and predecessors.

The work of Rimsky-Korsakov furnishes some of the loci classici of the “dominant mode,” among which is the fourth movement (Scena e canto gitano) of Capriccio Espagnol, Op. 34 (Kholopov 1988, 200-01). This piece exhibits a characteristic that is, on a smaller scale, quite widespread in Rimsky-Korsakov’s harmonic practice, particularly in what one might describe as his exotic line. The third movement of Scheherazade, Op. 35, offers a typical example. The main theme of this piece, as Johnston (2009) points out, draws on the nega idiom with a very clear \( \hat{5} \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow \hat{5} \) figure in an inner voice (190). *Example 6.1* shows mm. 15-30 of this piece, including the end of the first (G-major) statement of the main theme and the start of the second (D-major) statement. Leading to the G:PAC of m. 20, Rimsky-Korsakov revives the concluding \( \hat{6} \rightarrow \hat{5} \) (E-E-D) segment of the nega figure by transforming IV (beginning at m. 9, not shown) to iv (m. 17) before reaching V (m. 18), and by incorporating an inner-voice chromatic descent to the chordal fifth of the tonic (m. 20). Most impressive is the new harmonization of the \( \hat{5} \) neighbour during the post-cadential tonic prolongation (mm. 20-24). Here, Rimsky-Korsakov renders the G-major tonic suspiciously dominant-like: Fm7-GM could, after all, signify iv7-V in C. The next tonal goal, however, is D major: a GM-Gm shift in m. 24 signifies IV-iv in the new key, setting the stage for the nega figure in D major. While moving to the dominant (from G major to D major), Rimsky-Korsakov eschews V/V. Suggesting V/iv, the post-cadential tonic invites us to look back to the iv harmony (m. 17)—until it becomes iv itself (m. 24) in the new key.

In the simplest scenario, of course, a tonic becomes dominant-like—or literally V[7]/IV—because we actually are heading for the subdominant. This, indeed, is Rimsky-Korsakov’s strategy between the second and third movements of Capriccio Espagnol, Op. 34. At the end of the tonic-pedal-governed main theme of the F-major second movement (Variazioni), IV and iv alternate as neighbour chords of I (mm. 18-21; *example 6.2*). After the movement’s conclusive F:PAC (m. 117), Rimsky-Korsakov introduces a subtle change: ii6 and \( \hat{6} \)II6 now alternate as neighbour chords of I (mm. 117-28; *example 6.3*). Because the last resolution to F-major harmony can be interpreted as \( \hat{6} \)VI6-V in B♭ major (the key of the ensuing Alborada), the attacca seems especially effective. In the fourth movement (Scena e canto gitano), the harmony

Example 6.2: Rimsky-Korsakov, Capriccio espagnol, Op. 34, No. 2 (Variazioni), mm. 17-24
Var. 1
chiefly suggests a standing on the dominant of D minor (V alternating mainly with a iiø7 neighbour chord); a formal function associated with a contrasting middle is thus elevated to support a main theme. At the end of the movement, a iv7-V9/V progression in D minor seems to drive toward another iteration of the *canto gitano* theme (as it did earlier in the movement). Instead, it leads directly to the A-major tonic that supports the start of the Capriccio’s fifth and final movement (Fandango asturiano). In this way, A-major harmony undergoes a conversion between the fourth and fifth movements from dominant to tonic function, suggesting a bold, unconventional reversal of what happened between the second and third movements, i.e. the conversion of F-major harmony from tonic to dominant function.²

In the literature on Prokofiev, one piece that has been singled out as exhibiting a “dominant mode” is Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 18. **Example 6.4** shows the score of this work. According to Kholopov (1967a), the pitch material characterizes the bass E as a dominant, but

² A different interpretation is offered by Johnston (2009), who describes the mode of *Scena e canto gitano* as A Phrygian major (214). Johnston goes on to explore what he describes as “Phrygian organization” in Rachmaninoff’s music.
Example 6.4: Vision fugitive, Op. 22, No. 18

С нежной медленностью [Con una dolce lentezza]
because it never resolves, it “has become a tonic”; the “dominantness [dominantovost’] of the
tonic,” he adds, “permits us to attribute the mode of this piece to [Sposobin’s] group of so-called
‘dominant modes’” (350). In my view, Kholopov offers a better starting point than Ashley
(1963), who suggests that the mode is E Phrygian, with B-D-F-A as the main harmony—“one
long dominant harmony to the [E] Phrygian mode” (136). The opening E harmony may be
described as a dominant that has been rendered tonic-like—chiefly through an indefinitely
pending 4-3 (A-G) resolution. One might even hear the theme as a ghostly echo of a nineteenth-
century Viennese waltz. Example 6.5 illustrates with a prototype that starts on V9 in A major.
Corresponding to the tonic resolution in example 6.5, the Vision fugitive shifts its initial

Example 6.5: Hypothetical Viennese waltz prototype for Op. 22, No. 18

A: V9
I (6 - 5)

harmony down by semitone, giving rise to a neighbour chord rather than either clarifying
dominant function in A or moving to a tonic of A.³ At the climax of the work, the B section
might seem to reach a genuine dominant of A at m. 23 via ii7 (m. 22). The thematic return at m.
26, however, extinguishes any forward-relating dominant potential in the E harmony, reviving
the unresolvable, perpetually floating inner-voice A.

In some cases, Prokofiev creates what can be described as a state of doubt or darkness by
leading to a tonic as if it were a dominant. Typically, a passage seems almost to run out of
energy just before reaching an apparent dominant goal. Then the goal harmony does arrive, but
instead of expressing dominant function, it is a clear tonic, and any impression of having
wandered astray is instantly annulled. In Chapter 3 (pp. 82-84), I commented on such a scenario
in the approach to the A’ section in Tales of the Old Grandmother, Op. 31, No. 1. The B section
in that work seems to head toward V9 of G (or an enharmonically equivalent augmented-sixth
chord), but after a doubtful pause (mm. 43-44), a different kind of D harmony emerges: the

³ This semitonal shift, certainly, makes the piece closely comparable to the Waltz, Op. 102, No. 1 (discussed in
Chapter 5, pp. 183-85). In that work, however, E is quite firmly the tonic, in contrast to its treatment here.
minor-mode D tonic that supports the thematic return (m. 45). A more dramatic example can be found in the first movement of Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26. Prior to the C-major return at m. 169 is a standstill on a B♭ harmony (mm. 159-168). In isolation, the harmonic progression between the sections might suggest iv7-V in F minor. The gloomy setup of the C tonic (as if it were V/iv rather than I) makes it seem all the more brilliant when it does arrive (m. 169), launching the unstoppable C-major scalar patterns of the recapitulated introduction. A haunting example of the technique is the passage near the end (R25) of the first movement of Symphony No. 5, Op. 100 (referred to in Chapter 3), where Fø7 may momentarily induce doubt as to the security of the concluding B♭-major tonic (as if converting it into V of E♭ minor). The final, triumphant B♭-major harmony relies on A, C♯, and E embellishments to counteract this pernicious influence.

Prokofiev’s fascination with Rimsky-Korsakov’s music far outweighed his dissatisfaction with Rimsky-Korsakov’s teachings at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Octatonicism—or the “Rimsky-Korsakov scale”—is a central factor in some works by Prokofiev, but it is of less general importance in Prokofiev’s music than in Stravinsky’s. (Related to this is the pre-eminence of major- rather than minor-third cycles in Prokofiev’s harmony.) A study of modality—perhaps especially from a harmonic perspective, as adopted in this dissertation—could lead to further insights into Prokofiev’s place in Russian musical tradition, inviting comparisons not only to Rimsky-Korsakov and other older Russian composers but also to Soviet colleagues of Prokofiev such as Khachaturian and Shostakovich.

III. Harmonic function and inversional symmetry

Prokofiev’s innovative uses of symmetrical and inversional relationships have often been admired. In this dissertation, I have endeavoured not only to point out symmetrical and inversional relationships in particular works, but to explore the harmonic-functional significance of such relationships. Pairs of progressions with an at least partially inversional relationship occasionally play critical roles in tonal plans. In the simplest cases, the balancing progression entails tonal closure. For example, in the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 1, Op. 19 (discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 135-37), one can compare the beginning and ending with respect to

---

4 See, e.g., the discussions of inversionally related sets in Minturn (1997); Kholopova’s (1972) article on Prokofiev’s use of equal-interval patterns; Kholopov’s (1967c) overview of octatonicism in Prokofiev’s music (277-78); Bianchi’s (2010) commentary on the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135 (149-51); and Zimmerman’s (2002) analysis of Toccata, Op. 11 (166-219).
the “opposite” treatment of G-major chords. Within the main theme area, IV of D is reinterpreted as V of C, prompting a C-major reiteration of the theme (m. 21); in the coda, Prokofiev bypasses the C-major opportunity (mm. 183ff), achieving both tonal closure and a sense of balance. The first movement (or exposition, in a one-movement analysis) of Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 10 (also discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 133-35), features plagal and authentic resolutions of an A-augmented triad to, respectively, the E-minor tonic of the secondary theme and the returning D-major tonic of the majestic introductory theme. Here, the inversional relationship is exact in chromatic space, accommodating an augmented-second rather than major-second key relationship. More often, the balancing progression does not produce the concluding tonic harmony. A sense of closure can also be diminished by a strong duplication of harmonic-functional characteristics between the progressions—sometimes to such an extent that transpositional or repeated elements outweigh the inversional aspect. These factors are relevant in the third movement of Violin Sonata No. 2, Op. 94bis (discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 36-44), which features inversionally related resolutions of a [0358] augmented-sixth chord, as well as in main theme of the Lily Dance, Op. 75, No. 9 (also discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 30-36), where a similar scheme underlies the relationship between the tonic and i rather than ii. In both works, a transpositional relationship eventually proves critical to achieving tonal closure. Rather than feature inversionally related pair of progressions, some works display inversionally related tonal trajectories. A sophisticated instance of this is the third movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103 (discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 116-19), in which the main theme’s plagal route (in conflict with a tantalizing dominant) contrasts with the middle section’s authentic route (called into question by a very “obscure” dominant). Volte-face procedures can result in a strong sense of balance, especially if the volte-face itself suggests a reversal of the sum of a preceding sequential trajectory (as in the third movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82, where the concluding VI resolution reverses the I-VI span traversed since the start of the A’ section; see Chapter 3, pp. 88-91).

The Lily Dance stands out among the above examples for the small scale on which the inversion takes place: the two progressions occur at the outer edges of a sentential theme. In Prokofiev’s music, many other inversional relationships are responsible for still more immediate, local harmonic connections. In the main theme of Melody, Op. 35, No. 1 (discussed in Chapter 5, pp. 180-83), inversional relationships between adjacent harmonies can be understood as part of a strategy of concealing the obvious transpositional (T11) relationship between the respective
harmonic goals of the antecedent and consequent (Em and E♭m). Sometimes, Prokofiev fosters inversional relations between the two halves of a compound basic idea. In this regard, a couple of themes may be briefly recalled for their contrasting strategies. In the opening theme of the second movement of Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 2 (discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 155-60), an inversional relationship enhances the progression from i in the basic idea and iii in the contrasting idea. The inversional treatment of V at the end of the antecedent contributes to the sense of overall balance. The main theme of the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 9, Op. 103 (discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 26-30) features a diatonic major-mode progression from tonic to supertonic harmony within its compound basic idea. In this case, however, a non-transpositional inversional relationship emerges, offsetting rather than underscoring the sequential harmonic relationship.

On an even smaller scale, inversional relationships can enhance the shift from a 5 phase to a 6 phase. We encounter diatonic versions of this strategy in mm. 1-4 of the March, Op. 12, No. 1 (between Fm+D♭ and D♭M+C) and in mm. 1-8 of the first movement of Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 63 (between Gm+E♭ and E♭M+D). The main theme of the sixth movement of Quintet, Op. 39, may be invoked not only for another example of a 5-6 shift bolstered by inversional elements, but also to renew my broader argument regarding the importance of appreciating the harmonic-functional nuances of salient set-class equivalences and of considering the relevance of basic tonal schemes in “modern line” works by Prokofiev.

**Example 6.6** shows a piano reduction of mm. 1-11 of Op. 39/VI. In the idiosyncratic G tonic harmony with which the piece begins, an inner-voice C♯ is positioned as a harmonic tone in conflict with the upper-voice D, and a passing B in the melody “contradicts” the chordal third B♭. As the basic idea recurs sequentially in mm. 3-4, a special advantage of this peculiar melding of diminished, minor, and major quality becomes apparent: a simple T2 relationship conflates the progressions I-ii and i-ii°. A striking feature of the melody in this theme is the pause on A (m. 1, beat 3). In **example 6.6**, an asterisk draws attention to the harmonic sonority at beat 3 of m. 1, which may be labeled as a [01457] chord. On the downbeat of the second measure, Prokofiev inverts the harmony. **Example 6.7** sheds light on the tonal significance of this set-class equivalency: Gm (embellished with A and C♯) moves to EM (embellished with F and A), forming a 5-6 shift on the tonic. In m. 3, Prokofiev cleverly incorporates the original [01457]

---

5 In the configuration adopted in m. 1, the pentachord suggests the first five notes of what is sometimes referred to as a “Gypsy” minor scale. Among its well-known melodic usages is the opening melody of the sixth movement (“Two Jews, One Rich and the Other Poor”) of Musorgsky’s *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1874). Also cf. the secondary theme of the first movement of Prokofiev’s Piano Sonata No. 8, Op. 84 (discussed in Chapter 5, p. 209).
chord on beat 3 as a passing chord between the next 5 and 6 phases (the A and F chords). The 6
phase of A in m. 4—a pure F-major triad—offers a blissful resting point while contrasting
vividly with the elaborate 6 phase of G in m. 2. In mm. 7-10, a distinctly symmetrical scheme
leads to the dominant in the bass: F-E-E♭ (m. 7) is followed by B-C-C♭ (mm. 8-9), and the
dominant itself in mm. 10-20 (not entirely shown) emphasizes whole-tone-collection elements
(complementing the whole-tone-scale bass line of the main theme). On the whole, the theme’s i-
ii-V-i structure makes it fundamentally similar to, for instance, the main theme of Op. 103/I. A
typical example of Prokofiev’s “modern line,” the main theme of Op. 39/VI enhances a basic
tonal structure in innovative ways.

There are, to be sure, some deliberately “unbalanced” elements in this theme. For one
thing, the supertonic is more stable than usual for a minor-mode theme. In fact, the melody’s first
five notes, departing from the basic G-minor $\hat{5} \rightarrow \hat{4} \rightarrow \hat{3} \rightarrow \hat{2} \rightarrow \hat{1} \rightarrow \hat{7}$ plan to suggest a potential A-minor $\hat{4} \rightarrow \hat{3} \rightarrow \hat{2} \rightarrow \hat{1} \rightarrow \hat{\flat} \rightarrow \hat{7}$ descent, look forward not only to the sequential repetition of the basic idea, but also to the A-minor key of the contrasting theme. I address this general notion of imbalance in the next section.

### IV. Tonal imbalance, “lost” tonics, and Prokofiev’s “new simplicity”

In this dissertation, I assume in many of my analyses that balance is a generally desirable aesthetic trait. But imbalance is, after all, the essence of Prokofiev’s so-called fifth line, which the composer preferred to describe as the technique of bending the other lines. Persistently unbalanced or even unattainable tonics characterize some of the shorter works; in the larger works, the same strategies create problematic environments to be eventually corrected. In this section, I examine two extreme cases. First, I discuss the main theme of Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, interpreting its opening harmony as a drastically unbalanced D-minor tonic. Second, I investigate an unattainable or “lost” E$\flat$-minor tonic in the opening theme of Symphony No. 6, Op. 111. A secondary objective in this section is to qualify some typical differences between Prokofiev’s “modern line” and his late Soviet style, and to argue that the tonal principles and harmonic techniques outlined earlier in this dissertation tend to be extended rather than discarded in Prokofiev’s most complex works.

The Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, is the last and biggest work cited by Prokofiev as representing his “modern line.” Despite its unfavourable reception (“bewildering” everybody—even the composer himself), Prokofiev preserved “the hope that the symphony really is respectable [poriadnochnaja] and even well-constructed [stroinaia]—is it possible that in my old age and at the height of my technical powers I could still flop with such a thud, and what’s more after nine months of frenzied work?!?” (Brown 1967, 70). In my view, the first movement’s notorious difficulty lies chiefly in its almost unremittingly loud dynamic, high level of dissonance, thick texture, and heavy orchestration. From a harmonic perspective, the main theme certainly is complicated, but the thoroughly “primitivist” secondary theme provides an effective contrast. Above all, the complexity of the main theme derives not from true atonality but rather from a characteristic technique of deliberately unbalancing the D-minor tonic.

---

6 From a letter written to Myaskovsky on 4 August 1925. For the full letter in the original Russian, see Mendel’son-Prokoľeva (1956, 218-19).
Example 6.8 shows a piano reduction of the main theme of Op. 40/I (which begins at m. 10). Brown (1967) proposes that the theme features three “independent strata,” which together comprise a “‘tonic complex’”: at the bottom is the “‘fundamental’ dyad” D-B, which “may function alone as a kind of tonic reference”; in the middle, “the structural intervals are diatonic fifths which rise from E through B and F to C”; and at the top, “the melodic line traces its own course relative to a center on A” (78). “On a few occasions,” he adds, Prokofiev “resorts to his favored device of propelling the line forward by a sudden, unexpected tonal shift,” the first being between the tonal centres of D and D♭ in mm. 12-13 (78-79). Observing a very clear division between melody and accompaniment in this “strong-willed” main theme, Tarakanov (1968) suggests that the melody “cuts through the harmonic surroundings, asserting itself and overcoming the sonorous background that burdens it”; he gives an analysis of the melody in terms of a dovetailing series of keys (reproduced in example 6.9) (81).
Brown goes too far when he claims that “The connections of the components in the sound complex must be accepted as empirical combinations with only tenuous bases in systematic principles” (1967, 78), and it is an exaggeration, pace Tarakanov, to say that the harmony “burdens” the melody rather than supporting it. As a preliminary indication of Prokofiev’s systematic approach, example 6.10 offers a schema of three symmetrical pitch-class sets.

Beginning on the earth-shaking dissonance of [01356], Prokofiev travels through [0257] to the simplicity of [03]; these sonorities help to mark three-measure boundaries that offset the four-measure hypermeter (mm. 10, 13, 16). Looking at how the first of these set classes is deployed, one notices that the C on the downbeat of m. 10 anticipates the opening C of the melody, and that the melodic G\$ can be heard as a belated chordal third in a dominant of A minor (either in
third inversion or above a D tonic pedal). At m. 13, Brown and Tarakanov refer to a key change, but this is better described as a harmonic progression. **Example 6.11** posits a descending-major-third cycle as a harmonic prototype for mm. 10-16, while **example 6.12** suggests something in between that prototype and the actual music. Between mm. 10 and 13, Prokofiev eschews a melodic sequential relationship, instead transforming the basic idea in a manner that preserves the melodic G♯/A♭ on the second beat; this is reflected in the first prototype’s almost stationary upper line. In mm. 13-14, a 5-4-5 (E♭-D♭-E♭) neighbour motion over the A♭ root is synchronized against 4-3 (D♭-C) resolutions, delaying the appearance of a clear A♭-major triad until m. 15. At the end of m. 15, a particularly creative augmented-sixth dominant of E minor arises from an expansion of the formerly four-note quartal sonority to six notes (F-B♭-E♭-A♭-D♭-G♭).\(^7\) In mm. 18-25, Prokofiev gives the impression of a “contrasting middle” that has to work hard to

---

\(^7\) On the last quarter of m. 15, A♭ is not present, but implicitly carried over from the previous beat in the bass. **Example 6.11** rearranges the notes of that dominant of E to emphasize the passing status of the chord (hence the F bass) and the quartal constructional principle (which entails a respelling of the dominant agent D♭).
withstand the primitivist repetitive impulse: the bass D in m. 17 initiates a passing motion from E to C, but before C arrives, fragments of the basic idea return in mm. 18-19; at m. 22, a V4/2 on C suggests a rough T10 of the original harmony; and having reached A₃, the bass prematurely falls to E in m. 24. The E-C-A₃ bass descent in mm. 16-25 (pointing to E and anticipating the main theme’s own 8-cycle) and the bass ascent to D₃ in m. 25 (producing the dominant agent [D₃=C♯] of D minor) add to the sense of inevitability at the return in m. 26.

The main source of complexity in the main theme of Op. 40/I is the unbalancing of the D-minor tonic. Specifically, D minor is slanted toward E minor—the key of the secondary theme and goal of the exposition. One encounters a similar procedure in, for example, the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 5, Op. 38/135, where the gravitation toward A minor within the C-major main theme hints at the goal of the exposition. The first movement of Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, is still more closely related. As in Op. 40/I, the main theme of Op. 14/I is in D minor while the secondary theme is in E minor, and in view of the key of the secondary theme, one can only temporarily be surprised by the “dissonant arrival” within the main theme (Harter’s term for the B9 harmony at m. 8 [2003, 64]), which throws the D-minor tonic off balance while predicting the future E-minor key. The descending-major-third cycle in the main theme of Op. 40/I invites comparison to other themes by Prokofiev. For example, “The Young Juliet,” Op. 75, No. 4 (discussed in Chapter 3, p. 94) may provide an effective foil against which the complexities of the main theme of Op. 40/I stand out clearly. Instead of prolonging the overall (D-minor) tonic, the descending-major-third cycle of the main theme of Op. 40/I forges a new (E-minor) tonic. The upper line of the descending-major-third cycles of both themes is non-sequential, but whereas that in “The Young Juliet” surrounds the initial root (C-C-B-C), the melody in the main theme of Op. 40/I focuses on the initial chordal third (G♯-G-A♭-G). This strategy draws special attention to what is perhaps the most astonishing and brilliant aspect of the Op. 40/I main theme: the metamorphosis of the E root from the start of the major-third cycle in m. 10 (a violently dissonant local dominant in conflict with the global tonic) to its end in m. 16 (a pure-sounding local tonic).

In many ways, the first movement of Symphony No. 6, Op. 111 (1945-47), reflects a style that is diametrically opposed to that of Symphony No. 2, Op. 40. In the first movement of Op. 111, we find the hallmarks of Prokofiev’s late style: the texture is thinner, the range is more moderate, and in stark contrast to the two titanic themes of Op. 40/I, Op. 111/I presents three themes, each quite subdued. Major-third harmonic plans are important in both works, though in
different ways. In the exposition of the E♭-minor first movement of Op. 111, the second theme is in B (=C♭) minor while the third theme is in G minor; and within the third theme (as discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 103-04), one can hear an ascending-major-third sequential tendency. For the purposes of the present discussion, a different point will be central: as in Op. 40/I, Prokofiev finds a creative alternative in Op. 111/I to a firm tonic start. Instead of presenting an unbalanced tonic, the main theme of Op. 111/I features what can be thought of as a “lost” tonic, or a vain striving for the tonic.

Example 6.13 shows a piano reduction of the main theme of Op. 111/I. As in my analyses of the opening of Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3 and the B section of the second movement of Sonatina, Op. 54, No. 2 (both in Chapter 4, pp. 141 and 159), example 6.14 suggests a harmonic reduction involving an underlying ascending 5-6 sequence. In contrast to the opening harmonies in those cases, the A♭-minor chord of m. 11 in Op. 111/I is not the tonic at all: a 5-6 shift from E♭ to F (m. 4) clarifies the function of the A♭-minor harmony as iv6 progressing to V in E♭ minor. A repetition of the phrase appears to begin in m. 18: compared to mm. 11-12, the melody in mm. 18-19 is only slightly modified, and the harmony is the same but in root position. The situation encourages, perhaps, a hearing of the brief explicit V of m. 17 as a passing chord between iv6 and iv. As the phrase proceeds, however, a different functional understanding proves preferable: the A♭-minor chord in m. 18 is a passing chord between the B♭ chord of m. 17 and the G chord of m. 19. Adding to the complexity of the continuation is a T7 sequential treatment of the melodic fragment in mm. 18-19, which helps to conceal the underlying harmonic sequence. In mm. 18-19, the melodic fragment ascends to the seventh of the local A♭ chord (F♯=G♭), and in mm. 20-21, it reaches the ninth of the local C chord (D♭), forming the theme’s peak of intensity. In mm. 21-24, the theme encounters a momentary harmonic impasse. Describing this passage, Minturn (1997) observes that “the harmony rocks between F minor seventh four-three, a ‘minor’ dominant of B♭, and a B♭-minor chord whose chordal fifth is displaced by a 5-6 motion” (126). From a broader perspective, the tense harmonic situation cannot fully be accounted for with reference to a supposed B♭ harmony that is unable to become stable. In view of the ascending 5-6 plan, one might expect the bass B♭ (m. 22) to pass downward to an A♭ root. Following a melodic 4-3 resolution (D♭-C), a hypothetical A♭ chord could then lead to iVII (D♭M), from which point the E♭-minor tonic might be attained via V6. Yet the standstill on the melodic D♭ hints at the futility of a 4-3 resolution. Instead of resolving to a local dominant agent C, the D♭ becomes a dominant agent itself (D♭=C♯), leading to a D-minor harmony in m. 26. The same strategy—with
a very different expressive effect and in a simpler tonal context—is familiar from the second movement of Piano Sonata No. 6, Op. 82 (mm. 127-31, example 5.21). Since the D-minor harmony in m. 26 of Op. 111/I triggers a restatement of the main theme, it becomes reinterpreted in A minor as a iv chord that leads implicitly to V in m. 32. In contrast to m. 17, however, m. 32 avoids even weakly supporting the melodic E with an explicit E chord; instead, the iiø7 of A minor is revived (from mm. 29-31), and in m. 33 A♭-minor harmony returns to initiate the transition (just as it initiated the main theme). The roughness of the descent from iiø7 of A minor
to i of A♭ minor calls special attention to the tritonal outline: A♭m (m. 11), Dm (m. 26), A♭m (m. 33). Nevertheless, to describe the theme as based on a tritonal plan would give a misleading picture of the tonal experience. The theme involves an ascending 5-6 plan with a non-tonic beginning and a non-tonic culmination; the tritonal trajectory is the tragic result of a frustrated attempt to reach the tonic. To return to the technical comparison to Op. 82/II: like the E-major harmony that supports the start of the A’ section in that piece, the D-minor harmony in m. 26 of Op. 111/I is staged as a local upward chromatic displacement (from D♭ major). Since it restarts the ascending 5-6 plan, it can also (more abstractly) be considered a downward semitonal substitution for a desired E♭-minor tonic goal. And if the theme’s restatement at m. 26 suggests A minor as a new key, then the brutal A♭-minor start of the transition may be heard as a local downward chromatic displacement from a prospective A-minor tonic. The overall E♭-minor tonic is entirely absent from the main theme.

At the end of the movement, Prokofiev contributes to the sense of repose through a successful upward connection of V to i. Example 6.15 shows a harmonic reduction of the movement’s concluding chords. In m. 454, V9 resolves deceptively to VI; this chord shifts upward through vi (m. 464) to a first-inversion dominant with subdominant upper-voice elements (m. 471). The tonic resolution (with Tierce de Picardie) is at last accomplished at m. 477. In the upper voice, the tonic scale degree is sustained throughout the VI-i span. This emphasizes the effect of resolution—a winding-down that is especially effective in its contrast to the 5-6 upward-striving character of the main theme (as in Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 3).⁸

Example 6.15: Symphony No. 6, Op. 111, I, ending: harmonic reduction

⁸ The final harmonic progression also recalls the motivic content of the B-minor second theme, which contrasts strongly with the main theme. Governed by a B tonic pedal, this diatonic (Aeolian) dolce theme features a G-A-B bass motive (essentially a 5-6 motion) that suggests the reverse of the upward-striving 5-6 tendencies of the main theme.
In the quotation above from the 1925 letter to Myaskovsky about Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, Prokofiev used the word *stroinyi*, which could be translated as well-proportioned or well-balanced. In many of the analyses in this dissertation, I have investigated sources of imbalance at the beginnings of themes and pieces—e.g. the “slant” from i to ii in the main themes of Op. 40/I or Op. 14/I, the ascending 5-6 striving character of Op. 111/I or Op. 62, No. 3, or the initial semitonal motions in the themes discussed in Section II of Chapter 5—as a prerequisite to appreciating later events as “balancing.” The Symphonies No. 2, Op. 40, and No. 6, Op. 111, as well as many other works spanning Prokofiev’s career, offer fascinating material for further study along these lines.

V. Interlocking chords, unresolving suspensions, and related issues

In the above discussion of the main theme of Op. 40/I, I mentioned a case of interlocking chords in mm. 13-14, where an A₃-major triad (or A₇) is prevented from appearing as a stable tertian harmony until m. 14. The resulting quartal construction plays a role in a broader scheme of symmetrical sonorities and lays the groundwork for the ensuing quartally built dominant of E (at the end of m. 15). Pairs of interlocked chords are of widespread importance in Prokofiev’s music; this is another area in which further study is needed. Because of their reciprocal frustrating tendencies, such chordal pairs are especially conducive to ostinati, perpetual motion devices, impressionistic environments, and march patterns. Often, they give rise to quartal effects, but harmonic functionality and the primacy of tertian harmony in Prokofiev’s music generally create a need for resolution—and thus fuel the perpetual motion. An early example is the central chordal pair in “Otchalila lodka,” Op. 9, No. 2 (example 6.16). At the outset of the song is a [0257] sonority. An E-D♯ resolution would clarify the harmony as V4/3 of E; an A-G♯ resolution would create an E-major tonic with added ninth in the bass. As the right-hand dyad E-A moves upward in m. 3, one might presume that neither resolution will take place, but the new harmony in m. 3 allows for an indirect A-G♯ resolution. As Bertram (2001) observes, these quartal sonorities basically suggest V4/3 (with unresolving 7-6) alternating with I₆/₄ (with added sixth) (163). Sustaining the common ¹ in mm. 2-4, the voice helps to downplay the effect of D-T resolution. The bass also contributes to the melding of the two harmonic functions, as ⁵ supports the second harmony. The technique is well suited to the impressionistic scene described by the
Prokofiev sometimes employs similar interlocking techniques in a humorous spirit, as a way of preventing a “serious” dominant seventh—or its tritone in particular—from fully materializing. For example, Joke, Op. 3, No. 2 (example 6.17), ends with what is basically V7-I cadence, but the V7 is embellished in such a way that the F-B tritone never appears vertically. As Ashley (1963) points out, the harmony in m. 32 is closely related to a Ger6-V7 alternation (39-40). Meanwhile, the pairing of [0358] and [0257] produces a faintly quartal effect (as in “Ochalila lodka”). A similar procedure may be recalled from the first movement of the Classical Symphony, Op. 25 (discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 44-49). In mm. 15-17 of that movement, B7 in root position and D7 in second inversion are interlocked through overlapping 4-3 and 7-6.

9 At the end of the piece, there is a “decision” between T and D—in favour of D, allowing the piece to end openly.
resolutions. The inability of the dominant agent of E minor to materialize is the first sign that, in the course of this lighthearted movement, the tonal “threat” of that minor key need not be taken really seriously.

The topic of unresolving or “futile” 4-3 or 7-6 resolutions branches out into issues of both quartal sonorities and chromatic displacement. Example 6.18 suggests three stages in the application of a technique: in the first, a suspension embellishes a leading tone in the conventional way; the second may suggest either an implied resolution of the suspension or a conversion of the suspension into an anticipation; in the third, the suspension again does not resolve downward, but now it becomes the new leading tone itself, giving rise to a “special” dominant of a key a semitone higher. We encounter this third method, for instance, in mm. 25-26 of Op. 111/I (discussed in the preceding section), or mm. 130-31 in Op. 82/II (discussed in Chapter 5, p. 199).

![Example 6.18: "evolutionary" scheme:](image)

The notion of tonic and dominant chords being mixed vertically also invites further investigation of the links between the music of Prokofiev and that of other composers. For example, the celebrated endings of works like Scriabin’s Désir, Op. 57, No. 1 feature a chordal type that was well-known to Prokofiev: a tonic base with V7/#5 in the upper voices. An exploration of the contexts of such harmonies in Prokofiev’s music has been beyond the scope of the present study. Also fascinating are Prokofiev’s innovative uses of six-four chords, which might even strike one as the reverse of that Désir chord—a dominant base under a tonic harmony. I discussed an example of a six-four of ambiguous harmonic function in the third

---

10 For more on Scriabin’s innovative approaches to dominant function, see Ewell (2005).
11 See, e.g., Op. 40/II, m. 6; Op. 83/I, m. 129; and Op. 83/II, m. 95.
movement of Piano Concerto No. 3, Op. 26 (see Chapter 4, pp. 125-28). One might further investigate, for example, the six-four in m. 7 of Thoughts, Op. 62, No. 2 (followed by an eloquent breath mark), or—to take an extreme case—the “floating” six-four chord (mm. 116-18) prior to the secondary theme in the first movement of Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 83. Another way to branch out from the topic of pairs of interlocking chords would be to consider march patterns in general, perhaps extending the study beyond Prokofiev to Stravinsky, Shostakovich, and others to explore twentieth-century reinventions of this simplest of genres.

VI. Conclusion

From an analytical perspective, the vast stylistic diversity of Prokofiev’s music presents a challenge. One of my reasons for including an excerpt from Symphony No. 2, Op. 40, in this chapter is that this work seems to signal the end of a phase of Prokofiev’s career. It is the last of the pieces listed as representing Prokofiev’s “modern line” (Prokofiev 1991 [1941], 248), and in the 1925 letter referred to above, Prokofiev’s misgivings about this unpopular piece even prompted him to exclaim, “Schluss—it’ll be a long time before anything else complicated comes from me” (Brown 1967, 70). But Prokofiev’s “modern line” is surely best regarded neither as a category into which a specific group of pieces can neatly be placed, nor as a phase that ended precisely with Op. 40 in 1925, but rather as a set of techniques—mainly associated with harmonic language—that formed part of a lifelong quest for innovation and originality. In essence, this quest was not interrupted by Prokofiev’s turn to simplicity in the 1930s. Insisting on “a new simplicity” entailing “new devices [novymi priëmami] and, chiefly, new intonations [novymi intonatsiami],” he came up with a work that was arguably more complex than anything he had hitherto written: Piano Concerto No. 5, Op. 55. Admittedly, one of the disadvantages of my approach in this dissertation is that I have not been able adequately to explore the differences among the four (or five) “lines”; between the Russian, international, and Soviet periods of Prokofiev’s oeuvre; between the “complicated” and the no less innovative “simple” music; or between the “great music” and the “music for the masses.” On the other hand, my focus on aspects of harmonic function has, I hope, helped to shed light on some of the

12 “My chief virtue (or if you like, defect),” Prokofiev said, “has been a tireless lifelong search for an original, individual musical idiom … I detest imitation, I detest hackneyed devices” (Prokofiev 1959, 7).
13 See Prokofiev (1991 [1941], 294) for another translation.
14 On this last dichotomy, see the summary of Prokofiev’s speech at the meeting of the Union of Composers on 9 April 1937 (Nestyev 1971, 54-56; or in an English translation, Nestyev 1978, 94-97).
shared elements of works exhibiting astonishingly diverse styles. In my view, Prokofiev’s motto of constant innovation more often entailed the refinement and reinvention than the abandonment of old techniques.

Prokofiev’s music has often been celebrated for what Minturn (1997) describes as its “super-complete” rather than incomplete” nature (66): it seems to withstand scrutiny from numerous analytical perspectives and actually to require an eclectic approach to be appreciated fully. Yet it is important to question the relative validity of competing perspectives in each case. Prokofiev is universally acknowledged as a master of musical irony, but it would hardly be accurate to say that he took an ironic view of tonality itself (as opposed to some old-fashioned “rules” of tonality), or that he did not genuinely admire the music of Schubert, Beethoven, Grieg, and Rimsky-Korsakov. The groundwork for Prokofiev’s innovative harmonic language was laid largely by late nineteenth-century music. Viewing Prokofiev principally as either a neoclassicist or a modernist, many analysts have underestimated the importance of this point. Throughout this dissertation, I have tried to move away from the widespread view of Prokofiev’s music as characteristically featuring a competition or dialogue between tonal/traditional elements (where harmony is functional) and non-tonal/innovative elements (where harmony is non-functional). I have sought to present more unified perspectives of works by Prokofiev, exploring how harmonic function often manifests itself in subtle and complex ways as part of this composer’s idiosyncratic version of tonality.
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