Sentences, Sentence Chains, and Sentence Replication: Intra- and Interthematic Formal Functions in Liszt’s Weimar Symphonic Poems

Steven Vande Moortele

“Few composers,” Kenneth Hamilton remarks in his Preface to the recent *Cambridge Companion to Liszt*, “have benefited more than Liszt from the upsurge in interest in Romanticism over the last few decades.” This holds true for many aspects of Liszt’s works and personality, and certainly for the technical aspects of his music: since the 1970s, there has been no lack of studies that focus on its pitch organization and large-scale form. Most of these studies deal with Liszt’s piano music, leaving his other highly influential group of works, the symphonic poems, underexplored.

1 Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the European Music Analysis Conference in Freiburg-im-Breisgau and as part of the Leuven Lectures in Musicology at the University of Leuven in 2007, as well as at the New England Conference of Music Theorists in Cambridge, MA in 2008. I am grateful to William Caplin, Pieter Bergé, and the anonymous readers for this journal for their valuable comments.


Moreover, studies of form in Liszt’s instrumental music (both for piano and for orchestra) chiefly address what William Caplin has called “interthematic formal functions”: the ways in which formal units at various hierarchical levels combine to create the form of the work as a whole—in a “sonata-style” composition, from the level of themes and transitions to that of expositions, developments, and recapitulations, and eventually to entire movements. Far less attention has been paid to the organization of the lowest hierarchical levels, that is, to intrathematic formal functions in Liszt’s symphonic poems.5

Taking as a starting point theoretical work by Arnold Schoenberg, Carl Dahlhaus, William Caplin, and Matthew BaileyShea, I will draw a picture of the most common syntactic patterns in Liszt’s symphonic poems: sentences and sentence-like (or “sentential”) units.6 My article comprises five parts. I begin by designing a terminological and conceptual framework, exploring the limits and possibilities of a Formenlehre approach to music from the mid-nineteenth century. I then use this framework to develop a typology of sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems. In the next two sections, I investigate how sentences can be grouped together into larger units as well as how they can be replicated at a higher hierarchical level of formal organization. Finally, I investigate how

---

5 Caplin defines intrathematic formal functions as “[t]he constituent formal functions of a theme (or theme-like unit),” and interthematic functions as “[t]he constituent formal functions of a full movement … operating above the level of the theme. See *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 255. More recently, Caplin has introduced the terms phrase functions and thematic functions, which are synonymous with intrathematic and interthematic functions respectively; see “What are Formal Functions?” in Caplin, James Hepokoski, and James Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 35.

6 Caplin uses the term “sentential” when recognizing “the presence of sentence-like characteristics without wanting to say that the resulting structure is a sentence proper” (*Classical Form*, 51). In order to avoid the cumbersome formulation “sentences and sentential patterns,” I will use “sentences” to refer to both categories together.
the internal organization of Liszt’s sentences relates to their function in the large-scale form of his symphonic poems.

My aim is not only to offer insights into Liszt’s individual compositional technique, but also to develop analytical tools that are applicable to other music of the mid- to late nineteenth century. In spite of the renewed interest in musical form in the last two decades, modern Formenlehre has paid little attention to phrase structure after Beethoven, BaileyShea’s recent work on Wagner being a welcome exception. Shifting the focus from Wagner to Liszt seems but a small step, yet it warrants a brief aside. Composed between 1847 and 1861 (often in multiple versions), Liszt’s twelve Weimar symphonic poems are contemporaneous with Das Rheingold, Die Walküre, parts of Siegfried, and Tristan und Isolde—four of the operas in which Wagner, as BaileyShea has shown, makes extensive use of syntactic patterns that are very similar to the ones I discuss in this paper. There is, however, a fundamental difference between Liszt’s and Wagner’s respective uses of sentences: in Liszt’s symphonic poems, traditional modes of formal organization (conventions of symphonic sonata-style composition inherited from the overture and cross-fertilized with those of the symphony proper) are much more significant than they usually are in Wagner. The context in which sentences occur is, therefore, very different in Liszt than it is in Wagner, and this


8 On the question of Liszt’s potential influence on Wagner in this respect, see Rainer Kleinertz, “Liszt, Wagner, and Unfolding Form: Orpheus and the Genesis of Tristan und Isolde,” in Franz Liszt and his World, ed. Christopher Gibbs & Dana Gooley (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 231–54. Kleinertz does not, however, account for the fact that Wagner had already written sentences prior to his close acquaintance with Liszt’s symphonic poems (which, as far as can be established, began in 1856).
has consequences for the form-functional role we expect these patterns to play.

**Sentences and Sentential Patterns**

When discussing intrathematic function in Liszt’s symphonic poems, one cannot ignore Carl Dahlhaus’s 1975 essay, “Liszt’s Bergsymphonie und die Idee der Symphonischen Dichtung,” in which the author devotes several pages to the form of Liszt’s themes. Dahlhaus describes the layout of a typical theme as follows:

In its “idealypical” form, the scheme consists of four parts, comprising first a primary idea, second its repetition, variation … or sequence, third the splitting into parts, and fourth a “closure” that, in a way that is characteristic of Liszt, is both a culmination of the preceding and a link to what follows.⁹

A good example of the pattern that Dahlhaus describes is the main theme from *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne* (Example 1).¹⁰ The first eight measures present a “primary idea,” which is immediately repeated sequentially. Then come nine measures in which parts of the “primary idea” are isolated (“split into parts”); these lead to a distinctive closing gesture (“closure”), an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) in Eb major that is elided with the beginning of the next unit.

---


¹⁰ As my use of the term “main theme” suggests, I understand *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne* within the interpretive framework of sonata form. In fact, nine of the twelve symphonic poems Liszt wrote in Weimar can be argued to use or engage with conventions of sonata form at the most fundamental level of their formal organization, even though these are often combined with another, concurrent pattern. See my *Two-Dimensional Sonata Form*, 60–63.
Example 1. Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne, mm. 3–35
The pattern exemplified by this theme is arguably the most common model for phrase-structural organization in Liszt’s symphonic poems. Surprisingly, Dahlhaus has no name for it. This is striking, since he contrasts it with what he calls the “traditional period.” Given that Dahlhaus suggests a dichotomy between this pattern and the period, an obvious choice of label would have been the sentence, a term first proposed by Arnold Schoenberg several decades before. In a sketch from 1934 for his projected book Der musikalische Gedanke und die Logik, Technik, und Kunst seiner Darstellung, Schoenberg introduces the term “Satz” (sentence) for “one of the forms in which a theme can be stated” and defines it merely as being “in contrast to the period.” Although it is unlikely that in 1975 Dahlhaus would have known Schoenberg’s elliptic 1934 manuscript, there can be no doubt that he was familiar with the fuller definitions of period and sentence in Schoenberg’s Fundamentals of Musical Composition or Erwin Ratz’s Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre. Moreover, in 1978 Dahlhaus himself would tackle the issue of the sentence–period dichotomy head-on by contributing an influential essay titled “Satz und Periode.”

Dahlhaus’s decision not to use the sentence concept is all the more remarkable because he describes the “ideal-typical” Liszt theme in terms similar to those in which Schoenberg and others have defined sentence form. In William Caplin’s Classical Form, overtly based on Schoenberg and Ratz, the sentence is defined as a “theme consisting of a presentation phrase and a continuation … phrase.” The presentation consists of a basic idea and its

---

15 Caplin, Classical Form, 257; see also 35–43.
repetition; the second phrase comprises a continuation (one of the most common characteristics of which is fragmentation) and a concluding cadential function. As shown in Figure 1, the four components of Caplin’s definition parallel Dahlhaus’s “primary idea,” “its repetition, variation ... or sequence,” the “splitting into parts,” and the “closure.”

*Figure 1. Caplin’s model of the sentence and Dahlhaus’s model of the “typical Liszt theme.”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence (Caplin)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td>continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic idea</td>
<td>repetition of basic idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cadence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Liszt theme (Dahlhaus)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>primärer Gedanke</td>
<td>Wiederholung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>Abspaltung in Teilmomenten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequenzierung</td>
<td>Schluß</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These similarities should not obscure the many differences in scale and internal organization between the model Dahlhaus describes and Caplin’s eight-measure sentence. Caplin’s model, after all, was devised for the analysis of classical music, and its author never claimed systematic validity of his theory for any other repertoire. For Dahlhaus, the differences between classical and Lisztian phrase structure might have been sufficient reason to avoid the Schoenbergeian category of the sentence altogether. Instead, Dahlhaus traces the origins of the pattern he describes to the model–sequence–fragmentation technique typical of Beethoven’s development sections. This “reinterpretation of a developmental into an expositional structure,” as he calls it, has profound consequences.¹⁶ It implies that phrase-structural patterns like the one just described will not necessarily be themes—it can

---

also be the equivalent of what Caplin calls “theme-like” units. Indeed, such units be encountered in almost every formal area: in an introduction, as a main theme or part of a main theme group, in a transition, as a subordinate theme or part of a subordinate theme group, in a closing group, in a development, and in a coda. In addition, they occur in episodes or movements that are interpolated between the units of an overarching form.

In *Classical Form*, Caplin distinguishes between genuine sentences that occur in themes and so-called “sentential” structures in theme-like units. This distinction is much harder to make in Liszt’s symphonic poems, a fact that affects the extent to which a theory of classical form is useful for the analysis of the formal functions that Liszt’s themes and theme-like units express. The situation may be clarified by invoking the notions of “tight-knit” (“fest gefügt”) and “loose” (“locker”). This pair of concepts is essential for instrumental music in the classical style and functions as the point of departure for traditional Schoenbergian *Formenlehre*. In the Schoenberg–Ratz tradition, musical form is fundamentally viewed as the interplay between relatively tight-knit units on the one hand and relatively loose ones on the other. Tight-knit units are characterized, in Caplin’s words, “by the use of conventional theme-types, harmonic-tonal stability, a symmetrical grouping structure, form-functional efficiency, and a unity of melodic-motivic material.” Looser units do not possess these characteristics or at least exhibit them in a more limited way.

In Liszt’s instrumental music, as in that of many of his contemporaries, the distinction between “loose” and “tight-knit” loses much of the relevance it had in classical music. To be sure, some units in his symphonic poems are clearly more tight-knit than others, and sometimes tight-knit and loose units occupy exactly those positions in a form where one would expect them to be from a classical point of view. However, Liszt never maintains a systematic distinction between tight-knit and loose for the entire duration of a composition. In any of his symphonic poems,

---

17 Caplin defines “themelike unit” as “a unit that resembles a theme in formal organization but is usually looser and is not required to close with a cadence” (*Classical Form*, 257).

19 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 257.
relatively tight-knit units appear in places where one would not expect them (in the development, for instance), or, conversely, relatively loose units may occur where one would expect more tight-knit ones. All this suggests that the potential of Formenlehre as an analytical tool to determine the functionality of a given unit on the basis of its internal organization is seriously restricted. It is not just that the norm of what qualifies as loose or tight-knit in the context of Liszt shifts in comparison to classical music—that, for instance, a unit that would qualify as loose in classical music counts as tight-knit in Liszt. The change is more fundamental: the loss of the distinction between tight-knit and loose implies that one of classical composers' preferred techniques of form-functional differentiation has been disabled.

In spite of these differences, I will hold on, for the most part, to Caplin's existing terminology; provided one is willing to handle it with sufficient flexibility, it can be a sophisticated descriptive and heuristic tool also when applied to Liszt's music. It will, however, be useful to modify one element of Caplin's terminological system. In Caplin's theory, a distinction is made between formal function, “the role played by a particular musical passage in the formal organization of a work” and formal type, the specific form that is used to realize that function.\textsuperscript{21} In a sonata-form exposition, for instance, the initiating formal function of main theme can be expressed by a variety of formal types, including sentence, period, and small ternary; at a lower level, the initiating function within a main theme can be of the type presentation (e.g., in a sentence) or antecedent (e.g., in a period). At the next level down—at the level of the presentation in a sentence and of the antecedent (and, for that matter, the consequent) in a period—the name for the initiating function is “basic idea.” The same term, however, also refers to one of the formal types that can fulfill this function: “a two-measure idea that usually contains several melodic or rhythmic motives constituting the primary material of a theme.”\textsuperscript{22} But already in classical form, this is not the only formal type available

\textsuperscript{21} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 254. On formal type versus formal function, see Caplin, “What are Formal Functions?”

\textsuperscript{22} Caplin, \textit{Classical Form}, 253.
for this function, at least in the presentation of a sentence: the alternative type is the “compound basic idea,” which consists of a basic idea and a contrasting idea. The terminological conflation of formal function and formal type at this level is problematic, because it can lead to correct but awkward statements such as that “the basic idea is a compound basic idea (the beginning of which is a basic idea).”

The need for a terminological distinction between formal type and formal function becomes more pressing when it comes to phrase structure in Liszt’s symphonic poems. There, as we shall see, the basic idea (as formal type) is only one of many ways in which a basic idea (as formal function) can be organized. In many other types, a two-measure basic idea is only one of the constituent parts of the first half of the presentation. For a simple example, we can look again at the main theme from *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne*. Example 2 reproduces its opening module (the “primary idea” that is subsequently repeated). Although this module comprises eight measures, only the first two of them qualify as a basic idea (understood as formal type). The next pair of measures already repeats the basic idea, and the subsequent four measures elaborate it.23 In cases like this, in which the basic idea (as formal type) is only one part of the repeated unit, another term is required to refer to the unit as a formal function. For this purpose, I propose the term “model.” Its formal function can be defined broadly as a unit established for the purpose of repetition.24

Example 2. *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne*, mm. 3-10.

23 I will come back to this theme in the next section of my article.

24 This modifies Caplin’s definition of a model as “a unit established for the purpose of sequential repetition” (*Classical Form*, 255; my italics). Caplin specifically uses the term “model” in relation to the first unit of a developmental core (*Classical Form*, 142-44), so that generalizing it becomes particularly appealing in view of Dahlhaus’s aforementioned observation that the origins of Liszt’s sentences lie in classical developments.
Typology

The sentence is by far the most common mode of phrase-structural organization in Liszt’s symphonic poems. In fact—and in full compliance with Anton Webern’s remark that the sentence “is the form most favoured by post-classical music”—it is the only classical theme type to have retained a regular presence in this repertoire.\(^\text{25}\) Periodic patterns do occur, especially in slow lyrical themes, but they are relatively rare. Other theme types (ternary, binary, or hybrid) seem to be non-existent in Liszt’s symphonic poems.

In the following paragraphs, I will use the *Formenlehre* approach outlined above to describe what sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems look like. In order to clarify what options were available to Liszt, and which ones he selected more regularly than others, I will first discuss the overall proportions of Liszt’s sentences and then offer a more detailed discussion of their constituent units. The typology that I will develop is based on the 167 excerpts in Liszt’s symphonic poems that I have identified as sentential.\(^\text{26}\) Although the following discussion regularly includes percentages, I do not want to overemphasize their significance; they are intended merely to give a general idea of the frequency of the different options.

Relatively few sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems exhibit the symmetrical proportions characteristic of many of their classical counterparts. Figure 2 gives an overview of the different possible proportional relationships between the model (A), its repetition (A’), and the continuation (B) and their respective frequencies. Only 10% of sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems have a “classical” symmetrical layout (the main theme from *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne* cited in Example 1 is one of them). Much more commonly—29% of the time—the continuation is slightly shorter or longer than the presentation. This leaves another 61% in which the continuation is either significantly shorter (less than two-thirds of the presentation) or significantly longer (more than one and a

---


\(^\text{26}\) See appendix.
half times the presentation). Strikingly, the largest single group is those sentences in which the continuation is cut short to such an extent that it amounts to less than half the length of the presentation. As BaileyShea remarks, the ability of patterns such as these to convey a sentential impetus testifies to the strength of the functional sequence “presentation (including repetition) – continuation – closure.”

Figure 2. Proportional relationship in Liszt’s sentential patterns.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$B \geq 4A$</td>
<td>13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3A \leq B &lt; 4A$</td>
<td>7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2A &lt; B &lt; 3A$</td>
<td>22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B = 2A$</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2A &gt; B &gt; 4A/3$</td>
<td>8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4A/3 \geq B &gt; A$</td>
<td>12 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B \leq A$</td>
<td>28 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportional relationship between presentation and continuation in Liszt’s sentences is not the only striking difference from classical phrase-structure; their overall length too fluctuates enormously, ranging from eight to sixty-two measures. These differences arise primarily from the diverse length of the model: the number of different types that Liszt uses for this formal function far exceeds those used by earlier composers, and depending on the tempo, it can range from two to no less than eighteen measures.

To be sure, the models of about one third of the sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems are of the two-measure basic-idea type. These models do not differ fundamentally from classical practice. In the subordinate theme from Orpheus (Example 3), for instance, a two-measure basic idea is stated and repeated sequentially in the next two measures, after which a lengthy continuation begins with the head of the basic idea. Only somewhat less common are

---

28 Ibid., p. 51.
30 Other examples include *Les Préludes*, mm. 35–46; *Tasso*, mm. 428–437; *Prometheus*, mm. 48–53.
compound basic ideas (i.e., a basic idea and a contrasting idea), as in the excerpt from the main theme group of *Prometheus* shown in Example 4. In this sentence, the model comprises a two-measure basic idea and a starkly contrasting three-measure contrasting idea. This entire five-measure unit is repeated sequentially before the onset of a continuation that is based on the first measure of the basic idea.\(^{31}\)

Example 3. *Orpheus*, mm. 72–84.


\(^{31}\) Other examples: *Mazepa*, mm. 122–54, *Héroïde funèbre*, mm. 32–51; *Hungaria*, mm. 18–36.
Many other models, however, are very different from classical practice. A strategy Liszt regularly deploys (17% of the time) is to form a model out of a double basic idea. A basic idea is presented and immediately restated, most often in the form of an exact repetition, but occasionally as a sequential or modulating repetition. Initially, this double basic idea may appear to constitute the entire presentation. Yet when both are repeated in subsequent measures, they turn out to function merely as a model. A theme from the recapitulatory finale of Les Préludes (Example 5) illustrates this technique. The theme opens with a two-measure basic idea. When these two measures are repeated exactly, it might seem that the presentation is complete and that a continuation will follow. Instead, the entire four-measure unit is repeated sequentially, and only then does the continuation begin.\footnote{Other examples: Festklänge, mm. 293–306; Hunenschlacht, mm. 53–62; Die Ideale, mm. 525–539.}

\textit{Example 5. Les Préludes, mm. 356–369.}

A further category is that of the complex model (22% of cases), which consists of three or more distinct elements. Different possibilities abound: a single basic idea may be combined with a double complementary idea or with two different complementary ideas; a compound basic idea may be repeated in its entirety to form a double compound basic idea; a double basic idea may be combined with two complementary ideas; or a double basic idea may be repeated in its entirety. It would become tedious to illustrate each of these possible combinations in detail, but one
example, again from the main theme group of Prometheus (Example 6), should make the point. The sentence in mm. 84–101 comprises a five-measure model, its sequential repetition, and eight measures of continuation, which begins with a varied third statement and then moves away from the model halfway through the first complementary idea. The complex model itself consists of a two-measure first contrasting idea, a one-measure first contrasting idea (with an internal repetition), and a one-measure second contrasting idea.

A last type of presentation, although not particularly common (less than 7% of cases), is analytically very intriguing. Here, the model is itself a sentence. In other words, a sentential pattern is nested within an overarching sentence, as in the main theme of Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne. As the discussion of Example 2 already suggested, the eight-measure model of this main theme can itself be analyzed as a smaller-scale sentence, comprising a two-measure basic idea, its exact repetition, and four measures of continuation. The same situation occurs in the final sentence of the expositional transition in Hamlet (mm. 133–156; see Example 7). Note that in both examples, the repetition within the nested sentence is exact, whereas the repetition of the model as a whole is sequential. This is a typical procedure that helps to differentiate the hierarchical levels.

---

33 Examples of the other categories include Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne, mm. 180–206 (repeated double basic idea) and 764–795 (double basic idea with two complementary ideas); Mazeppa, mm. 436–464 (basic idea with double complementary idea); and Festklänge, mm. 71–97 (double compound basic idea).

34 The presentation thus comprises two sentential gestures. As such, it is not to be confused with what Mart Humal has described as an “evolving presentation,” in which the “concluding two-bar unit arises as the result of a development within the presentation—a kind of twofold swing,” thus constituting a single sentential gesture (Humal, “Structural Variants of Sentence in Main Themes in Beethoven’s Sonata Form,” in A Composition as a Problem II, ed. Mart Humal, Tallinn: Estonian Academy of Music, 1999, 38). Nested sentences as models are not new in Liszt, of course. One well-known classical example is the main theme in the first movement of Beethoven’s First Symphony.

35 Further examples of models in the form of a nested sentential pattern include mm. 35–96 in Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne, mm. 27–49 (and their recapitulation in mm. 348–370) in Tasso, mm. 133–156 in Hamlet, mm. 9–24 in Hunneneschlacht, and mm. 809–830 (and their varied repetition in mm. 831–850) in Die Ideale.
Example 6. Prometheus, mm. 84–101.

Example 7. Hamlet, mm. 133–156.
The repetition of the model, the continuation, and the closure of sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems are not nearly as idiosyncratic as the internal organization of their models. I will therefore treat them only briefly. Figure 3 summarizes the different options available for each module of a sentence in Liszt’s symphonic poems as well as their frequency.

Figure 3. Frequency of possible situations in the different modules of a sentence in Liszt’s symphonic poems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>REPETITION</th>
<th>CONTINUATION</th>
<th>CLOSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple basic idea</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>sequential 50.5%</td>
<td>T arrival 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compound basic idea</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>exact 42%</td>
<td>no closure 30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double basic idea</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>statement-response</td>
<td>D arrival 22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex model</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>other 5%</td>
<td>evaded / abandoned / deceptive cadence 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nested sentence</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>non-cadential closure 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the overwhelming majority of cases, the repetition of the model is either sequential (just over 50%) or exact (about 42%). Repetitions of the statement-response type, by contrast, are extremely rare, occurring only in 2.5% of cases. (As I will suggest later in this article, this is not without cause.) Usually, the model is repeated in its entirety; only in a handful of cases is the repetition

---

38 Many of BaileyShea’s perceptive general observations about continuation and closure in sentential patterns also apply to Liszt. BaileyShea notably distinguishes between different types of continuation, such as the dissolving third statement, the sentential continuation, the sentence with AABA design, and the Fortspinnung-like continuation, at the same time acknowledging that his typology is not exhaustive. See BaileyShea, “Beyond the Beethoven Model,” 8–21.

39 A small number of repetitions (about 5% of the cases) is harder to classify. They are varied, also harmonically, but not in such a way that the relation to the model can be described as sequential or statement–response.
cut short. One of the rare examples of this technique appears in the theme from the finale of *Tasso* (mm. 397–418; Example 8). The theme begins with an eight-measure complex model, a double compound basic idea in which the repetition of the compound basic idea modulates. A sequential repetition of the model is begun but breaks off after six measures. Then the continuation begins, reducing the unit size progressively to two measures, one measure, and a half measure. In this case, the process of fragmentation, which normally characterizes only the continuation, already begins toward the end of the presentation.

An obvious consequence of the preponderance of sequential repetition in the presentation of Liszt’s sentences is that tonic prolongation is much less common here than it is in the classical presentations. In fact, given that a significant number of the models that are repeated exactly do not project tonic harmony, the number of sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems that do not prolong the tonic at the beginning is even larger than Figure 3 suggests. Needless to say, this is an additional feature that contributes to the generally loose character of Liszt’s sentences.

*Example 8. Tasso, mm. 397–418.*
Continuations can be catalogued according to their opening material, thus permitting us to determine their relation to the presentation. In about half of the cases, continuations in Liszt's symphonic poems begin by referring back to the initial idea of the model. In just under a quarter of the cases, the opening material of the continuation comes from a later part of the model, while a slightly larger group features a continuation that begins with motivic material unrelated to the model. Most continuations express the forward-oriented and dynamic character that is often associated with the nature of the sentence in general.\footnote{The idea that a sentence is more forward-oriented than a period is a central tenet of Schoenbergian Formenlehre that finds its clearest formulation in Josef Rufer’s comment that the sentence is “a dynamic form which is really ‘in motion,’ in contrast to the static, ‘resting’ period form” (Rufer, Composition with Twelve Tones, transl. Humphrey Searle, London: Rockliff, 1954, 33). See also Ratz, Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre, 24.} In a number of cases, however, the continuation has the opposite effect, gradually reducing the momentum. As we will see in Section 5, this unusual situation has clear form-functional implications.

Given that sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems can function both as themes and as theme-like units, it comes as no surprise that they end in a variety of ways. Although genuine cadences are extremely rare, many patterns in these works end with a quasi-cadential tonic or dominant arrival. Thirty percent of them terminate with an arrival on a tonic chord in root position. This is true of the sentences shown in Examples 1, 3, and 8. Slightly less frequent are those sentences that end on a dominant (in any inversion and including dominant-seventh chords) or a diminished seventh chord. An example of the latter category is shown in Example 4, one of the former in Example 5. In one tenth of the cases, sentences end with an evaded, abandoned, or deceptive cadence that is elided with the beginning of the next formal unit. An even smaller number of sentences achieve closure in some other way that is not primarily pitch-related. A final third achieves no closure at all; the pattern ends, either because the music literally stops (i.e., it is followed by a general pause) or because the next formal unit begins. Typically in these cases, the last measures of the continuation function as a drive to the beginning of the next unit.
thus complying with Dahlhaus’s previously quoted remark about “closure which … is both a culmination of the preceding and a link to what follows.” This is what happens in Example 6: there is no closure, and the liquidation process at the end of the continuation simply leads to the entry of the next formal unit. In the absence of a clearly expressed ending function, the beginning of a new unit at the same hierarchical level is often expressed by the re-establishment of larger-sized units following a process of fragmentation.\footnote{On this procedure, consult Caplin, “What are Formal Functions?,” 35.}

**Sentence Chains**

In a note titled “Zur Formenlehre” from April 20, 1917, Schoenberg mentions the term “Satzkette” (sentence chain) as an example of “compound forms.”\footnote{Schoenberg, Zusammenhang, Kontrapunkt, Instrumentation, Formenlehre (Coherence, Counterpoint, Instrumentation, Instruction in Form), ed. and transl. Severine Neff and Charlotte M. Cross (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 102.} The same term reappears in a “Schema für die Terminologie” intended for *Der musikalische Gedanke.*\footnote{Schoenberg, *The Musical Idea*, 164–5.} In both instances, as well as in Schoenberg’s later writings, the term remains undefined and even undiscussed. BaileyShea has recently revived the concept, which proves very useful for the description of certain passages both in Wagner—for which BaileyShea uses it—and in Liszt.

BaileyShea defines *Satzkette* as “any string of distinct musical units that come together to project a consistent and recurrent sentential impulse.”\footnote{BaileyShea, *The Wagnerian Satz*, 190.} This definition does not require that a sentence chain consist entirely of complete sentences. Although sentence chains exclusively made up of complete sentences occur, most are realized as an alternation of complete and incomplete ones (for instance, isolated presentations and continuations). For the present purposes, I will therefore define sentence chains as any succession of four or more complete or incomplete sentences without interruption (e.g., a fermata) and in a steady tempo.
According to this definition, thirteen such sentence chains can be found in Liszt’s Weimar symphonic poems.\textsuperscript{45} Figures 4 and 5 give an overview of two of them, one from the development of \textit{Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne} (mm. 309–478) and the other from the exposition of \textit{Prometheus} (mm. 48–115).

On the largest scale, the sentence chain that opens the development of \textit{Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne} consists of eight complete or incomplete sentences or sentence-like units (shown in the upper rows of the scheme). As shown in the scheme’s lower rows, smaller-scale sentential gestures are often nested within these larger patterns, functioning either as models or as continuations. The sentential impetus at the very beginning of the chain (mm. 309–328) is particularly strong. A four-measure sentential pattern (\(\alpha\alpha\beta = a\)) is repeated exactly (\(a’\)) to form a complex model (A). This model is then repeated sequentially (\(A’\)) before giving way to a six-measure continuation (B) that is itself organized as yet another small-scale sentence. The re-establishment of longer units marks the beginning of the second large-scale sentence (mm. 329–355), comprising a double basic idea, its sequential repetition, and seven measures of continuation, again itself organized sententially. After two more complete sentences (mm. 356–365 and 366–401), the sentential impetus becomes less clear: mm. 402–423 and 424–441 constitute two sentence fragments (an isolated presentation and a basic idea + continuation respectively). The sentential nature of the two final members of the chain (mm. 442–453 and 454–478), however, is unambiguously clear.

\textsuperscript{45} Mm. 309–478, 632–742, and 764–795 in \textit{Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne}; mm. 72–129 in \textit{Orpheus}; mm. 48–115, 185–249, and 269–298 in \textit{Prometheus}; mm. 74–156 and 222–337 in \textit{Hamlet}; mm. 3–62 in \textit{Hunneninselacht}; and mm. 26–99, 263–318, and 319–380 in \textit{Die Ideale}. Although the minimum number of four sentences or fragments in my definition may appear arbitrary, I do think that, given the ubiquity of sentences in Liszt’s symphonic poems, any succession of fewer patterns would fail to stand out against the general phrase-structural context.
Figure 4. Sentence chain in mm. 309–478 of Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne (overview).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 8</td>
<td>A’ 8</td>
<td>B 6</td>
<td>A 10</td>
<td>A’ 10</td>
<td>B 7</td>
<td>A’ 24</td>
<td>B 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a’ 4</td>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a’ 4</td>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Sentence chain in mm. 48–115 of Prometheus (overview).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>A’ 2</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>A’ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a’ 4</td>
<td>b 6</td>
<td>a 4</td>
<td>a’ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a 2</td>
<td>a’ 2</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>a 2</td>
<td>a’ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sentence chain that opens the exposition in *Prometheus* comprises five sentences. While the opening two are short and simple, the formal organization of the third one (mm. 62–83) is more intricate: its fourteen-measure continuation (B) is itself organized as a nested sentence (aa’b), and the continuation of that nested sentence in mm. 84–101 also takes a sentential form (aa’β) at the next lowest level. After another simple sentence, mm. 102–115 (shown in Example 4 above) constitute the concluding sentence in this chain.

In the examples from *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne* and *Prometheus*, the separate units that constitute the sentence chain are very different from each other. They diverge not only in size, but also with respect to the kind of model they use, the degree of completion, and their relative degrees of symmetry or asymmetry. Viewed in isolation, some of them do not even qualify as sentences. Taken together, however, they form one large formal unit that sustains the “consistent and recurrent sentential impulse” that BaileyShea mentions. In the sentence chain from the exposition of *Prometheus*, this impulse is further strengthened by an almost systematic avoidance of closure at the end of the separate units.

The two sentence chains discussed above are organized following a purely additive principle: they consist of a simple concatenation of sentences or fragments thereof. Some other sentence chains, although rare, are organized according to a more intricate pattern. The six sentences that constitute the sentence chain in mm. 72–129 of *Orpheus*, for example, are grouped into two sequences of three (mm. 72–101 and 102–129 respectively). As shown in Figure 6, each group is internally organized as an ABB’ design. In the first group, the third unit is a transposed and slightly expanded repetition of the second, and the second group of three is a tonally reorganized repetition of the first in which the final portion of the last sentence is modified. Unlike the simple concatenation in the previous sentence chains, this passage thus exhibits a more elaborate hierarchical organization.46

46 Kleinertz discusses this passage in similar terms (Kleinertz, “Liszt, Wagner, and Unfolding Form,” 235–7). Since he starts his analysis only at m. 85 (and thus
ignores that mm. 102–114 are a repetition of mm. 72–84), however, his results differ from mine.
Sentence Replication

We have repeatedly observed in the course of this article how the formal structure of a unit at a given hierarchical level is replicated at a higher one in the formal structure of a larger unit whose beginning coincides with that of the former. This procedure is akin to Alfred Lorenz’s concept of *Potenzierung* as applied to Wagner: the idea that a pattern of formal organization can be reproduced from the lowest up to the highest levels of a musical form. In contrast to Lorenz, however, I find that replication can occur only at a limited number of hierarchical levels; by no means can it be reproduced mechanically over the entire hierarchical organization of a musical form.

Replication most frequently occurs at the intrathematic level, i.e., within a single large-scale sentence. It is an essential feature of sentences that have a model in the form of a double basic idea or a nested sentence. In the case of a model containing a double basic idea, a simple basic idea is presented and immediately restated, most often as an exact repetition. Initially, this basic idea and its repetition may appear to constitute the entire presentation. When the subsequent measures do not bring a continuation, but instead repeat both the basic idea and its repetition, the first presentation of the basic idea and its repetition turn out to function merely as a model. Thus, the internal formal organization of the model—a basic idea and its repetition—is replicated at the level of the presentation, as shown in Figure 7.

---

Something similar happens on a slightly larger scale in sentences with a model that is itself sentential. In this case, the internal organization of the model—a basic idea, its repetition, and a continuation—is analogous to that of the sentence as a whole, so that the latter replicates the formal organization of the former (see Figure 8).
In these sentences, it is not the concrete internal organization of the model that is replicated at a higher hierarchical level. Rather, an abstract formal pattern (either AA or AA'B) is common to the model and the entire presentation or sentence. The relationship between a unit and its repetition at distinct levels can be very different, both regarding the proportions and the nature of the relationship. Within the model, the repetition is usually exact, while in the presentation, it is usually sequential.

Replication can also go beyond the individual sentence. In Figure 6, we have seen how a sentence chain can have an ordered layout that transcends the purely additive. Another possibility—although admittedly an exceptional one—is that a sentence chain takes the form of a large-scale sentence. A sentence is, in other words, replicated at the level of the sentence chain. This happens in mm. 105–156 from the exposition of *Hamlet* (Figure 9). The bottom rows of Figure 9 show a rapid succession of nine sentences (or, in the case of the last one, a sentence-like unit). Because mm. 119–132 are an otherwise unaltered transposition (from B minor to D minor) of the two patterns in mm. 105–118, the relationship between the first two pairs of sentences is that of a model (A, in the form of a double basic idea: a and a') and its sequential repetition (A'). The longer sentence that concludes the chain (mm. 133–156) was discussed in relation to Example 7 above. Following two large-scale units that can be perceived as a model and its repetition, this sentence has the effect of a large-scale continuation, particularly given its clear motivic connections to the units that precede it. Thus, the formal organization of the opening unit (αα'β) appears replicated in the form of mm. 105–156 as a whole.48

---

48 I have been able to identify only one additional example of this situation. Incidentally, it also comes from *Hamlet*: the sentence chain in mm. 222–337, which functions as the core of the development.
Figure 9. Sentence replication in a sentence chain in mm. 105–156 from Hamlet.
Sentences and Large-Scale Form

The replication that often takes place between different hierarchical levels involving sentences is characteristic of a tendency towards expansion in Liszt’s symphonic poems. That which initially appears to happen at a given level turns out to occur at the level below—a unit that seems to be a presentation or even a complete sentence turns out to be only a model, and one that seems to be a self-sufficient sentence turns out to be part of a sentence chain that is itself organized sententially. In each of these situations, the basic procedure is the same: the scale on which the form develops is enlarged in the course of the form itself. For the listener, this requires a constant retrospective reinterpretation of what has just been heard, interpreting its function in ever larger formal units.\(^{49}\)

Rainer Kleinertz has described procedures like these with the term “unfolding form”: “[T]he unfolding process of a small melodic unit in a series of repetitions and sequences that are gathered into greater units on a larger scale.”\(^{50}\) As Kleinertz argues, this process is in principle open-ended. Moreover, it often intensifies the forward-oriented character that is traditionally ascribed to the sentence.\(^{51}\) Indeed, this might also explain why presentations of the statement-response type are so strikingly rare in Liszt’s sentences: a return to the tonic at the end of the presentation or at the beginning of the continuation would create a sense of closure—however superficial—that Liszt would have wanted to avoid. The expectation that something else will follow is much stronger when the model is repeated exactly or sequentially. Thus, replication is an efficient means of building larger structures. It is, however, also implicated in what might be considered one of the aesthetic flaws of Liszt’s symphonic poems: large units built


\(^{50}\) Kleinertz, “Liszt, Wagner, and Unfolding Form,” 250.

\(^{51}\) Compare note 38.
from multiple repetitions of a small unit can easily become tedious when the same procedure is used too frequently.

The question remains as to how sentences and sentence chains relate to the form-functional organization of Liszt’s symphonic poems at the interthematic level. Given that, as I have claimed in Section 1 above, the distinction between tight-knit and loose has become largely irrelevant in this repertoire, the formal function of a sentence cannot be deduced from its internal organization in a systematic way. Alternative means of form-functional clarification are therefore needed. Before concluding, I will briefly discuss four strategies involving sentential patterns that Liszt regularly uses to express the formal functions of introduction, main theme and transition, development, and closure in the absence of an effective distinction between tight-knit and loose designs.

Several of Liszt's slow introductions take the form of a sentence. In their organization, they markedly differ from sentences that occur in other formal positions. The flow of the music is often interrupted by long rests and fermatas—usually at the end of the model and its repetition, sometimes in the course of the continuation. The result is that the dynamic and forward-oriented potential of the sentence remains unrealized and is instead replaced by a hesitant quality that is suggestive of a formal position “before the beginning.”

An example of this opening gambit is the introduction to Tasso (Example 9). Here, a seven-measure complex model, its sequential repetition, and the continuation are separated from each other by a fermata on the last note of each unit. The first phase of the continuation, fragmenting the model into two-measure units, runs aground on yet another fermata after eight measures. Only the continuation’s second phase, fragmented into one-measure units, picks up momentum (increased by the accelerando) and leads to the entry of the main theme in m. 27. This main theme, which also has a sentential form, is differentiated from the preceding sentence not only by the fast tempo (obviously a very strong formal marker for the beginning of an exposition) and the increased phrase-structural flow, but also by the fact that the sentential impetus, which was only latent in the introduction, now simultaneously
appears at different levels: not only the theme as a whole is sentential, but so are its model, repetition, and continuation.\footnote{Similar opening gambits occur in \textit{Les Préludes}, \textit{Héroïde funèbre}, \textit{Hungaria}, and \textit{Die Ideale}.}

\begin{center}
\textit{Example 9. Tasso, mm. 1–26.}
\end{center}

Similar gestures can occur in other positions in the form, where they serve to delineate major sections. In \textit{Prometheus}, for instance, the (fast) introduction is separated from the beginning of the exposition by a slow passage marked “Recitativo” that returns in only slightly varied form right before the recapitulation. The “Recitativo” episode, shown in Example 10, has the form of a sentence, but as in the introduction to \textit{Tasso}, its flow is repeatedly interrupted by rests. In the continuation, the energy level, which
was already low in the presentation, is further reduced. This contrasts markedly with the highly dynamic sentence chain that opens the exposition (discussed above in relation to Figure 5). Although the “Recitativo” stands outside the form, its role as an interruption clarifies the subsequent formal initiation.

Another situation in which adjacent sentences often have differing formal functions is in expositional main themes and transitions. In these local situations, relative degrees of looseness and tightness sometimes continue to play a role. Measures 3–96 of *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne* are a case in point. Measures 35–96 form a varied repetition of the main theme presented in mm. 3–34 (discussed above). They comprise a model of thirteen measures, its sequential repetition, and a continuation of thirty-six measures, leading to a half cadence in F major. In addition to its asymmetrical layout, this unit as a whole displays an increased harmonic-tonal mobility (it modulates from E♭ major to F major) and a greater melodic-motivic diversity. All these factors contribute to mm. 35–96 being much looser than mm. 3–34. Also, the model itself is considerably loosened by the insertion of six measures of new motivic material. This material then initiates the structural modulation at the beginning of the continuation. The increased looseness of mm. 35–96 in comparison to what precedes them effectively expresses the different formal function of both units: the relatively tight-knit mm. 3–34 function as a main theme, the much looser varied restatement in mm. 35–96 as a transition.

Example 10. Prometheus, mm. 27–47.

---

53 A related situation occurs in the two *Allegro mestoso* episodes that frame the core of the development in *Ce qu’on entend sur la montagne*. 
An additional feature that characterizes mm. 3–34 as a main theme is the rhetorically reinforced IAC with which it closes. In this case, the clear closure matches the theme's overall relative stability. Similar (quasi-)cadential closure on the tonic can, however, also operate independently from a theme’s overall design, concluding a main theme that, as a whole, has a rather loose organization. The enormous main theme in Die Ideale (mm. 111–158), for example, is very loose, particularly in its continuation, but it is clearly rounded off by a tonic arrival. This firm closure is one of the factors that distinguishes this theme from its environment and sets it apart as the main theme, but it contradicts a looseness of grouping structure and internal harmonic organization earlier on; closure is imposed on the theme from above.

The use of sentence chains in Liszt’s symphonic poems, too, has a specific formal function. As we have seen, the rapid succession of complete and incomplete sentences in a sentence chain can generate a strong dynamic and forward-oriented impulse. In a style in which individual sentences are ubiquitous, sentence chains become one of Liszt’s preferred ways to evoke development function. It is thus not surprising that several of the lengthiest sentence chains in this repertoire appear in development sections—not only in mm. 309–378 of Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne (one of the examples discussed above), but also in mm. 185–249 in Prometheus, mm. 222–337 in Hamlet, and mm. 319–380 in Die Ideale; in both Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne and Hamlet, moreover, a sentence chain constitutes the entire core of the development.

Interestingly, the same developmental connotation often continues to play a role when a sentence chain occurs outside the development section. In all cases, the formal unit that takes the shape of a sentence chain is markedly unstable, and without exception, that instability is related to the specific function of that unit in the large-scale formal organization. The clearest examples are the sentence chains in the expositions of Prometheus (mm. 46–115) and Hamlet (mm. 74–156). Both pieces involve what James Hepokoski has called a “two-block exposition”: an exposition that opens “with a tormented, driven, ‘masculine’ first theme, typically thrashing about in the minor mode and sometimes bonded to a continuation or transition,” which starkly contrasts with “an angelically redemptive, lyrically ‘feminine’ second theme in the non-
tonic major mode and not infrequently in a slower tempo as well. In both Prometheus and Hamlet, where the presence of a two-block exposition is obviously program-related, the entire first block of the exposition consists of a sentence chain. The transplantation of the developmental connotation brought about by the sentence chain accounts for the restless character of the music.

Finally, a specific type of sentence is particularly apt to express closing function. Similar to sentences with introductory function, these patterns feature a continuation in which the level of energy gradually decreases. What sets them apart from introductory sentences is that they are in a fast tempo and that their presentations are characterized by a steady flow and a high energy level. The clearest example occurs in mm. 180–206 of Ce qu'on entend sur la montagne, which function as the exposition’s closing group. After the multiple nesting in the presentation (a two-measure basic idea is repeated exactly to form a double basic idea, which is then repeated sequentially to form a complex model; this eighth-measure complex model is than repeated in its entirety), the continuation gradually liquidates the model to a one-note figure through a process of fragmentation. At the same time, the level of surface rhythmic activity drops with each new stage in the fragmentation process: from eighth notes at the beginning of the continuation to quarter notes, half notes, and eventually to whole-note pulses that bring the music to a complete standstill. Needless to say, the effect of winding down is enhanced by the overall diminuendo and the gradual registral descent. Transpositions of the same sentential pattern later return twice with a similar closing function at the end of the core of the development (mm. 454–478, right before the onset of the central chorale) and at the end of the recapitulation (mm. 891–922).55

55 Examples from other symphonic poems include mm. 344–355 in Festklänge and mm. 132–152 in Héroïde funèbre.
In sum, the sentence clearly is the basic building block in Liszt’s Weimar symphonic poems. In sections 2 and 3 of this article, I have studied these sentences through the analytical lens of Formenlehre. The applicability of this approach to this repertoire has its limits: while Formenlehre concepts are a useful tool to clarify the internal organization of Liszt’s sentences, they say little about the role these patterns play in the large-scale formal organization of his symphonic poems. As the technique of sentence replication and the various strategies of form-functional clarification discussed in sections 4 and 5 illustrate, the methods Liszt uses to establish connections between the different levels of his forms are quite different from those that theorists of musical form have analyzed in music of his predecessors. The result of this article is, therefore, a twofold one. On the one hand, it provides a detailed picture of the phrase-structural aspect of Liszt’s personal style (at least as far as his symphonic poems are concerned). On the other hand, the extended Formenlehre toolkit that I have developed is likely to be applicable to works by a variety of other nineteenth-century composers. Using these tools for the analysis of instrumental music by contemporaries of Liszt (such as Berlioz, Schumann, and Mendelssohn) as well as later composers (such as Bruckner, Mahler, and Strauss) can contribute to a better understanding of how musical form in the nineteenth century works.

Appendix: Sentences in Liszt’s Weimar symphonic poems
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