

Introduction

As Richard Wagner's star began to rise, and Robert Schumann's peeked before beginning its slide downward, their paths crossed for a few years in Dresden. With good reason, no one thinks of them as friends, much less as composers who helped each other develop their own mature styles. By the end of his career, Wagner routinely derided Schumann, especially late Schumann, whom he portrayed variously as mentally weak and too much under the influence of Jewish music, meaning primarily Mendelssohn. This was the argument of his essay *Judaism in Music* (*Das Judenthum in der Musik*), which he had initially published anonymously in 1850, and then in 1869 under his own name, in an expanded form that included a discussion of Schumann. Wagner here distinguished between an early, brilliant, and healthy Schumann, the genius who composed remarkable piano works, and a late, unstable, and uninspired composer of second-rate instrumental music. Even that division between the good Schumann and the pathetic had disappeared by 1879, when Wagner helped his henchman Joseph Rubinstein prepare and publish the attack "Über die Schumannsche Musik" in the *Bayreuther Blätter*. In this rabid diatribe, even the early music received scorn.

Yet earlier in their lives they had encountered each other on numerous occasions. Twice they had lived in the same cities, in the early 1830s in Leipzig, where both of them knew Friedrich Wieck, Clara's father, and much more consequentially from 1845 to 1849 in Dresden. From the beginning Schumann may have seen Wagner as an adversary.

A thirteen-year-old Clara Wieck unwittingly fanned competitive flames by writing to Schumann that “Herr Wagner has outdistanced you; a symphony of his was performed; it is as like Beethoven’s A-Major Symphony as it is possible to be.”¹ Wagner, though three years younger than Schumann, had written a C-major Symphony that was performed in January 1833 at the Leipzig *Gewandhaus*; Schumann had already drafted his juvenile G-minor Symphony, a movement of which was performed in 1832 in Zwickau. Subsequently Schumann published some of the reports Wagner wrote from Magdeburg (1836) and Paris (1841–42) in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*.² Both by the examples of his own critical writings and by the availability of an opportunity to publish in his journal, Schumann helped Wagner to become a writer.³

Wagner’s 1842 return to Germany—to Dresden, an easy train ride from the Schumanns, who lived a hundred kilometers away in Leipzig—did not bring them closer personally. As Ulrich Konrad has documented, after two visits from Wagner in spring 1842, Schumann ignored at least four invitations from Wagner to come to Dresden to witness a performance of *Rienzi*. Although Wagner chose not to invite him the following year to the premiere of *The Flying Dutchman*, his offer to pay Schumann’s expenses for him to attend the third performance was again in vain. When he then actually sent Schumann the score of his new opera, Schumann’s negative reaction greatly offended Wagner (as discussed below).

The opportunity for an actual friendship between the two composers increased considerably in fall 1844, once Robert and Clara Schumann decided to leave Leipzig for Dresden. That this was an opportunity that neither man was capable of seizing is well known. But the most often cited account of their interactions, Wagner’s autobiography, *My Life*, is misleading on several accounts, two of which can be raised here. As Wagner told it, from Schumann’s arrival in late 1844 to Wagner’s hasty departure in summer 1849, he and Schumann met from “time to time,” and he “didn’t get any real stimulation from his company.” In fact, in the four years between fall 1845 and New Year’s Day, 1849, they met at least twenty-four times, and quite possibly more, since Wagner occasionally took part in evening gatherings hosted by Ferdinand Hiller that Schumann and others often attended. The density of meetings between Schumann and Wagner varied greatly, including only once each in 1847 and 1849. During the fall and winter of 1845–46 and the calendar year 1848 they saw each other frequently. Because the vast majority of these encounters were at Wagner’s instigation, his claim that he got no stimu-

lation from them seems typically self-serving, especially since by the time he wrote his autobiography he was well into his habit of denigrating Schumann.

The meetings they had with each other over a period of six months in 1845–46 occurred at a time of particular stylistic growth for both Schumann and Wagner. Independently, studies of both composers have long identified this year as a time in which they developed more contrapuntal approaches to composition. Schumann brought to a close months of intensive studies of counterpoint and began composing his Second Symphony, a work that critics then and in the generations to come have heard as particularly indebted to Beethoven's Ninth Symphony; Wagner premiered *Tannhäuser*, made substantial progress on *Lohengrin*, and conducted the Ninth for the first time. The extent to which their compositional styles changed in a common direction, toward a style that was both more contrapuntal, more densely motivic, and engaged in processes of motivic/thematic transformation, has for the most part gone unexamined. Until recently, discussions of Wagner's stylistic development and Schumann's have been pursued without reference to the other. Comparative studies of Wagner and mature Schumann are few in number and largely deal with Schumann's opera *Genoveva*.⁴

My aim in the chapters that follow is to show that the stylistic advances that Schumann and Wagner both made in Dresden in 1845–46 stemmed from a deepened understanding of Beethoven's contrapuntal techniques and strategies in the Ninth Symphony. Whether the original insights were Schumann's or Wagner's, the evidence provided by their compositions from this pivotal year and the years to come suggests that they discussed Beethoven's Ninth with each other in the months preceding the performance of this work that Wagner conducted on Palm Sunday, 1846. What appears to have interested them both was Beethoven's use of counterpoint that involved contrary motion, and the way in which the Ode to Joy melody was developed gradually in the preceding movements, so that the appearance of the theme in the finale was dramatically and musically motivated.

By the later decades of his life, Wagner's interest in Beethoven's Ninth Symphony had become proprietary. He was Beethoven's worthiest heir, the only one of his generation to have advanced music beyond what Beethoven had accomplished, the pinnacle to which Beethoven's music naturally led. Wagner's diverse writings about the Ninth Symphony took many forms. They ranged from broad statements—at times cast as

historical narrative, at times as artistic polemic—about how his own music had boldly gone beyond the initial combination of word and tone that Beethoven had pioneered in the Ode to Joy, to narrowly focused essays such as his conductor’s notes about the infelicities of Beethoven’s score, in which he offered the solutions he had devised to realize Beethoven’s “true” intentions. Similar in scope are the didactic program notes that he wrote to accompany his 1846 performance of the Ninth. The historical and polemical writings immediately spurred a critical debate on the division of absolute music from programmatic that continues to the present day, and the essay on performing the Ninth has influenced conductors ever since; while in contrast, his program notes, which matched Beethoven’s movements with quotations from Goethe’s *Faust*, have had comparatively little impact.

Wagner wrote and spoke about Beethoven’s Ninth throughout his career, often to emphasize his special connection to the work. No work was more central to the construction of his personal myth. In his 1840 novella, *A Pilgrimage to Beethoven*, he first staked a claim for having a privileged bond with this work, imagining that he had met an elderly Beethoven and become the first person other than the composer to see a score of the Ninth Symphony. After Beethoven confessed the inadequacy of Schiller’s words (noting “the incompetency of poetry” in general), Wagner waxed euphoric: “Still today I can scarcely grasp my happiness at thus being helped by Beethoven himself to a full understanding of his gigantic last symphony, which was then barely finished, and still known to no one.”⁵ Much later in his life he and Cosima Wagner spent part of an evening talking together about the Ninth, as indicated by Cosima in her diary. Once they had discussed Beethoven’s motives for composing the symphony, and mused about the order in which the movements had been written, they concluded by praising not the choral finale but the first movement: “We are, however, more and more convinced that such compositions as the first movement of this symphony do not belong in front of an audience, which never achieves the concentration necessary to grasp such mysteries.”⁶ This singling out of the first movement for mysteries that only a worthy elite could perceive echoes passages in his autobiography. There he describes the opening measures as “the ghostly fundamental of my own life” and the symphony as a work that “held the secret of all secrets,” that possessed “mystic constellations” and exercised a “mystic influence” over him.⁷

Wagner’s understanding of the Ninth demonstrably advanced in stages, deepening in a way that supports his description of the sym-

phony containing mysteries that needed to be plumbed. By October 1830 he had made both a copy of the full score and a complete reduction for piano (two hands) that he attempted to publish, in vain. Soon afterward, a rehearsal he attended in Leipzig that was conducted by August Pohlentz in 1830 left him disappointed and full of doubts, not only about the symphony but about Beethoven himself.⁸ These doubts persisted until they were dispelled in fall and winter 1839, when Wagner heard rehearsals of the first three movements in preparation for a performance of the Ninth in Paris, with François-Antoine Habeneck leading the orchestra of the Paris Conservatoire. This Beethovenian epiphany ended “years of bewildering confusion” and sowed “the seeds of an inner change of direction . . . as though exerting a magic force.”⁹ It coincided with an attempt to write a *Faust* Symphony in D Minor, of which only the first movement was completed and later published in revised form as his *Faust* Overture. And it briefly preceded both his writing of *A Pilgrimage to Beethoven* and the composition of *The Flying Dutchman*, which has long been thought to commence with an allusion to the first measures of the Ninth.

Wagner reached the next milestone sometime after the summer of 1845, when he decided in his capacity as Royal Saxon Kapellmeister in Dresden to conduct the Ninth Symphony at the Palm Sunday Concert that would take place the following April, 1846. For this event he wrote his program note for the work based on quotations from Goethe’s *Faust*, strung together with his own interpretive narrative. As he prepared for this concert, his studies of the score again impressed him with the first movement, which filled him now with awe: “it is simply not possible that the heart of a pupil has ever been captivated with such rapturous force by the work of a master as mine was by the first movement of this symphony.”¹⁰ Wagner conducted the Ninth twice more in Dresden, in 1847 and again in 1849, in the volatile month before the May uprising in Dresden. As he prepared for the 1846 performance, Wagner completed the verse draft of *Lohengrin* (November 1845); in the months following the April performance, that is, from May to July 1846, he composed a first draft of the music.

The starting point for my study is Wagner’s program for the Ninth, which mixes his own narrative with four extended quotations from Goethe’s *Faust*. Wagner’s program is a dramatic narrative of struggle that is based on his analysis of the music, an analysis I attempt to explicate. As Scott Burnham observed in his discussion of Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony, programmatic readings of works in the nineteenth century

and analytical interpretations of the twentieth are both rooted in study of the music: “programs make explicit metaphorically some of the same grammatical and stylistic aspects of the music that other analytical methodologies do formally.”¹¹ Both approaches discuss the same musical issues in different languages. Wagner’s association of the Ninth with *Faust* came many years after he first combined ideas from the Ninth with music about Faust. His *Faust* Overture, the only completed movement of the D-minor *Faust* Symphony that he began in December 1839, has from the outset been interpreted as building on the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth; moreover, the passage that he chose from Goethe’s *Faust* as a motto for this movement are the verses that continue seamlessly from the passage that he chose for the first movement of the Ninth.

Among the aspects of Wagner’s narrative for the Ninth that seem particularly related to musical processes is his description of a struggle between good and evil. What in Beethoven’s movement spurred Wagner’s depiction of the first movement of the Ninth Symphony as a struggle “between the soul striving for joy and the oppression of some inimical power interposing itself between us and earthly happiness”? What musical feature(s) led him to speak of “a noble defiance, a virile energy of resistance that increases, in the center of the movement, to a state of open battle against its opponent”?¹² After briefly examining and, for various reasons, rejecting a few possible musical traits that could have inspired Wagner’s interpretation, I settle on the exceedingly common and simple technique known as “contrary motion” (in German, *Gegenbewegung*); that is, musical lines accompanied by a line (or lines) moving in the opposite direction, whether in an exact mirror inversion or in a freer, yet still close, opposing motion that in many cases makes use of the same pitches as the idea being countered, such as scales, triads, or diminished sevenths moving in opposite direction. Wagner’s first father-in-law, Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus, deemed the term important enough to include this entry on it in many successive issues of his *Conversations-Lexikon*, an encyclopedic twelve-volume handbook on all aspects of culture: “*Contrary motion* is what one in music calls such a passage with several voices in which one voice ascends while another falls, or whose sequence of notes in one voice leaps upwards and the other down, or also reversed, from the upper registers and the lower against the middle. By means of this can one avoid many errors in voice leading and unharmonious songs.”¹³

For the purposes of this study, I do not include contrary motion that is successive rather than simultaneous, as contrary motion occasionally

is in imitative or fugal writing where one voice can be answered by itself in inversion, whether strictly or loosely. I also allow for the possibility that the use of contrary motion carries with it a rhetorical or symbolic meaning, such as that depicted in Wagner's narrative of struggle. In the chapters that follow, I will examine four different varieties of counterpoint in contrary motion:

1. passages that are entirely oppositional but not thematic, like octave scales and arpeggios moving in the opposite direction against each other;
2. strictly mirrored counterpoint, when a motive or theme is accompanied simultaneously by its inversion;
3. short passages of three to five notes that are self-contained and clearly oppositional, because they repeat in extended passages (e.g., sequences), occur in outer voices, or have thematic/motivic significance, as in Brahms's First Symphony;
4. short mirrored passages of three or four notes moving in opposite directions that may be interior filler designed to thicken a contrapuntal texture.

Beethoven's use of contrary motion in the Ninth encompasses two reasonably distinct stylistic types, both of which may grow out of eighteenth-century musical topics, the system of culturally defined musical signs, such as hunting calls, pastoral music, Turkish music, and dance types. As indicated in examples 0.1 and 0.2, the one suggests a topic appropriate in battle music, the other in Masses and sacred music, although by the time Beethoven applies them in the Ninth, they appear to have lost much of their topical significance and become more symbolic. The shift from sign to symbol is one that Kofi Agawu proposed: "whereas eighteenth-century music defamiliarizes 'ordinary' materials such as fanfares, hunt calls, brilliant style effects, and so on, therefore making them properly and self-consciously artistic, Romantic music, without abandoning this gesture, often prefers a break with the outside world by entering into private biographical realms."¹⁴ While this transformation has been qualified by Raymond Monelle, who identifies several topics that survive into the twentieth century, the shift from easily recognized topic to more ambiguous musical symbol applies to Beethoven's use of counterpoint in the Ninth.¹⁵ As I argue in chapter 3, judging from the changes in his counterpoint between *The Flying Dutchman* and *Lohengrin*, and between the first version of his *Faust*

EXAMPLE 0.1. Passages in contrary motion representing conflict

a. Beethoven, Wellington's Victory (part 1, The Battle), mm. 174–80. Strings only

b. Wellington's Victory (part 2, Victory Symphony), mm. 568–76, nine measures of a twelve-measure passage. Strings only

Overture and the revised version, it took Wagner years to recognize Beethoven's methods and to apply them in his own compositions.

To demonstrate the two types of contrary motion and to establish their distinctive characters, a few examples in other works of Beethoven's exhibit the styles and techniques he invoked in the Ninth and show that they had, at least for him, preexisting associations. For counterpoint associated with struggle, example 0.1 shows two passages taken from his so-called Battle Symphony, Wellington's Victory, from part 1, The Battle, and from part 2, the Victory Symphony. Both are representative of passages in the Ninth Symphony. Although, as Monelle puts it, "the military topic has the longest history" of any musical topic, with centu-

ries of works that incorporate marches and trumpet signals of various kinds, there are no identifications of this kind of contrapuntal writing as a military topic.¹⁶ The first of the two excerpts shows an example that combines ascending and descending arpeggiations on the same triad but also in the last measures, descending octave leaps countering ascending triads. The second shows a different degree of contrary motion, exact mirroring which resembles the battle passage that follows the Turkish music in the finale of the Ninth.

Whatever the obvious merits of two opposing lines for representing struggle or conflict, nineteenth-century German speakers had a distinct advantage over twenty-first-century English speakers for understanding the topical connection between counterpoint and battle. Principally, the English term *contrary motion* fails to capture a crucial element of its German counterpart, *Gegenbewegung*. In German this word is also the term commonly used in military treatises and histories to describe the strategic movement of columns and lines of troops against the enemy, according to the way war began to be practiced during the eighteenth century from Frederick the Great onward;¹⁷ in this context *Gegenbewegung* is expressed in English prose about military matters either as *countermovement* or *countermaneuver*. Similarly, *oblique motion* is a musical term, *oblique movement* a military one, while in German both are *schräge Bewegung*.

An account of Napoleon's battles in 1815 underscores the importance of *Gegenbewegungen* for an ability to respond to the enemy: "Like the plot of a drama, a battle has its beginning, its middle and its dénouement. The beginning brings the counter-movements [*Gegenbewegungen*] of the enemy, through which gaps in the line arise that one must overpower and these influence the last movements [*Bewegungen*] which decide the battle."¹⁸ Comparable English-language texts of this period agree in the utility of countermovements and countermaneuvers for the same purpose. The lengthy article "War" in the 1824 supplement to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* uses both terms interchangeably in discussing the offensive merits of an oblique order of attack: the beneficial effects offer "another advantage still more decisive, in bringing the half of the army constantly into action against the extremity . . . of the hostile army, which has no counter manoeuver to stop its progress;" and regarding other columns, these "will be more moveable, and not being intended for the first attack, they will nevertheless cover it against counter-movements of the enemy."¹⁹ The art of "maneuver war" (*Bewegungskrieg*) was at this time an art of movement more than battle. In

the mid-eighteenth century, Saxony's military doctrine declared that "a great general shows his mastery by attaining the object of his campaign by sagacious and sure maneuvers, without incurring any risk."²⁰ Napoleon introduced far more violence into his campaigns, but the principles of movement and countermovement were the same.

Because eighteenth- and nineteenth-century battles were fought by opposing rows of troops, the interaction of two rows of notes and two rows of soldiers moving against one another could more readily be understood as metaphorically related. The lexical flexibility that allowed for two definitions of *Gegenbewegung* thus grew out of the different nature of war before the static trench warfare of World War I. For Brahms, who played with toy soldiers his entire life, the connection between counterpoint and war may have been stronger than for most. According to his friend Albert Dietrich, young Brahms loved to play with toy soldiers: "arranging them and forming them in different rows served the boy to stimulate his musical fantasy."²¹

For Beethoven to employ contrary motion in the first movement as a musical representation of battle required an awareness of the military that was commonly available in newspapers and periodicals such as August von Kotzebue's *Literarisches Wochenblatt*, the *Wiener allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, and the *Oesterreichischer Beobachter*, general encyclopedias such as the *Conversations-lexicons* of the day, and scores of books on Napoleon. In fact, it required little more than an adolescent boy's knowledge of toy soldier formations and in that regard is not more learned than the Turkish music in the finale. Wagner, by discerning representations of battle in the first movement, made an important connection between the outer movements of the Ninth. The Turkish music and the instrumental fugato which follows it do not intrude into the finale from out of the blue; according to Wagner they are motivated by events present already in the first movement.

The other type of contrary motion present in the Ninth, certainly, but also in the music of Wagner and Schumann, involves longer, at times seemingly unending, lines moving in opposite directions by step or by thirds. While the patterns suggest circular motion, a common symbol of infinity, Beethoven employs them in the *Missa solemnis* in contexts that suggest the power or majesty of God. In the Credo Beethoven indulges his mimetic tendencies at every opportunity. At "*et ascendit*" the lines rush upward; at "*descendit*" they leap downward; lively loud music emerges at "*vivos*," a hushed stillness at "*mortuos*," and excessive repetition at "*cujus regni non erit finis*" (whose reign shall have no end).

All of this is the conventional musical rhetoric of Mass composition from the sixteenth century onward. Example 0.2 presents three examples of contrary motion: one from the Benedictus at the words “*qui venit*” (from “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord”), with an expanding wedge formed by steady motion outward to far distant registers; the second at the beginning of the Credo, illustrating “*Patrem omnipotentem*” with outward-moving triads; and lastly at “*et vitam venturi, Amen*” (life in the world to come), potentially endless movement outward in repeating cycles of thirds against sequential scales upward, as if to suggest eternal life.

A preliminary example from the Ninth Symphony of the first type of contrary motion can indicate the type of varied repetition that suggested to Wagner his narrative of an intensifying struggle between two combatants. An excerpt from the first movement of the Ninth—the descending D-minor theme as it appears successively in the exposition, development, and recapitulation—illustrates the trait that I believe Wagner interpreted as growing resistance against a malevolent force (example 0.3). The theme first appears in unison, without resistance; when it returns at the start of the development section, there is contrary motion but it is scored quietly, as if two opponents were tentatively probing for the other’s weaknesses. In contrast, the return of this idea in the recapitulation is not in any dramatic sense recapitulatory. Passionate resistance from the upward-moving contrapuntal bass voice appears to hold its own, at least for the moment. Wagner’s insight into this poetically suggestive application of contrary motion is one that we will trace in his own music, initially to determine when in his development as a composer this occurred, later to provide a means of comparison with the music of Schumann. And while the attempt to say how and when Schumann and Wagner applied the techniques they gleaned from Beethoven’s Ninth can contribute unexpected insights into their individual developments as composers, my larger aim is to use this information to demonstrate how significantly they influenced one another.

If counterpoint was one of the lessons Wagner and Schumann learned from studying the Ninth, another is what I will term “thematic dispersion,” the preparation for a moment later in a work by planting varied, anticipatory forms of a musical idea earlier. This is related on the one hand to Wagner’s comments about the “spreading net” of a “thematic image” in *The Flying Dutchman*, and, on the other hand, to his description in *Opera and Drama* (1851) of Beethoven’s technique of “shattering” the Ode to Joy theme into parts that were presented and developed

EXAMPLE 0.2. Passages in contrary motion representing spiritual power and glory
 a. Beethoven, *Missa Solemnis*, Benedictus, mm. 191–93

Vln. S. *cresc.*
 S. S. qui ve - nit, qui ve - nit in
 T. S. ve - nit in no - mi - ne, no -
 B. S. Do - mi - ni, qui ve - nit in no - mi - ne
 Org., Vc. *cresc.*

b. *Missa Solemnis*, Credo, mm. 19–22

Fl. *ff*
 Vln. *ff*
 S. - - - mni - po - ten -
 A. - - - mni - po - ten -
 Vc. Db. *ff*

c. *Missa Solemnis*, Credo, mm. 352–56. Vocal parts only

J
 men, a - men, et vi - tam, et vi - tam, et vi - tam, et
cresc.
 et vi - tam ven - tu - ri, ven - tu - ri, ven - tu - ri, ven - tu - ri
 - - - men, a - men, a - men, a - men, a -
 cu - li,

EXAMPLE 0.3. Comparison of first theme statements in the Ninth Symphony, mvmt. 1

a. Exposition (violins 1 and cellos), mm. 16–21

b. Development (violins 1 and basses), mm. 197–203

c. Recapitulation (oboes, violins 1, basses, and cellos), mm. 314–18

in the preceding movements (discussed in chapters 1 and 2). The importance of this technique still remains in *Music of the Future* (1861), where he describes Beethoven's preparatory presentations of fragmentary ideas: "I cannot resist drawing your attention to the structure of a Beethoven first movement. What we see is a dance-melody split into its tiniest fragments, each one of which—it may amount to no more than a couple of notes—is made interesting and significant by a pervasive rhythm or significant harmony. The fragments are continually being reassembled in different formations—coalescing in a logical succession

which here pours forth like a stream, there disperses as though in a whirlwind.”²²

Wagner then explains how his aim is to apply this “instrumental technique” not to symphonies or even music for choir and orchestra but to drama. This attempt necessarily requires a new kind of operatic text, with “a dramatic poem itself providing a counterpart to a symphonic form.”²³ While with Wagner the fragmentation and dispersion applies to music and text, the application of this concept to the symphonies of Schumann and Brahms is easily justifiable, both because Wagner had found his inspiration in Beethoven’s symphonic practices and because the ways in which Schumann and Brahms also followed the examples of Beethoven’s Ninth have been noted from the very first critiques. I have elected to call this process “thematic dispersion,” rather than one of several other possible terms, such as thematic unfolding, adumbration, or foretelling, because each of those words describes the process from the standpoint of the perceiver, of the listener or analyst who encounters fragments of a theme along the way to a complete and climactic combination of them late in a work, there reassembled as a theme. The benefits of the word *dispersion* are both that Wagner’s use of the verb *zerteilen*—translated above as “disperse”—suggests this, and that it operates from the standpoint of the composer, who having devised a central theme, then sets about preparing it by disassembling it into small units. These dispersed units can be either musical as in a symphony, poetic as in a play or book, or at once musical and poetic, as in an opera or a music drama.

In order to provide a context for discussing the impact of the Ninth Symphony on *Lohengrin* (discussed with the *Faust* Overture in chapter 3), I begin in chapters 1 and 2 by comparing the poem and then the music of *The Flying Dutchman*, the work for which Wagner abandoned his *Faust* Symphony, to Beethoven’s Ninth, and also to the passages from Goethe’s *Faust* that Wagner chose to explicate the Ninth. Wagner’s interpretation of the Ninth, as he described it in his 1846 program, functions remarkably well to describe several scenes in *The Flying Dutchman*, including elements of scene structure, rhythmic pacing, harmony, and motive. Whether Wagner selected the quotations from Goethe’s *Faust* as he prepared the 1846 performance, or, as I suspect, already as he began composing his D-minor *Faust* Symphony in late 1839, the four passages from Goethe have a strong resonance with several scenes in *The Flying Dutchman*. The two performances of Beethoven’s Ninth, first in Paris under Habeneck and then his own in

Dresden, were followed by the composition of two operas, operas that together allow us to trace Wagner's deepening understanding of Beethoven's symphony.

With chapter 4 the focus turns to Schumann, to his Symphony no. 2 in C Major and the Finale of the Overture, Scherzo and Finale, op. 52. He drafted his C-Major Symphony quickly in the last two weeks of 1845, having met with Wagner several times during the preceding months, attended two performances of *Tannhäuser*, and listened to Wagner read a draft of his poem for *Lohengrin*. This symphony has attracted considerable attention for Schumann's use of thematic transformations to build up gradually to the arrival of the main theme—his allusion to Beethoven's song-cycle *An die ferne Geliebte*—in the finale. His application of contrary motion suggests he was well aware of what had motivated Wagner's conflict narrative in his program for the Ninth. The chapter closes with a review of his interactions with Wagner during this year.

I continue in chapter 5 to examine how Schumann and Wagner veered toward each other stylistically in the years that followed *Lohengrin* and the Second Symphony, taking special note of the influence of Bach on both of them. *Tristan und Isolde* seems particularly indebted to late Schumann—including the Second Symphony—as well as to Bach. Although Wagner credited Liszt with introducing him to the wonders of Bach's music, an introduction that biographers have variously placed in the 1860s or late 1850s, musical and biographical evidence points to Schumann's role already in the mid-1840s.

In chapter 6 I pose the question of whether or not the application of contrary motion and thematic dispersion is evident in the music of the composer who was most likely to have understood the musical insights of Wagner's Faustian program, Johannes Brahms. His First Symphony demonstrates his awareness both of Beethoven's techniques and of Wagner's and Schumann's responses to them. Though his symphony was dubbed "Beethoven's Tenth" largely because of its finale, the title is also warranted by the formal and contrapuntal debts of his first movement to Beethoven's. And Brahms's sustained use of counterpoint in contrary motion exists as well in his First Piano Concerto, which indicates that by the mid-1850s he was already aware of the insights that Schumann and Wagner had discovered in 1845–46.

The final chapter works its way toward the question of who influenced whom, and in what ways. Schumann initially seems to have been the better prepared to understand Beethoven's counterpoint, Wagner the thematic dispersion, but there is a case to be made that it was Wagner

who also made the discovery about contrary motion. Because Wagner's deepening appreciation of Beethoven's Ninth, both regarding counterpoint and thematic dispersion, has implications for how he composed, the chapter begins by reviewing his methods as a composer. His application of formal schemes derived from Beethoven's Ninth, his expanded use of contrary motion in *Lohengrin*, and his awareness of Beethoven's pre-finale preparation of the Ode to Joy—each of these gives new meaning to his insistence on the notion of opera as symphony. But most important of all for determining his contribution to the conversations he had with Schumann are his views about the relationship of words and music in the process of composition. Contrary to Wagner's subsequent representation of their discussions, Schumann and Wagner must have shared their insights into Beethoven's Ninth with each other, and in so doing forever altered the way each composed.