

Rena Charnin MUELLER (New York)

Most musical source scholarship involves clearly defined idea sketches, secondary sketches, compositional drafts, final printer's copies, authoritative printed editions, and in some cases, revisions. Each stage is not only self-contained but also clearly traceable as we progress through the compositional lineage. However, with the evidence of the Liszt sources we find that this utopian picture of the genesis of any work can be and often is clouded by two factors. First, many of the steps just mentioned are unaccounted for in the extant sources, and not just because the manuscripts were lost either during or after the composer's lifetime. An artist who earned his living for nine years in a constant series of concert tours, often called upon to improvise upon materials suggested by an enthusiastic audience, surely did not write down everything he played. He 'realized' ideas immediately, and the physical process of piano playing further enhanced his imagination. This improvisatory facility, acquired at an early age, stayed with Liszt throughout his life.

And second, as I have stated before, we must bear in mind that „[. . .] an immense amount of intricate composition went on inside Liszt's head. Pieces were sometimes highly evolved before he ever put pen to paper, and the process was the same whether the material was 'original' or based on the music of another composer.“<sup>1</sup> This obscuring of the direct transmission of the music is exacerbated by this composer's facility, ability, and willingness to explore the inherent possibilities in any musical material, whether original or borrowed from others. Both these factors can and did result in missing steps, that is, manuscripts, in the line of transmission. I should like to explore the implications of these two factors for the study of the Liszt sources, as a way of gaining greater understanding into the way in which Liszt composed music.

There is both a syntactical and taxonomic inadequacy when applying the terms *sketches*, *drafts* and *revisions* to Liszt's music. As with any composer, Liszt only had to write down what he thought he could not remember or what he particularly did not want to forget. I have spoken before about the contents of the Liszt sketchbooks<sup>2</sup>, but let me briefly remind you that of the nine that survive in public collections (all in Weimar), only two (WRgs MS N1, the *Ce qu'on entend* Sketchbook, and WRgs MS N8, the Lichnowsky Sketchbook) truly meet the accepted definition of *sketchbook*: that is, they record brief motivic ideas that are sometimes more fully developed into larger structures in other documents. The other sketchbooks are more correctly termed *draftbooks*, and we should begin to refer to them as such. Although they may contain brief motivic sketches, more often they are devoted to extended workings-out of musical material that is not found in any earlier written form: Draftbooks WRgs MS N2 (The *Mazepa* Draftbook), WRgs MS

N3 (the *Prometheus* Draftbook), WRgs MS N5 (The *Tasso* Draftbook), WRgs MS N6 (The *Revolutionary Symphony* Draftbook), WRgs MS N7 (The *Hugo Songs* Draftbook), and WRgs MS N9 (The *Harmonies poétiques* Draftbook) — as well as the recently recovered early Lord Londonderry Draftbook offered at Christie's (London) in May 1990<sup>3</sup> — all meet these criteria.

When one looks over the entire corpus of manuscript materials, the number of sketches in relation to the succeeding compositional documents is astonishingly small. Some would argue that smaller sketches existed for many works but were subsequently discarded by Liszt after their incorporation into a later stage of musical development. However, after many years of investigation into the way Liszt composed, I would say that this was not the case.

Sketching is a composer's method of regulating the compositional process<sup>4</sup>. It allows him to think through various stages in the evolution of a melody, harmonic sequence, rhythmic or formal unit. That Liszt often skipped this stage is an indication of the speed with which he conceptualized his work. Preliminary, what I have termed primitive, sketches simply do not exist for the majority of his works: the pieces were full-blown by the time they reached the writing stage, often after many trial performances. In addition to the extant Weimar sketch- and draftbooks, we have several large portfolios of miscellaneous musical materials from across sixty years of the composer's lifetime. These do contain sketches — for instance, the preliminary *Faust* materials<sup>5</sup>. But unlike *Faust*, the majority of these never reached a more highly developed stage of composition. Newly recovered manuscripts of important compositions — for example, the recent Sotheby MS of *A la Chapelle Sistine*<sup>6</sup> — almost always reflect what are clearly later compositional phases.

However, one characteristic feature of the extant Liszt sketches that were developed into larger compositions remains constant: the initial musical inspiration holds fast throughout decades of substantial rethinking. The clearest example of this are the sketches for the *Petrarch Sonnets*. Inscribed into the Lichnowsky Sketchbook (WRgs MS N8) some time in late 1844 or early 1845, the basic melodic material and its harmonic implications remained the same through 35 years of revision<sup>7</sup>. But Liszt was never able to satisfy himself with these pieces, as his constant shifting between the genres of piano and song shows. And too, while apparently devoted to the principal melodic formula of *Sonnet No. 47* („Benedetto sia 'l giorno“), Liszt tinkered with it constantly. This illustrates a problem that seems to be critical for Liszt — that the composer was always developing the multiple possibilities in a single musical thought. This led to his writing at least two other, distinctly varied settings of the same text, one from ca. 1844 (WRgs MS D77) and the other ca. 1854 (WRgs MS D57); both remain unpublished. Both were taken well beyond the sketch and draft stage, but were ultimately discarded. Yet their manuscript sources remain to document Liszt's unending fascination with the musical implications of several levels of the Petrarch compositions.

The best word that describes the working document Liszt produced in all genres is the neutral word *draft*, usually indicating a state of a piece with several layers of completeness evident, one of which might be primitive enough to be described as a sketch<sup>8</sup>. In piano music, such ideas are succeeded by drafts in varying degrees of finality, as in the case of the *Petrarch Sonnets*. In the songs, by contrast, most often the initial state appears to have been a fully-realized draft put down without any predecessor, followed by numerous revisions — both of component sections and states of the music. I view the versions of *Anfangs wollt' ich fast verzagen* and *Liebstraum II, Gestorben war ich*, which may have begun as a song, as examples of this process. In the only extant music for his opera, *Sardanapale*, found in WRgs MS N4, we find material ranging from the solo vocal line with text (but without accompaniment) to a draft for an extended orchestral interlude.

But in symphonic music we find drafts ranging in size and content from single lines — the main theme of *Tasso* found in WRgs MS N1 — to clusters of chords combined with melodic lines or fully-developed sections with completely-realized phrases and instrumentation indicated — such as the materials for *Ce qu'on entend*. Within sections of these drafts, Liszt sometimes worked quickly, writing an aide-mémoire or a suggestion of the fuller texture, then going back and forth and adding instrumentation at the same time as the music was being composed. In other sections, he worked more slowly, returning later to add instrumentation after the completion of a portion. In still others, he drafted sections and never fully completed them with either accompanimental material or instrumentation, and only in subsequent copies by one of his scribes do we find the final realization of the ideas nascent in Liszt's original plan. Because there is no intermediate manuscript in Liszt's hand documenting this later stage, Liszt's authorship of some works has been challenged: we have always been troubled by the implication that Liszt's copyists were not only involved in the instrumentation of his works but also had much to do with the composition as well<sup>9</sup>. However, from Liszt's compositional point of view, this was not the case. When one examines the sources, it is clear that by the time Liszt handed a copyist an orchestral draft for the preparation of a fair copy, the „compositional process“ had already ended for him, and all that remained was the mechanical task of preparing a full score<sup>10</sup>.

We must now turn to the body of sources which makes up the largest and most problematic part of the manuscript corpus: the *revisions*. We have of necessity touched on these before, when I outlined the problems with the syntactical nomenclature for Liszt. There is much further confusion here, centered around the point that for Liszt, drafts in one medium often functioned as revisions of another medium — but for a succeeding state of the musical text. For example, the 1847 transcriptions of the *Hugo Songs* stand between the 1844 and later song versions<sup>11</sup>. Liszt drafted piano transcriptions, but never published these substantially revised versions. Instead, he used the 1847 musical text as the springboard for the later revisions of the songs themselves. The transfer of medi-

um from song to piano was then not just a draft for the piano: it doubly functioned as a revision for the songs.

To take another example, both piano 4-hand and 2-piano versions of the symphonic poems — *Les Préludes* is a classic case — served as connecting links between the earlier and later orchestral versions. The impetus for the *Les Préludes* revision was the anticipated performance of the symphonic poem in a piano 4-hand version by Liszt's pupils Hans von Bronsart and Dionys Pruckner on 27 March 1855<sup>12</sup>. The musical changes in the 4-hand MS, a Liszt autograph found in the Rosenbach Collection in Philadelphia, were later transmitted to the *Stichvorlage* for the 1856 Breitkopf edition of the orchestral version of the symphonic poem, a manuscript in the hand of Joachim Raff. We know that there were similar musical changes in the 2-piano version of the same piece, and it too may have served as a *Zwischenstufe* between the earlier Liszt orchestral manuscripts and the Raff *Stichvorlage*. Unfortunately, the 2-piano manuscript is in a private Swiss collection and was only exhibited once in 1975 — long enough for Tilman Seebass to note the discrepancies between it and the published version of the symphonic poem<sup>13</sup>.

But here, we find that 'modern scholarship' has intruded on the classification of the Liszt sources and considerably muddied the waters. Peter Raabe, from 1910 the curator of the Liszt Museum, produced a catalogue for the collection in Weimar, and attempted to establish the hierarchy of the various source materials representing successive stages of a work<sup>14</sup>. But Raabe failed to realize that „[. . .] given Liszt's propensity for revision at all stages of composition, the qualitative difference between an *Urschrift* and an *Abschrift* was often rendered meaningless. This in turn often blurred the distinction between a *Zwischenstufe* and a totally separate *Fassung* in its own right. This misrepresentation of sources, [for instance, Raabe catalogued the Weimar manuscripts N1 through N9 as *S k i z z e n h e f t e*] as well as the all-too-frequent misidentification of the scribal hands [. . .] and the complete absence of any attempt to analyze the papers, has confounded most previous attempts to establish an accurate chronology of many works [. . .] [T]his aspect of research provides not only crucial but indispensable information for any attempt to distinguish among the different types of sources or different compositional stages in the evolution of a work.“<sup>15</sup>

Our task in the present day is to approach the Liszt compositional materials as the composer himself did. We cannot start with the preconceptions that have been overlaid on musical source scholarship by the study of Mozart, or Beethoven, or Wagner. We have to establish Liszt's train of thought, however anomalous it may be to what we are used to, and allow the path to lead us where it will. To that end, I wish to discuss certain overriding principles that I consider crucial when looking at Liszt's music, and which must govern the way in which we perceive the sources.

We must come to grips with the fact that while Liszt was first and foremost a keyboard performer, his compositional instincts were also governed by a vocal ethos, a strong feature of the age in which the composer lived and worked<sup>16</sup>. This accounts for the regularity with which we face the ‚chicken or the egg‘ question with songs and piano works. The repertoire of the concert pianist was still being established when Liszt was at his peak of concertizing. As with all artists of his calibre, he needed to freshen his programs not only with ‚new‘ music (like Schumann’s *Carnaval*) but also with music with which the audience was familiar — such as famous operatic tunes or Lieder. ‚Pot-boilers‘ such as the sextet from *Lucia* or the *Robert le Diable* and *Don Juan* transcriptions made Liszt into a household name. *Carnaval* initially failed with audiences. Not only was it too sophisticated, but more importantly, it lacked the requisite ‚vocal‘ element: one had to become familiar with the work before one could appreciate it.

Liszt was never very far from the vocal medium in any of his compositions, and formulaic elements from opera and song permeate his thinking. Strophic forms are common, and prove agreeable to the ear, for they provide coherence without tedium. More importantly, they lend themselves ideally to transcription or paraphrase or fantasizing at the keyboard, depending on which level of elaboration Liszt chose to apply<sup>17</sup>. When these vocal elements appear in instrumental genres, their success often depends on whether or not they — the vocal elements — were implicit in the initial stages of the work. This is critical. Thus, the final chorus at the end of the *Faust Symphony*, not envisioned until at least two years after the completion of the orchestration draft, appears poorly integrated in the work<sup>18</sup>. Yet its presence reflects Liszt’s strong predilection for a vocal conclusion to the symphony. By contrast, the brilliant accomplishments of his Lieder and most of the sacred choral music, as well as the majority of his transcriptions for the piano, are accounted for by virtue of their original texted roots.

Along the same lines, another strong element Liszt found just as compatible as the vocal ingredient are the structures of dance forms. These forms, replete with their formulaic internal repetitions, exert the same kind of authority over the composition as the strophic elements in vocal music mentioned before.

A new concept that we must recognize is what I call the „Anthologizing Principle“ — the superimposition at some later point of a larger framework on a body of pre-existent music. Liszt often collected his works into sets post factum, frequently at the behest of a publisher, stringing them together with artful and often tenuous connective images drawn from extra-musical associations. The anthologizing principle was at work in sets such as the first *Album d’un voyageur* (which became the Swiss volume of the *Années de pèlerinage*) and the *Harmonies poétiques et religieuses*, but it was not initially the means by which the individual pieces themselves were composed. *Années de pèlerinage: Suisse* concentrates on naturalistic descriptions of locales; the *Harmonies poétiques* rely on the skillful alternation between visionary images and texted religious meditations.

To take more examples of this notion, Liszt may have conceived the second volume of the *Années de pèlerinage: Italie* as a geographical tour of Italy, according to the 1843 inventory we find in WRgs MS N1, the *Ce qu'on entend* Sketchbook<sup>19</sup>, but he built the set upon a core of pre-existing compositions, the *Petrarch Sonnets*, and expanded it with the addition of pieces that had similar Italianate inspirations but which had been composed independently (the *Dante Sonata*, *Il Penseroso*, *Sposalizio*, and the *Canzonetta del Salvatore Rosa*). The separability of the component gatherings of the MS of the *Deuxième Année* (WRgs MS I 13) exemplifies the anthologizing principle at work<sup>20</sup>. Gatherings of different sizes made up of different papers demonstrate clearly that the assembling of the volume took place late in the history of the work and utilized music composed over a substantial period of time.

And Liszt planned an entirely German *Années* volume, but this was never written for piano<sup>21</sup>. He viewed the Hungarian Rhapsodies as a „National-epos“, as Detlef Altenburg pointed out in 1986<sup>22</sup>, an idea prompted by the political circumstances of Hungary as a member of the Austrian Empire. And he linked the *Historische ungarische Bildnisse* thematically and tonally into a unified set we have only come to appreciate through the recent work of Dezső Legány<sup>23</sup>. Similar parallels for the collecting of songs into sets can be drawn.

Whether the large-scale impetus was tonal, textual, geographical, political, or visionary, for publication Liszt assembled the larger sets as if out of little building blocks — that is, the individual pieces themselves. Unavoidably, this increased the incidence of ‚weak‘ or problematic pieces in strong sets: Liszt was often forced to fill in a gap at the last minute by restyling older pieces just for the occasion. We need think only as far as the *Dante Sonata*, which Liszt refashioned for inclusion in *Années de pèlerinage: Italie*, but which clearly stands out of place in that set if only because of its scale.

The assembling of large sets out of individual pieces also spotlights another important aspect of his conceptual thinking: the application of this process on the smaller dimension — the internal constructions of any given piece.

Liszt tended to compose in small sections<sup>24</sup>. Whether or not the options for continuation were eventually governed by melodic or harmonic considerations, one factor characterizes these sections: that is, manifold possibilities of resolution. The composer moved these sections around to different pitch levels and in different structural relationships, with what appears initially to have been a fairly casual interest in the overall form, juxtaposing bits and pieces that worked as individual units and then welding them together into a larger whole. As a result, the linking material assumed great importance structurally, because it joined sections that seemed disjunct in most musical perspectives. In a sense, these articulations or seams are the clues to his thinking. What happened when he took components A and B and tried to link them? Either he had to supply suitable connective tissue or somehow modify A or B so that they would interlock. The sources reveal that, in an effort to bridge the gaps, the composer often relied upon the repetition of whole sections each with a different tonal goal,

thereby effecting the proper combination<sup>25</sup>. This paralleled Liszt's expanding (and expansive) concept of harmonic freedom, and the enrichment of the harmonic palette with which he worked. This extrapolation of the musical resources allowed him room to experiment and move between sections that were formerly considered as being widely separated tonally.

The song *Anfangs wollt' ich fast verzagen* is the prime example of the manner in which he solved the problem of moving between a tonic and a contrasting tonality, in this case separated from the former by a semitone<sup>26</sup>. The solution, the working out of which is documented in five manuscripts (two in his hand and three by copyists), did not present itself for approximately eight years — and then, it was of the utmost clarity, a shift accompanied by a stepwise chromatic progression.

As Liszt drew on his experiences with the Weimar orchestra, his ability to deal with form in larger works developed in this unique way. Again and again, the sources reflect pieces that begin on a rather small scale and which Liszt expanded at the seams — not by a systematic process of sketch to draft to full score, but by preparing a partially complete draft and then proceeding as has been described above. This fitted perfectly with the growing concept of „tone poem“ (also translated as „symphonic poem“).

The works mentioned were not creations that depended upon traditional notions of form, because Liszt was not a composer in the way Schumann or Chopin were. Neither did he choose to follow a large-scale psychological plan inherent in a work (Beethoven), or opt for a massive dramatic plan (Wagner). The manipulation and satisfactory ordering of small compositional units, as well as the larger blocks within which they were contained, was the process by which he arrived at the completed work — a kind of ‚anthologizing‘ on several different levels of conception. Throughout his compositional career, this method was the most fundamental aspect of the way in which he worked.

Liszt's was an eternally restless creative imagination, often unable to settle in advance on a particular master plan for a work. His mind continually altered the genetic controls of pieces as they developed. Because he had the ability to realize alternative versions immediately, his options proved to be infinite. His processes resemble anthologizing as I have described it above — the continuous adjustment of freely developing ideas, and the superimposition at some later point of a larger framework. Liszt's approach to composition was conceptually flexible enough to enable him to shift a piece between genres and make the change appear effortless in the finished product. However, unlike any of the composers that I mentioned before, Liszt was able to streamline a finished product often out of materials which, even in his mind, were constantly in a state of flux. Liszt has been unjustly maligned by many critics — unjustly because their complaint has been that he did not do what they considered correct. In fact, and I suggest here, Liszt's procedures were merely different, perhaps more adventurous and more visionary (at the very least, more consistently spon-

taneous), certainly presenting an intense view of romanticism — a view without organic growth and with evolving shapes as limiting forces.

How do we approach a new classification of the sources? In the first place, by recognizing that these varying levels of conceptualization and finality exist. This certainly involves renaming „sketchbooks“ „draftbooks“, thereby recognizing the true nature of the source materials themselves. In the second place, we must evaluate the interplay of the sources within an almost three-dimensional, living model of their transmission — one which takes into account the various faces of revisions and *Zwischenstufen*. In some instances, we may never know what the composer considered „die Fassung letzter Hand“<sup>27</sup>, and perhaps Liszt wanted it that way. But in our effort to establish taxonomic order, thereby avoiding the egregious errors of the past, we must show the same pliability in evaluating the materials that Liszt showed in their creation.

#### Notes:

- 1 For a complete discussion of Liszt's compositional habits, see Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook: Studies in Sources and Revisions*, Ph. D. Diss. New York University, 1986. Subsequent references to *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook* are to this work, and not to the article with similar title published in *Studia Musicologica* 28 (1986).
- 2 Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook: Studies in Sources and Chronology*, in: *Studia Musicologica* 28 (1986), p. 273—293.
- 3 Apparently the Draftbook did not reach the reserve price and remains unsold.
- 4 Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 330.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 391 — Appendix C. II.
- 6 Sotheby's (London), p. 18—19 May 1989, Lot 445.
- 7 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 143—159; and *The Composition of Liszt's „Petrarch Sonnets“*, paper given at the annual meetings of the American Musicological Society (Boston, 1981) and the American Liszt Society (Hartford, 1982).
- 8 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 331 ff.
- 9 The controversy surrounding this question has not yet abated. For a summary of some of the main points in the arguments of Haraszi, Raabe, and Bonner, see Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 31 ff.
- 10 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 51 ff. and p. 278—303.
- 11 Mueller, *Liszt's Hugo Song Piano Transcriptions*, paper given at the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society (Baltimore, 1988); in press.
- 12 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 111 ff.
- 13 Seebass, Tilman, ed., *Musikhandschriften in Basel aus verschiedenen Sammlungen*, Basel, 1975. The question of the relationship of *Les Préludes* to *Les Quatre Élémens* has been laid to rest by Andrew Bonner in his 1986 article entitled *Liszt's „Les Préludes“ and „Les Quatre Élémens“: A Reinvestigation*, in: *19th-Century Music* 10/2 (1986), p. 95—107.
- 14 Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 106 ff.
- 15 Mueller, *Reevaluating the Liszt Chronology: The Case of „Anfangs wollt' ich fast verza-*gen“, in: *19th-Century Music* 12/2 (1988), p. 135.
- 16 I am indebted to Robert Bailey for his suggestions concerning the question of vocal elements in 19th-century instrumental music.
- 17 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 304 ff.



- 18 The idea of a musical work on the *Faust* subject had been active with both composers since the early 1840s. Wagner had written his *Faust Overture* in Paris in 1840, and revised it in 1843—44. He left this score with Liszt when he escaped from Dresden in 1849, and Liszt made several suggestions for changing it, which Wagner did not take. Wagner had envisioned this piece as the first movement of an entire symphony in three parts, of which the remaining movement would be *Gretchen* and *Mephistopheles* — a plan that he had long since discarded. He finally added a small central section to the overture, for which sketches exist, but decided against making any further changes to the *Faust* score in 1852—53 because work on the revision of *Fliegende Holländer* intervened.
- Meanwhile, Liszt had taken over this idea of a tripartite symphony based on the *Faust* subject, for which sketches exist dating from the late 1840s (WRgs MS Z18, No. 20), among them a clear outline of the primary theme.
- 19 See Mueller, Review of Alan Walker, *Franz Liszt. The Virtuoso Years, 1811—1847*, in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* (1984), p. 185—196; and *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 144 ff.
- 20 Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 144 ff.
- 21 The Lichnowsky Sketchbook, WRgs MS N8, contains an inventory, without music, for a „3me Année de pélerinage“. The entries include a „Rolands Saga“ and „Loreley“. See Mueller, Review of Walker in *JAMS*, p. 191 ff.
- 22 Detlef Altenburg, *Lizsts Idee eines ungarischen Nationalepos in Tönen*, in: *Studia Musicologica* 28 (1986), p. 213—223.
- 23 Dezső Legány, *Hungarian Historical Portraits*, in: *Studia Musicologica* 28 (1986), p. 79—88.
- 24 See Mueller, *Liszt's „Tasso“ Sketchbook*, p. 328 ff.
- 25 See Mueller, *ibid.* In volume 2 of his Liszt biography (*Franz Liszt. The Weimar Years, 1848—1861*, New York 1989), Alan Walker writes most perceptively about this aspect of Liszt's working method. He quotes Liszt as follows: „It is a mistake to regard repetition as poverty of invention. From the standpoint of the public it is indispensable for the understanding of the thought, while from the standpoint of Art it is almost identical with the demands of clarity, structure, and effectiveness.“ See the chapters on the so-called „Years of Maturity, 1853—57“, in particular, p. 322 ff.
- 26 See Mueller, *Reevaluating the Liszt Chronology*, p. 140 ff.
- 27 See Georg von Dadelsen, *Die ‚Fassung letzter Hand‘ in der Musik*, in: *Acta musicologica* 33 (1961), p. 1—14.

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Wissenschaftliche Arbeiten aus dem Burgenland](#)

Jahr/Year: 1991

Band/Volume: [087](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Mueller Rena Charnin

Artikel/Article: [Sketches, Drafts and Revisions: Liszt at Work. 26-34](#)