



DOI: 10.4312/mz.57.1.131-148
UDK 781.41:781.5Schönberg

Interior Cadences in the Sentence of Schoenberg

Dimitar Ninov

Texas State University

ABSTRACT

This essay will argue against William Caplin's concept of cadence and will disprove his allegation about an unquestionable lack of interior cadence in the sentence of Schoenberg. Another subject of criticism will be the assumption expressed by Caplin and other theorists that functional prolongation always negates cadence.

Keywords: cadence, sentence, harmony, form, prolongation

IZVLEČEK

Esej izpodbija koncept kadence William Caplina in ovrže njegovo obtožbo o nedvomnem pomanjkanju notranje kadence v Schönbergovem stavku. Druga kritika pa se navezuje na domnevo Caplina in drugih teoretikov, da funkcionalna prolongacija vedno negira kadenco.

Ključne besede: kadenca, stavek, harmonija, oblika, podaljšanje

In his book *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, Arnold Schoenberg draws attention to a particular structure whose melodic-rhythmic organization sets it apart from the period. He names that structure “sentence” and discusses its internal organization in general terms.¹ The term “sentence” has been used in different European schools of thought independently of Schoenberg’s ideas, and it refers loosely to various structures such as a “phrase,” a “period,” or a “phrase group.”² On the other hand, Schoenberg’s notion of sentence refers to a particular structure which begins with a short basic idea that is immediately repeated in some form: exact repetition, transposition, or variation. This repetition makes the first half of the sentence a parallel structure, named “presentation.” The following passage that concludes the sentence is named “continuation.” These two terms are used consistently by William Caplin who coined them from Schoenberg, although the latter only mentioned them once or twice in the description of sentence.³

One predicament that arises from the description of sentence in the book *Classical Form* by William Caplin is the author’s claim that sentences lack interior cadences. While Schoenberg did not specifically discuss the cadential features of sentence, Caplin made the decision to describe the harmonic support of the first half of all sentences as “tonic prolongational.”⁴ This term is supposed to exclude the presence of harmonic cadence in the middle of the structure, and to impose harmonic uniformity on all presentation phrases, regardless of how diverse they may be. Such a blunt approach could only have a provoking effect on a group of theorists and practicing musicians, including myself. Consequently, I decided to write an article on this problem, with the following main objectives in mind:

- a) to criticize Caplin’s concept of cadence in favor of traditional notion of cadence;
- b) to illustrate various cases of interior cadences in the sentence, some of which will match Caplin’s concept of cadence, while others will match traditional concept of cadence. At the basis of Caplin’s notion of cadence lies the denial of cadential features to progressions involving inverted dominants and tonics.

Four topics will be explored during the course of this exposition:

- I. Differences between Caplin’s notion of harmonic cadence and traditional notion of harmonic cadence.

1 Arnold Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1967).
 2 For example, in the theory books of Percy Goetschius; Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov; Iosif Dubovsky, Sergei Evseev, Igor Sposobin, and Vladimir Sokolov; Pencho Stoyanov and Miloš Zatkalik.
 3 See William Caplin, *Classical Form* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 10, and Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, 21 and 58.
 4 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 10.

- II. Occasional coexistence of functional prolongation and harmonic cadence.
- III. Interior cadences that match Caplin's notion of cadence.
- IV. Interior cadences that match traditional notion of cadence.

Differences between Caplin's Notion of Harmonic Cadence and Traditional Notion of Harmonic Cadence

Caplin's concept of cadence may be traced in his book *Classical Form* (1998) as well as in his article "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions" (2004). It may be summarized in his thoughts presented below in a combined form of paraphrase and quotation:

1. "[...] cadence is best understood as a *syntactical* component of music, as distinguished from the wide variety of musical forces that are, broadly speaking, *rhetorical* in function."⁵
2. Cadence "closes a *theme* and, in many cases, a component part of a *theme*."⁶
3. The role of the cadence is to "confirm a tonality."⁷
4. Closure and cadence may have a different meaning; "[...] not all closure in music is cadential."⁸
5. A true cadence "must present the dominant and the final tonic in root position, their most stable form."⁹ He thinks that otherwise the closure does not have "sufficient strength to confirm a tonality"¹⁰ and, therefore, it must not be called "a cadence."
6. Harmonic progressions are divided in three types: prolongational, sequential, and cadential. Only the cadential progression is capable of confirming "a tonal center as such."¹¹

I think that postulates 4, 5, and 6 from the above list represent the Achilles' heel of Caplin's harmonic and formal theories, as they suggest the dismissal of all variety in cadential types (including plagal cadence) and the limitation of cadence to two "acceptable types," namely: a perfect authentic and a root position imperfect authentic. In other words, Caplin insists that all cadences must be harmonically perfect, allowing some of them to be melodically imperfect. This prerequisite entails a series of highly subjective harmonic and

5 William Caplin, "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no. 1 (2004): 52.

6 Ibid., 58.

7 Ibid., 71.

8 Ibid., 56.

9 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 27.

10 Ibid.

11 Caplin, "The Classical Cadence," 70.

formal analyses which obliterate traditional ideas of harmony and form, and sometimes go counter to musical intuition.

The traditional notion of cadence may be summarized in the following definition, given in Ann Blombach's article "Phrase and Cadence: A Study of Terminology and Definition":

A cadence is any musical element or combination of musical elements, including silence, that indicates relative relaxation or relative conclusion in music. ("Conclusion" is intended in the sense of "destination of ideas," as opposed to merely stopping with no indication of finality or direction.)¹²

To this definition one may add the idea of "absolute conclusion" as observed in perfect cadences.

While Caplin talks about harmonic cadence alone, Ann Blombach also includes the melodic and the rhythmic cadence (caesura) as elements that contribute to the closure of a musical gesture. Indeed, a cadence is a complex event, and I would like to reintroduce some traditional ideas of this phenomenon that stand up directly to Caplin's points presented earlier:

1. Cadence is a syntactical component of music. This is the only point on which I completely agree with Caplin.
2. Cadence closes a musical gesture that may represent a musical idea, a segment of a musical idea or, in some cases – a harmonic progression in the form of introduction, connecting part, or codetta.
3. The main role of cadence is **not** to confirm a tonality, but to **close** a musical gesture as it has gained sufficient momentum. As a result of this closure, tonality is asserted with a different degree of strength depending on the musical syntax. Some of the harmonic endings are absolute or perfect, while others are weaker or imperfect. Both categories have their own nuances of strength in which lies the beauty of cadence.
4. Cadence and closure are synonyms. For the vast majority of educated musicians around the world, the term "cadence" (meaning "to fall")¹³ is a synonym of "closure," "ending," or "conclusion." From the point of view of this widely spread agreement, Caplin's statement, "not all closure in music is cadential" bears a nonsensical redundancy that makes it sound like: "not all closure in music is closing," or "not all cadences in music are cadential." Caplin's decision to draw a distinction between the meaning of cadence and closure is not universally acknowledged but only has local acceptance among a group of theorists, primarily Schenkerian followers.

12 Ann Blombach, "Phrase and Cadence: A Study of Terminology and Definition," *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 1 (1987): 231.

13 From the Latin verb "cado," "cadere" (to fall).

5. The bass position of the last two chords in a harmonic cadence does **not** endorse or disallow a harmonic cadence; rather, the sense of cadence emanates from the functional interaction between the chords whose roots are heard, even if they are not present in the lowermost line. This could be easily verified through background analysis. Therefore, tonality may be easily established by a melodic line or a harmonic progression which creates clear context and eliminates the constant necessity to confirm the key by perfect means.
6. Dividing harmonic progressions in three different categories (prolongational, sequential, cadential), and assuming that they are mutually exclusive, is misleading. Some prolongational or sequential progressions are also cadential, while others – deemed as “prolongational” – are only partially so, or do not constitute a functional prolongation. For example, in the following excerpt the only clearly prolongational segment is the T–S–T progression involving a subdominant pedal 6/4 on a strong beat (a relatively rare occurrence). However, this three-note prolongation of the tonic function in the bass does not undermine the perception of subdominant function on the downbeat of the third measure.

T D T S T D T (IAC)

Example 1a: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Piano Sonata No. 16 in C major, K. 545 (I), mm. 1–4. The first theme is a four-measure phrase ending with an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC).

In keyboard textures the convenient position of the left hand often determines the voice leading, which may comprise passing, neighboring or pedal harmonies. The stepwise or stationary nature of those harmonies may create a weaker acoustic effect but still convey a clear functional exchange. Therefore, a harmonic progression involving inverted chords is not necessarily an equivalent of “functional prolongation of a single chord.” It is the harmonic syntax in combination with the melodic-rhythmic content of the leading line that will determine the overall nature of a certain progression and the availability or absence of a cadence. To clarify the harmonic syntax of a progression involving inverted chords, a simple background analysis is recommended as the one illustrated below, where the functional basses of the three main harmonic

functions replace the inversions. This operation reveals what the analyst must be able to hear “below the surface” in Mozart’s original fragment shown above. If they are not able to hear that, their study of harmony has gone wrong since the very beginning.

T D T S T D T (IAC)

Example 1b: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Piano Sonata No. 16 in C major, K. 545 (I), mm. 1–4. The background analysis with fundamental bass tones clarifies the functional interaction in Example 1a.

Therefore, the discussion of cadence is closely related to functional thinking, the T–S–D–T cycle and its numerous possible variations and permutations.

The only undeniable form of functional prolongation is the physically present one – the pedal point, most typically in the bass. Everything else is a subject of debate that will inevitably involve a lot of bias. But as the music of the above excerpt suggests, even a pedal point may not be meant to neutralize a clear functional exchange.

Last but not least, the discussed Mozart passage confronts Caplin’s own premise on the relationship of theme and cadence; his declaration that a theme ends with a cadence is suddenly confronted by this short theme which, according to Caplin himself, ends with no cadence...

Coexistence of Functional Prolongation and Harmonic Cadence

Much speculation has occurred on the topic of functional prolongation, and more specifically – on tonic prolongation. Some theorists readily declare all stepwise approaches to the tonic triad as “tonic prolongation.” Moreover, Schenkerian followers have slashed the subdominant function, downgrading it to two possible applications, explained as: a) predominant (a problematic term), and b) tonic embellishment (or prolongation). As a result of this bizarre approach, Schenkerians are constructing their tonality on two harmonic functions – tonic and dominant, downplaying all other chords as “periphery.”

However, a house cannot stand on two beams, and tonality cannot be fully represented without the subdominant function, which – as a mirror inversion of the dominant – is the only other function that falls in a strong acoustic (quartal-quintal) relationship with the tonic. This fact seems to have escaped the

minds of Schenkerian theorists, whose background analyses of tonal music are all identical in terms of harmony and melody; the amputation of rudimentary elements is so big in the final analysis, that one cannot tell which particular work has been the subject of analysis. This situation reminds me of the so-called “pitch set analysis” that may be exercised without knowing or having seen the musical work that is to be “analyzed”; all one has to do is to know the collection of tones used in a certain theme or piece, and then the *mutilation* may begin. After the pitch set analysis is finished, no one can tell the work, the composer, the epoch or the style... and that by itself is an astonishing “achievement”!

One must recognize, however, that in order to become a Schenkerian analyst, a person has to have musical background. To become a “pitch set analyst,” on the other hand, a person does not have to be a musician per trade, but just possess some basic knowledge of musical notes and intervals.

As it has already been mentioned above, a chord prolongation does not necessarily obliterate the sense of cadence. Even the most conspicuous form of functional prolongation (the pedal point) may coexist with harmonic cadences, as seen in the following example.

Nicht sehr schnell

T S D T (IAC) T S D T (PAC)

tonic double pedal point

Example 2: Robert Schumann, *Schnitterliedchen*, op. 68, No. 18, mm. 1–4.

Parallel period with implied cadences over a double pedal point.

In Schumann's excerpt the pedal point represents the surface of the texture. A background analysis will unveil the basic cadential progression: T–S–D–T with its fundamental basses.

Interior Cadences that Match Caplin's Notion of Cadence

In his book *Classical Form*, Caplin introduces a rule that is meant to govern the harmonic organization of the presentation phrase in a sentence: “According to my definition, a presentation phrase prolongs tonic harmony.”¹⁴ In his article on cadence he declares:

14 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 39.

But the initial four-measure phrase of the sentence, what I have termed a presentation, never closes with a cadence, even if its final harmonic progression (V-I) suggests one. A presentation consists of a two-measure basic idea that is immediately repeated in measures three and four of the phrase. Inasmuch as the basic idea itself functions to begin the theme, its repetition must also be seen to express formal initiation; indeed, the repetition could even be said to intensify that sense of initiation. As a result, the repeated basic idea should not be comprehended as concluding a formal process, and so we should not speak of a cadence closing the presentation phrase.¹⁵

The word “even” in the above quotation sounds as though it has the power of denying the listener to perceive a cadence, regardless of what the harmonic progression suggests! Indeed, Caplin often tries to amplify the strength of his claims with the note “No Cadence!” which he writes at such places of the musical texture where he thinks the listener may hear a cadence... Ironically, such “warning signs” on the map of musical analysis not only fail to support the validity of a claim, but also leave the impression of inner hesitation on the part of the writer...

The paragraph cited above also suggests that Caplin has ignored Schoenberg’s intriguing remark about the role of sentence in musical form. The latter writes: “The sentence is a higher form of construction than the period. It not only makes a statement of an idea, but at once starts a kind of development.”¹⁶ Note that Schoenberg uses the word “development,” especially concerning basic ideas that are transposed or varied somehow. Yet, William Caplin insists that the repetition of the basic idea – even in a transposed or varied form – expresses nothing else but “formal initiation.”

After Caplin declares that “a presentation never closes with a cadence” and “we should not speak of a cadence closing the presentation phrase,” he immediately contradicts himself by admitting a huge exception to his own allegation: “An exception arises in the case of a basic idea that itself seems to close with a cadence, as considered later in connection with the idea of “limited cadential scope.”¹⁷

Here, the expression “seems to close with a cadence” is meant to diminish the fact that, occasionally, a basic idea really closes with a cadence and, therefore, the presentation phrase itself closes with that same cadence which is repeated. Moreover, the term “limited cadential scope” seems to have been especially conjured in an attempt to reconcile a rigid theoretical postulate with its refutation in musical practice.

In the following Mozart excerpt, the basic idea unfolds over what Caplin calls “an extended cadential progression” (T-S-D-T) and closes with a perfect cadence. As the basic idea is repeated literally, the same cadence closes the presentation phrase as well.

15 Caplin, *The Classical Cadence*, 59–60.

16 Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, 58.

17 Caplin, *The Classical Cadence*, 60.

Allegro

basic idea

f

T S T S D

rep. basic idea

mp

T (PAC) S T S D T (PAC)

Example 3: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Piano Sonata No. 1 in C major, K. 279 (I), mm. 1–5. Both the basic idea and the presentation phrase end with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC).

Caplin reflects further on the above “exception” found in Mozart’s excerpt:

*To the extent that we want to identify cadences at the downbeats of measures 3 and 5, it is best to see them functioning to provide closure to the basic idea itself, but having no further effect on the theme. For at the level of the theme, a basic idea is exclusively an opening idea; that idea itself cannot bring a formal cadence.*¹⁸

If one tried to apply the meaning of the above statement in reference to larger forms, it would sound like this: At the level of opera, the overture is exclusively an opening idea; such an idea cannot bring a formal cadence. Here is an operatic overture whose cadences have no further effect on the opera itself...

On a more serious note, I am astounded by Caplin’s comments on the musical fragment in question. They can hardly conceal an analyst’s futile attempt to cover a striking contradiction between an inflexible concept and its immediate refutation in music literature. Certainly, Mozart’s excerpt disproves the allegation that an opening formal unit cannot have a formal closure! Obviously it can, and the term “cadence of limited scope” sounds like a “rescue label” that is supposed to conceal the gap between wishful theorizing and actual result. Of course, internal cadences typically are of limited scope, for they are subordinate to a higher syntactical unit. But when the same “cadence of limited scope” sounds again in the end of the repeated basic idea, it becomes a cadence of the

18 Caplin, *The Classical Cadence*, 86.

presentation phrase itself. This empirical observation suggests that, contrary to all arguments expressed against the endorsement of sentential interior cadences, one may declare with confidence:

An opening formal unit can have a formal closure, that is – a cadence.

The example below illustrates an interesting combination of a sentence and a parallel period (a presentation phrase plus a consequent phrase), wherein the presentation ends with a half-cadence, as a result of the repeated cadence of the basic idea. The varied repetition of the basic idea bears the features of development, its first half being reharmonized, introducing a brief tonicization of the submediant. This process reminds us about Schoenberg's idea that the first half of the sentence "at once starts a kind of development." The sentence-period modulates into the dominant key.

Andante presentation: *basic idea* *basic idea varied*

T D T D T SII D(HC) T D T D/VI

consequent

TSVI S D(HC) T D T D T=S/G: D T

SII alt. K D T

Example 4: Ludwig van Beethoven, Piano Sonata in G major, op. 14, No. 2 (II), mm. 1–6. Hybrid form: sentence-period (presentation plus consequent).
Basic idea and presentation end with a half cadence.

The following excerpt reveals a compound presentation phrase of eight measures, in which the basic idea is a four-measure phrase itself, ending with a PAC. In the end of the transposed basic idea an analogous perfect cadence in A major is attempted, but is canceled half-way by the elliptical connection of the new tonic with the SII chord in C# minor, which redirects the motion back into the main key.

Tempo giusto presentation: *compound basic idea*

mp

T DD D T (PAC)

6 *transposed compound basic idea* continuation

A: T alt SII (DD) D T c#: SII D
 dominant pedal point cancelled cadence/ellipsis

Example 5: Frederic Chopin, Waltz in C# minor, op. 64, No. 2. Compound basic idea ends with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC); transposed compound basic idea ends with an initiated cadence, canceled by ellipsis.

Interior Cadences that Match Traditional Notion of Cadence

As mentioned in the beginning of this article, to so-called “traditional notion of cadence” is outlined in Ann Blombach’s article on phrase and cadence, although I am certain that any critically thinking theorist may create his own definition of cadence. Indeed, the notion of cadence is related to the vaster idea of division in the musical flow as it unfolds over time. The sense of division is caused by some of the following factors, which usually work in different combinations:

1. melodic cadence
2. harmonic cadence (which typically incorporates a melodic one)
3. rhythmic cadence (caesura)
4. immediate repetition of the same material
5. introduction of new material
6. symmetry

7. Interaction of chords that does not necessarily represent a cadence, such as ellipsis, and other combinations;

The above list of factors suggests a looser definition of a musical phrase, freed from the stipulation for a mandatory harmonic cadence. In my article “Basic Formal Structures in Music: A New Approach,”¹⁹ I propose the following definition of a musical phrase:

The musical phrase may be defined as a well-outlined musical idea that is bound to expire at a point of division. Typically, but not exclusively, a phrase will end with a harmonic closure.

While not all phrases end with a cadence, sometimes a semi-phrase (a phrase segment) may end with a cadence. This is something that certain theorists will find hard to digest, arguing that an opening gesture cannot conclude even partially, because it belongs to the very beginning of the theme, etc. These arguments have already been addressed in previous paragraphs. Of course, if a cadence may be a partial closure of a miniature gesture, even if it belongs to a larger opening structure, then this will not be Caplin’s definition of cadence.

In Example 6 the tonic-dominant statement of the basic idea is complemented by a dominant-tonic response of the transposed basic idea, thus rounding up the presentation phrase with a tangible imperfect cadence. In fact, this is a harmonically perfect, but melodically imperfect closure, described as “a root position IAC” in some textbooks. This case one more time illustrates Schoenberg’s observation of “a kind of development” in the first half of the “sentence,” contradicting Caplin’s claim that one cannot speak of any development in an opening gesture such as a presentation phrase.

Allegro con brio

T
D
D
T (IAC)

[basic idea = tonic-dominant statement]
[transposed basic idea = dominant-tonic response]

Example 6: Ludwig van Beethoven, Piano Sonata in C major, op. 2, No. 3, (I), mm. 1–4.
Basic idea and its repetition form a statement-response gesture.

19 Dimitar Ninov, “Basic Formal Structures in Music: A New Approach,” in *Music Theory and Its Methods: Structures, Challenges, Directions*, Methodology of Music Research, vol. 7, ed. by Denis Collins (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013): 179–208, <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-02906-2>.

A similar effect is achieved in the following Mozart excerpt where the T–D statement and the D–T response shape a presentation phrase that is more subtle acoustically, because of the inverted chords. While Caplin and his supporters will dismiss the idea of a cadence with inverted chords, a background analysis will endorse it, and a competent listener who is not preconditioned will recognize it. In relation to inverted chords, one rhetorical question may be posed to the author of “The Classical Cadence”:

How come that a stepwise approach to the dominant may yield a cadence, but a stepwise approach to the tonic may not?


T D D T (IAC)

basic idea = T-D statement transposed basic idea = D-T response

Example 7: Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Piano Sonata No. 5 in G major, K 283, (I), mm. 1–4. Presentation ending with imperfect authentic cadence (IAC).

In the last music example, all three phrases end with different cadences, producing an unbalanced sentence. In schools of thought where the sentence of Schoenberg is not recognized as a formal unit, this passage will easily fall into the “three-phrase period” category.

Allegro compound basic idea: T-S-D



T S D (HC)

transposed compound basic idea: D-T

D T (IAC)

continuation: T-S-D-T

T S D T (PAC)

Example 8: Joseph Haydn, Piano Sonata No. 49 in E \flat major, (I), mm. 1–12.
 Unbalanced sentence of three phrases: a compound presentation and a simple continuation. Cadences: half cadence (HC), imperfect authentic cadence (IAC), and perfect authentic cadence (PAC) (as a cadential progression T–S–D–T).

Summary and Closing Thoughts

William Caplin did not have to engage himself with formulation of concepts whose validity is easily refuted by examples from the music literature. While he claims that his concept of cadence is mostly valid in reference to the Classical era, he firmly maintains the same concept throughout his analysis of Romantic music as well, as it is seen in his article “Beyond the Classical Cadence: Thematic Closure in Early Romantic Music” (2018). There he still fails to recognize the plagal cadence and uses the term “prolongational closure” to cover cases including some closures that other musicians would recognize as true cadences.

As I have already stated, the formulation of “rescue” terms such as “cadence of limited scope” and “prolongational closure” looks like an attempt to

reconcile highly debatable theoretical concepts with their refutation in real music. As for the term “evaded cadence,” not discussed in this article so far, I think Caplin has twisted its meaning into a direction that has almost nothing to do with what most musicians imagine as an “evaded cadence.” He describes it as “[...] inverting one or both harmonies or adding dissonance to the final harmony [...].”²⁰ While the latter condition may be partially true, the **evading of a cadence** is not caused by the presence of inverted harmonies but by the omission or replacement of the expected tonic chord – an event called “ellipsis” by some theorists (ellipsis is not limited to cadences only but it also encompasses unexpected resolutions within the phrase). In this sense, a half cadence may also be evaded or canceled if the expected dominant (and quite rarely subdominant) does not show up or is modified to change function. Moreover, some half cadences may display a final dominant as a dissonant chord and still create the impression of a half-cadence rather than one of an “evaded” cadence or ellipsis.

Following the logic of Jean Philippe Rameau, who warns that a chord root does not have to be in the bass in order to be heard,²¹ the analyst realizes that there is no need to hear chords in root position in order to recognize a harmonic progression, a harmonic goal, or a cadence. The potential of those factors to function efficiently under disguise is easily proven by a background analysis that will call to the fore the fundamental bass notes of the inverted chords, and will match the overall sound of the original harmonic progression. The fundamental basses will enhance the progression acoustically and boost the functional strength of the included chords, thus providing the analyst with the opportunity to compare various progressions and acquire a better understanding of the meanings of “perfect” and “imperfect,” “absolute” and “relative,” “whole” and “half.”

The presence or absence of a cadence is not determined by the bass position of the last two chords in a harmonic progression, but by the functional interaction between the chords at the end of a musical gesture. The bass may enhance or diminish the effect of a cadence.

Indeed, the sense of cadence is created by the overall interaction among the essential elements of the musical fabric: bass, melody, harmony, rhythm, and

20 Caplin, *The Classical Cadence*, 66.

21 Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Treatise on Harmony*, trans. and ed. Philip Gosset (New York: Dover, 1971), 242.

He writes, “Take careful notice, then, of this inverted harmony, which only involves placing any desired note in the bass, provided that this note is contained in the fundamental chord which should be heard, while we place above this note the other notes in the chord.”

syntax. Therefore, the following suggestion may be given to those who analyze tonal music:

Instead of staring anxiously at the last two bass notes of a given harmonic progression in an attempt to recognize or deny a cadence, the analyst had better listen to the interaction among harmonies and other elements of texture as they shape a musical idea and bring it into a state of relative or absolute conclusion.

To use the word “cadence” only in relation to those closures that are harmonically perfect (even though melodic imperfection is allowed in the root position IAC) is to pretend that a colorful picture may be painted in black and white. This manner of thinking inevitably results in distorted harmonic and formal analyses that go counter to intuition and defy a more sober, practical approach. The devastating impact of what I call “new theory of cadence” may be traced in various writings published in the past ten–fifteen years. A conspicuous example is the article of James S. MacKay “A Case for Declassifying the IAC as a Cadence Type: Cadence and Thematic Design in Selected Early- to Middle-Period Haydn Sonatas.”²² In this work the author advises us to feel free to eliminate imperfect cadences at different points of a given passage, in order to reorganize it into more interesting syntactical units. One may only guess what the next step of “declassification” will be... Perhaps to eliminate a number of perfect cadences at will, and eventually declare **an omnipresent tonic prolongation** as the ultimate result of every harmonic analysis of tonal music... facilitating enormously the role of the future analyst.

The well-invited sarcasm expressed above will be followed by a more serious concluding statement:

The beauty of cadence lies in its nuances of strength. The elimination of these nuances practically kills the concept of cadence, leaving the analyst with no choice but to call “a cadence” only the root position authentic closure. This approach drains music analysis of color and diversity, and makes it gray, monotonous, highly predictable, and uniform. I feel sorry for all those students who are taught and will be taught harmony and musical form in this manner. For them, all the variety of cadential nuances, all the colorful palette of cadential formulas will remain hidden if not forbidden, along with the opportunity to make music analysis more flexible and more open to real music.

22 James S. MacKay, “A Case for Declassifying the IAC as a Cadence Type: Cadence and Thematic Design in Selected Early- to Middle-Period Haydn Sonatas,” *Ad Parnassum* 15, no. 30 (2017): 1–27.

Bibliography

- Berry, Wallace. *Form in Music*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986.
- Blombach, Ann. "Phrase and Cadence: A Study of Terminology and Definition." *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 1 (1987): 225–251.
- Caplin, William. *Classical Form*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Caplin, William. "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no. 1 (2004): 51–117.
- Caplin, William. "Beyond the Classical Cadence: Thematic Closure in Early Romantic Music." *Music Theory Spectrum* 40, no. 1 (2018): 1–26.
- Dubovsky, Iosef, Sergei Evseyev, Igor Sposobin, and Vladimir Sokolov. *Učebnik garmonii*. [Textbook of Harmony.] Moscow: Music, 1965. [И. Дубовский, С. Евсеев, И. Способин, В. Соколов. Учебник гармонии. Москва: Музыка, 1965.]
- Goetschius, Percy. *The Homophonic Forms of Musical Composition*. New York: G. Schirmer, 1898.
- Green, Douglass M. *Form in Tonal Music*. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- MacKay, James S. "A Case for Declassifying the IAC as a Cadence Type: Cadence and Thematic Design in Selected Early- to Middle-Period Haydn Sonatas." *Ad Parnassum* 15, no. 30 (2017): 1–27.
- Ninov, Dimitar. "Basic Formal Structures in Music: A New Approach." In *Music Theory and Its Methods: Structures, Challenges, Directions*. Methodology of Music Research, vol. 7, edited by Denis Collins, 179–208. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-02906-2>.
- Kostka, Stefan, Dorothy Payne, and Byron Almén. *Tonal Harmony*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2013.
- Rimsky-Korsakov, Nikolay. *Praktičeskij spravočnik garmonii*. [Practical Manual of Harmony.] 16th ed. Edited by Maximilian Steinberg. St. Petersburg: 1912. [Римский-Корсаков, Н.А. Практический учебник гармонии. 16-е издание. Отр. МаХимилиан Стейнберг. Санкт-Петербург: 1912.]
- Schoenberg, Arnold. *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.
- Stoyanov, Pencho. *Muzikalen analiz*. [Musical Analysis.] Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 1969. [Стоянов, Пенчо. Музикален анализ. София: Наука и Изкуство, 1969.]
- Zatkalik, Miloš, and Olivera Stambolić. *Rečenica u tonalnoj instrumentalnoj muzici*. [The Sentence in Tonal Instrumental Music.] Beograd: Univerzitet umetnosti, 2005.

POVZETEK

Notranja kadenca v Schönbergovem stavku

V svoji knjigi *Fundamentals of Musical Composition (Osnove glasbene kompozicije)* Arnold Schönberg opredeli posebno strukturo, ki jo imenuje »stavek« in katere melodično-ritmična organizacija jo ločuje od periode. Čeprav se ta izraz v različnih evropskih šolah uporablja neodvisno od Schönbergovih idej, bo glavni predmet razprave v tem prispevku Schönbergov stavek, ki se začne s kratko glasbeno idejo, katere prvi del se ponovi neposredno za njenim pojavom. Ena od težav, ki pade v oči ob opisu stavka v knjigi *Classical Form (Klasična oblika)* Williama Caplina, je avtorjeva izjava, da se predstavitvene fraze vedno razvijajo s »podaljševanjem tonike«, zato vsem stavkom manjkajo notranje kadence. Schönberg pa o prisotnosti ali odsotnosti kadence v stavku ni izrecno razpravljal. Caplin se je na lastno pest odločil za to osupljivo opredelitev, katere številne vrzeli je nemogoče zapolniti. Poglavitna cilja te razprave sta izpodbiti Caplinov koncept kadence in ovreči njegovo trditev o nedvomnem pomanjkanju notranje kadence v stavkih. Nekateri tukaj prikazani empirični dokazi se skladajo s tradicionalnim konceptom kadence, medtem ko drugi ustrezajo t. i. »modernemu konceptu kadence«, ki temelji na stopnjevanem pojmu »podaljševanja tonike« in zanika kadenčne značilnosti pasaż, ki vsebujejo obrate dominante in tonike. Naposled pa bo ovržena tudi implikacija, da podaljšanje funkcije vselej negira kadenco, in sicer s predstavitvijo različnih glasbenih odlomkov, podrobnejša analiza katerih zlahka razkrije akustično moč cikla T–S–D–T.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

DIMITAR NINOV (dn16@txstate.edu, www.dimitarninov.com) teaches music theory at Texas State University. He is a published composer and theorist as well as an invited lecturer at international, national, and regional music conferences. His original research spreads in the fields of tonal harmony and musical form. His music has been performed worldwide. Ninov is a former Chair of the National Association of Composers, USA. He holds a DMA in composition from The University of Texas at Austin, and master's degrees in theory and composition from the National Academy of Music in Sofia, Bulgaria.

O AVTORJU

DIMITAR NINOV (dn16@txstate.edu, www.dimitarninov.com) poučuje glasbeno teorijo na univerzi Texas State University. Je skladatelj in teoretik z mnogimi objavljenimi deli kot tudi gostujoči predavatelj na glasbenih konferencah širom sveta. Njegovo glasbo izvajajo po vsem svetu. Ninov je nekdanji predsednik Nacionalnega združenja skladateljev ZDA. Iz kompozicije je doktoriral na Univerzi v Teksasu v Austinu, iz teorije in kompozicije pa je magistriral na Nacionalni akademiji za glasbo v Sofiji, Bolgarija.