CLASSICAL MODELS, SONATA THEORY, AND THE FIRST MOVEMENT OF LISZT’S FAUST SYMPHONY

HOWARD CINNAMON

For many years, conventional wisdom about form in nineteenth-century music assumed that thematic organization and program took precedence over harmonic structure, and that conventional (i.e., Classical) models were limited in their influence in favor of expression. Later studies, like those by Edward T. Cone and Charles Rosen, emphasized harmonic structure more strongly, revealing much about formal procedures (especially in sonata form); but overstatements and broad generalizations posed problems for theorists seeking a balance.¹ More recently, studies of sonata form such as those by William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski, and Warren Darcy offered additional insights when applied to this music; but like earlier studies they focused primarily on thematic organization (although in a much more systematic way) and thus underemphasized characteristics illustrative of the foundational formal/harmonic relationships that exist between many nineteenth-century pieces and those of an earlier practice.² Although some of these more recent studies based many of their ideas on earlier treatises, and quoted liberally from them, their


* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2007 meeting of the Music Theory Society of New York State (Fordham University, New York).
emphasis is thematic rather than harmonic. This often leads the authors to arrive at substantially different conclusions than would have developed if the structural principles suggested in those earlier treatises had been used as an analytical model, and applied directly to this music.\textsuperscript{3}

For example, Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory—in an attempt to correct (what they see as) “the eagerness of the mid-twentieth century to define a sonata only in tonal terms, pushing aside the important considerations of thematic function and arrangement”\textsuperscript{4}—emphasizes thematic patterns to such an extent that sometimes it leads to analyses in which the determination of form seems to be based exclusively on these patterns, with considerations of harmonic structure having little influence over decisions about sectional divisions and formal functions.\textsuperscript{5} Hepokoski has consistently argued against “the sonata principle” and (what he sees as) overstatements by Cone, Rosen, and others as to the role of harmonic structure in the analysis of sonata-form pieces; he argues for the inclusion of poetic, programmatic, and hermeneutical elements in the analysis of programmatic pieces in particular, and other works as well.\textsuperscript{6} Caplin

\textsuperscript{3} Although Hepokoski and Darcy (Elements of Sonata Theory) consistently refer to and quote from a large number of treatises, often citing them as sources for some of their concepts, Caplin (Classical Form) specifically excludes them as sources for his approach stating: “Much of the recent work on classical form has been inspired by a renewed interest in the authority of theorists contemporary to classical composers. Some music historians are thus likely to be disappointed that the theory presented here makes little reference to earlier writings on form. This omission is largely motivated by the goal of developing a modern theory, one that permits an unfettered rethinking of formal issues while taking advantage of the full history of music-theoretical thought (which certainly includes the work of theorists postdating the classical period)” (Classical Form, 5). On the other hand, Caplin has no problem citing Schoenberg, Ratz, and other proponents of the Formenlehre tradition as the basis of his theory, thereby acknowledging the theme-based methodology they represent as his primary influence (Classical Form, 3).

\textsuperscript{4} See, for example, the analyses in Warren Darcy, “Bruckner’s Sonata Deformations,” in Bruckner Studies, ed. Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997): 256–277. A focus on thematic rotational patterns leads Darcy to present fourteen analytical diagrams and models of sonata form movements by Bruckner, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, and Schumann that demonstrate just such a tendency.

\textsuperscript{5} See, for example, Hepokoski, “Beyond the Sonata Principle” and “Fiery-Pulsed Libertine”; and Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 242–244. For discussions of “the sonata principle,” see also Cone, Musical Form and Musical Performance, 76–78; and Rosen, Sonata Forms, particularly 25 and 287. Cone summarizes the principle as “requiring that important statements made in a key other than the tonic must either be re-stated in the tonic, or brought into closer relations with the tonic, before the movement ends” (Musical Form and Musical Performance, 77).
indicates a similar emphasis through his definition of form and “formal function,” which he describes as “how the various parts of a composition are arranged and ordered; how standard patterns for repeated material appear in works; how different sections of a work are organized into themes; and how the themes themselves break down into smaller phrases and motives.”

While it may be true that thematic patterns and the role of extra-musical aspects were underemphasized during the mid-twentieth century, in favor of harmonic structure, analyses that now

---

7 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 9. This study will cite Caplin sparingly, as he specifically limits his assertions to a particular repertoire and acknowledges their limited application to music of other periods: “My investigation is limited to the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven as representing the core repertory of the high Viennese classical style (ca. 1780–1810) . . . . Although tonal music from earlier and later periods (baroque, early classical, romantic, and late romantic) also exhibits formal functionality in a variety of ways, form in these periods is considerably less conventional, thus frustrating the establishment of general principles” (*Classical Form*, 3). In other words, Caplin is reluctant to apply contemporaneous theories to the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, preferring to apply nineteenth-century theories to their music (see n. 5), but he is reluctant to apply those same theories to music with which they are contemporaneous. In keeping with the limitations he himself established on his theory, citations of Caplin’s approach will be limited to instances where it refers to specific features that appear in these pieces. On the other hand, Hepokoski and Darcy (*Elements of Sonata Theory*) make no such limitations on the applicability of their theory, and in the course of their presentation they often cite numerous pieces from earlier and later repertories. For this reason their theory will be cited much more frequently and will in fact form the basis of the comparative analyses to follow. In addition, their theory has been applied by others to numerous nineteenth-century works, including those of Liszt (see, for example, articles by Steven Vande Moortel: “Form, Program, and Deformation in Liszt’s *Hamlet*,” *Tijdschrift voor muziktheorie* 11/2 [2006]: 71–82; and “Beyond Sonata Deformation: Liszt’s Symphonic Poem *Tasso* and the Concept of Two-Dimensional Sonata Form,” *Current Musicology* 86 [2008]: 41–62).

This emphasis on thematic organization has affected both Caplin’s and Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s basic definition of sonata form itself. Caplin defines it thus: “Sonata form consists of three large-scale functions—exposition, development and recapitulation . . . . In its large-scale tonal and formal-functional organization, sonata form is analogous to the small ternary form . . . . More specifically, sonata form resembles the rounded binary version, since the exposition is normally repeated . . . and the development and recapitulation are sometimes repeated together” (*Classical Form*, 195). Caplin’s focus on thematic features allows him to subsume rounded binary form under the same ternary umbrella as the more generally accepted ternary form, despite the fact that the typical rounded binary has a first section that is harmonically open (ending most often with a modulation to V or III) and a second section that is harmonically dependent on the third, while the typical ternary has three sections that are harmonically independent, the middle one of which usually tonicizes a contrasting harmony: a fundamentally different harmonic structure. For those who feel harmonic structure plays (at least) a part in determining form, this may pose a problem. Hepokoski and Darcy come to a somewhat different conclusion, also identifying sonata form as a rounded binary, but avoiding the inclusion of that under the heading of ternary form and gently coming down on the side of a binary interpretation: “The most typical sonata form (what we call Type 3 sonatas) articulates and overall rounded binary structure. The two parts of this larger binary structure are, in modern terminology: (1) the exposition and (2) the development and recapitulation . . . . Not withstanding its binary origins, the normative Type 3 sonata consists of three musical action spaces . . . laid out in a large Aliba’ format. Hence the common observation that the form consists of an originally binary structure often arrayed in a ternary plan” (*Elements of Sonata Theory*, 16).
deemphasize harmonic structure in favor of these other elements are no better. Our approaches should not be mutually exclusive.

The goal of the present study, however, is not to solve or even arbitrate this debate, but rather to offer an alternative by demonstrating how incorporating analytical methods based on principles expressed in earlier models, which emphasize harmonic structure and interpret thematic organization in that context, alongside some of the more recent models, can prove valuable in the study of a single piece with a distinctively unconventional harmonic structure. In the discussions and analysis that follow, an oft-cited example of Liszt’s approach to form will be examined: the first movement of the *Faust Symphony* (1854–57). Initially, we will consider problematic passages that are often seen to deviate from earlier conventions, and by offering alternative readings we will show how they are actually consistent with earlier practices. Once clarified, the large-scale tonal structure and its relationship to thematic material will be compared with earlier, harmonically based models of sonata form—specifically, those of Augustus F. C. Kollmann, Francesco Galeazzi, and Liszt’s teacher, Carl Czerny—to demonstrate how the *Faust Symphony* adheres to those models in remarkably consistent ways, including in its bipartite formal division.8

Each of these earlier models has been chosen for specific reasons. Kollmann’s model is the most basic, consisting of little more than a harmonic outline with scant reference to thematic material. As such it represents a “common denominator,” presenting principles with which the
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other two would agree, yet allowing some flexibility in application that might make it more relevant to later styles. Galeazzi’s is a late-eighteenth-century model that incorporates thematic material to a greater extent than many of its predecessors; yet clearly it identifies the harmonic outline as the primary concern. Much of its terminology is easily understood and is, in many ways, similar to twentieth-century nomenclature, making its comparison to later models both easy and effective. The reason for selecting Czerny’s model is the most obvious of the three. As the latest of them, coming in the first half of the nineteenth century, it is chronologically closest to the piece at hand (his School of Practical Composition having been published in 1848, just six years before the completion of Liszt’s movement), yet its basic principles remain fundamentally the same as those of the others. (Aside from terminological differences, his description of sonata form is essentially the same as Galeazzi’s.) In addition, as Liszt’s teacher, it is possible that Czerny had some influence on his conception of form. Nonetheless, no specific claim is made that any of these theorists had a direct influence on Liszt’s compositional practice. Their models are employed as analytical tools, like those of the contemporary theorists; they are intended as paradigms that may be used to understand formal procedures present in Liszt’s music, and how they compare to those of an earlier period.

The music of Franz Liszt has often been cited by authors like Humphrey Searle, Sacheverell Sitwell, Constantin Floros, and Fredrich Blume as representing the epitome of the Romantic concept of form. More recently, authors like Carl Dahlhaus, Richard Kaplan, and

Michael Saffle have shown how many features of conventional formal procedures may still be found in Liszt’s works.\textsuperscript{10} However, their application of nineteenth-century models, with their emphasis on thematic elements and tripartite formal divisions, caused them to miss significant and conservative aspects of these pieces, and to overlook the eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century precedents upon which they are based.

There have been many attempts to explain the formal organization of the first movement of Liszt’s Faust Symphony, with many varied results. Figure 1 presents a table by Kaplan, in which he illustrates four interpretations of this movement’s form, including his own.\textsuperscript{11} Most remarkable about these is the diversity of interpretations. While some find formal articulations at

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{table1.png}
\caption{Table 1 from Kaplan, “Sonata Form in the Orchestral Music of Franz Liszt”}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{11} Kaplan, “Sonata Form in the Orchestral Works of Franz Liszt,” 147.
similar points, there is no agreement as to how these points relate to the overall organization—or even which sections they articulate. For example, whereas Kaplan views the first seventy-one measures as “Introduction,” Gernot Gruber sees them as the entirety of the exposition. Both Floros and Searle believe the exposition begins at the outset of the movement and ends in m. 297, but they cannot agree on where the recapitulation begins or how far it extends. The main reason for this diversity is that these interpretations are based almost exclusively on thematic organization, while giving only token consideration to harmonic structure.

The opening section of the movement (mm. 1–22), which is perhaps its most famous passage, has been discussed widely in the literature, including in publications by Robert P. Morgan in 1976, by the present author in 1984 and 1986, and by R. Larry Todd in 1988 and 1996 (in analyses based upon Morgan’s). Figure 2 presents a voice-leading graph of the opening of the introduction (which duplicates my earlier analysis); it illustrates the unfolding of an Ab–C–E₃ augmented triad that forms an equal division of the octave by major thirds. This chord, and the equal division of the octave produced by its arpeggiation, serve motivic roles in the movement. Here, it initiates a large-scale approach to tonic that does not employ a root-position dominant.
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At m. 23, the A\textsuperscript{b} root of this chord becomes the seventh of a diminished-seventh chord that is itself arpeggiated and prolonged, leading to I at m. 71. The role of mm. 1–70 as a contrapuntal approach to tonic clearly defines an introductory function, and thus identifies m. 71 as the start of the exposition.\textsuperscript{13}

The first key area, which spans mm. 71–98, comprises a roughly ternary organization that prolongs I with a lower neighbor motion to $\sharp$VII\textsuperscript{4}$\sharp$ at m. 87. It ends in m. 98 with a motion to IV that descends by third to D\textsuperscript{b} (enharmonically reinterpreted as C\#), which initiates a mostly chromatic descending line that arpeggiates a major I chord (through its fifth and third) prior to returning to its root. The C$\flat$ supports an augmented-sixth chord, which moves down to B$\flat$ at m.

\textsuperscript{13} A similar interpretation may be found in Timothy L. Jackson, “The Finale of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony and the Tragic Reversed Sonata Form,” in Bruckner Studies, ed. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997), 197–199; however, Jackson identifies the first arrival at the tonic as occurring in m. 61 (actually an F$\#$ diminished-seventh chord, with C in the bass), and ignores the actual arrival at I in m. 71. In addition, while he ascribes a harmonic function of VI to the arrival on A$\flat$ in m. 356 (which is actually the seventh of a diminished-seventh chord at this point, and does not become VI until m. 359, where the augmented harmony returns), and (one assumes) to the return of the introduction that follows, he makes no such attribution to its first occurrence in the introduction.
FIGURE 3. Liszt, *Faust* Symphony: mm. 1–179

(a) voice-leading analysis

(b) thematic material and harmonic structure
179. Figure 3a illustrates the voice leading of these passages, while Figure 3b shows the coordination of motivic and thematic materials with the harmonic structure. The transitional section between mm. 99 and 178, with its frequent sequential passages that do not return in the recapitulation, is remarkable for its achievement of harmonic and thematic diversity within the context of the arpeggiated tonic harmony it unfolds.

The passage that follows is frequently described as “Theme II” or the “Love Theme.” It appears in mm. 179–220 (see the score in Appendix I). Figure 4 presents another table by Kaplan,14 in which he identifies this passage as “Theme II” with the harmonic orientation of E major (♭Ⅲ♯ of C minor); however, this view overlooks the fact that the harmony prolonged throughout is not the tonic of E, but its dominant.15 This dominant is extended even beyond the end of the passage, up to m. 224, where it finally resolves to E major with the arrival of yet additional thematic material (which Kaplan calls Theme III).16

Neither the use of ♭Ⅲ♯ as a second key area, nor the extended prolongation of its dominant prior to its arrival, are that unusual.17 Use of the major mediant in a major key was made much earlier, as in the music of Beethoven (for example, opp. 31/1/I and 53/I), and therefore by the middle of the nineteenth century it had become a familiar second key area for major-key
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15 The same interpretation may be found in Longyear and Covington, “Tonal and Harmonic Structures,” and “Liszt, Mahler and a Remote Tonal Relationship.” While they acknowledge the presence of this material over a 6/4 chord, they do not equate it with dominant function, or even harmonic instability. On the other hand, Jackson (“The Finale of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony”) identifies the passage as dominant in function, although he still refers to it as the “Second Group.” Hepokoski and Darcy would likely also identify this as “S” material, probably S0, as it represents a prolongation of the dominant of the new key, and is similar to instances they discuss as such (see Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 142–145). In the view held here, all of these interpretations are in direct opposition to those presented in most eighteenth-century treatises, which clearly place the beginning of the second subsection (in Kollmann’s terms) at the arrival on the new tonic, not on its dominant (see the following discussion).
16 Longyear and Covington’s “Closing Theme,” what Hepokoski and Darcy would likely call S1.
17 Numerous precedents in both theory and practice may be found in Longyear and Covington, “Liszt, Mahler and a Remote Tonal Relationship.”
18 Its inclusion as an element of mixture in a minor-key piece is hardly unprecedented either—especially by a composer like Liszt, whose harmonic language had included such elements since at least the mid 1830s. 19 An extended prolongation of the dominant of $\sharp$III$\sharp$, preceding the second key area, may also be found in several pieces by Beethoven (and others),
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18 For a discussion of this phenomenon in several other nineteenth-century pieces, see Rey M. Longyear and Kate R. Covington, “Tonic Major, Mediant Major: A Variant Tonal Relationship in 19th-Century Sonata Form,” Studies in Music from the University of Western Ontario 10 (1985): 105–139.
19 See Cinnamon, “Third Relations as Structural Elements,” and “Tonic Arpeggiation and Successive Equal Third Relations.”
where it is best considered part of the transition, despite its association with significant thematic material (see, for example, the first movements of opp. 2/1 and 13). Figure 5 presents a voice-leading graph of part of the exposition, through the arrival at the second key area (mm. 71–225), with thematic materials and their formal functions indicated.

The reprise of this transitional theme (mm. 450–479; see the score in Appendix II) has always been troublesome for analysts, because it appears to reprise the material in its original key, rather than in the tonic. As Figure 4 shows, Kaplan sees it as beginning in E major and then moving to C (Ⅲ♯, then I)—a commonly held view. The apparent reprise of this “second theme” in its original key might be seen as an example of Liszt’s break with eighteenth-century

---

20 For a differing view of the function of such dominant prolongations in these pieces, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 97–100 and 143–144.  
21 See also, for example, Longyear and Covington, “Tonal and Harmonic Structures,” and “Liszt, Mahler and a Remote Tonal Relationship.”
conventions, but realizing that the harmony prolonged here is B major (as it was in the exposition), we can understand that it really functions as the upper third of V in C, and that this is not a reprise in E at all. Heinrich Schenker illustrates such a possibility in *Der freie Satz*, Figure 111a (reproduced here as Figure 6a). He shows a progression from $\text{VI}^5_1$ to V through a descending third, in which the raised 3 and 4 resolve chromatically to their diatonic counterparts. He cites a similar example in Figure 62,8 (see Figure 6b), in which he illustrates how such a progression occurs in the fourth movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony. The embellishing role of this harmony in relation to V is made explicit in mm. 480–485 of the *Faust* Symphony (Appendix II), where an ascending arpeggiation of a $\text{VI}_7^5$ dominant-seventh chord in the first violins resolves to a descending arpeggiation of $V_7^9$, as the lower strings make the voice leading explicit. Figure 7 illustrates the voice leading in mm. 421–503, showing how the $\text{VI}_7^5$ chord resolves to $V_7^7$ in m.
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472, and that the entire recapitulation can be understood as being in the tonic throughout.\(^{23}\)

With the tonal structure of the movement thus understood, one can see that its large-scale harmonic structure is remarkably consistent with late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century conventions. The one exceptional feature is the motivic equal division of the octave that forms the basis of harmonic organization for the majority of the movement. It replaces a more conventional dominant at the end of the development with a prolongation of \(bVI^{5}\), in the form of a reprise of the opening of the introduction, that approaches I just as it did at the beginning of the movement. As I have noted elsewhere, this kind of equal division of the octave, in which the

equal division occurs in the lower voice only, creates a harmonic/contrapuntal structure that implies a hierarchy among the third-related harmonies.\textsuperscript{24} Figure 8 shows how the I–$\flat$III–I progression takes primacy while the $\flat$III–I third is inverted, forming a minor sixth that is divided equally by an A\textsubscript{b} augmented harmony like that in m. 359. This view is also consistent with the role of that augmented harmony as a transitional (or better, re-transitional) harmony that connects $\flat$III with I, paralleling its role as a preparatory harmony in the introduction. In both cases it assumes a role normally assigned to the dominant.\textsuperscript{25}

Also noteworthy is the fact that the equal division of the octave is, itself, partitioned into two parts: the motion from C to E\textsubscript{7} that spans the exposition, and the motion from A\textsubscript{b} to C that

\textsuperscript{24} See Cinnamon, “Tonic Arpeggiation and Successive Equal Third Relations,” 13.

\textsuperscript{25} In fact, $\flat$III could be seen to unfold throughout this section, with the bass moving from its root (m. 225) to its third via a digression to its fifth (mm. 343–359), and then on to its fifth (m. 414) before returning to I, with the upper voice similarly arpeggiating the harmony from its root to its third twice (at m. 349 and again at m. 414). This would interpret the augmented chord at m. 359 as part of a large-scale arpeggiation with the diminished-seventh chords at mm. 349 and 420 interpreted as voice-leading chords. While this would be consistent with the view of $\flat$III as the more primary harmony, the $b\flat$ chord that appears in m. 420 over the fifth of $\flat$III is really part of a larger chromatic motion from $b$VI\textsuperscript{7} to I and is, therefore, not considered to function at a higher level.
spans the development and recapitulation. This two-part division of the tonal structure coincides with a division of the form into two parts that is consistent with eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century descriptions of sonata form, suggesting that a comparison of Liszt’s practice with those descriptions might be informative. Figure 9 presents the voice leading of the main portion of the movement, from the introduction to the beginning of the recapitulation. Figure 10 presents a diagram of the entire movement, in which the tonal organization is illustrated at the bottom; an analysis of sections and thematic material, and an interpretation in terms of Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, occupies the middle; and an interpretation in terms of the three representative eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century treatises is placed at the top.26 The potential

26 This reading is based upon my earlier analyses (in Cinnamon, “Third Relations as Structural Elements,” and “Tonic Arpeggiation and Successive Equal Third Relations”), but it differs significantly from that of Jackson (“The Finale of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony”), who discusses some of these differences in a footnote. His analysis is based on an interpretation of the primary melodic tone as $\bar{5}$, which leads him to assert an unsupported $4$ in m. 614 (not shown in this graph). His justification is based on motivic parallelisms he finds throughout the piece, but he seems to place the cart before the horse, as no such motivic parallelisms can be found unless the voice-leading inter-
for a bipartite interpretation of this piece, based on the Classical models, is immediately evident, not only as a result of its tonal structure but also from the distribution of thematic material within it, and from its proportions.

The application of Kollmann’s purely harmonic model is especially revealing in this case: it results in a division of the form into two sections, further divided into two subsections, which coincide with the four stages of the equal division of the octave. As we know, Kollmann identifies a first section as one in which there is a large-scale harmonic motion from tonic to either the dominant or the mediant (depending on whether it is in major or minor). This aptly describes mm. 71–318, in which there is a large-scale motion from I to Ⅲ#. In this view, the passage in mm. 71–224, with its initially prolonged tonic that first unfolds through a descending arpeggiation and then leads to V/Ⅲ#, is consistent with Kollmann’s description of the first subsection as “the setting out from the key towards its fifth [in major] or third [in minor],” while the passage interpretation is sound. For example, he asserts his preference for 5 as the primary melodic tone because “Cinnamon’s reading obscures the signal importance of the chromatic motive A♭–G (C–: 6–5), which . . . dominates the movement.” In making his case, he points out what he believes to be one instance of this, which actually negates his claim: “A particularly telling moment in this regard is the recomposition of the beginning of the first group in the recapitulation (m. 419ff.), where A♭ is emphatically led to G” (197, n. 92) In fact, no such melodic motion occurs. The A♭ he speaks of in m. 419 is actually spelled as G♮ (the sixth of a 64 chord). It is carried over as an enharmonic common tone, becoming A♭ in m. 421 (the seventh of a diminished-seventh chord), which is transferred and resolved in an inner voice (specifically, in the third horn). The third scale degree (E♭), on the other, is emphatically re-attained as the goal tone of melodic motion in m. 424, as part of a voice exchange that spans mm. 422–424 (see Figure 9). Jackson further asserts that “Cinnamon’s analysis also overlooks the motivic significance of Liszt’s move to C[8] in the bass in the development (m. 334); this is the middle of a descending arpeggiation of the augmented triad motive E–C–A♭ identified by bracket ‘b’ in ex 8.17” (197, n. 92). In fact, my analysis does not overlook this C (which, incidentally, is the bass of a dominant-ninth chord), but rather interprets it as part of a sequential chromatic motion connecting 6 of E (C♭ in m. 319) to 5 of E (B♭ in m. 343), the bass of a V7 with F♯ in the soprano. The soprano then continues up to G♯ (spelled enharmonically as A♭) while the inner voices fill in a diminished-seventh chord to replace the more normative stationary ⅔ chord that would have resulted in conjunction with a 5–6 motion over B. The counterpoint for this bass motion thus continues an unfolding of the E-major harmony begun in m. 225, with a motion from its root (E♭) to its third (G♯), here spelled as A♭ to be consistent with the inner voices. The seventh of this diminished-seventh chord (A♭) then becomes the bass in m. 356 (where Jackson identifies a VI chord of C), leading directly into the reprise of the introduction with its augmented harmony on A♭. Although I agree that augmented triads play a highly motivic role in this movement, that is not the case here. In pointing out his motive “b,” Jackson overlooks the sequential nature of this passage and the extension of the E-major harmony from the end of the exposition into the development, via a motion to its dominant through its VI chord.

FIGURE 10. Liszt, *Faust* Symphony: formal diagram of first movement
in mm. 225–318, with its prolonged $\flat III$ harmony followed by a transitional passage that leads into the next section, is consistent with his description of the second subsection, which “comprehends a first sort of elaboration, consisting of a more natural modulation than that of the third subsection . . . [wherein no] digression is made to any key but the said fifth in major, or third in minor.”28 The differences here do not involve form per se, but rather harmonic language. Nineteenth-century chromatic tonality accepts the replacement of the diatonic $\flat III$ from minor with a chromatically altered $\flat III$, but its formal function remains the same. Similarly, what would be considered Kollmann’s second part, the passage in mm. 319–598, is remarkably consistent with his third and fourth subsections: the passage in mm. 319–420 “comprehends a second sort of elaboration, consisting of digressions to all those keys and modes which shall be introduced besides that of the third or fifth” (including $\flat V I^5$ in this case), while that in mm. 421–598 “contains the return to the key, with a third sort of elaboration” that includes all the thematic material from the first part.29 In sum, this movement is consistent with Kollmann’s model, once adjustments for harmonic language are recognized.30

While Galeazzi and Czerny adhere to the same harmonic plan as Kollmann, both discuss thematic material and its relationship to harmonic structure in greater detail. Although they use different terminology, they describe basically the same musical events (Figure 10). Galeazzi’s division of Kollmann’s first subsection into “Principal Motive” and “Second Motive and

---

30 Not surprisingly, this two-part division is reinforced by the proportions of the piece: 248 measures in the First Section (in Kollmann’s terms) and 280 measures in the Second Section; when the Introduction and Coda are included, the proportion is even closer: 318 measures for the first half vs. 336 for the second. It should be noted that the cadence that closes off the tonal structure at the end of the piece occurs in m. 636, dividing the harmonic structure of the piece exactly into $318 + 318$ measures. Considering the numerous changes in tempo and meter, this correspondence is quite remarkable. It results in an undeniable balance between the two halves. When tempo changes and rubatos are taken into consideration, the “real time” durations of each of these two halves are nearly equal (although this will vary across performances, of course).
departure to the most closely related key” seems particularly appropriate here, as is Czerny’s “Principal Subject” and “continuation or amplification, together with a modulation into the nearest related key.” 31 Their respective descriptions of what follows as a “Characteristic Passage” followed by a “Cadential Period,” and “Middle Subject” followed by “a new continuation of this Middle Subject,” seem equally appropriate to explain the events of (what would be) Kollmann’s second subsection (mm. 225–318). Only the closing passage, mm. 297–318, seems to be at odds with both their descriptions of the end of the first part as having a strong cadence in the new key; but the role of this passage as a transition into the next section is reasonable, considering the lack of a repeat of the first part, which Czerny and Galeazzi both say is likely but not necessary.

Similarly, their descriptions of (what, in Kollmann’s terms, would be) the second part are consistent, both with each other and with Kollmann. All three describe the next portion (the third subsection, here mm. 319–420) in terms similar to Kollmann’s: as a passage “consisting of digressions to all those keys and modes . . . besides that of the fifth (or third); and being the place for all those abrupt modulations, or enharmonic changes which the piece admits or requires.” 32 Czerny and Galeazzi both suggest the appropriateness of using motives from either of the preceding subsections, or possibly new material, and both emphasize the need to return to the original key in some logical and definitive way. 33 Neither is very specific about the thematic content of this subsection, although Galeazzi does allow for the inclusion of material from the introduction (if there is one), albeit at the beginning of the passage.

31 Churgin, “Francesco Galeazzi’s Description (1796) of Sonata Form,” 187; and Czerny, School of Practical Composition, 33.
32 Kollmann, An Essay on Practical Musical Composition, 5. The original punctuation in “(or third;)” has been adjusted to modern practice.
33 Churgin, “Francesco Galeazzi’s Description (1796) of Sonata Form,” 194–195; and Czerny, School of Practical Composition, 33 and 35-36.
In reference to the content of Kollmann’s fourth subsection (here mm. 421–598), they are all quite consistent as well. Galeazzi and Czerny both emphasize the essential nature of a return to the tonic key immediately upon its outset, and the coordination of this return with the motivic material associated with the tonic in the first part and that which immediately follows it; however, they do allow that it may be modified, abbreviated or—in Galeazzi’s case—omitted entirely. Both also emphasize the crucial requirement that all the material originally in the nontonic key—the “Characteristic Passage” followed by the “Cadential Period,” or the “Middle Subject” its “Continuation” and the “Final Melody”—return in the tonic in its entirety. As Figure 10 illustrates, this piece completely satisfies their requirements for both subsections.

Of particular interest are the ways in which this piece seems to reflect features distinctive to Czerny’s description. In discussing the harmonic plan of the first part, Czerny states: “Many composers, it is true, have essayed to conduct the middle subject and the conclusion of the first part into a more remote key—as, for example, Beethoven from C to A major, and from C to E major, and Hummel from E to Ab.” Of course, the present modulation to $\frac{4}{3}$ represents a further element of mixture from the parallel major, but its relationship to the examples cited by Czerny is indisputable. In his initial discussion of the beginning of the second part, Czerny also mentions the role of thematic material from the first part, stating: “The second part commences with a development of the principal subject, or of the middle subject or even of a new idea.” Later he adds: “As to the modulations in the development of the second part, the composer has a free choice of all keys. But he must, to a certain extent, avoid the original key of the piece and its dominant.” He also states that “For the first portion of the second part . . . the composer must

---

34 Churgin, “Francesco Galeazzi’s Description (1796) of Sonata Form,” 196.
35 Czerny, School of Practical Composition, 34.
form a plan . . . [to] invent, in some degree, a particular form, corresponding to the character of the first part and to the peculiarity of the subject.\textsuperscript{36}

It is interesting to find how closely Liszt’s solution for mm. 319–420 incorporates each of these elements. First, it begins with an exact quotation of the principal subject, however in the most remote key possible: C\textsuperscript{♭} minor, a key that enables Liszt to avoid the tonic (as Czerny suggests) yet emulate the stepwise descending bass motion to B\textsuperscript{♭} that initiates the harmonic motion toward the second key of the first subsection.\textsuperscript{37} He is also able to continue this descent down to B\textsuperscript{♭}VI\textsuperscript{5}, which allows him to incorporate the motivic augmented harmony into the deepest levels of middleground structure. The remaining thematic material of this section incorporates only motivic material that had previously appeared in the first part, yet it reflects a unique feature of the piece: the augmented triad that occurs motivically in so many ways throughout. A well-formed plan if ever there was one. As alluded to earlier, it is not surprising that Liszt’s movement should follow Czerny’s model so closely: not only is it the closest chronologically to his composition, but Czerny was his teacher during the early part of Liszt’s career, and it is hard to imagine Czerny would not have discussed form and other compositional elements while Liszt studied with him.

\textsuperscript{36} Czerny, \textit{School of Practical Composition}, 33, 36, and 35 (respectively).

\textsuperscript{37} This is referred to as a “false recapitulation” in Kaplan (“Sonata Form in the Orchestral Works of Franz Liszt”), Longyear and Covington (“Tonal and Harmonic Structures in Liszt’s Faust Symphony”), and Gernot Gruber, “Zum Formproblem in Liszts Orchesterwerken—exemplifiziert am ersten Satz der Faust-Symphonie,” in \textit{Liszt Studien I: Kongress-Bericht Eisenstadt 1975}, ed. Wolfgang Suppan (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1977): 81–95. But it seems more appropriate to view it as consistent with Czerny’s suggestion that the development might begin with the principal subject in a remote key, especially as false recapitulations usually occur well into the development, where they might actually be confused with a true one. That would hardly be likely here.
The benefit of the demonstrated approach, and the clarity it can provide, are illustrated best by comparing its results with the diagrams of Figure 1, and with the results of analysis based on current Sonata Theory. Compared to the interpretations of Figure 1, the one offered here is most consistent with Kaplan’s. It is consistent in its interpretation of all the larger sections and subsections, although it differs most with Kaplan’s apparent ternary view of the form, and with his interpretation of elements within each larger section—particularly that of the transition theme (mm. 179–224) and its reprise (mm. 450–502). Each of the other interpretations of Figure 1 contain some features that can be rationalized, and some that seem arbitrary (and even questionable); and each agrees with at least one of the others on some aspects of the form.

Floros, Gruber, and Searle consider the opening material to be part of the exposition, despite its harmonic instability, apparently because of its thematic prominence as a source of motivic material for the entire movement (and subsequent movements as well).\(^{38}\) Floros and Searle agree upon the length of the exposition, and assert that the development begins in m. 297,\(^ {39}\) but disagree as to the development’s length. Floros marks the beginning of the recapitulation at m. 359, apparently persuaded by the return of the opening thematic material, as does Gruber. But Searle includes this material in the development and starts the recapitulation at the return to tonic in m. 421, despite the fact that he does not see its parallel passage (m. 71) as the

\(^{38}\) This interpretation also ignores the obvious association listeners would draw between this slow beginning and a normative slow Introduction that is conventional in first movements of other eighteenth- and nineteenth-century symphonic repertoire.

\(^ {39}\) This is understandable to an extent, as m. 297 begins harmonic motion away from the local tonic (E) and clearly leads into what follows. The fact that mm. 297–318 return in the corresponding place at the end of the recapitulation (mm. 582–598), continuing the parallel with the exposition until m. 599, suggests a closing function for this passage in both cases, despite the harmonic instability (something that is not uncommon in closing material that serves as a retransition when there is a repeat of the exposition, or as a lead-in to the development when there is not). Floros’s interpretation of the Coda as beginning in m. 582 is consistent with this view as well (Floros, “Die Faust-Symphonie von Fran Liszt”), whereas Searle’s continuation of the recapitulation to include the reprise of this material seems dubious (Searle, The Music of Liszt).
beginning of the exposition. Searle’s interpretation, in particular, seems wrought with inconsistencies, ignoring both harmonic and thematic parallels at every point of formal articulation. Gruber, on the other hand, presents an interpretation that is internally consistent yet contradictory of traditional norms. His view of mm. 1–70 as exposition, and mm. 359–420 as recapitulation, is consistent, as is his interpretation of mm. 71–319 as development, paralleled by mm. 421–598 (which are given no formal designation). But this interpretation turns the normative association of thematic stability with harmonic stability on its ear, associating the most harmonically *unstable* passages with thematic *stability* (exposition and recapitulation), and harmonically *stable* passages that assert the tonic with thematic *instability* (development). This obviously theme-driven interpretation parallels the conclusions drawn here only in its (apparent) division of the form into two parts, although with differing articulation points.

A comparison with an interpretation based upon Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory is informative, mostly for what the present approach offers in the way of clarification. The largest problem with an application of Sonata Theory to this piece involves the interpretation of the beginning of the recapitulatory rotation, and how that affects the view of the overall form.\(^{40}\) If the final thematic rotation (in their terms) is heard to begin with the return of the Primary Theme and the tonic at m. 421, it does so with only the last portion of the P material as it appears in the exposition, identified here as P\(^{1,3}\) (see Figure 10). On the other hand, the preceding modules of P do appear at the start of the development section (mm. 319–358), albeit in a non-tonic key. As Hepokoski and Darcy observe:

\(^{40}\) In fairness, it must be noted that the interpretation on the basis of Sonata Theory offered here is my own, as I am not aware of any published analysis of this movement by either Hepokoski or Darcy (or anyone else for that matter) using their methodology. Obviously their conclusions could differ substantially from mine.
Since the strongest identifier of the beginning of a rotation is the sounding of its opening module, $P^{1.1}$ . . . , any suggestion that a recapitulatory rotation begins with a post $P^{1.1}$ module . . . is at least problematic and possibly an inadequate account of the situation at hand. Is this a rotation that genuinely omits $P^{1.1}$ in order to begin with $P^{1.2}$, $P^2$, or $TR^1$? If so, to what end? Or is the $P^{1.2}$, $P^2$, or $TR^1$ itself part of an ongoing rotation that had begun earlier with $P^{1.1}$, perhaps off-tonic, within the development space? When the latter is the case, we would most likely be confronting either an instance of a Type 2 sonata or an ad hoc intermixture of Type 2 and Type 3 principles . . . . Such structures can be clarified only by keeping in mind the theory of rotations.\footnote{Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 256.}

The ambiguity created here is compounded if the introduction is considered to be a $P^0$ (i.e., $P$-preparatory) module of $P$ (indicated in parentheses in Figure 10).\footnote{This would be consistent, at least in part, with the views of the form held by Floros and Searle, both of whom include the opening of the movement in the exposition.} The reprise of this material at m. 359 would thus be part of a larger reorganized statement of $P$ that begins at m. 319, the start of the development, making this (in Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s terms) a Type 2 sonata, albeit one with an abnormal return of some $P$ material in the tonic.\footnote{Because Hepokoski and Darcy consider Type 2 sonatas to be binary, and refer to them as such quite frequently, this view would reinforce the binary interpretation offered here, although for very different reasons. Caplin would likely agree with a binary interpretation here, even though his view of sonata form is essentially ternary. In discussing movements in which the main theme (or parts thereof) is omitted from the recapitulation, he states: “As a result of deleting the opening of the main theme, the large-scale form of a sonata movement would seem to be analogous more to the small binary than the small ternary” (Classical Form, 173).}

A view based on the Classical model, however, emphasizes harmonic structure over thematic function, differentiating the appearance of $P$ material in m. 319ff. from that in m. 421ff., and clearly assigning the earlier material to the third subsection.

Because my determination as to the beginning of the recapitulation is based entirely on harmonic considerations, m. 421 would qualify as the “fourth subsection” without question. This interpretation would be consistent with the parallels formed with the opening of the exposition by the reprise of the introduction, and with the perception of most listeners who hear the return of tonic as a decisive articulating event. The passage between mm. 319 and 421 would thus be
considered the “third subsection,” despite its employment of first-key-area and introduction material. Sonata Theory’s observations about the organization of thematic material and its reinforcement of a binary interpretation would add a useful dimension and reinforce the overall view of the form, while pointing out some ambiguities that affect our perception of it. Comparing the two emphasizes the mixed messages the listener receives.

Another issue involves the interpretation of the (still troublesome) passage between mm. 179 and 225, from a Sonata Theory perspective. Figure 10 identifies this passage as S₀ (an S-preparatory module), in keeping with Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s statement:

Following an MC [Medial Caesura], it sometimes happens that a thematic S-module sets out over a prolonged dominant in the new key. This dominant typically lasts for several measures, then shifts to the tonic for the sounding of a different idea (or thematic module) that seems to be more securely grounded within S space . . . . Here the dominant underpinning the S₀ theme retains the MC’s active dominant, which continues to ring through the succeeding music as momentarily fixed or immobile. Consequently, this type of zero-module functions locally as a prolongation of the caesura-dominant itself.⁴⁴

This view is complicated, however, as the MC is blocked: the arrival on V/IV in m. 179 coincides not with a caesura but with the beginning of new thematic material, which unfolds over an extended elaboration of a cadential 6–5–4–3 formula, and a prolonged dominant that does not resolve until m. 225. This interpretation places mm. 179–224 squarely in S space (as Hepokoski and Darcy call it), and Caplin would likely agree.⁴⁵ In contrast, the Classical models would consider the arrival at the new tonic in m. 225 as the delineating feature in the determination of the beginning of the second subsection (in Kollmann’s terms). One way to reconcile this would be to consider mm. 179–225 as still part of the transition, with the a third-level default MC

---

⁴⁴ Hepokoski and Darcy, Elements of Sonata Theory, 142–143.
An alternative might be to consider mm. 179–224 as “caesura-fill,” despite the fact that there is no caesura at m. 179.\(^{46}\) Obviously, application of Sonata Theory here offers several problems of interpretation and, perhaps, more than one possible solution. The clearest view of sonata form in this piece results from a presentation of these three views side by side: Classical models, conventional terminology, and Sonata Theory. This approach incorporates perspectives on sonata form, tonal structure, and thematic organization, with a historical grounding; and it indicates more about formal organization in this piece than any one view can by itself.

One conclusion that can be drawn from these observations is that an analysis of Liszt’s work based on earlier models can reveal a great deal about its formal organization that we have not previously understood, and it can clarify some aspects of its structure that other approaches do not. Rather than being revolutionary, we find Liszt’s application of formal procedures to be, in many respects, remarkably consistent with those of his teacher, Carl Czerny, and other Classical theorists. This understanding can pave the way to correcting a long-standing misconception, by allowing us to construe Liszt’s contributions to nineteenth-century form and harmonic language in their proper context and perspective. One additional observation should be made, as well. If the analytical application of these earlier treatises can be informative when applied directly to this piece, whose overall harmonic structure is significantly different from eighteenth-century norms, might they not be equally (or even more) informative when applied to pieces

\(^{46}\) Hepokoski and Darcy acknowledge this ambiguity in their discussion of S\(^6\) modules (Elements of Sonata Theory, 143). Other problems with this view include the character of the thematic material at m. 225, which—despite the fact that it represents the first harmonically stable passage—is more typical of closing material, while the character of mm. 179–224 is more typical of S, despite its harmonic instability.
whose harmonic structures more closely resemble the norm for that period, even if they were
written during the nineteenth century?
APPENDIX I

LISZT, Faust Symphony: mm. 179–228

Affetuoso, poco Andante.
APPENDIX II

LISZT, FAUST SYMPHONY: MM. 450–506
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**ABSTRACT**

Recent theories of sonata form compensate for a perceived overemphasis on harmonic structure during the latter half of the twentieth century by emphasizing thematic organization as the determining feature of formal function. The present study demonstrates how an analytical method based on earlier practice can be valuable in the analysis of one of Liszt’s most unconventional pieces, the first movement of the *Faust* Symphony. Initially, it considers “problematic” passages often thought to deviate from earlier conventions, and by offering alternative readings, it shows how they are actually consistent with those earlier practices. Once clarified, the movement’s large-scale tonal structure, and its relationship to thematic material, is compared with earlier, harmonically based models of sonata form (by Kollmann, Galeazzi, and Czerny), in order to demonstrate that the movement adheres to those models in remarkably consistent ways. The study then employs aspects of Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory to show how its conclusions differ, and how the present methodology might be complementary.
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