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ABSTRACT

PART I: SAMSON SUITE

The Samson Suite is a four movement composition written for string chamber orchestra. The first movement, Samson at the Gates (Overture), and the second movement, The Emptying (A Meditation Prayer) represent a fusion of classical and baroque compositional devices with twentieth century minimalism. Maximum musical mileage is achieved through minimal harmonic means. The first movement does this by exploiting the Ti → Do relation between the tonic key center of g minor and the key center of the leading tone, f# minor. This technique is used extensively by Prokofiev in Opus 94. Likewise, the second movement in D Major exploits and elongates the Ti → Do relationship. Both movements are in ternary form. The first movement substitutes a fugato for the development section in the relative major of Bb. The second movement introduces a new theme in the B section in the dominant key of A. The overall scheme of the four movements continues the leading tone relationship, moving from the key of g minor in the first movement to f# minor in the third movement and from D Major in the second movement, to c# minor in the last movement. The third movement, Journey to Saga City (Journey to Sagacity) is a prelude of virtually equal proportions (eighty-one measures) to the fugue in the fourth and final movement, The Finishing (eighty-two measures). The Samson Suite represents a crystallization of twentieth-century compositional ideas and classical tradition found in the twentieth-century neo-classical school, of which Prokofiev was a leading proponent. The Samson Suite was premiered on April 30, 2008, by the New Music Festival Chamber Orchestra, under the direction of Dr. Robert Rollin, at the DeYor Performing Arts Center in Youngstown, Ohio.
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ABSTRACT
PART II: THE PROVOCATIVE PROKOFIEV
Analysis of Moderato Movement
*Sonata for Flute and Piano in D Major, Opus 94*

The thesis examines Prokofiev’s treatment of the traditional sonata-allegro form, as it presents itself in the first movement, *Moderato* of the *Sonata for Flute and Piano, Opus 94*. Five compositional procedures peculiar to Prokofiev’s treatment are identified and examined throughout the movement: 1) the use of chromatic mediants to promote root movement by thirds rather than fifths; 2) the exploitation of the tertian harmonic balance inherent in the augmented chord; 3) the use of the chromatic root shift, raising or lowering the tonic and fifth of the triad changing major to minor and minor to major; 4) harmonic treatment of the seventh degree of the scale; and, 5) Prokofiev’s use of themes that can be circumscribed within each other, enabling him to integrate the operative harmonic treatment introduced in one theme into another theme. The ongoing thrust of Prokofiev’s music is achieved by the constant re-synthesizing of previous ideas in new contexts by idea-extension. This is Prokofiev’s unique way of incorporating variation form into sonata-allegro form. The thesis hypothesizes that Prokofiev’s innovative approach to traditional harmonic progressions allows for the introduction of chromaticisms which expand the range of tonal centers available for resolution. An overview of the historical circumstances influencing Prokofiev’s life is provided to give perspective on *Opus 94*, relative to the entire body of Prokofiev’s creative output. A Map to Themes and Tonal Centers is provided in Appendix II (p. 124) as a companion guide to the detailed analysis of the movement. Sources for the first movement, *Moderato, Sonata for Flute and Piano, Opus 94* can be found in the Music Scores references listed in the Bibliography.
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INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH AGENDA

The 135 completed works in Sergei Prokofiev’s oeuvre embrace a broad range of genres, from symphonies, ballets, chamber works, concerti, and solo piano works to film soundtracks. Despite the diversity of this output, his compositions all bear the hallmark of Prokofiev’s dynamism and the ability to be provocative, whether in his more extroverted works or in his most introspective works. The naïve original perception that he peppered his music with intentional “wrong notes”, in light of later 20th century musical developments, now seems rather antiquated.

We can “hear” a hypothetical original version of the music lurking beneath the surface. In other words, it is as if we could remove the witticisms and discover a truly classical symphony. Prokofiev’s son once remarked that his father first writes music and then “Prokofievizes” it. It is certainly possible to imagine such a compositional process producing the “Classical” Symphony.

This is “wrong-note” music….We smile more than laugh at the quirky turns of phrase and unexpected harmonies, because they are not so very wrong. Out of place in a symphony of Mozart or Haydn, these “wrong” notes gain in Prokofiev’s hands an integrity and a rightness appropriate to 1917. They give the symphony its charm and grace. ¹

Jason W. Clark, in his thesis on Prokofiev’s pitch organization and form in the first movement of Quintet, Opus 39, cites William Austin, Neil Minturn, and Deborah Rifkin to emphasize this same point.

Far from implying mistakes, this label, first used by William Austin in a 1956 Music Review article…describes Prokofiev’s longstanding habit of subverting traditional harmony with notes that seem to miss their mark by a step. Most scholarship on Prokofiev is dedicated to the idea of modifying the academic understanding of these notes. Neil Minturn, especially, has devoted several studies to the affirmation of these notes, not as “wrong” but as expressions of a different approach to harmony. Deborah Rifkin assails the notion of “wrong notes” while also acknowledging the

usefulness of the misnomer, as it “captures an incongruous effect that many of Prokofiev’s chromatic shifts create.”

This thesis will seek to understand how that notion could be applied to the first movement of Prokofiev’s Sonata in D Major for Flute and Piano, Opus 94 written in 1943, ten years before his death.

In order to see where this composition fits into Prokofiev’s total creative output, historical perspective is required. Prokofiev was born in Sontsovka, Ukraine on April 23, 1891, to Sergei Alekseevich Prokofiev, an agricultural engineer, and Maria Grigoryevna Zhitkova, a pianist. In addition to his mother, the composer Reinhold Glière, a graduate of St. Petersburg Conservatory who lived with the Prokofievs, was Sergei’s teacher and an early influence. Glière is credited with preparing Sergei for entrance into St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1904 at the age of 13, the youngest student ever admitted. Prokofiev was a prodigious pianist and premiered many of his own works for piano, winning the Rubenstein prize in 1914, for the performance of his own Piano Concerto No.1.  As a member of the Contemporary Music Society at the Conservatory, Prokofiev premiered Arnold Schoenberg’s Three Piano Pieces, Opus 11, in 1911, demonstrating a life-long interest in the works of other composers. After graduating from the Conservatory in 1914, Prokofiev remained in Russia for four years, writing his Piano Concerto No. 2, the Classical Symphony, Violin Concerto No. 1, Sarcasmes, and Vision Fugitives for piano. Following the 1917 Revolution, Prokofiev left the Soviet Union for San Francisco, California, where he remained until April

---

3 David Nice, Prokofiev from Russia to the West (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 83.
of 1920, when he left for Paris. He remained in Europe until 1936, when he moved his family back to the Soviet Union permanently.

During the time abroad, he completed *Symphonies 2, 3, and 4*, three more piano concerti, *String Quartet No. 1*, and the opera *The Love for Three Oranges*. In the early years after his return to the Soviet Union, he composed *Peter and the Wolf*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Violin Sonata 1*, *Piano Sonatas 6 - 8*, and *Symphony No. 5*. His early, middle, and late periods can be likened to Beethoven’s experience – first as a virtuoso pianist-composer, having his “enfant terrible” prodigy years, then his middle years returning to Mother Russia, basking in his international acclaim back at home, and finally, a late period during which he was subjected to official cultural reproaches along with fellow composers Kabalevsky and Shostakovich.4

Like Beethoven, Prokofiev’s fame was quickly won and enjoyed for a substantial period of his life, even though his later works were subject to Stalinist misunderstanding and criticism. The fame that he had garnered while in the West, initially a source of pride for Soviet music officials, eventually became a source of suspicion during the Stalinist era. Prokofiev was coerced to publicly apologize for his Western extravagances, confessing that, on occasion, he had lapsed into formalism and even atonality. He was forced to adopt his folk roots once again, incorporating the New Simplicity movement that guaranteed originality without sacrificing an ability to communicate to the people.5 Perhaps Prokofiev’s final note of irony is not in his music, but in the fact that he and Stalin died on the same day, March 5, 1953.

---

In his Autobiography, written when he was fifty years old, Prokofiev identifies five categories into which his early famous compositions fall. Those five categories or “lines”⁶, as Prokofiev called them, were the classical, the modern, the toccata, the lyrical, and the grotesque.⁷

The first was the classical line, which could be traced back to my early childhood and the Beethoven sonatas I heard my mother play….The second line, the modern trend, begins with that meeting with Taneev when he reproached me for the crudeness” of my harmonies….The third line is the toccata, or “motor” line, traceable perhaps to Schumann’s Toccata which made a powerful impression on me when I first heard it….The fourth line is lyrical: it appears first as a thoughtful and meditative mood, not always associated with the melody, or at any rate, with the long melody….

I should like to limit myself to these four “lines”, and to regard the fifth, “grotesque”, line which some wish to ascribe to me as simply a deviation from the other lines. In any case, I strenuously object to the very word “grotesque” which has become hackneyed to the point of nausea….I would prefer my music to be described as “scherzo-ish” in quality, or else by three words describing various degrees of the scherzo - whimsicality, laughter, mockery.⁸

These categories are elements that will be examined in the analysis of the first movement of Opus 94, particularly the classical and lyrical “lines”. Expanded traditional harmonic analysis will be used, allowing for the inclusion of Prokofiev’s harmonic innovations, and for clarifying tonal centers. Over and above harmonic tension, Prokofiev combines various features of texture and rhythm to create climax.

Traditional harmony with goal-driven formulae (for example, tonic to tonic extension to dominant preparation to dominant, back to tonic) had become a gear-like mechanism, through which harmonies shifted into one another, navigating to destinations or tonal centers that had been discovered as agreeable places to go. What had heretofore been heard as

---

“wrong notes” or “wrong harmonies” in Prokofiev’s music, are actually innovations. Prokofiev’s unique way of shifting to unanticipated tonal centers is an earnest attempt to include overlooked and unexplored tonal realms, hidden within the familiar. This is not the work of an “enfant terrible” looking to shock the listener, but the art of a seasoned and visionary composer, whose discoveries would increase the understanding of harmonic potential dormant within the traditional system. “Abrupt change of tonality is a mannerism of certain Soviet composers, and this device has sufficient currency in 20th century music to justify its consideration.” Often Prokofiev’s modulations are implied and cadential elisions are employed, achieving an effect that is jarring, but still coherent. This effect is not new and can even be found in some of Beethoven’s early piano sonatas (e.g., final movement, Opus 10 No. 1 in c minor), and in Mozart’s Symphony No. 40 in G minor.

Deborah Rifkin discusses an example from the third movement of Opus 94 in which, …an F♯-Minor harmony…seems sudden and out of context in relation to the surrounding F-Major tonic and dominants. Many scholars have called chromatic shifts such as this wrong notes. It is an unfortunate term because there is, of course, nothing wrong about these particular notes. I believe the term has prevailed for more than fifty years because it captures an incongruous effect that many of Prokofiev’s chromatic shifts create – as if they don’t belong in their tonal contexts. This chromatic shift is a harmonic trick Prokofiev often uses. Traditionally, the lowering of the third of a Major triad yields the minor counterpart of the Major (the parallel minor), but Prokofiev keeps the third of the Major triad and raises instead, the root and the fifth to yield a minor triad, which shares its identity with the I chord as a ♯i, not a ♭ii. It is treated differently from a Neopolitan which moves normally to the dominant or cadential in traditional practice. This will be labeled a chromatic root shift. The Neopolitan chord is

---

actually a result of a downward chromatic root shift applied to the ii chord (D, F, A becomes D♭, F, A♭). Other non-traditional Roman numeral labels, such as #iv, biv and the bvi, revolve around the dominant of the key center, and are the result of the use of the *chromatic root shift*. The VII (a major triad built on the leading tone) and the bVII are also used by Prokofiev.

Before preceding further with analysis an in-depth look at the circumstances surrounding the composer and this particular composition that was begun in 1942 and completed in 1943 is warranted. In 1941 as World War II approached, Prokofiev was residing in the artistic resort of Nalchik, a small town near the Black Sea. As an employee of The Soviet Central Film Studio, a Party organization, he was transferred to Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, across the Caucasus Mountains. Upon his arrival there, Prokofiev was invited to collaborate with Sergei Eisenstein on the film *Ivan the Terrible*. He had already scored Eisenstein’s *Alexander Nevsky* in 1938. Prokofiev accepted the invitation in May 1942 and traveled sixteen hundred miles to Alma-Ata accompanied by his future wife, Myra Mendelsohn.

Alma-Ata is near the Chinese border, at the foothills of the Altai Mountains, in what is now Kazakhstan. Prokofiev wrote some music before scenes were shot and would finish the score after seeing the final cut. While on the movie set, he spent his spare time orchestrating the cantata *War and Peace* and writing other film scores for The Central Soviet Film Studio. He also wanted to write some “absolute” music. At the urging of fellow composer, Nikolai Miaskovsky, Prokofiev immersed himself in the folk music of the region. He became fascinated with integrating the folk idiom into classical forms. The *String Quartet No. 2, Opus 92* aimed to achieve “a combination of virtually untouched folk
material and the most classical of classical forms, the string quartet.”¹¹ Prokofiev seemed to have continued in the same vein for Opus 94. In his Autobiography, Prokofiev states, “I had long wished to write music for the flute, an instrument which I felt had been undeservedly neglected. I wanted to write a sonata in a delicate fluid classical style.”¹² At this later point in his life, Prokofiev concentrated on chamber works in classical forms. Many modern theorists seem reluctant to acknowledge the classical forms inherent in Prokofiev’s compositions, because of his innovative and unorthodox use of harmonies.

Prokofieff’s music is characterized by a drastic simplification of style and, in line with the political pressures of Soviet life and some of the prevailing esthetic ideas of the period, a strong revival of tonal procedures. This stylistic evolution took the form, not so much of any kind of conscious Russian nationalism or populism, as of a very distinctive, accessible neo-classicism. Eighteenth-century ideals are invoked in the use of ‘sonata form’, at least its external shell.¹³

Salzman’s observation leads one to ask, “What is the sonata-allegro form anyway, but an external shell?” It is a formal tool that can be used to extend, develop, integrate, and connect musical ideas. That the use of sonata-allegro form should have evolved concurrently with new harmonic discoveries over the centuries in no way diminishes its original purpose. Utilizing sonata-allegro form, modern composers are free to augment, supplement, and supplant the original formula.

The more probing question to ask is, “In what ways has Prokofiev utilized sonata-allegro form to preserve the external shell?” Prokofiev was a self-proclaimed neo-classicist, writing in sonata-allegro form during the 1940’s, when the tonal system was considered to

have been exhausted. If the tonal system had indeed collapsed, then many of the forms dependent upon tonality for their very existence would have fallen into obsolescence. A composer of Prokofiev’s ability, acuity, and awareness must have had a sense of calling when he embarked upon writing in the sonata-allegro form at that point in tonal evolution, as well as at that point in his own career. Beyond composing what he called “absolute music”, he was engaging in the preservation of a musical species.

Prokofiev’s unique and often misunderstood harmonic vocabulary challenges the listener and musicologist alike to discover if Prokofiev, indeed, adheres to the prescriptions of the sonata-allegro form. Analysis of Opus 94 will make apparent that once Prokofiev’s harmonic practices are understood, he fully meets the requisites of sonata-allegro form.

Opus 94 was premiered in Moscow on December 7, 1943 by flutist Nikolai Kharkovsky and pianist Sviatoslav Richter to favorable reviews. Richter enlisted Kharkovsky, a colleague at the Moscow Conservatory, to premier Opus 94. Richter had made a favorable impression on Prokofiev with his performance of the Sixth Piano Sonata, while a student at the Conservatory when Prokofiev was on faculty. Prokofiev was known for being highly critical of performances of his works, but upon hearing Richter’s rendition of the Sixth Sonata, he dedicated it to him. Prokofiev also invited Richter to premiere the Seventh and Ninth Piano Sonatas, both of which he dedicated to Richter.14 Richter’s sole appearance as a conductor was the premiere of Prokofiev's Symphony-Concerto in E minor,

---

Opus 125, on February 18, 1952. Prokofiev’s friend, violinist David Oistrakh, requested him to write Opus 94B, a transcription for violin and piano. Oistrakh and pianist Lev Oborin premiered this version of the work on June 17, 1944 in Moscow. Oistrakh’s and Richter’s high regard for Prokofiev was evidenced at Stalin’s funeral on March 9, 1953, when they played Prokofiev’s Violin Sonata No.1, Opus 80, even though Prokofiev had fallen out of favor with Stalin. One must read between the lines of history to decipher for whom their tribute was really intended.

Looking at the aforementioned lines or categories which Prokofiev used to describe his works, the classical and the lyrical are particular to the first movement of Opus 94. In the exposition, Prokofiev uses his lyrical gift to introduce seemingly different themes, and restates these themes in their entirety with melodic embellishment, depending more on transposition than on motivic development. It is interesting to note that in the entire movement, there is not one simultaneous moment of rest interrupting the continuous flow of the music, nor more importantly, a single perfect authentic cadence.

Prokofiev’s intricate chromatic voice leading is used in a melodic fashion to arrive at harmonic tonal centers that progress in whole steps or thirds, minimizing traditional dominant-tonic relationships. These progressions can still be analyzed using traditional Roman numerals. Traditional harmonies are often replaced by others providing a new sense of harmonic logic. The traditional idea of closely related keys is expanded. Prokofiev’s reliance on chromatic mediants with root movements down a third allow him to include key

---

17 The classical, the modern, the toccata, the lyrical, and the grotesque. See footnotes 6, 7, and 8, page 78.
centers a whole step removed in either direction, enabling what sounds more like a “shift” rather than a modulation. The use of the lowered submediant chord, the raised subdominant, the lowered supertonic, and the bVII are aspects introduced into Prokofiev’s musical vernacular. They can also be found in Russian folk music.

Altered tones which are used as fundamental tones of a tonality occur in Russian folk songs. Lowered second and seventh steps of a scale are common in Russian folk songs. Alterations within diatonic Major and minor tonalities are basic in Prokofiev’s style, and altered tones are as important as the seven tones of the scale.

In analyzing Prokofiev’s thought-provoking innovations within the traditional harmonic system, a clearer picture of the true intentions of his music is revealed that overshadows his image as a “wrong note” musical provocateur. Some theorists advocate non-traditional systems to analyze Prokofiev. For the scherzo movement of Opus 94, Minturn’s non-tonal approach uses “unordered set motifs”. For the andante movement, Rifkin’s theory of “ordered linear progressions – progressions that can have varying degrees of connection to tonal structure”, divides motives into three different types, “systemic, functional pitch-class, and non-functional pitch-class.” These approaches identify salient features of Prokofiev’s technique in the second and third movements of Opus 94. The first movement, however, is in sonata-allegro form, a structure with a formula evolved from harmonic interrelationships. Prokofiev brings to light new harmonic potentials that lay dormant in this formula. The first movement of Opus 94 is tonal and the melodies are often triadic, so this analysis will employ an expanded use of the traditional system. Roman-numeral analysis

---

best serves this purpose, however altered some of the Roman numerals might appear because of the peculiarities of Russian folk music, and Prokofiev’s own take on these harmonic practices.22

The research question for analysis then, is “How does Prokofiev integrate and reconcile his harmonic vocabulary with the time-honored harmonic practices of sonata-allegro form?” A cursory examination of the score will reveal the traditional tonic-dominant-tonic progression inherent in sonata-allegro form, but an in-depth analysis reveals that the composer visits every tonal center in the chromatic scale in either its major or minor form, except for the bII (Neopolitan center E♭) and the III (F♯ or G♭). This feat is not accomplished by sequencing through the Circle of Fifths, but by Prokofiev’s exploitation of mediant relationships, chromatic root shifts, and abrupt shifts in tonal centers. A Map to Themes and Tonal Centers (summarized in the table below) is provided in Appendix II (p. 124) as a companion guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonal Center</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Tonal Center</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Tonal Center</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>42-47</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>89-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>E♭ Phrygian</td>
<td>48-51</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>91-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>C♯</td>
<td>52-54</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>95-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>55-57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>108-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>b/G</td>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>112-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>62-64</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>115-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>65-71</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>124-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>126-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e/C</td>
<td>35-37</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>73-75</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>129-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>81-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>85-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 See v7 in Example 2, page 89, m. 3; vii/VII and VII in Example 7, page 96, mm. 24-25; b♭v = Ⅵiv in Example 8, page 97, m. 28; and, V7-vii in Example 15, page 108, m.64 , as representative of Roman-numeral based anomalies.
Five features of Prokofiev’s compositional procedures are particularly relevant to addressing the research question. First, is Prokofiev’s reliance on the use of chromatic mediants to promote root movement by thirds rather than fifths. Second, is Prokofiev’s use and treatment of the augmented chord (V♯5). Third, is Prokofiev’s use of the chromatic root shift, raising or lowering the tonic and fifth of the triad to change major to minor and minor to major. Prokofiev applies this technique particularly to the IV chord as depicted in Example 1.

Example 1: By Author - Chromatic Root Shift applied to IV Chord

Fourth, is Prokofiev’s harmonic treatment of the seventh degree of the scale. For example, in Theme IA the antecedent phrase will modulate down a whole step (♭VII), and in Theme II the antecedent phrase will cadence down a half-step on the leading tone (Major VII). Fifth and perhaps most importantly, is Prokofiev’s ability to circumscribe his themes within one another, necessitating intensive re-examination of each theme as it recurs. Prokofiev collects ideas from theme to theme and unexpectedly applies treatments, which seem to be indigenous to one theme, to another theme. This idea-extension mode of variation is a

---

23 In Ex. 1, Prokofiev would spell the 5iv in D as iv in E♭(G♯, B, D♯ = A♭, C♭, E♭), referencing simultaneous tonal centers a half step apart. (See Ex. 8, m. 28, page 97, where the 5iv in E is spelled as a iv in F).
unique method for incorporating variation into sonata-allegro form. The ongoing thrust of Prokofiev’s music is attained by the constant re-synthesizing of previous ideas in new contexts. This technique gives Prokofiev’s music great fluidity and integration of ideas.
Upon hearing Theme IA of the exposition, one is taken by the sense of novelty within the framework of something very familiar. Prokofiev often avoids traditional progressions to arrive at a familiar harmonic goal. An eight-measure period is neatly divided into two four-measure antecedent-consequent phrases (Ex. 2 below). The antecedent phrase begins in the D tonal center, but ends on the dominant of the subtonic (G or V of bVII) to modulate down a whole step to the C tonal center in the consequent phrase. This harmonic sequence, while shifting down a whole step, subsequently cadences back in the original key at the period’s conclusion. The built-in harmonic design for the antecedent phrase dictates that it modulates down a whole step, while the built-in harmonic design for the consequent phrase dictates that it modulates back up a whole step. It should be noted however, that later in the movement, the antecedent and consequent phrases of Theme I are not always paired. They will be used independently of each other later in the development section, depending upon which whole step shift the composer chooses to enact.
Example 2: Theme IA Antecedent Phrase Modulates Down a Whole Step Consequent Phrase Modulates Up a Whole Step, mm. 1 – 8

In this theme the designated tonal center of D, established in the first measure, is supplanted by its chromatic mediant ($b^7VI$) in the second measure. The $b^7$ chromatic mediant is a $b^7VII$ in the tonal center of C, just as C is a $b^7VII$ in the tonal center of D. Once the modulation to the C tonal center is achieved in m. 3, it is immediately followed by its own chromatic mediant ($A^b$) in m. 6. The $A^b$ triad is the $b^7VII^7$ of $B^b$. In m. 8, Prokofiev moves back to the tonal center of D, avoiding a perfect authentic cadence with a post-cadential ii-V#5-I progression over a tonic pedal. Throughout the movement, each time Theme IA re-emerges, it will do so from an unexpected direction with increased impact and new significance.
The whole-tone shifting effect created by the use of chromatic mediants and b\(^7\)VII\(^s\) obscures the sense of tonic, in a manner analogous to the use of the whole-tone scale as found in Debussy’s works. Hearing the sonorities of major triads D, B\(^b\), C, A\(^b\) in succession has an effect comparable to the planing technique used by Debussy. Prokofiev subtly alters the sense of tonic until it is restored at the end of the consequent phrase in m. 8. The use of the minor v chord facilitates the whole-tone shifts in either direction, as in Ex. 2 above where the minor v chord becomes the pivot chord to the key center a whole step down in m. 3 and then a whole step up in m. 7.

If one focuses on the flute melody alone, one finds that the entire eight-measure phrase can be perceived in the key of D. Note the Phrygian tetrachord in mm. 2-3 and mm. 6-7 used to keep the tonic centered on D. By using Phrygian and Ionian modes, the melody serves as a binding agent between the two tonal centers of D and C. Prokofiev is dealing with layers of harmony and stratification of ideas. The ensemble between flute and piano is never purely melody and accompaniment, but more of an interplay of thematic material.

Theme IB, mm. 9 – 14 (Ex. 3 below), is not as neatly packaged as Theme IA. A four-measure antecedent phrase in D is divided into a two-measure repetition which inverts the earlier descending gesture found in Theme IA by using three consecutive ascending triads (D, E, F augmented) in the flute melody, before descending to the triad outlining the V chord.
Example 3: Theme IB Introduction of the V♯5 Chord and Ascending Triads on Consecutive Scale Steps of the Parallel Minor Scale, mm. 9 – 14

The arpeggiated triadic motif built on consecutive scale steps in m. 9 (I, V/V, V♯5, V over a tonic pedal in this statement) will play a significant role throughout the movement. The melody in the flute, a pattern of arpeggiated triads on consecutive steps of the d parallel minor scale, introduces the V♯5 chord, (F, A, C♯ is an enharmonic spelling and inversion of the V♯5 chord). This motif is of more use to Prokofiev throughout the movement than the accompanying piano part, which emphasizes the V♯5 chord. This triadic pattern will be

24 The piano part of Theme IB will not be heard again until the end of the development section, when it appears in the subdominant key of G (mm. 76 – 80, Ex. 18, p. 113).
incorporated into the transitional theme and will play an important part in Prokofiev’s tonal scheme in the development section. It will also be used as a bridge to introduce Theme II.

Prokofiev’s melodies are clear and precise. They are usually built on tones of Major or minor triads, which represent the essence of Prokofiev’s “neo-classicism.” Sudden “displacements” of tones, angularities of melodic outlines, and leaps immediately reveal Prokofiev’s individual style….

Another characteristic of Prokofiev’s mature period is the wide range of his melodies. From low to middle registers, a melody rises upward into higher registers….

The augmented chord is a favorite sonority of Prokofiev’s. Example 4 from an early work for solo piano demonstrates how Prokofiev utilizes strictly descending chromatic treatment of the augmented triad.

Example 4: An Early Treatment of the Augmented Triad Excerpt from “March” Op. 3 No. 3 for Piano.

Because of its symmetrical structure, the augmented triad lends itself to movement to tonal centers a major third away from the original tonal center.26 With the exception of the flute part, the V\#5 chord in Theme IB is treated in a traditional manner (V\#5 – I), and the chromatic mediant possibilities remain dormant. Later in Theme II the mediant relationships inherent

---

26 A, C\#, E\# = D\#, F, A = F, A, C\#. The spelling changes imply different resolutions. A, C\#, E\# → D;
D\#, F, A → G\#; F, A, C\# → B\#
in the $V^{#5}$ chord are activated, demonstrating Prokofiev’s penchant for collecting ideas and employing them when they are most opportune.

In m. 12 (Ex. 3, p. 91) Prokofiev uses the $V^{#5}$ of D in an enharmonic respelling (A, C#, F) as a signal of his departure from D to $A^b$. The E# in D equals the F in $A^b$. In the consequent phrase of Theme IB, Prokofiev’s chromatic voice leading achieves a tritone shift (D to $A^b$) without preparation or pivot.

Related to modulation in traditional music, shifted tonality contrasts with conventional modulation in three basic respects. Where conventional modulations are prepared with common material and proceed smoothly to related keys, contemporary shifts in tonality are unprepared, precipitate, and typically [go] to distant tonal regions.27

These sudden shifts are favored harmonic devices in Russian compositional technique.

The move to $A^b$ doesn’t sound as jarring as it would have, had the ear not become attuned to the $A^b$ sonority as a chromatic mediant to C, as presented in Theme IA.28 This is an enharmonic foreshadowing of the tonicization of the seventh step of the scale of the dominant key of A Major ($G^#$) which is achieved in Theme II.

After m. 13 and m. 14 in $A^b$ Prokofiev unexpectedly breaks into the transitional theme, releasing a torrent of harmonies in the B tonal center (Ex. 5 below). Although this tonal center bears a mediant relationship to the $E^b^{#5}$ chord that ends Theme IB (see m. 14 in Ex. 3, p. 91) and is the relative minor of D Major, it can also be viewed as an extended preparation to Theme II in the key of A ($b = ii$ in A; $B = V/V$ in A; $bV^7 = vii^{o65}$ in A). In the transitional theme a portion of Theme IB is maintained (upward stepwise movement of triads in the accompaniment in m. 16, now $bII$- iii- IV, in the piano part. Ex. 5 below).

---

28 The relationship between tonal centers related by tri-tone is familiar to all jazz artists through the practice of tri-tone substitution. The $V^7$ of $A^b$ ($E^b$, G, D$^b$) when subjected to tri-tone substitution yields the $V^7$ of D ($A$, G, C$^b$). The dominant of one tonal center is the Neapolitan of the other and vice versa. $V$ of D = N of $A^b$ and $V$ of $G^b$ = N of D.
Example 5: Transitional Theme, mm. 15 – 18

In Ex. 6 below, Prokofiev vacillates between a G⁷ and an E⁷ chord by manipulating the b⁷ chord. Lowering any note of a fully-diminished seventh chord a half step yields a dominant seventh chord. Lowering the seventh of the b⁷ chord a half step yields a G⁶/⁵ and lowering the fifth of the b⁷ chord yields a E⁴/³ chord. The G⁷ chord is actually a German augmented 6⁷ in B/b, but that is not its function here. Instead it is the mediant relationship to the E⁷ chord that is important. The E⁷ chord is the V⁷ of the key of A that introduces Theme II in the dominant key of A.
Example 6: Point of Modulation to Theme II in A, m. 19

The Transitional Theme reaches the point of modulation to Theme II in m. 19 (Ex. 6). This fulfills the forward movement from Theme I in the tonic to Theme II in the dominant.\(^{29}\)

It is significant to note that the last three tonal centers visited (D and A\(^b\) in Theme IB, and B in the Transitional Theme) outline the vii\(^o\) chord in the key of A (D, A\(^b\) enharmonic to G\(^#\), B). Prokofiev applies a variation of the triadic step progression found in Theme IB (inversions and dotted rhythms) to introduce Theme II in m. 20 (Ex. 7 below).\(^{30}\)

\(^{29}\) The transitional theme will also be used in the development section (mm. 58-61, Ex.15, page 108) and again in the recapitulation as a false transition (mm. 97-101, Ex. 21, page 116).

\(^{30}\) Perhaps Prokofiev’s use of dotted rhythms is an homage to the Baroque tradition’s French Overture.
Example 7: Antecedent Phrase of Theme II, mm. 20 – 25

In the first statement of Theme II (Ex. 7), Prokofiev returns to use of the classical-period syntax as was found in Theme IA. The antecedent phrase (mm. 22 - 25) is in the new tonic (A Major) and the consequent phrase will be in the dominant (E Major). While the consequent phrase of Theme IA cadences down a whole step, Theme II cadences down a half step in m. 25, tonicizing the leading tone (G#). Prokofiev arrives in G# by turning the I chord into a Fr. 6th (A, C#, D#, Fx) at the beginning of m. 24. The G# tonal center is further stabilized by the vii07 which precedes it. Prokofiev could remain in G# or use the G# as a dominant to C# (which he will do in the development section). By using G# as VII, Prokofiev can access mediant-related triads in the consequent phrase (1st statement G#
to E, 2nd statement G# to C), hence visiting all tonal centers inherent in the V\(^{b_5}\) triad in A (E, G#, B\(^b\)). Thus Prokofiev capitalizes here on the idea presented by the V\(^{b_5}\) chord in Theme IB. Instead of using the augmented chord as a sonority, he extracts the harmonic possibilities inherent in a triad comprised of major thirds.

Example 8: Use of Chromatic Root Shift in First Statement of Theme II Consequent Phrase, mm. 27 – 29

In m. 28 of Ex. 8, Prokofiev uses the borrowed iv chord in the key of F (B, D, F), temporarily blurring the tonal centers of E and F. The chromatic root shift has the effect of momentarily altering the anticipated tonal center up a half-step. This creates a shock to our sense of tonal center. Just as the antecedent phrase cadences down a half step, Prokofiev coaxes the ear into anticipating that the consequent phrase might cadence up a half-step in m. 29. Despite its spelling, the b\(^b\)v is really a #iv and is still a dominant preparation for the V chord in the key of E. This effect is what gave Prokofiev the reputation as a “wrong note” composer. Early critics would have been more correct to label him a “wrong harmony” composer. Prokofiev navigates a simple diatonic melody through a vortex of harmonies that
could draw the melody into a tonal center a half-step removed in either direction, leaving the
listener wondering where the music will cadence. The element of unpredictability that
Prokofiev introduces here lends a freshness to the traditional treatment of the material.

Example 9: Canonic Treatment of Theme II, Reduction of mm. 29 – 31

Prokofiev’s second statement of Theme II in A Major employs a chromatically
embellished canon at the octave in the antecedent phrase (Ex. 9). Both antecedent
phrases, m. 25 (Ex. 7, p. 96) and m. 34 (Ex. 10 below), end on a G♯ chord, a half-step below
the tonic of A Major, tonicizing the seventh step of the scale.

Example 10: Consequent Phrase Melody of Theme II in e parallel minor instead of
E Major, mm. 34 – 37
The consequent answer to the second statement of Theme II (Ex. 10 above) uses a chromatic mediant on the other side of the tonicized VII (C Major triad instead of E Major in m. 35), to maintain the tertian balance inherent in the V7 triad. This allows the flute’s melody to be stated in the parallel minor mode (e minor instead of E Major), enriching the theme with extended harmonies. The C Major triad is a VI in the key of e minor.

Prokofiev’s intent is to state the antecedent phrase of Theme II in the new tonic of A, having the consequent phrase answer in both the dominant (E in the first statement) and the minor dominant (e parallel minor in the second statement). The e♭ minor chord on the first beat of m. 37 (Ex. 10 above) is an upward chromatic root shift applied to the IV chord in A. It is ingeniously reached by the unorthodox treatment of the V4/2 chord which precedes it. Normally the seventh of a V7 chord resolves downward. In this case, the seventh of the V4/2 (D) resolves upward to E♭ allowing the V4/2 chord to resolve up a half step. As in the previous antecedent phrase of Theme II, the chromatic root shift temporarily masks the progression’s harmonic trajectory, but still functions in a manner related to traditional harmonic progressions.

Prokofiev concludes the exposition with a codetta in mm. 38 - 41 (Ex. 11 below) which seems to be derived from the drone-bass accompaniment pattern in the piano part of Theme II (mm. 22 – 23, Ex. 11). There is a gestural similarity in melody, rhythm and meter, the use of dotted notes and the repetition within both phrases. This codetta for solo piano merely hints at the significance it assumes later in the development section, as an accompaniment pattern (in diminution) to Theme II and as an expanded codetta in the recapitulation. The dominant key has now been established and the codetta is punctuated with the repeat sign, an emblem of sonata-allegro form.
Example 11: Theme II Codetta, mm. 22 – 23 and mm. 38 – 41

Much of Prokofiev’s harmonic innovation is centered on his treatment of the seventh step of the scale. In Theme I, the antecedent phrase modulates to the subtonic ($bVII$). In Theme II, the antecedent phrase cadences down a half-step to the VII. Prokofiev also makes a connection between the $V^{#5}$ ($e, g^\#, b^\#$) and a major triad spelled on the leading tone ($g^\#, b^\#, d^\#$). These triads have two tones in common including the leading tone. Their use allows for an expanded harmonic range. The tonicization of the leading tone (seventh degree of the scale) will have further ramifications in the development section.

There is also a connection between Theme IA and Theme II that goes beyond the use of the classical-period syntax. Prokofiev suggests alternative melodies hidden within the original ones. Theme II suggests a subliminal reworking of Theme I. Examine Ex. 12 below (edited by author) where identical pitches match up in both melodies. With the author’s alterations, Theme IA can be played simultaneously against Theme II. Here Theme IA is placed in the dominant key of A, with minor changes in Theme I to accommodate the descending half-step modulation of Theme II.
Example 12: Author’s Illustration of How Theme IA and Theme II can be Circumscribed within Each Other

Whether done consciously or not, Prokofiev’s lyrical gifts allow him to access many themes at once, reflecting the organic quality of his compositional methods. While Prokofiev’s themes can be derivative of one another, each one contains unique properties. These unique properties are extended from one theme to another, as Prokofiev engages in idea-extension and variation.

The remainder of the analysis will not concentrate so much on Prokofiev’s harmonic idiom, but on the development and unexpected couplings of themes that hitherto have been presented independently of each other, as illustrated in Example 12 above. The purpose is to highlight Prokofiev’s ability to take a seminal idea and expand and multiply its implications. He relentlessly integrates seemingly disparate ideas into one another. In this way, Prokofiev’s music achieves a fluid texture in a musical stream of consciousness. His technique avoids the expected, only to present it later when it is no longer anticipated.
Opus 94’s development section is more in line with the German concept of *Druchfuhring*, “leading” or “pushing through”, as Prokofiev combines and expands melodies from the exposition. The development section begins with what appears to be new material, but is in fact a hybrid theme. Like in Example 12 (p. 101) where Theme IA and Theme II were shown to circumscribe each other, the two-measure antecedent phrase of the hybrid theme can encompass Theme IA and Theme II in diminution. Example 13 below illustrates Theme IA in diminution over the development theme.

![Example 13: Origins of Development Theme, mm. 42-43](image)

The flute introduces a martial theme in staccato triplets in mm. 42 - 43. This triplet figuration attaches itself to all the other themes in the development section. It signifies a marshalling of forces, a call to order, fortifying the dominant key center of A (an obligatory harmonic signpost in sonata-allegro form), but Prokofiev will remain in the A tonal center for only four measures (mm. 42 – 46, Appendix III, p. 132), before replacing it with the C# mediant-related tonal center. At the beginning of the development section, Prokofiev embarks on a five-step plan in mm. 42 – 51. All ten measures must be viewed simultaneously in order to analyze his multi-step development plan. Please refer to
Appendix III (p. 129 - 132) for a detailed dissection of Prokofiev’s implementation of the Five-Step Development Plan outlined here.

### Five-Step Development Plan

**Measures 42 – 51**

**Step A:** Theme IA and Theme II can be amalgamated into the hybrid theme as demonstrated in Ex. 13 above (mm. 42 – 43, p. 102).

**Step B:** The hybrid theme is paired with ascending triads of Theme IB in the piano (mm. 42 – 46, Appendix III, p. 132) to form a five-measure phrase.

**Step C:** Theme II is superimposed by the author in the top line of the score throughout the passage in both its original form and in diminution (See Appendix III, p. 132). Here we can see how Theme II silently governs the harmonic progression. The tonicized seventh degree of the scale of A (G#) that was found in Theme II is now used as a dominant to the key of C# (m. 46, Appendix III, p. 132).

**Step D:** The triadic pattern of Theme IB ascends and descends simultaneously (mm. 46–50, Appendix III, p. 132) outlining C# Phrygian scale, moving the tonal center from A to C# Phrygian.

**Step E:** The vº in C# Phrygian is transformed into V in C# (mm. 50-51, Appendix III, p. 132) leading to the re-emergence of Theme IA in C# (m. 52, Ex. 14 p. 105), rather than the traditional dominant key of A.

Traditionally in the major key, the seventh step of the scale employs a diminished chord which is highly utilitarian for modulation. Prokofiev uses the diminished chord only in
its secondary function as in Theme IA, where the vii\(^{07}\)/IV and \(^{ '#}\)vi\(^{07}\) is applied and in Theme II where, ironically, the rarely seen vii\(^{07}\)/VII (vii\(^{07}\) of G\(^{#}\)) appears. Prokofiev tonicizes the seventh step of the scale of A at m. 46 (Appendix III, p. 132) and uses it as a V to access C\(^{#}\) Phrygian.

The G\(^{#}\) (leading tone of A) now becomes V in the C\(^{#}\) Phrygian scale. In m. 51 (Ex. 14 below) G\(^{#}\) becomes V to C\(^{#}\) Major. Prokofiev increases the harmonic tension by using the raised fourth degree of the Phrygian scale (F\(^{x}\)) before resolving to G\(^{#}\) in the flute in m. 52, where Theme IA begins in the key of C\(^{#}\) Major. Prokofiev uses the seventh step of the scale of the dominant key of A (G\(^{#}\)) as a gateway to the chromatic mediant-related center of C\(^{#}\). The return of Theme IA in the development section (m. 52, Ex. 14) should now be in the dominant key of A, which is traditional in sonata-allegro form, but instead it is in the key of C\(^{#}\) (the leading tone to the original tonic center of D in the exposition). This creates the effect of a prolonged, unresolved, leading tone emphasis.

Prokofiev reaches all the way back to the first two measures of the entire movement, magnifying the mediant relationship found on the micro level in the harmonic progressions of Theme IA (D to B\(^{b}\)) into expanded related tonal centers on the macro level (A to C\(^{#}\)) in the development section. Now, however, the mediant relationship is inverted. The dominant function of the tonicized seventh in Theme II is utilized in the re-statement of Theme IA in C\(^{#}\) Major at m. 52 (G\(^{#}\) as V to C\(^{#}\), Ex. 14). This is another example of Prokofiev’s use of idea-extension to create variation.
Example 14: Re-emergence of Theme IA Coupled with Development Theme as Consequent Phrase, mm. 51 – 57

In its new presentation, Prokofiev separates the antecedent and the consequent phrases of Theme IA. The antecedent phrase is in the new tonic of C# (m. 52, Ex. 14 above) and the consequent phrase is in the dominant of G# (m. 62, Ex. 15, p. 108) replicating the tonic-dominant treatment found in the first presentation of Theme II in the exposition. Here again is an example of an idea extended from the treatment of one theme to another theme.
Prokofiev uses an ingenious plan in which the antecedent phrase of Theme IA (mm. 52 – 55, Ex. 14, p. 105) is joined to the development theme (mm. 56 – 57, Ex. 14, p. 105), yet maintains the built-in harmonic scheme applied to the antecedent phrase of Theme IA (the ability to modulate down a whole step). The consequent phrase of Theme IA in the dominant of G♯ will not arrive until m. 62 (Ex. 15, p. 108), yet antecedent and consequent phrases could have been joined together.

In the measures between 55 and 62, the consequent phrase of Theme II appears, answering the antecedent phrase of Theme II which was harmonically inferred at the beginning of the development section. Like an M. C. Escher print, the antecedent and consequent phrases of Theme IA and Theme II interlock as in a lattice, weaving in and out of each other (Figure A).

Figure A: M. C. Escher Analogy, Interlaced Antecedent and Consequent Phrases Theme II and Theme IA

The consequent phrase of Theme II in b minor (pick up to mm. 58 – 61, Ex. 15, p. 108) is paired with the transitional theme (from the exposition) in the G tonal center (VI in the key of b minor as the result of a deceptive cadence from mm. 57 – 58 (Ex. 14, p. 105 and Ex. 15, p. 108). As in the second statement of the consequent phrase of Theme II in the
exposition (m. 35, Ex. 10, p. 98), here the restatement of the theme in the parallel minor
mode in the flute is embellished by shifting the piano part down a major third into the key of
the chromatic mediant (b to G in m. 58, Ex. 15 below). This is another example of
Prokofiev’s use of idea-extension in a new combination of materials (Theme II joined with
the Transitional Theme). These tonal centers converge, forming an inverted French 6 chord
(spelled G, C♯, D♯, A) in G in m. 61 (Ex. 15). The French 6 chord is treated as a dominant to
the key of G♯, where the consequent phrase of Theme IA is stated (Ex. 15). Since the
consequent phrase of Theme IA always modulates up a whole step, its statement in m. 62 in
G♯ (dominant of C♯) leads up a whole step to the key signature change to B♭ at m. 65.
Prokofiev’s tonic to dominant treatment of Theme IA is purposive. Reaching the tonal center
of B♭ is the ultimate goal of this procedure.
Example 15: Interlocking of Antecedent Consequent Phrases of Themes IA and II, mm. 58 – 64

In m. 65 (Ex. 16 below) Theme II in B♭ is now coupled with the codetta from Theme II in 16th note diminution, another unexpected pairing. From the beginning of the development at m. 42 to the arrival in B♭ at m. 65 there has been one overarching goal – to get to the exact midpoint of the movement (65th of 130 measures) in a key center which is
the chromatic mediant of the tonic key (D). The only key signature change in the movement occurs exactly midpoint at m. 65 (from D to B♭).

Example 16: Theme II Re-Introduced, Key Signature of Chromatic Mediant (B♭)
Replaces D Major, mm. 65 – 68

The relationship between the tonal centers of B♭ and D are the twin pillars upon which the entire first movement of the sonata is based. The expansion of the chromatic mediant relationship into a symmetrical design within the parameters of sonata-allegro form is a structural fait accompli (Figure B below).
Figure B: Symmetrical Placement of Key Signatures, mm. 1 - 130

The key signature changes back to D Major at m. 71 (Ex. 17 below). Since the antecedent phrase of Theme II always shifts down a half step, Prokofiev takes advantage of the tonicization of the seventh degree of the scale of B♭ in mm. 71 – 72, treating it now as a V in the key of D, allowing for a deceptive cadence in m. 73 to B Major. This enables a second statement of the antecedent phrase of Theme II up a half step in the key of B (Ex. 17).
Example 17: Chromatic Modulation of Theme II from $B^b$ to D to B, mm. 71 – 74

Prokofiev overlaps, interlaces, and merges ideas and their treatments. The resulting fluid texture conceals the seams in the structure and leads to thematic integration and metamorphosis.

In his later works, Prokofiev’s handling of transitions, pacing, and especially phrase structure show that his design skill eventually grew to encompass large-scale rhythmic design as well as surface rhythm. Strictly regular and square hypermetrical design, present in some earlier works, is absent in the later ones, where a remarkably plastic and flexible phrase structure animates the music.³¹

Prokofiev’s partial second statement of the antecedent phrase of Theme II is the only time in this theme when the seventh step is not tonicized. Here B Major is a segue to the reappearance of Theme IB in the subdominant key of G (chromatic mediant of B) at m. 76

---

³¹ Neil Minturn, The Music of Sergei Prokofiev (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997) 42. The use of the term hypermetrical refers to exceeding the normal measure, specifically having a redundant syllable, taking up unnecessary space.
(Ex. 18, p. 113), a sign that the end of the development section is nearing. This is reminiscent of Bach who often signals the end of a fugue with a statement of the theme in the subdominant key. The subdominant tonal center seems to suggest a natural denouement. In classical design the subdominant is often used in the recapitulation and devoted to a subsidiary theme, in order to stabilize a return to the tonic. Prokofiev uses the subdominant here to redevelop a subsidiary theme (Theme IB) before reaching the recapitulation. This is only the second full statement of Theme IB. It will not be coupled with Theme IA in the recapitulation as it was in the exposition. Theme IB adopts the triplet figuration that was grafted onto Theme IA in the development section, an extension of the triplet figuration found in the hybrid theme.

The V\(^\#5\) harmony (D, F\(^\#\), A\(^\#\)) that is indigenous to Theme IB is also essential to the retransition. Note the spelling of the inverted V\(^\#5\) chord in the flute in mm. 76 and 79 (Ex. 18 below). It is spelled enharmonically as B\(^b\), D, F\(^\#\), while in the piano the V\(^\#5\) is spelled as D, F\(^\#\), A\(^\#\).
Example 18: Return of Theme IB, mm. 75 – 80

Similarly in mm. 81 – 82 (Ex. 19 below) the inversion of the V\(^{\#5}\) chord is spelled G\(^b\), B\(^b\), D. In m. 83 the piano begins a chromatic descent in triplet sixteenths from D against a B\(^b\) harmony, while the flute plays the G\(^b\)\(^+\) triad. Recall that in Theme II the triads outlined in the V\(^{\#5}\) chord were presented individually, but here the triads contained in the augmented chord are referenced simultaneously. Prokofiev is using the augmented chord to obscure a clear tonal center. Significantly, the final statement of Theme IA (mm. 126 – 130, Ex. 25, p. 120)
which closes the movement, downwardly traces the triads of $B^b$ and $G^b$, before resolving to $D$
outlining the augmented triad.

Example 19: Tonal Centers Inherent in Augmented Triad Used Simultaneously, mm. 81 – 83

The retransition begins with a chromatic descent from $D$ in quarter notes in m. 84
(Ex. 20 below), before it is interrupted by a piano solo in mm. 85 – 87, with the right hand
tracing the descending $D$ chromatic scale, while the left hand traces descending fourths ($B^b$, $F$, $C$, m. 85; and $E$, $B$, $F^\#$, m. 86). This leads to the $d^{6/4}$ chord in m. 88. The $d^{6/4}$ minor chord
is achieved by applying the downward chromatic root shift to the $B^{b5}$ chord. It ends the
period of intentional ambiguity between the tonal centers of $B^b$ and $D$. This is the only
reference to the $d$ minor mode in the movement and it is transformed into $D$ Major at m. 89,
where Theme I re-emerges in its original form (without the triplet figuration) to begin the recapitulation (Ex. 20).

Example 20: Retransition and Recapitulation, mm. 84 – 92

In mm. 97 – 101 (Ex. 21 below), the transitional theme (from the exposition) between Theme Group I and Theme II is in the D tonal center and is utilized as a false transition. It re-introduces Theme II in the tonic key of D Major, achieving harmonic reconciliation with Theme IA.
Example 21: False Transition and Re-Introduction of Theme II, mm. 97 – 103

Measures 103 – 110 of the recapitulation are a transposition of the initial antecedent consequent statement of Theme II in the exposition, from the dominant key of A to the tonic key of D, using the same harmonic procedures: tonicized seventh in the antecedent phrase modulating to the dominant in A, and chromatic root shifts in the consequent phrase. The fermata in m. 111 (Ex. 22 below) is the only fermata in the movement. It signals a departure from the treatment given to the second statement of Theme II in the exposition (m. 30, Ex. 9, p. 98). Here, the second statement of Theme II is not subjected to canonic treatment and the harmonic scheme is altered. Rather than beginning the second statement of Theme II in the
tonic of D, Prokofiev begins the second statement of Theme II in the dominant minor (a parallel minor) in the flute part harmonized with the VI chord, F Major (m. 112, Ex. 22). This achieves a uniquely ethereal effect as if Prokofiev were going to the mediant related key of F. After all that has preceded it, Prokofiev manages to save his best for last.

Example 22: Second Statement of the Antecedent Phrase of Theme II in a parallel minor, mm. 111-114

In yet another surprising coupling, Prokofiev uses the codetta of Theme II as a consequent phrase to the second statement of Theme II (mm. 115 - 118). A repetition of the codetta from Theme II takes place from mm. 119 – 122 (Ex. 23 below). Instead of being written for piano alone as in the exposition, Prokofiev showcases a virtuosic flourish in the flute using staccato 16ths, triplets, and 32\textsuperscript{nd} notes, with octave displacements, and written-in trills.
A second repetition of the expanded codetta is truncated by a drum-like motif in $b^b$ minor in the piano at m. 123 (Ex. 24 below), which introduces the coda. Although the $b^b$ minor chord is a chromatic mediant ($bvi$ in D), the $b^b$ minor tonal center is arrived at by applying a chromatic root shift to the V chord ($B^b$, $D^b$, $F$ instead of $A$, $C^b$, $E$), creating an element of suspense by avoiding the dominant. $Bb$ minor takes the place of A Major.
Example 24: Drum-like Introduction of Coda Evading the Dominant, mm. 122 – 125

The coda provides a mini-compendium of compositional devices incorporated throughout the movement: chromatic root shift, chromatic mediants, use of the $b\text{VII}$ tonal center, and use of the tonal centers contained in the augmented chord. The mediant relationship between D and $B^b$ tonal centers is emphasized again in the final measures of the movement (Ex. 25 below). The final statement of Theme IA appears in the minor mode ($b\text{b}$ minor) for the first time at m. 126, but quickly moves back to $B^b$ on the second beat of the measure. Using the harmonic scheme found in the consequent phrase of Theme IA, Prokofiev moves up a whole step to arrive at a C Major triad in m. 129, which is treated as a $b\text{VII}$ to D in m. 130, the movement’s final measure (Ex. 25). A final acknowledgement to the importance of the augmented triad in this composition is emphasized again as Prokofiev traces the triads of $B^b$, $G^b$, and D in the final statement of Theme IA. Beat three of m. 129, which Metz calls a “quasi-plagal” cadence$^{32}$ is an ii $\text{O}6/5$ chord, which contains the borrowed iv chord, leading to the final cadence in m. 130 (Ex. 25 below). Prokofiev has avoided a perfect authentic cadence throughout the movement.

---

Example 25: Coda, mm. 126 – 130

The analysis of the First Movement of *Opus 94* demonstrates how Prokofiev’s unique harmonic idiom expands the concept of Sonata-Allegro form. The thesis has highlighted Prokofiev’s ability to introduce variation by interweaving themes and their treatments. It has demonstrated his capacity harmonically to enrich Sonata-Allegro form beyond its traditional formula through his treatment of the seventh step of the scale, his shifting of harmonies through chromatic mediants and root shifts, and his realization of harmonic possibilities inherent in the augmented chord. In so doing, the Sonata-Allegro form is revealed as much more than “an external shell” to Prokofiev. In a February 2, 1930 interview with *New York Times* music critic, Olin Downes, Prokofiev states:

> …I think we have gone as far as we are likely to go in the direction of size or dissonance, or complexity in music. Music, in other words, has definitely reached and passed the greatest degree of discord and complexity that can be attained in practice. I want nothing better, more flexible or more complete than the sonata form, which contains everything necessary for my structural purposes.33

---

Since its inception, Sonata-Allegro form has continued to serve as a vehicle for the examination, expansion, integration, and completion of musical ideas. Prokofiev’s recognition of the viability of Sonata-Allegro form propels him to go to heroic lengths, not only to preserve this musical species, but to champion its evolution. In light of the radical shifts and upheavals in compositional approaches to music in the twentieth century, Prokofiev stands not only as an iconoclast, but as a visionary genius of epic proportion.
APPENDIX I

Minturn and Rifkin Motif Examples
MINTURN’S UNORDERED SET APPROACH\textsuperscript{34}

![Example 6.7. Sonata for Flute and Piano, op. 94/II, analysis of piano right hand, mm. 1-2](image)

RIFKIN’S SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL AND NON-FUNCTIONAL PITCH CLASS APPROACH\textsuperscript{35}

![A hypothetical systemic motive and its repetition.](image)

Pitch-class motives in “Masks” from \textit{Romeo and Juliet}


APPENDIX II

Map to Themes and Tonal Centers of

Sonata for Flute and Piano in D Major

Opus 94, Moderato
APPENDIX III

Genesis of The Beginning of The Development
Measures 42 - 51
Prokofiev’s Five-Step Development Plan can best be represented by audiating Theme II over the rest of the score in mm. 42 – 51 (p. 132). In the score below, the author superimposes Theme II in the top line of the score, to demonstrate how Theme II silently governs the harmonic progressions in the development theme. Audiation is the process of hearing and comprehending music in one’s mind, mentally, even when no physical sound is present. The term audiation was coined by music education researcher Edwin E. Gordon.

Although music is not a language, the process is the same for audiating and giving meaning to music as for thinking and giving meaning to speech. When you are listening to speech, you are giving meaning to what was just said by recalling and making connections with what you have heard on earlier occasions. At the same time, you are anticipating or predicting what you will be hearing next, based on your experience and understanding. Similarly, when you are listening to music, you are giving meaning to what you just heard by recalling what you have heard on earlier occasions. At the same time, you are anticipating or predicting what you are hearing next, based on your musical achievement. In other words, when you are audiating as you are listening to music, you are summarizing and generalizing from the specific music patterns you have just heard as a way to anticipate or predict what will follow….Through the process of audiation, we sing and move in our minds, without ever having to sing and move physically.36

---

Five-Step Development Plan
Measures 42 – 51

Step A: Theme IA and Theme II can be amalgamated into a hybrid theme as demonstrated in Ex. 13 (mm. 42 - 43, p. 102).

Step B: The hybrid theme is paired with ascending triads of Theme IB in the piano (mm. 42 – 46, p. 132) to form a five-measure phrase.

Step C: Theme II is superimposed by the author in the top line of the score throughout the passage in both its original form and in diminution (see p. 132). Here we can see how Theme II silently governs the harmonic progression. The tonicized seventh degree of the scale of A (G#) that was found in Theme II is now used as a dominant to the key of C# (m. 46, p. 132).

Step D: The triadic pattern of Theme IB ascends and descends simultaneously (mm. 46 – 50, p. 132) outlining C# Phrygian scale, moving the tonal center from A to C# Phrygian

Step E: The vº in C# Phrygian is transformed into V in C# (mm. 50 - 51, p. 132) leading to the re-emergence of Theme IA in C# (m. 52, Ex. 14, p. 105), rather than the traditional dominant key of A.
A Major: I - Step C: Inferred Theme II Governs Harmonic Progression

Flute

Piano in double-octaves

Step A: Themes IA & II Circumscribed in Diminution into Development Theme

Flute

Step B: Ascending Triad of Theme IB Used as Consequent Phrase

Piano

Theme II in Diminution

Flute

m46

G♭(7th of A) Tonicized as V to C♯

Piano

A replaced by c♯ Phrygian

Step D Begins:

Piano

Theme II no longer in Diminution

Flute

Step D: Triads of Theme IB Ascend and Descend Tracing c♯ Phrygian Scale

Piano

c♯: vii7 of Phrygian v
c♯: I in Phrygian

Flute

Step E: v♭ in c♯ Phrygian Becomes V♭ in C♯ Major

Piano

Whole Tone Scale Obscures Goal of C♯ in m52

c♯: vii7 of Phrygian v
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