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From the reprise overture
to Liszt’s B minor Sonata.
Romantic creations in an
eighteenth century formal ‘corset’?

ABSTRACT: The present paper summarises the general affinities that link the great romantic piano fantasies (Schubert’s Op. 15, Schumann’s Op. 17, Chopin’s Op. 49 and Liszt’s B minor Sonata) by means of the presence of dual structures of various kinds, including the tonal, formal and an extramusical, interpretational ‘false bottom’, the latest often of autobiographical nature. One of the most prominent dual structures present in all the above-mentioned fantasies is a so-called ‘duble-function form’ (apart from far-reaching individualism in detailed solutions) which have no roots in the tradition of keyboard fantasia written by predecessors. As possible source of inspiration some oeuvres of Beethoven are often evoked. However, the paper juxtaposes them with the tradition of the so-called reprise-overture, a particular kind of sonata form (called also ‘interpolated sonata form’ as its key element consists in an intrusion of slow movement within the course of sonata form) that emerged in the circles of Italian 18th century opera, widespread often in conjunction with the scope to link an operatic sinfonia with the rest of the drama. Examples by Salieri, Mozart and Haydn are briefly analyzed to show the variety of solutions and posing the hypothesis that reprise overture might be (as transferred well into the 19th century by many operatic composers and ‘kleine Meisters’ that used it in purely instrumental pieces) one of the possible – and unexpected – roots of the formal design of the greatest oeuvres in piano literature ever composed.
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When listening to the grand piano fantasies of the first half of the nineteenth century, from Franz Schubert’s Fantasy, Op. 15 (1822), through the first movement of Robert Schumann’s Fantasy in C major, Op. 17 (1836–38) and Fryderyk Chopin’s Fantasy in F minor, Op. 49 (1841), and ending with Ferenc Liszt’s Sonata in B minor (1852–53, dubbed a ‘rhetorical fantasy’ by Johannes Brahms), one gains the impression that these works contain some continually repeated elements. Following the summary of the key features of Chopin’s F minor Fantasy that Mieczysław Tomaszewski included in his study of that work,¹ one is perhaps surprised to note

¹ Mieczysław Tomaszewski, “Fantazja f-moll op. 49: struktura dwoista i drugie dno” [The F minor Fantasy, Op. 49: dual structure and false bottom], in: idem, Muzyka Chopina na nowo
– considering the widespread conviction of the singularity of Romantic composers’ creative output – that all these works are characterised by the following:

1. a special link to songs, albeit manifest in different ways:
   a) Schubert’s *Fantasy*, Op. 15 is linked to the song ‘Der Wanderer’: a fragment of that song was the source of both the basic rhythmic motif that bonds all the themes of that work and also – in the form of an almost literal quotation – the theme of the variations that constitute the emotional centre of that composition;
   b) towards the end of the first movement of his *Fantasy*, Op. 17, Schumann quotes part of the last song, ‘Nimm sie hin denn, diese Lieder’, from Beethoven’s *An die ferne Geliebte*. The central section of that movement, ‘Im Legendenton’, was conceived as a ‘song without words’ (the composer originally intended this to be a ‘Romanza’, and so a song about unhappy love);  
   c) the *Fantasy*, Op. 49 contains references to Polish national songs from the time of the November Uprising of 1830–31: ‘Litwinka’ [The Lithuanian] and ‘Marsz obozowy’ [Camp march] (both with music by Karol Kurpiński). The central movement, *Lento sostenuto*, in turn, has what many scholars have deemed the character of a religious chorale;
   d) the principal melodic phrase of the central section of Liszt’s *Sonata in B minor*, *Andante sostenuto*, comes from *Consolation* No. 4 in D flat major (described in the latter work as *cantabile con divozione*). According to the composer (MS of *Consolations*), this phrase originates from a song (not yet identified by scholars) by Maria Pavlovnà Romanova, wife of Grand Duke Carl Friedrich von Sachsen-Weimar-Eisenach;

2. the presence of dual structures of various kinds, including the tonal and formal, and an extramusical, interpretational ‘false bottom’ (see also §3)
   a) a debatable tonal centrum (in both the Schubert and the Schumann, the ‘main’ key is merely the key of the beginning and the end of the composition; in the Chopin, there are two main keys), a constant major-minor opposition (Schumann, Chopin, Liszt);
   b) these fantasies embody – albeit with different detailed solutions – the so-called ‘double-function form’ (see Table 1), that is, a sonata cycle written in sonata form (we will return to this issue in a different context in §4).

3 Tomaszewski, “Fantazja f-moll op. 49”, 91–92.
4 Recurring in the interpretations cited by Tomaszewski (Ibid., 84) are ‘chorale, hymn, prayer, song of faith’, linking this fragment with the idiom of religious song.
6 William S. Newmann, *The Sonata since Beethoven* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), 373. See also Rey M. Longyear,”Liszt’s *B minor Sonata*. Precedents for
Table 1. The ‘double-function form’ in the sonatas by Schubert, Schumann, Chopin, and Liszt.

a) Schubert (author’s analysis; the generally adopted interpretations of the sonata form elements in this work are given in parentheses in the second row of the diagram)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.</td>
<td>1st.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.</td>
<td>3rd.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>fugal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) Schumann (after John Daverio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st mvt.: Durchaus phantastisch..., C</th>
<th>2nd mvt.: 2/4</th>
<th>3rd mvt: Erstes Tempo, C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st th gr</td>
<td>Variations</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd th gr</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 gr</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 gr</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work is usually regarded as a four-movement cycle played attacca (Schubert would not produce a full ‘double-function form’ until his Fantasy in F minor for four hands – see Longyear, “Liszt’s B minor Sonata”, 201–202). And indeed, the four-movement design is strongly marked here (including rests between the movements and the independent design of the third movement, typical of a Scherzo). However, elements of ‘double-function form’ are also discerned here. That said, the reprise here is usually seen as beginning with the fugato – see Patrick McCreless, “A Candidate for the Canon? Fantasie in C Major for Violin and Piano”, 19-th Century Music 20 (1997/3), 211. For many reasons (including analogy with Liszt’s B minor Sonata), I consider the reprise (two themes from the exposition, stability of key, though it is not C major) to begin from the Presto. The character of the third movement as a structural ‘reflection’ of the first (with an almost Lisztian technique in the transforming of themes) is also stressed by Brian Newbould, Schubert. The Music and the Man (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 347.

7 This work is usually regarded as a four-movement cycle played attacca (Schubert would not produce a full ‘double-function form’ until his Fantasy in F minor for four hands – see Longyear, “Liszt’s B minor Sonata”, 201–202). And indeed, the four-movement design is strongly marked here (including rests between the movements and the independent design of the third movement, typical of a Scherzo). However, elements of ‘double-function form’ are also discerned here. That said, the reprise here is usually seen as beginning with the fugato – see Patrick McCreless, “A Candidate for the Canon? Fantasie in C Major for Violin and Piano”, 19-th Century Music 20 (1997/3), 211. For many reasons (including analogy with Liszt’s B minor Sonata), I consider the reprise (two themes from the exposition, stability of key, though it is not C major) to begin from the Presto. The character of the third movement as a structural ‘reflection’ of the first (with an almost Lisztian technique in the transforming of themes) is also stressed by Brian Newbould, Schubert. The Music and the Man (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 347.

8 John Daverio, “Schumann’s ‘Im Legendenton’ and Friedrich Schlegel’s Arabeske”, 19-th Century Music 10 (1987/2), 158.
c) Chopin (omitted from the diagram are the improvisational parts, neighbouring with the thematic parts)\(^9\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{1 mvt.: Grave-agitato, C-}\text{ɛ} & \text{2 mvt.: Lento sost., \(3/4\)} & \text{3 mvt.: Tempo primo,\text{ɛ}} \\
\text{Intro.} & \text{Expo.} & \text{Devt.} & \text{Recap.} & \text{Coda} \\
\text{1–5ths.} & \text{1–2ths.} & \text{Impr.-Chorale} & 1–5ths. & \text{e.a.Chorale} \\
f-F & f & \text{Aflat c Eflat Gflat Gflat-B} & \text{bflat Dflat f} & \text{Aflat--------} \\
b.1–42 & 43–142 & 143–179 & 180–222 & 223–309 \text{ 310–332} \\
\end{array}
\]

d) Liszt (analysis after Rey M. Longyear)\(^10\)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
\text{1 mvt.: Lento-Allo energico} & \text{2 mvt.: Andante sost. \(3/4\)} & \text{3 mvt.: Allo energico} & \text{event. 4 mvt.} & \text{Devt. cont. or Recap.} & \text{Coda} \\
\text{Intro.} & \text{Expo.} & \text{Th.intr.} & \text{4th.} & \text{1th(fugato) 1th. 2th. 3th} & \\
\text{A B C D C’} & \text{X(new) – C-D-B – X} & \text{B + C} & \text{B C A D C’} & \\
\text{b. 1–7} & 8–178 & 179–330 & 331–459 & 460–522 \text{ 523–649} \text{ 650–769} \\
\end{array}
\]

3. ‘independent and essentially non-programmatic existence’ (with the exception of Schumann’s \textit{Fantasy}), against a parallel ‘considerable power to generate specific interpretations of a supra-musical nature, through both the drama of the musical narration and the expressive-semantic references accessible to a listener who is au fait with the context of the specific history and culture’. Those ‘references’ are generally cast in allusions to songs (see §1), and their general character has in these cases a remarkably concordant suggestiveness, namely autobiographic, often tragically inflected:

a) the song fragment with the words ‘Die Sonne dünkt mich hier so kalt’ and the use of a dactylic rhythm allow one to infer the personal meaning of Schubert taking up the romantic theme of the wanderer: an outsider wherever he goes.

Scholars link this to the moods that accompanied the composer during a crisis

\(^9\) Themes according to Tomaszewski, \textit{“Fantazja f-moll op. 49”}, 82–83. However, Tomaszewski considers Chopin’s \textit{Fantasy} in narratological terms, eschewing terms that are typical of sonata form (e.g. phase I of the narration: ‘expositional’ rather than simply ‘exposition’).

\(^10\) Longyear, \textit{“Liszt’s B minor Sonata”}, 198. Some authors see in the fugato an equivalent of the Scherzo, and I take account of this in the diagram – see e.g. Alan Walker, \textit{Franz Liszt}, vol. 2: \textit{The Weimar Years 1848–1861} (New York: Alfred and Knopf, 1989), 151. For a comparison of the most important analyses of this work, see Serge Gut, \textit{Franz Liszt} (Sinzig: Studio-Verlag, 2009), 458. Gut sees its form as one-movement (Ibid., 459–460). The conception of the ‘double-function form’ was rejected also by Dolores Pesce, \textit{‘Expressive Resonance in Liszt’s Piano Music’}, in \textit{Nineteenth-Century Piano Music}, ed. R. Larry Todd (New York-London: Routlege 2004), 423–424, after Sharon Winklhofer, \textit{Liszt’s Sonata in B Minor: A Study of Autograph Sources and Documents} (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980), 162. However, the argument, that Liszt would have written further movements if he had wanted the \textit{B minor Sonata} to be considered a cyclic work does not convince us at all (it is not a question of denying that the work is in one movement, but only of the sense of its formal structure).
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in both his health and his composing in 1821–22 (the Fantasy, Op. 15 was written in the autumn of 1822);\(^{11}\)
b) the genesis of the first movement of Schumann’s Fantasy, Op. 17 dates from the summer of 1836. It is likely to have been conceived originally as a one-movement work, intended as a tribute to Clara Wieck, who became his ‘ferne Geliebte’ at that time. The emotional centre of the Fantasy was to have been a ‘Romanza’ (it is not certain who made the change to ‘Im Legendenton’);\(^{12}\)
c) the Fantasy, Op. 49 is a musical autobiography of Chopin as a Pole (alongside the Polonaise-Fantasy, Op. 61, which adheres to a similar form): ‘Today I finished the Fantasy – and the sky is beautiful. There’s a sadness in my heart – but that’s alright. If it were otherwise, perhaps my existence would be worth nothing to anyone’. This concise wording in a letter to Julian Fontana (October 1841) contains the sense of guilt (at not taking part in the November Uprising) that accompanied him throughout his life\(^{13}\) and obliged him to continually repay a perceived debt to his homeland with his own output – the only action open to him as an artist;
d) the Sonata in B minor has been treated to the largest number of programmatic-symbolic interpretations. The most common references are to Faust and to Milton’s Paradise Lost.\(^{14}\) There is also a strictly autobiographical interpretation, according to which the work’s principal themes arose from motivic cells contained in soggetti cavati derived from the name of the composer, Ferenc Liszt, and his beloved, Carolyne von Sayn-Wittgenstein.\(^{15}\) Thus they represent the protagonists and their love (the theme of the introduction and T1 are Liszt and his love; T2 and T3, derived from T1, are Carolyne and her love), and the theme of the central section (X) is a picture of ideal love, full of devotion – as we can see, that Lisztian con divozione from Consolations fits not just interpretations that see in this fragment a portrait of Gretchen (or ‘Das Ewig-Weibliche’), and even the idea of devotion to God.

4. individual formal solutions, without ‘the deformation of any of the a priori forms’.

---

\(^{11}\) There are few contrasting opinions. An unintentional similarity between melody and rhythm is posited by Elaine Brody, “Mirror of His Soul. Schubert’s Fantasy in C (D. 760)”, The Piano Quarterly 104 (1978), 22–31; quoted in Maurice J.E. Brown, “Schubert’s ‘Wanderer’ Fantasy”, The Musical Times 92 (December 1951/1306), 540–542. Brody sees this work as testimony not to a crisis, but to the self-confidence regained in its wake (Ibid., 31).

\(^{12}\) Marston, “«Im Legendenton»: Schumann’s «Unsung Voice»”, 230–238.

\(^{13}\) For more on this subject, see M. Tomaszewski, Chopin. Człowiek, dzieło, rezonans [Chopin. The man, his work and its resonance] (Poznań: Podsiadlik and Raniowski, 1998), 17.

\(^{14}\) For the most important symbolic-programmatic interpretations, see Walker, Franz Liszt, vol. 2, 150.

Scholars demonstrated the links these works displayed with sonata form (obvious in the case of the *B minor Sonata*), though emphasising that it was treated ‘freely’, ‘loosely’ and ‘elastically’, crossed with other Classical forms (rondo, variations) and with the sonata cycle (the ‘double-function form’). The most problems were usually encountered when analysing the freedom with which the tonal course of these works was organised and the presence of a centrally located ‘slow movement’, which often proved – as was instinctively sensed – the key to understanding the work as a whole. With time – in order to explain the formal logic of these compositions, often in connection with their programmatic or symbolic meaning – scholars began resorting to the creation of new notional apparatus (e.g. Schumann: ‘parallel form’, ‘déjà vu form’), and to references to Romantic literature (Schumann and Romantic ironical literature) and semiotics. The results are often interesting and quite striking. Crucially, however, from the point of view of our considerations, most scholars have generally assumed the following:

a) in formal terms, each of the fantasies is a different, individual musical entity, with at most certain structural analogies in other works by the same composer. Hence old opinions of the affinity between Liszt’s *B minor Sonata* and the earlier fantasies by Schubert, Schumann and Chopin should be discarded;

b) those individual, experimental design solutions that are typical of the new epoch do not have (even ought not to have) any prototypes among the forms of the Classical era (perhaps excepting Beethoven). In respect to the piano fantasy, this view could be supported by research into the tradition of the keyboard fantasy of the turn of the nineteenth century, which did not lead to the singling out of any formal model preferred by composers. All that was noted, in the period of late classicism, was a tendency for a greater connection to be made between the design of fantasies and elements of sonata form or rondo form, albeit treated in a highly individual way. In this context, the fantasies by Schubert, Schumann and Chopin and Liszt’s *B minor Sonata*, as realisations – in our opinion – of ‘double-function form’, would be decidedly more homogeneously orientated in formal terms (which does not preclude far-reaching individualism in detailed solutions) than the fantasies by their predecessors (e.g. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach). Among the features common to the fantasies of the end of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth

---


17 Daverio, “Schumann’s ‘Im Legendenton’”, 150–163.

18 e.g. Mártia Grabóczi, “La Sonate en si mineur de Liszt: une stratégie narrative complexe”, *Analyse Musicale* 8 (1987), 64–70.
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... distortion of a specific mood (the character of a tombeau or lament) and a profound connection, particularly notable in the case of purely instrumental works (not being keyboard fantasies on operatic themes), with the style of vocal-instrumental output of that period – with opera and song. So if operatic style or even particular operatic works played such a significant role in the shaping of the emotional musical language of keyboard fantasies, then why not seek in this area also inspirations in respect to their formal design? The present study offers a certain thread for discussion and further research in this area, but one that differs from those previously proposed, especially those which overlook the question of ‘double-function form’. As a signpost for ‘double-function form’, scholars have usually pointed to Beethoven and his mature variation sets, the formal shape of which is marked by processes that are characteristic of both sonata form and sonata cycle (Variations, Opp. 34 and 120, Fantasy, Op. 80, Finale of the Ninth Symphony). The historical context of the formal design of Liszt’s B minor Sonata was pointed out by Krzysztof Komarnicki: ‘double-function form’ or ‘interpolated sonata form’ appeared in works by the ‘kleine Meisters’ of the Italian-French circle during the first decades of the nineteenth century. Tellingly, however, they did not give their works the title ‘sonata’ (Ferdinando Carulli, Nocturnes, Op. 118 for two guitars).
[c.1817] and Opp. 127 and 131 for guitar and piano [c.1819], movt II of Grand duo, Op. 70 for guitar and piano [c.1810]). Also composed in this form were concertos (Oboe Concertos Nos. 3 and 7 by Gustave Vogt [before 1814? and 1824], Guitar Concerto in E minor, Op. 140 by Carulli [c.1820], Concerto da camera No. 2 in C sharp minor by Charles-Valentin Alkan [1834], Violin Concertos Nos. 4 and 5 by Charles Auguste de Bériot [c.1844 and 1846]).

Longyear went back the furthest in his search for the roots of ‘double-function form’, giving the example of the first movement of Muzio Clementi’s Sonata in G minor, Op. 34 No. 2 (Vienna 1795). Here, the main theme of the sonata form was derived from the theme of the introduction, which in turn was quoted in the middle of the development. Haydn had employed such processes in the transformation of the theme (motif) from the introduction into themes (motives) constituting other elements of form appearing over the further course of the cycle in his Paris and London symphonies. Yet Clementi’s incorporation of material from the introduction in the development, even given the original slow tempo assigned to it, does not seem to us to be an equivalent of a slow movement ‘projected’ into a sonata form, as it is lacking a formally closed character. This thread is promising, however, since it departs from another established view that the main source of all innovation in nineteenth-century music was the output of Beethoven.

Without precluding either the mutual influence of the works of interest to us here on one another (especially in the case of Liszt, who was familiar with the fantasies by Schubert, Schumann and Chopin) or the cult which the Romantics did indeed attach to the Beethoven legacy, ‘double-function form’, or ‘interpolated sonata form’, was actually of an eighteenth-century provenance.

It was not just nineteenth-century composers (from Beethoven onwards) who experimented with form. During the eighteenth century, Italian opera composers

---


27 His Piano Fantasy in C major (Hob. XVII/4) is also an interesting example of the elaboration of a whole work from practically a single motif.

28 Andrzej Chodkowski defined this view, by no means in a pejorative sense, as ‘well worn’. Voice in “Dyskusja po wykładzie Krzysztofa Komarnickiego” [Discussion following a lecture by Krzysztof Komarnicki], in Sonata romantyczna, 68. Longyear (“Liszta B minor Sonata”, 201) gives various analogies linking Liszt’s B minor Sonata to works by Beethoven, but they all concern solutions of a detailed nature (reprise not in the key of the tonic, use of counterpoint techniques), and not the overall concept of ‘double-function form’.

---
experimented with a cyclic operatic sinfonia, creating a prototype of ‘double-function form’: they enclosed a cyclic, tripartite overture within the framework of a sonata form. The phenomenon of interest to us here was described variously as ‘ABA overture’, ‘da capo overture’ and ‘reprise overture’. As this terminology indicates, the form of such an overture was generally interpreted solely in terms of the transferral of a vocal-instrumental form, specifically the ‘da capo’ aria with an expressive contrast in the middle section (tempo, metre, key), to this specific genre of instrumental music, but associated first and foremost with opera, and only then functioning independently in the concert repertoire. This occurred probably because no other context for the use of such a solution was taken into account except the operatic (we have already quoted here examples of its use in purely instrumental music). Only Stephen Fisher considers that the reprise overture in its ‘classic’ form (quick section 1 = sonata form exposition; slow section 2 = in lieu of development, quick section 3 = reprise), which became widespread during the 1760s and 70s, should be treated as ‘a kind of modified sonata form’. Although we fully agree with his standpoint, we much prefer the term ‘interpolated sonata form’, which does not contain the pejorative epithet ‘modified’, designating simply another variant of sonata form that should appear alongside other sonata forms enumerated by Rosen, such as ‘first-movement sonata form’, ‘slow-movement [sonata] form’, ‘minuet sonata form’ and ‘finale sonata form’ (with ‘sonata rondo’ included).

The emergence of an overture with such a specific formal design, combining the formal functions of both the cycle and the one-movement sonata form, initially

---


31 Stephen C. Fisher, “Haydn’s Overtures and their Adaptations as Concert Orchestral Works” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1985), 63. Niccolò Piccinni is given as the precursor of this solution. He supposedly used it several times during the 1760s, yet Fisher (Ibid., 65) gives a similar example from that time in the oeuvre of Pietro Guglielmi (Il ratto d’Elena, 1765). Earlier forms of ‘reprise overture’ resembled a tripartite sinfonia, with the sections played attacca. The first generally encompassed the full sonata form (exposition-reprise), and only a bridge (even a few chords) leading into the second section lent it an harmonically open character. The ‘reprise’ involved the iteration of a shortened version of the first section at the end. This is the form displayed, for example by Leonardo Leo’s sinfonia to Olimpiade (Naples 1737). However, our research shows (score in I-Nc, Rari 7.3.8) that its third section is not a repeat of any specific fragment of the first section. It is only based on the principal motif of the first section, but it develops in a free way in relation to it; moreover, the copyist gave it a different tempo (Allegro assai) than the first section (Con spirito). It may be that Fisher (Ibid., 60 and 64, after Helmut Hell, Die Italienische Opernsinfonie in der ersten Hälfte des 18.Jahrhunderts: N. Porpora, L. Leo, G.B. Pergolesi, L. Vinci, N. Jommelli, Tutzing: Schneider, 1971, item 115) was describing the same sinfonia, but preserved in a different copy.

32 Rosen, Sonata Forms, 98–132.
resulted from purely economic causes, as well as temporal and financial considerations. Such an overture allowed a composer writing up to several operas a year to conform with the tradition of preparing a tripartite sinfonia but with less creative effort (only the first two sections instead of three). He could even save on notation (and so the work of the copyist, paper and ink) — after the slow movement, they placed the sign Da Capo al Segno, for the relevant segment of the exposition to be repeated up to the modulation, and at the end it sufficed to write out the next segment of the exposition, with appropriate tonal alterations.

Composers active during the last decades of the eighteenth century employed this solution with remarkable ingenuity, finding within it some splendid programmatic possibilities that were useful in an operatic overture that was to meet the postulates of the reform of the Italian dramma per musica. The traditional cyclic sinfonia was one of the most criticised elements of the opera seria of those times. Regarded as insufficiently independent, with a fixed formal and aesthetic convention, it was seen by reformers as a ‘trumpeting’ (‘una strombazzata’) that heralded the beginning of the show with ‘beautiful long words’ (‘bei paroloni’), with which the writer (composer) masked the ‘lowliness of his own inventiveness’ (‘la bassezza del proprio ingegno’). So the character of an opening sinfonia was not dependant on the content of a dramma per musica. However, in the eyes of the reformers of Italian opera seria ‘its [sinfonia’s] main task is to announce the action in a certain way, to prepare the listener for receiving all the affective impressions that result from the whole of the Drama. This should shape its form and its expression’ (‘Suo principale fine è di annunziare in certo modo l’azione, di preparar l’uditore a ricevere quelle impressioni di affetto, che risultano dal totale del Dramma. E però da esso ha da prendere atteggiamento e viso.’). Both the spread of the one-section overture and the incorporation within it of additional, contrastive musical material gave greater scope for the realisation of this postulate. Presented below are selected examples of reprise overtures adhering to ‘double-function form’ (interpolated sonata form); it is worth emphasising, in the context of the Romantic fantasies discussed here, that the interpolated ‘slow section’ is usually key to an understanding of their extramusical sense.

In La fiera di Venezia (Vienna 1772), Antonio Salieri linked the overture with the action in two ways: between the exposition with development and the reprise, he inserted two dances, a Minuet and a Forlana, presaging the key ball scene in Act II, whilst the actual sinfonia is linked to the beginning of Act I (Merchants’ chorus). Algarotti’s postulates are also met by the example of a ‘reprise overture’ that is most often cited in the literature – the introduction to Mozart’s singspiel Die
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Entführung aus dem Serail (Vienna 1782). The exposition and reprise, adhering to a quick tempo, serve here not only as a ‘loud trumpeting’ but also paint for us – in the European convention of the day – the couleur locale of the place of the action. Between them appears an Andante. In this way, the ‘Turkish wildness of morals’ (exposition and reprise) is contrasted with the lyricism of the civilised love that moves Belmonte to save his beloved from Muslim hands. The Andante, in the key of C minor and 3/8 time, is a portent of the first aria of Act I, ‘Hier soll ich dich denn seen’, played out in the key of C major and constituting the tonal closure of the reprise.

Yet another variant of interpolated sonata form is presented by two overtures to Haydn operas, the azione teatrale L’isola disabitata (Eszterháza 1779) and the dramma eroico Armida (Eszterháza 1783/84). The first of these illustrates all the events (described in an ‘Argomento’), preceding the dramatic situation in which the protagonists find themselves at the beginning of this azione teatrale: a storm at sea forces Gernando to interrupt his journey by ship – his young wife, Costanza, and her younger sister must rest on dry land after the torment of sea sickness. While the girls are recuperating on an island, Gernando is kidnapped by pirates. Henceforth, Costanza is convinced that her unfaithful husband has abandoned her. When Gernando succeeds in escaping, he sails as quickly as he can to the island, having all but given up hope of finding his ladies alive. Here, the composer turns to the Sturm und Drang style, placing the overture in the key of G minor (that mood corresponds with all tragic events: storm, kidnapping and abandonent) with a brief rest in G major (maybe a real rest of the girls on an island). In formal terms (see Table 2), this overture is extremely interesting – it may be considered an interpolated sonata form (more precisely its variant comprising an exposition and reprise, that was quite often chosen for a one-section operatic overture35: in such a case the interpolation occurs within a reprise) or a sonata rondo. And so it is wrong to assume that form in Classical compositions is always easily recognised and only in works by Romantic composers is it sometimes impossible to interpret form unequivocally.

Table 2. Joseph Haydn, overture to L’isola disabitata, Eszterháza 1779

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>B flat</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>B flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap.</td>
<td>Menuetto[?]</td>
<td>Recap. cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap.</td>
<td>Menuetto[?]</td>
<td>Recap. cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st tr.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

35 Rosen, Sonata Forms, 107.
a) as sonata rondo; b) as sonata form; in both cases, interpretational problems are created by the presence of a dance-like section in Allegretto: it appears within the reprise, at the point where theme 2 should appear; although we can speak here of tonal agreement (g-G), in terms of musical material this is a completely new fragment.

In a cursory analysis, the form of the overture to Haydn’s dramma eroico Armida might also prompt associations with a rondo. However, a closer examination shows that in this case we are dealing with no doubts with a sonata form. Again the characteristic interpolation in a slower tempo, giving the whole thing the character of a tripartite sinfonia, quick-slow-quick,\(^{36}\) interrupts the flow of the reprise.

In the context of the opera as a whole, the overture brings a whole baggage of programmatic references. The choice of key, B flat major, is already symptomatic, as it presages the heroic key of E flat major that dominates the part of the opera’s main protagonist, Rinaldo, and the key scene in which he participates (III/2), showing the knight’s final confrontation with earthly love and the magic that supports it. Even the utterly conventional binary first theme (thundering tutti [a] contrasted with lyrical musical thought played by the strings [b]), in the context of the opera and the further course of the overture, may be interpreted programatically, as a musical portrait of the dual nature of Rinaldo, as valiant knight and affectionate lover. The second theme, a twice-repeated march fanfare played by wind instruments (ob, fl, bn), evokes various associations. On one hand, it may be interpreted as heralding the victory of Rinaldo’s knightly obligations;\(^{37}\) on the other, through a colouristic contrast with the first theme, it might symbolise the Muslim side of the armed conflict that forms a backdrop to the love between Ri-


\(^{37}\) See Ibid.
From the reprise overture to Liszt’s B minor Sonata

Rinaldo and Armida. The interpolation itself is a melodic quotation from the scene of the knight’s ‘last temptation’ (III/2): out of the tree which the hero has to cut down in order to free himself finally from Armida’s spell (and banish the evil spirits from the forest from which the Christians are taking wood for the siege engines to conquer Jerusalem) come beautiful nymphs, and sweet sounds can be heard all around. One of the nymphs (in fact Zelmira, Armida’s accomplice) appeals tenderly to Rinaldo in the aria ‘Torna pur al caro bene’. But the spells are no use, the hero conquers his weakness even when Armida pleads with him to spare the tree – the two protagonists’ dramatic conversation is ‘summarised’ in the overture by a short recitative segment leading from the interpolation to the resumption of the reprise, held up during the bridge that links the first and second themes. However, the reprise is resumed quite freely, with the introduction of new – in relation to the exposition – figurations in the key of B flat minor. These presage the next stage in this dramatic scene. When the hero’s imperviousness enrages Armida, she – brandishing her magic wand – reveals the true nature of the enchanted forest and her magic: as effects of the action of infernal powers. In the overture, the second theme subsequently returns. The ending of the whole sinfonia (codetta) with the principal motif of the first theme (a), typical of Haydn, also takes on new meaning: out of the forest comes the valiant knight, and Rinaldo’s alter ego, the affectionate lover, is cast into the background.

All these works, discounting examples from the work of other composers of those times, were very well known in the musical world, sharing the popularity of the operas they accompanied (e.g. Salieri’s La fiera di Venezia was still being played during the first decades of the nineteenth century) or existing independently, as concert works (both of the Haydn sinfonie, published during his lifetime, enjoyed much greater popularity than the operas themselves, known chiefly on the Esterházy’s estates, where, incidentally, Liszt’s father, Adam, worked and the young Ferenc spent his childhood). Research has yet to reveal, however, the extent and frequency of the appearance of overtures of this type in operas written during the first half of the nineteenth century. Fisher is of the opinion that they must have

38 This possibility was exploited in a concert production of Haydn’s Armida with Cecilia Bartoli in the titular role (Concentus Musicus Wien, cond. Nicolaus Harnocourt, Teldec/ Das Alte Werk 2000). The ‘Turkish’ accents of the second theme were reinforced by a suitable setting of percussion instruments.

39 None of the extramusical interpretations of the second theme given above would appear to be at odds with the content of the summary of III/2: that theme may herald Rinaldo’s triumph over the forces of evil or be a reminder that the protagonists’ love is played out against the background of armed conflict between the Christians and the Saracens.

40 Fisher (“Haydn’s Overtures”, 59–62) provides a sizeable ‘catalogue’ of eighteenth-century reprise overtures, though he emphasises that it in no way exhausts the topic.

41 The overture’s linking with the first scene was no obstacle here. In such instances, a Konzertschluss would be prepared (sometimes by the composer himself) in order to close the work tonally.
been widely familiar, given that they were employed by such non-Italian composers as Beethoven, in *Leonora No. 1* (1805), and Carl Maria von Weber, in his overture to *Euryanthe* (1823). One is also not surprised at its use in instrumental music by composers of the Italian-French circle, which was most influenced by current operatic trends. One may wonder to what extent Romantic composers realised that they were availing themselves of a formal solution that was already familiar, at most imparting to it new vigour and new extramusical meanings. Or perhaps the door that had once been quietly pushed ajar by the Classics was thrust wide open with a bang by the Romantics? How current, therefore, proves to be Jesse Parker’s assertion that, in the case of fantasies from those times, ‘the more facts there are revealed the more questions appear that remain unanswered’.  

Translated by *John Comber*  

---  

43 Parker, “The Clavier Fantasy”, 143.