



Research Article

Rondo^{Squared} • Kabalevsky, Op. 59

Ismet Karadeniz¹

Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies, Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Ankara, Turkiye

Article Info

Received: 14 January 2025

Accepted: 18 April 2025

Available online: 30 June 2025

Keywords

Analysis

Form

Kabalevsky

Op. 59

Rondo

Abstract

Dmitry Borisovich Kabalevsky's (1904-1987) *Rondo* in A Minor, Op. 59 (1958), composed for the inaugural Tchaikovsky International Piano Competition, stands as a remarkable convergence of traditional rondo principles and innovative compositional techniques emblematic of the 20th century. This study examines the structural and motivic complexities of the piece, providing a detailed analysis of Kabalevsky's inventive approach to classical forms and his skillful fusion of tradition and innovation. Traditionally characterized by alternating a principal theme (A) with contrasting episodes (B, C, etc.) in patterns such as ABACADA, the rondo form is the foundation of Kabalevsky's composition. However, Kabalevsky transcends conventional approaches by embedding additional 'sub-rondos' within sections B, C, and D, resulting in a multi-tiered formal design. This unique framework, termed 'Rondo^{Squared}' [R²] for the first time in this study, offers a new analytical perspective in which rondo structures interact across multiple levels. By emphasizing the cyclical and recursive qualities of the form, this approach underscores Kabalevsky's ingenuity in pushing the limits of traditional composition. Motivic analysis of the piece reveals nine distinct motifs, each meticulously woven into the tonal and structural fabric of the work. These motifs demonstrate Kabalevsky's mastery of balancing repetition and contrast and highlight his skill in generating fluid transitions between tonal areas and structural sections. Integrating traditional rondo characteristics with elements reminiscent of the sonata-rondo form reflects Kabalevsky's ability to reinterpret classical forms for a contemporary audience. This synthesis results in a work that is both accessible and intellectually sophisticated, appealing to performers, educators, and listeners alike. The 'Rondo^{Squared}' concept, proposed in this study, offers a novel perspective for understanding complex formal relationships, providing new avenues for exploring the evolution of classical forms in modern music.

2717-8870 © 2025 The JIAE.

Published by Genc Bilge (Young Wise)

Pub. Ltd. This is an open access article

under the CC BY-NC-ND license



To cite this article

Karadeniz, I. (2025). Rondo^{Squared} • Kabalevsky, Op. 59. *Journal for the Interdisciplinary Art and Education*, 6(2), 89-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15510392>

Introduction

Only when the constituent parts of a whole have the unique end of contributing to the consummation of a conscious experience, do design and shape lose superimposed character and become form. They cannot do this so long as they serve a specialized purpose; while they can serve the inclusive purpose of having "an" experience only when they do not stand out by themselves but are fused with all other properties of the work of art (Dewey, 1980: 117).

In most intellectual work, in all save those flashes that are distinctly esthetic, we have to go backwards; we have consciously to retrace previous steps and to recall distinctly particular facts and ideas (Dewey, 1980: 182).

Dewey's perspective highlights a crucial aspect of music theory: Form is not merely a structural blueprint but a dynamic process of fragmentation and reintegration. Musical analysis, therefore, extends beyond identifying formal

¹ Assoc. Prof., Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Faculty of Music Sciences and Technologies, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: ismet.karadeniz@mgu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0003-1530-2506

patterns; it requires a deeper engagement with how disparate elements coalesce into a unified artistic experience. This perspective is particularly relevant in works that challenge conventional boundaries, where structure emerges through transformation rather than static design. By adopting this interpretative approach, music theory moves beyond mere classification, embracing the way form is perceived, reconstructed, and ultimately understood.

Dmitry Kabalevsky's (1904-1987) *Rondo in A Minor, Op. 59* (1958) was composed for the inaugural Tchaikovsky International Piano Competition², a major cultural event showcasing Soviet musical excellence (Sikorski, 2018: 83). This context influenced the piece's virtuosic demands, formal clarity, and balance between tradition and innovation. As a Soviet composer, Kabalevsky adhered to Socialist Realism, favoring accessible yet sophisticated structures. The piece also aligns with Soviet preferences for structured, technically demanding music that highlights national artistry. A closer analysis of the work reveals how Kabalevsky reimagines the rondo form in a highly innovative manner, a concept that will be explored in the following sections. This study highlights how Kabalevsky enhances the rondo form by balancing complexity with clarity.

General Structure: Journey to the Form

Among the genres, forms, and concepts of Western Music, the 'rondo' (in Italian, English, and German usage; in French, *rondeau*) occupies a particular position due to its easy comprehensibility. Its clear structure, which can also be characterized as simplicity, has been the main reason for its widespread use. Although providing a precise explanation of the term's origin is problematic, it should be noted that the connection between the medieval and Renaissance *rondeau* and the 17th and 18th century rondo is tenuous at best (Cole, 1995: 172).

In the conventional rondo form, the principal theme (typically denoted as 'A') functions as the central motif, also termed the refrain. This core theme interchanges with subordinate sections identified as couplets or episodes (notated as 'B,' 'C,' etc.) before circling back towards the conclusion to finalize the movement (Wolf, 1986: 717). The refrain consistently resides in the tonic key throughout the piece, while the couplets or episodes explore contrasting tonalities.

The rondo form emerged in the Baroque period and became increasingly popular during the Classical period. The earliest examples of compositions employing rondo form are found within Italian opera arias and choruses of the first years of the 17th century. These examples use a multi-couplet rondo or chain rondo (ABACAD) known as the Italian rondo (Cole, 1995: 172).

Typical forms of this formal structure, in which the main theme is constantly returned to and contrasting musical sections are heard in between (Bennett, 1995: 280), are as follows: 'ABACA', 'ABACADA,' 'ABACAB,' 'ABACBA,' or 'ABACABA' (Wolf, 1986: 717).

The 'sonata-rondo,' which is a combination of classical 'sonata' and 'rondo' structures in various degrees, follows an ABACAB'A plan in which the first A and B are treated as the first and second themes of an Exposition (B is usually in the dominant or related tonality), the C section is a Development (Dev.), and the second A and B (AB') correspond to a Recapitulation (A and B' in the tonic) (Wolf, 1986: 717). This hybridization of rondo and sonata elements in Op. 59 resonates with Hepokoski & Darcy's (2006: 388) discussion of the flexible boundaries between classical forms. Their concept of 'dialogic form' suggests that formal sections engage in a dynamic reinterpretation rather than adhering to rigid paradigms. Similarly, Kabalevsky's approach to form in Op. 59 explores new structural possibilities by incorporating recursive formal elements within a larger rondo framework, reflecting the evolving nature of form in 20th century compositional practice. Although Gauldin (2004: 446) classifies rondos as 'five-part,' 'seven-part,' and 'sonata-rondo,' and Caplin (1998: 231) classifies rondos as 'five-part rondo' and 'sonata-rondo' in the Classical period, it is possible to speak of three types of rondo, valid for the entire Common Practice Period:

- Type 1 Rondo: Italian Rondo or Theme and Variations Type Rondo – ABACADA...A
- Type 2 Rondo: Seven-Part Rondo – ABA C ABA
- Type 3 Rondo: Sonata-Rondo – ABA Dev. ABA

² For the details of that competition see Isacoff, 2012; Riem, 2022.

Apart from the rondo types mentioned above, the study has identified another rondo approach, and this formal organization will be explained through a 20th century rondo: Russian composer Dmitry Kabalevsky's *Rondo in A minor* (Op. 59), composed in 1958 for the First International Tchaikovsky Competition.

This study explores Kabalevsky's reinterpretation of the rondo form in his *Rondo in A Minor*, Op. 59, highlighting its structural innovations and musical significance. This research seeks to demonstrate how Kabalevsky reinterprets traditional rondo form by incorporating smaller rondo structures within its episodes, thereby expanding formal possibilities in 20th century piano music. Rather than focusing solely on traditional rondo models, this analysis explores how Kabalevsky's formal design enriches our understanding of compositional techniques. The findings provide insight into how classical forms can be adapted and reinterpreted in modern contexts.

These formal complexities in Kabalevsky's work necessitate a detailed structural and motivic analysis, which will provide the foundation for a new interpretative framework: 'Rondo^{Squared}' or 'R².'

Methodology

This study employs a formal and motivic analysis approach to examine the structural and thematic organization of Kabalevsky's *Rondo*. The methodology is based on structural segmentation, thematic recurrence, tonality shifts, and motivic transformation. To ensure transparency, this section explicitly defines the criteria used for identifying form sections and motifs.

Criteria for Determining Form Sections

Cadences:³ The identification of structural boundaries is primarily based on cadence types and their placement within the piece. Authentic and half cadences play a crucial role in segmenting the form into its principal and subordinate sections.⁴

Thematic Recurrence: The presence of recurring thematic material in the same or transposed keys helps delineate large-scale sections.

Tonality and Modulation: Changes in tonality, particularly between tonic and closely related keys, contribute to the demarcation of episodic sections.

Phrase Structure: The phrase design (e.g., period, sentence, or hybrid forms) influences the segmentation of formal units.

Motivic Variation: Instances of significant motivic transformation or development serve as indicators of transitions and structural shifts.

Criteria for Identifying Motifs

Melodic Contour: The shape of the melody and its intervallic characteristics serve as primary distinguishing features of motifs.

Rhythmic Identity: Recurrent rhythmic patterns, even in different pitch contexts, contribute to the recognition of motifs.

Harmonic Context: The harmonic progression surrounding motif aids in establishing its distinct identity.

Textural Prominence: Motifs appearing in prominent textural positions (e.g., right-hand melodic lines in piano compositions) are prioritized in the analysis.

By employing these criteria, this study ensures a structured and consistent approach to analyzing the formal and motivic aspects of Op. 59. The methodological framework enhances clarity in distinguishing between primary themes, episodic content, and motivic development, thereby reinforcing the validity of the Rondo^{Squared} [R²] concept.

³ For the types of cadences see Gauldin, 2004: 133-134.

⁴ Cadences serve as primary structural markers, delineating formal sections as outlined by Laitz (2012: 106). In Op. 59, the alternation between authentic and half cadences reinforces sectional boundaries, contributing to the overall coherence of the Rondo^{Squared} design.

Analysis

Form Analysis

In general, cadences play an essential role in determining the boundaries of the form, and the boundaries defined by these cadences shape the internal dynamics of the section as well as the external framework of the form. The analysis reveals the main divisions of the 1958 work (Kabalevsky, n.d.: 3-17) in order. The abbreviations and symbols in the table have the following meanings respectively:

Table 1. Abbreviations, symbols, and their meanings throughout the study

Abbreviations and symbols	Meanings
m	measure number
f	form section
s	sentence type
t	tonality
Int.	introduction
tr	transition
Cd	coda
m ^c	closing material
t	closing theme
m ⁿ	new material
↓	descending part
→	prolongation

The data obtained as a result of the analysis of the work can be expressed as follows:

Table 2. Form Analysis: Kabalevsky, Op. 59

m	1	5	22	41	45	55	66	73	87	93	101	113	125	129	139	145
f	Int.	A				B						tr		A		
s	0	1	1		m ^c	a↓	b	m ^c	b	m ^c	b	0	1	1		a↓→
t	a:				c:		d#:		f:		g#:	-		a:		
	154.3	156	161	170	175	188	191	199	216	226	240	259	263	269		
tr		C						tr				A				
		c	d	c	d	c	t ^c		m ^c			a	m ^c	a↓	a↓→	
		2	3	2	3	2	m ⁿ , 2	1	0	1		1	0	1	1	
		c#:	f:	e:	g#:	c#:	f:	-			a:					
	277	289	291	303	305	339	347	351	359	363	367	381	398	402	411	
D										tr	A		Cd			
e		m ^c	e	m ^c	e			m ^c	e→	m ^c	a↓	a↓→		m ^c	m ^c	
	4	0	4	0	4	4		0	4	0	1	1	1	0	2	0
d:		f#:		bb:		c#:				-	a:		a:			

Motivic Analysis

The word ‘motif’ is explained with the following sentences in the sources: “A brief melodic and/or rhythmic musical idea – often a small but significant fragment of a theme, with recognizable shape and musical character and identity” (Bennett, 1995: 197). “A short musical idea, be it melodic, harmonic, or rhythmic, or all three. A motif may be of any size, though it is most commonly regarded as the shortest subdivision of a theme or phrase that still maintains its identity as an idea” (Drabkin, 1995: 648). Motivic transformation plays a crucial role in structural coherence, as described by Schoenberg (1967: 16-19). Kabalevsky’s approach demonstrates a balance between thematic recurrence and variation, aligning with Rothstein’s (1989: 102) discussion on phrase rhythm and motivic development.

As a result of the analysis, the presence of nine different motifs in the work has been determined, and it is possible to show them in the order in which they appear as follows:

Material #1

8

1

f con fuoco

Figure 1. Material #1 ► *f*: Int. ► *s*: 0

Material #2

5

cantando

sf marcato

12

19

Figure 2. Material #2 ► *f*: A/a ► *s*: 1

Material #3

41

Figure 3. Material #3 ► *f*: A/m^c ► *s*: 0

Material #4

Musical score for Material #4, measures 45-51. The score is written for piano in a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). Measure 45 starts with a dynamic marking of *ff*. The music features complex chordal textures and melodic lines in both hands, with various accidentals (flats and naturals) and articulation marks (accents and slurs). The key signature changes to one flat (B-flat major or D minor) between measures 45 and 51. Measure 51 ends with a repeat sign and a first ending bracket labeled '8'.

Figure 4. Material #4 ► *f*: A/a ↓ ► *s*: 1

Material #5

Musical score for Material #5, measures 55-62. The score is written for piano in a grand staff. Measure 55 starts with a dynamic marking of *p*. The music consists of a steady melodic line in the right hand and a rhythmic accompaniment in the left hand. The key signature changes to two flats (B-flat major or D minor) between measures 55 and 62. Measure 62 ends with a repeat sign.

Figure 5. Material #5 ► *f*: B/b ► *s*: 1.2

Material #6

Musical score for Material #6, measures 156-159. The score is in 3/4 time and C major. Measure 156 starts with a forte (*ff*) dynamic and the instruction *sonore*. The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment. Measure 159 begins with a *dim.* (diminuendo) instruction. The piece concludes with a key signature change to C minor in the final measure.

Figure 6. Material #6 ► *f*: C/c ► *s*: 2

Material #7

Musical score for Material #7, measures 161-169. The score is in 3/4 time and C minor. Measure 161 is marked *cantando* and *espressivo*. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and accents, and the left hand has a harmonic accompaniment with *tr* (trills) indicated. Measure 165 features a *cresc.* (crescendo) instruction. Measure 169 includes *allargando* and contains triplets and a quintuplet. The piece concludes with a key signature change to C major.

Figure 7. Material #7 ► *f*: C/d ► *s*: 3

Material #8

Musical score for Material #8, measures 191-196. The score is in 5/4 time and features complex rhythmic patterns with many beamed notes and rests. It includes dynamic markings like 'f' and 'p', and a tempo change to 'allargando' at measure 196.

Figure 8. Material #8 \blacktriangleright *f*: C/ τ^c \succ *s*: m^n , 2

Material #9

Musical score for Material #9, measures 277-283. The score is in 4/4 time and features a melody with a 'cantando dolce' marking and a piano 'p' dynamic. It includes a 'ff' dynamic in the bass line and four-measure rests in the bass line.

Figure 9. Material #9 \blacktriangleright *f*: D/*e* \succ *s*: 4

A New Suggestion: Rondo^{Squared} [R²]

According to the analysis, it was revealed that the piece has the form of Type 1 Rondo – Italian Rondo: ABACADA. Although Shen (2019: 364) suggested that the work is a typical rondo in terms of playing, he could not help but draw attention to its similarity with the sonata-rondo:

“Rondo in a Minor Op.59” is a piano piece for the first Tchaikovsky International Piano Competition in 1958 against the background of war. This piece is a typical Rondo for playing. It not merely boasts a structure in

which the principal part and the inserting part of the Rondo alternate, but possesses the characteristics of the principal part, the unfolding part and the reproduction part of the sonata form (Shen, 2019: 364).

Shen (2019: 364) provides an important perspective on the performance aspects of Kabalevsky’s *Rondo* in A Minor, Op. 59, describing it as a ‘typical rondo’ while also acknowledging its structural similarities with the sonata-rondo form. This duality aligns with the findings of the present study, where the Rondo^{Squared} [R²] concept further clarifies how the piece operates on multiple structural levels beyond traditional rondo expectations. It would be appropriate to mention another type of rondo that can exemplify unusualness:

Although the rondo was used less frequently in the 19th century (compared to the end of the 18th century), it was still very much in vogue, especially in concertos. Many composers retained the formal structure perfected by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. At this point, however, Schubert should be recognized as a notable exception: Schubert favored the ABABA design in his early years (Cole, 1995: 176), rarely using the more common ABACA structure or the sonata-rondo.

Now that we have mentioned Schubert’s favorite, we can focus on Kabalevsky’s rondo design from this perspective: The work’s repeated (or ‘rounded’) sections are not limited to the A sections. New classifications need to handle this type of rondo. Although the structure in question points to a seven-part rondo in ABACADA form and is of the Type 1 Rondo, it is no coincidence that the C section also exhibits a structure of ‘c-d-c-d-c + t^c (as a coda)’, in line with Schubert’s favorite ABABA form structure.⁵ In fact, a similar approach was taken in the B and D sections of the composition: While the subfields of section B are ‘b-m^c-b-m^c-b,’ section D is designed as ‘e-m^c-e-m^c-e-m^c-e-m^c-e→ + m^c (as a coda).’

Table 3a. Detail from the Table 2: Sub-rondo in C part

156	161	170	175	188	191
C					
c	d	c	d	c	t^c
2	3	2	3	2	*, 2
c#:	f:	e:	g#:	c#:	f:

Table 3b. Detail from the Table 2: Sub-rondo in B part

55	67	73	87	93	101
B					
b	m^c	b	m^c	b	
1.2	0	1.2	0	1.2	1.2
c:		d#:		f:	g#:

Table 3c. Detail from the Table 2: Sub-rondo in D part

277	289	291	303	305	339	347	351	359
D								
e	m^c	e	m^c	e		m^c	e→	m^c
4	0	4	0	4	4	0	4	0
d:		f#:		bb:		c#:		

⁵ Kabalevsky, who uses a similar form structure in his *Sonatina* (Op. 13, No. 1) in the form of AA’BABA (see Blakley, 1982: 53), has an approach that follows tradition when it comes to ‘musical form’ (Lindsey, 1964: 14).

There is a ‘sub-rondo’ in each of the three sections. This intertwined form structure, in which the composer reinforces the alternating structure of the rondo form as much as possible and, in a sense, memorizes it, is named Rondo^{Squared} [R²] in this study. R² refers to Kabalevsky’s unique approach of embedding smaller rondo structures within the main rondo framework, creating a multi-layered form. Traditional rondo form is characterized by a principal theme (A) alternating with contrasting episodes (B, C, etc.). In R², however, these episodes themselves contain internal rondo-like structures, creating a multi-tiered, self-referential design. Just as squaring in mathematics results in exponential growth, this compositional approach amplifies the cyclic nature of the form, reinforcing both repetition and contrast on multiple levels. By explicitly layering rondo elements within the main structure, Kabalevsky transforms a traditionally linear form into an intricate, recursive system. This squared effect enhances thematic coherence while expanding formal complexity, making R² a fitting term for this unique structural innovation. This titling proposal should be treated as a super-category of the other types of rondos. This is because a work (or movement) can be a R² and any of the three types of rondos. The distinguishing feature here is that the formal structure reflects the rondo in all subdivisions.

Kabalevsky’s R² concept stands out when compared to other modern rondo forms. While Prokofiev’s *Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 83* (III. Precipitato), emphasizes relentless rhythmic drive and harmonic boldness, Kabalevsky embeds recursive structural layering within a more classical framework. Similarly, Bartók’s use of rondo elements in *Out of Doors, Sz. 81* (IV. The Night’s Music: Lento) incorporates folk influences and irregular phrasing, contrasting with Kabalevsky’s methodical approach.

Unlike these more linear or atmospheric interpretations, R² distinguishes itself by embedding complete sub-rondo cycles within secondary episodes, making it a unique fusion of tradition and innovation. This comparison underscores its significance as both a theoretical model and a compositional technique.⁶ The structured recurrence within R² enhances both formal clarity and performance interpretation.⁷

Conclusion

The Rondo^{Squared} [R²] concept proposed in this study presents a novel approach to analyzing multi-tiered rondo structures, exemplified in Kabalevsky’s *Rondo in A Minor, Op. 59*. However, to establish a more robust theoretical foundation, this concept should be situated within a broader musicological and theoretical discourse.

Rondo forms have undergone significant transformations since their early iterations in Baroque and Classical periods. The Italian rondo (ABACADA) and seven-part rondo (ABACABA) have been widely used in Western music, while the sonata-rondo form (ABA Dev. ABA) reflects a fusion of thematic development and cyclic repetition (Wolf, 1986: 717). The R² structure can be understood as an evolution within this lineage, integrating sub-rondo formations into the secondary episodes of the primary rondo structure. A precedent for multi-layered rondo structures can be found in certain works by Beethoven, such as the final movement of his *Piano Sonata No. 8, “Pathétique”, Op. 13*; where the central rondo theme undergoes embedded developmental transformations. Similarly, Schubert’s preference for ABABA structures, particularly in his early piano works, provides another historical touchpoint that aligns with the R² approach (Cole, 1995: 176).

While Kabalevsky’s Op. 59 provides a primary case study for Rondo^{Squared} [R²], similar formal constructions can be identified in other compositions. For example:

Chopin’s Scherzos: These works exhibit recursive thematic returns with embedded secondary developments, suggesting a rondo-like expansion within sections.

Prokofiev’s Piano Sonatas: Many of Prokofiev’s works employ rondo elements with interwoven motivic recurrences, particularly in *Piano Sonata No. 7*.

⁶ Beyond its structural role, Rondo^{Squared} [R²] shapes the listener’s experience by enhancing expectation and familiarity. The nested rondo cycles reinforce cyclicity, making the form more engaging and memorable. Depending on thematic variation, sub-rondo sections may feel like intensified contrast or structural reinforcement. The interplay between return and deviation adds dynamism, transforming Kabalevsky’s traditional form into a multidimensional listening experience.

⁷ Dmitry Kabalevsky’s dual role as composer and educator is evident in *Rondo in A Minor, Op. 59*. His emphasis on accessibility, technical growth, and expressiveness shapes the piece’s design. The rondo form reinforces memory through thematic repetition, while sub-rondo sections introduce formal complexity. Varied articulation, dynamic contrasts, and technical demands further develop control and interpretation, making Op. 59 both a concert work and a valuable teaching tool.

Bartók's Contrasts and Bulgarian Rhythms: These compositions feature cyclical structures with embedded thematic returns, a characteristic shared with R^2 .

By framing R^2 within these examples, it is possible to view it as an analytical tool applicable beyond Kabalevsky's Op. 59. This approach emphasizes the potential of rondo structures to encapsulate hierarchical recursivity, furthering discussions on form perception and compositional innovation in the 20th century. In conclusion, positioning R^2 within this expanded theoretical and musicological context enhances its applicability and relevance. Further research may explore how similar structural principles manifest in non-Western musical traditions and contemporary compositions.

This study meticulously dissects Kabalevsky's Op. 59 (1958), revealing its intricate relationship with the traditional rondo form. The motifs in all tonal zones (and transitions) are painstakingly identified, and their distribution within the basic form parts is meticulously revealed. This detailed analysis aims to elucidate the composer's use of motif structures and the innovations in this Modern period work.

The formal structure, contours, and internal dynamics of a work of art are equivalent to our first steps in understanding the work from a hermeneutical perspective. At the same time, the receptors required for the intended connection with the work and the targeted transformation are directly proportional to how much meaning we are loaded with while walking around the work. Just as concepts such as rhythm, phrase, period, or development are not only components of music theory but also valid for all fictional works of art, similarly, formal structure is not the monopoly of music, and it constitutes the first area of union with the receiver of all works of art that contain narration.

Beyond its theoretical contributions, this study also has practical implications for music education and performance. The R^2 concept provides a valuable framework for analyzing complex formal structures, making it a useful pedagogical tool in both theory and performance studies. Additionally, a deeper understanding of Kabalevsky's form and motivic strategies allows performers to make more informed interpretative choices, enhancing the clarity and expressiveness of their playing.

The composer's educator aspect is very prominent in his biographies (see Roizman, 1962; Daragan, 2001; Caliga, 2019; Jiang, 2020). Kabalevsky, who designed a rondo that has some similarities with the sonata-rondo but generally shows an example of Type 1 Rondo, seems to have composed one more form in the lower compartments of his work. In addition to being an Italian Rondo in this form, constructing a new 'rounded form' in each section draws attention. For this reason, it is considered appropriate to call this type of rondo 'Rondo^{Squared},' indicating the result of 'rondo multiplying with rondo.'

Rondo^{Squared} [R^2] represents a structural approach where each section of the rondo form embeds its own internal rondo structure, creating a multi-layered design. This recursive approach reinforces the cyclic nature of the form, metaphorically making it a 'rondo raised to the power of two.'

Acknowledgment

First and foremost, I would like to thank my family for always being there for me. I also extend my gratitude to the journal editor and the reviewers who contributed to the development of this study, as well as to all my professors for their guidance and support throughout my academic journey, and to my students for their involvement and interest in my work.

Biodata of Author



Assoc. Prof. **Ismet Karadeniz** began his education at the Faculty of Dentistry, Ankara University, but left the program in 2009. He then applied to the Hacettepe University Ankara State Conservatory, where he graduated in 2013 with a project *On the Comprehensibility of Program Music Works According to Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*, from the Musicology Department. He continued his graduate studies at the Hacettepe University Institute of Fine Arts in the discipline of music theory, receiving a master's degree in 2016 with the thesis titled *A Signature of Saygun: [3,5,3]*, and a doctorate in 2020 with the thesis titled *Makam Abstractions on Saygun's Music: Piano Concerto, Op. 34, I*. Between 2015 and 2022, he taught "Western Music Theory" and "Music Performance Analysis" at the Hacettepe

University Ankara State Conservatory. Additionally, since 2007, he has been an active performer in various music ensembles, playing instruments such as the *yaylı tanbur*, *refik-i rebab*, fretless guitar, fretless bass guitar, *kopuz*, and e-bow. He has published works in areas such as contemporary compositional approaches, program music, music forms, music performance, and music criticism, and continues his analytical studies focusing on composers of Contemporary Turkish Music and Republican Era Classical Turkish Music at Ankara Music and Fine Arts University.

Institution: Ankara Music and Fine Arts University, Ankara, Turkey.

Email: ismet.karadeniz@mgu.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0003-1530-2506

Personal Website: <https://ismetkaradeniz.academia.edu>

ResearchGate: <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ismet-Karadeniz>

AcademiaEdu: <https://mgu-tr.academia.edu/IsmetKaradeniz>

References

- Bennett, Roy. (1995). *Music Dictionary*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blakley, J. M. (1982). "A Stylistic Comparison of Six Twentieth Century Piano Sonatinas Written Between 1905 and 1950". Master's thesis. Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois.
- Caliga, M. (2019). The Development of Dm. Kabalevskii Ideas in Contemporary Musical Pedagogy. *Review of Artistic Education*, 17, 118-125. <https://doi.org/10.2478/rae-2019-0013>
- Caplin, W. E. (1998). *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, M. S. (1995). Rondo. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (Ed. S. Sadie), Volume 16, pp. 172-177*. London: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Daragan, D. G. (2001). Kabalevsky, Dmitry Borisovich. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (Ed. S. Sadie), Volume 13, pp. 298-300*. London: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *Art as Experience*. New York: A Wideview / Perigee Book.
- Drabkin, W. (1995). Motif. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (Ed. S. Sadie), Volume 12, p. 648*. London: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Gauldin, R. (2004). *Harmonic Practice in Tonal Music (Second Edition)*. New York & London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Hepokoski, J., & Darcy, W. (2006). *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Isacoff, S. (2012). Tchaikovsky's Piano Concerto, No. 1 -- Van Cliburn (April 11, 1958). *Library of Congress*. Retrieved from: https://www.loc.gov/static/programs/national-recording-preservation-board/documents/Tchaikovsky-Piano-Concerto-No1-Van-Cliburn_Isacoff.pdf
- Jiang, N. (2020). Research on the Compatibility Between Kabalevsky's Music Education Concept and Children's Piano Education. *Advances in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities Research*, 425, 101-105. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200328.021>
- Kabalevsky, D. (n.d.). *Rondo, Op. 59 / for the Piano*. New York: International Music Company.
- Laitz, S. G. (2012). *The Complete Musician: An Integrated Approach to Tonal Theory, Analysis, and Listening*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lindsey, S. (1964). "A Study of the Solo Piano Music of Dmitri Kabalevsky". Master's thesis. Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois.
- Riem, F. (2022). The Day Van Cliburn Won. *World Federation of International Music Competitions*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wfmc.org/news-media/day-van-cliburn-won>
- Roizman, L. (1962). Kabalevsky's Piano Pieces for the Young. *The Soviet Review*, 3(4), 53-59.
- Rothstein, W. (1989). *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*. New York & London: Schirmer Books.
- Schoenberg, A. (1967). *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Shen, L. (2019). An Analysis of the Performing Skills of Kabalevsky's "Rondo in a Minor Op.59". *2019 International Conference on Art Design, Music and Culture (ADMC 2019) (Ed. K. Sankar), pp. 363-371*. Prague, Czechia. Retrieved from: https://webofproceedings.org/proceedings_series/article/artId/12384.html
- Sikorski. (2018). *Dmitri Kabalevsky*. Sikorski Musikverlage Hamburg.
- Wolf, E. K. (1986). Rondo. *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music (Ed. D. Randel), pp. 717-718*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Appendix 1. Kabalevsky, Rondo, Op. 59 (Score)

РОНДО

Presto

8

f con fuoco

Д. КАБАЛЕВСКИЙ
Соч. 59 (1958)

5 *cantando*

sfz marcato

12

19

piu f

26

28283

4
33

40

46

55

62

28283

69 5

74

80

86

91

Кабалевский

28283

6
96

poco

This system contains measures 96 through 101. It features a treble and bass staff. The treble staff has a melodic line with various intervals and slurs. The bass staff provides a harmonic accompaniment. A *poco* dynamic marking is present in the final measure of the system.

102

a poco *cresc.*

This system contains measures 102 through 106. The treble staff continues the melodic development with slurs and ties. The bass staff has a steady accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *a poco* and *cresc.*

107

This system contains measures 107 through 112. The treble staff features a complex melodic line with many slurs and ties. The bass staff continues with a consistent accompaniment.

113

p *crescendo* *molto*

This system contains measures 113 through 117. The treble staff has a very active melodic line with many slurs and ties. The bass staff has a simple accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *p*, *crescendo*, and *molto*.

118

f

28283

This system contains measures 118 through 123. The treble staff has a very active melodic line with many slurs and ties. The bass staff has a simple accompaniment. A *f* dynamic marking is present. A rehearsal mark '28283' is located below the system.

123

Musical score for measures 123-128. The system consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#). The music features a complex texture with many beamed notes and slurs. A fermata is placed over the final measure (128). A small number '7' is written in the upper right corner of the system.

129

Musical score for measures 129-134. The system consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has two sharps. The music features a complex texture with many beamed notes and slurs. A dynamic marking of *mf* is present at the beginning of the system.

135

Musical score for measures 135-141. The system consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has two sharps. The music features a complex texture with many beamed notes and slurs. A dynamic marking of *f* is present in the middle of the system.

142

Musical score for measures 142-148. The system consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has two sharps. The music features a complex texture with many beamed notes and slurs.

149

Musical score for measures 149-155. The system consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The key signature has two sharps. The music features a complex texture with many beamed notes and slurs. A dynamic marking of *sf* is present in the middle of the system.

28283

8

L'istesso tempo, ma poco più sostenuto

156

Musical score for measures 156-158. The piece is in 3/4 time with a key signature of three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The tempo is *L'istesso tempo, ma poco più sostenuto*. The first system shows a vocal line in the upper staff and a piano accompaniment in the lower staff. The piano part begins with a dynamic marking of *ff* and the instruction *sonore*. The piano accompaniment features a steady eighth-note bass line.

159

Musical score for measures 159-160. The piano accompaniment continues with a dynamic marking of *dim.* (diminuendo). The vocal line features a melodic phrase with a slur.

161

Musical score for measures 161-164. The tempo is marked *cantando*. The piano accompaniment is marked *espressivo m.d.* (espressivo mezzo-dolce) and *p* (piano). The vocal line is marked *m.d.* (mezzo-dolce). The piano accompaniment consists of chords with a wavy bass line.

165

Musical score for measures 165-168. The piano accompaniment features a *cresc.* (crescendo) marking. The vocal line continues with a melodic phrase. The piano accompaniment has a wavy bass line.

169

Musical score for measures 169-172. The tempo changes to *allargando* (ritardando) for the first measure, then returns to *a tempo*. The piano accompaniment is marked *ff* (fortissimo) and *poco* (poco). The vocal line features a melodic phrase with a slur. The piano accompaniment has a wavy bass line.

28283

172

a poco dim.

poco rit.

This system contains measures 172 and 173. It features a treble and bass clef with a 3/4 time signature. The music consists of eighth-note patterns in the treble and bass staves, with some chords. The tempo marking is *a poco dim.* and *poco rit.*

174

a tempo espr.

p

trm

This system contains measures 174, 175, and 176. The tempo marking is *a tempo espr.* and the dynamic is *p*. There are trills marked *trm* in the bass staff. The key signature changes to three sharps (F#, C#, G#).

177

poco a poco piú agitato

poco a poco cresc.

trm

This system contains measures 177, 178, 179, and 180. The tempo marking is *poco a poco piú agitato* and the dynamic is *poco a poco cresc.*. There are trills marked *trm* in the bass staff.

180

This system contains measures 180, 181, and 182. It continues the musical development with eighth-note patterns and chords in both staves.

183

This system contains measures 183, 184, and 185. The music features a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes, with some trills in the bass staff.

28283

10

186

rit. a tempo poco meno mosso

189

191

193

196

allargando

2828

199 **Presto**

p marcato

This system contains measures 199 to 204. It features a piano part with a treble and bass clef. The tempo is marked 'Presto'. The dynamic is 'p marcato'. The music consists of eighth and sixteenth notes with various accidentals. A slur covers measures 200-201.

205

poco a poco cresc.

This system contains measures 205 to 210. The piano part continues. The dynamic marking is 'poco a poco cresc.'. A slur covers measures 206-207.

211

This system contains measures 211 to 216. The piano part continues with a treble and bass clef. The music features eighth and sixteenth notes with various accidentals.

217

This system contains measures 217 to 222. The piano part continues. The music features eighth and sixteenth notes with various accidentals. A slur covers measures 218-219.

223

sub.p cresc.

This system contains measures 223 to 228. The piano part continues. The dynamic marking is 'sub.p cresc.'. A slur covers measures 224-225.

28283

12

228

cresc.
marcato

This system contains measures 228 to 232. The right hand features a melodic line with a long slur over measures 228-230 and a series of chords in measures 231-232. The left hand provides a bass line with chords and a melodic fragment. Dynamics include *cresc.* and *marcato*.

233

This system contains measures 233 to 237. The right hand has a dense, repetitive chordal texture. The left hand has a simple bass line with a few melodic notes. Dynamics include *ff* and *mf*.

238

This system contains measures 238 to 244. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and a final chord. The left hand has a bass line with chords. Dynamics include *ff* and *mf*.

245

This system contains measures 245 to 251. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and a final chord. The left hand has a bass line with chords. Dynamics include *ff* and *mf*.

252

This system contains measures 252 to 257. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and a final chord. The left hand has a bass line with chords. Dynamics include *ff* and *mf*.

28283

259

Musical score for measures 259-262. The piece is in G major (one sharp). Measure 259 features a long melodic line in the right hand and a supporting bass line in the left hand. Measures 260-262 continue this melodic development with various articulations and dynamics.

263

Musical score for measures 263-269. The key signature changes to F major (one flat). Measure 263 starts with a forte (*ff*) dynamic. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs, while the left hand provides a rhythmic accompaniment. Measures 264-269 show further melodic and harmonic progression.

270

Musical score for measures 270-276. The key signature changes to D minor (two flats). Measure 270 begins with a melodic phrase in the right hand. The left hand has a steady bass line. Measures 271-276 continue the melodic and harmonic development.

277

Musical score for measures 277-282. The key signature changes to C major (no sharps or flats). Measure 277 starts with a forte (*ff*) dynamic. The right hand has a melodic line, and the left hand has a bass line. The instruction *cantando dolce* appears above the staff. Measure 282 ends with a piano (*p*) dynamic.

283

Musical score for measures 283-288. The key signature changes to B-flat major (two flats). Measure 283 starts with a melodic phrase in the right hand. The left hand has a bass line. Measures 284-288 continue the melodic and harmonic development.

28283

14

289

Musical score for measures 289-294. The piece is in 4/4 time. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The music is marked *f sub.* (for *f* *subito*). The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and single notes.

295

Musical score for measures 295-301. The piece is in 4/4 time. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The music is marked *p* (piano). The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and single notes.

302

Musical score for measures 302-308. The piece is in 4/4 time. The key signature has one sharp (F#). The music is marked *f sub.* (for *f* *subito*). The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and single notes.

309

Musical score for measures 309-315. The piece is in 4/4 time. The key signature has two flats (Bb, Eb). The music is marked *mf* (mezzo-forte). The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and single notes.

316

Musical score for measures 316-321. The piece is in 4/4 time. The key signature has two flats (Bb, Eb). The music is marked *marc.* (marcato). The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and single notes.

28283

323

Musical score for measures 323-329. The piece is in 4/4 time with a key signature of two flats (B-flat and E-flat). The right hand features a melodic line with eighth-note patterns, while the left hand provides a steady bass accompaniment with quarter notes. A dynamic marking of *mf* is present.

330

Musical score for measures 330-336. The right hand continues with eighth-note patterns, and the left hand has a more active bass line with some sixteenth-note figures. A dynamic marking of *resc. f* is present.

337

Musical score for measures 337-343. The right hand features a melodic line with some chromaticism. The left hand has a bass line with some sustained notes. A dynamic marking of *più f* is present.

344

Musical score for measures 344-349. The right hand has a more complex melodic line with some sixteenth-note runs. The left hand has a bass line with some sustained notes. A dynamic marking of *f* is present.

350

Musical score for measures 350-355. The right hand has a melodic line with some chromaticism. The left hand has a bass line with some sustained notes. A dynamic marking of *f* is present.

20253

16

355

Musical score for measures 355-360. The piece is in 4/4 time. The right hand features a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, often beamed together. The left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and moving bass lines. Dynamic markings include *mf* and *f*. The key signature has one sharp (F#).

361

Musical score for measures 361-367. The right hand continues with a melodic line, while the left hand features more complex chordal textures. Dynamic markings include *mf* and *ff*. The key signature has one sharp (F#).

368

Musical score for measures 368-374. The key signature changes to two flats (Bb, Eb). The right hand has a melodic line with some grace notes. The left hand has a steady accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *mf* and *f*.

375

Musical score for measures 375-380. The key signature has two flats (Bb, Eb). The right hand features a melodic line with some grace notes. The left hand has a steady accompaniment. Dynamic markings include *mf* and *f*.

381 **Più mosso**

Musical score for measures 381-387. The tempo marking is **Più mosso**. The dynamic marking is ***ff marcato***. The right hand has a melodic line with some grace notes. The left hand has a steady accompaniment. The key signature has two flats (Bb, Eb).

28283

388

8

strepitoso

394

400

ff marc.

408

marc.

415

ff

