

PART III

Reception

11 Schumann in his time and since

REINHARD KAPP

The image takes shape

The reactions of his immediate circle to the musical exploits of the young Schumann, from domestic music-making to performances in the school context, are known to posterity almost entirely in the form of later reminiscences: we see him in his social environment but learn little that is specifically musical. We have rather more precise information about his progress and setbacks in his study of the piano, as well as about the appearances as a soloist in Zwickau, Schneeberg and even Heidelberg. The primary source is Schumann himself, but at least he collected the opinions voiced in Heidelberg and compiled a unique list in his diary of various views (possibly edited or touched up, but clearly representative). There are no reports of the occasional performances of his music during his childhood, in private or semi-public contexts, all under his personal supervision and with his own participation, but he profited by even such modest exposure. What is clear from these events is that Schumann grew up in an environment where music was not only loved but also eagerly discussed.

After his first lessons with Kuntsch, who may have been a provincial musician but was by no means deficient in judgement or understanding, Schumann turned to various professional musicians with a reputation extending beyond Saxony in his search for a formal course of study. Carl Maria von Weber responded affirmatively to an enquiry from August Schumann, but was prevented from taking his son as a pupil: Robert suffered the deaths of potential musical fathers (Weber, 1826; Beethoven, 1827; Schubert, 1828) as well as his birth father (1826) one after another in close succession. The opinions of the teachers he then chose, or half-heartedly considered choosing, communicated as little as the compositions he sent them. At a later date he published, without attribution, the assessment of the Lieder composer Gottlieb Wiedebein as one that he could accept as fair comment. Hummel was unable to form any very clear impression from the fragment of a piano concerto (in a somewhat Hummelish style) submitted to him. Only with Friedrich Wieck, a systematic but also volatile teacher, did Schumann pursue, from 1830, a programme of study to some extent worthy of the name. Wieck oversaw and commented on Schumann's development

as a pianist and also on his early essays in large-scale forms (C minor Piano Quartet, Toccata, G minor Symphony).

With his first publications, Schumann began to make his name almost simultaneously as a writer on music and a composer of piano music – to begin with both media were substitutes for the larger-scale works he planned to compose. The journalist became known more quickly. Even so, the responses of the growing circle of readers must have been hard to gauge at first: they tended to be reactions primarily to the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in which his work appeared – the movement the journal represented, or the type of information and opinions it conveyed – rather than to the personality of the editor or author (often hard to identify amid the bewildering proliferation of pseudonyms and monograms). The new form of the reviews, the semi-fictional members of the *Davidsbündler*, aroused interest and curiosity; as he built up a team of co-writers, Schumann succeeded in spreading something of the spirit of his undertaking and even in finding imitators¹ – one of the ways by which to restore ‘the poetry of art’ to a position of honour.²

Schumann the composer had a harder time of it, partly because of the unconventional elements of the works (which observers saw primarily, and with some justification, as reaching out towards a hypothetical future), partly because he was unable to give the virtuosic performances that would have made them known and established a performing tradition for them. He was reluctant, too, to publicize them in his own journal to any significant extent. We need to recognize how unusual his career as a composer was in being promoted entirely through publication, the championship of other, well-disposed pianists and above all private performances. The major exception in Schumann’s keyboard period – the public performances of movements from the G minor Symphony in Zwickau, Schneeberg and Leipzig (and these were neither rehearsed nor directed by the composer) – failed to arouse any more significant reactions. Since putting himself in the public eye, therefore, Schumann achieved his ends indirectly: he theorized, he took no personal active part in the occasional performances of his compositions, and thirdly he created works that in a certain sense did not stand on their own feet. All of this had an enduring effect on how he was received. At the same time, the mysterious incognito made the composer, distancing himself from every form of praxis, pre-eminently the representative and spokesman of the Romantic movement.

Some musicians among those closest to him became acquainted with the early works soon after they were written: Clara Wieck (at first with her father’s backing) is inseparable from any account of Schumann’s life, a permanent and decisive factor in his development, in all her many roles. She played his music in private circles to begin with; the first piece she played in

public was the Toccata, followed by smaller pieces or selections but nothing bigger than the Piano Quintet. Although she did not venture to perform many of the larger-scale piano works in public until much later, it was she who would make Schumann's piano music known across half Europe and determine its reception until almost the end of the nineteenth century. Schumann's friend and almost exact contemporary Louis Schuncke also played the Toccata, although not on his concert tours: any further engagement with Schumann's music was halted by his early death, which lost it the championship of a well-disposed virtuoso. Schumann's relationships with these two pianists, his first interpreters, are among those 'situations' in which repeatedly he entered into close productive collaboration with contemporaries. Similar situations, which have not yet received the attention they merit, would recur: with Bennett, Berlioz, Brahms, Gade, Heller, Henselt, Hirschbach, Joachim, Liszt, Mendelssohn and Wagner. In every one of these cases the influence was mutual. It is hard to think of another composer whose orientation was so interactively effective.

Already some sympathetic reviews appeared, from the pens of Moscheles and Liszt, both admittedly acquaintances of Schumann as editor and of their fellow-pianist Clara Wieck. Little is known, even now, about the dissemination of the early piano works among contemporaries in general. Clearly, Schumann understood from an early age how to interest individuals in himself and his aspirations, but the attention of the wider public was harder to gain. The cryptic elements in the works themselves went hand in hand with their reception in closed circles. There is relatively little testimony from outsiders, those who came to know the works exclusively from the printed editions (Reilstab, von Seyfried, Gottfried Weber). Reviewers recognized the originality; Schumann was accepted as an aspiring though perhaps rather over-ambitious votary of art. If the pieces seemed obscure, muddled, it was at first attributed to the composer's evident youth, seen as grounds for sympathetic treatment – although Schumann continued to be thought of in such terms for rather a long time. But his development reveals that he was aware of it. His ever wakeful self-criticism, often published in the form of reviews of other people's music, had to make up for the absence of greater public attention, but criticism of his own works, whether oral or printed, was carefully noted and considered and the reception had an effect on his production. At this stage, when Schumann was still wide open and his position not yet stabilized, he was at the centre of an extensive process of evolution of ideas, partly initiated by himself, but into which also he was drawn by others, and in this process the works too were an element.

Gradually the word began to spread. Johann Peter Lyser's 1838 essay 'Robert Schumann und die romantische Schule in Leipzig'³ was an attempt

to prepare the ground in Vienna. Julius Becker's 'musical novel' *Der Neuro-mantiker* (Leipzig, 1840) contains a chapter entitled 'Über Compositionen von Florestan und Eusebius'. Schumann found it necessary to defend himself against the charge of being 'a Romantic'. Georg Kastner, in the profile he published in 1840 in the *Revue et gazette musicale*,⁴ spoke already of Schumann's growing influence and advised him to pursue orchestral composition as his true *métier*. As he emerged from writing purely for the piano and turned to genres that the authorities of the musical world rated as more significant and less subjective (Lied, symphony, chamber music, oratorio), a wider public did indeed become more aware of Schumann as a composer. This is the real starting point of a reception history as the history of reactions to a compositional trajectory as it stabilized. Greater clarity of musical thought and more immediately comprehensible musical messages were speedily followed by acclaim. It must be said, also, that this recognition was coloured in advance by the 'romantic' (in the other sense) tale of the composer's fight to win the hand of Clara Wieck, an extension of the poetic life of the *Davidsbündler* into real life. This kind of poeticization helped now to make the piano works more accessible, with their characteristically fragmentary, many-layered and playful qualities; what had at first been regarded as signs of immaturity were now taken as modern, interesting, witty and intelligent. Another reason for the increased understanding and acceptance was probably that the greater variety in Schumann's output gave him a more clearly distinguishable public profile. The Lieder would help to advance Schumann's recognition: listeners were no longer in any sense bereft of words. The first commercial success in Schumann's career also came at this stage, borne on the back of a surge of mass feeling; his was the umpteenth setting of Nikolaus Becker's patriotic *Rheinlied*. The First Symphony made the round of the concert halls relatively quickly after its première in the Leipzig Gewandhaus. While the relationship with Wieck and his daughter (Liszt, too) could count as personal, it was as established fellow-musicians that Mendelssohn and Ferdinand David took up Schumann's music. If the symphony ranked still as a surprise, a lucky fluke, the first chamber compositions and above all *Das Paradies und die Peri* earned Schumann the respect also of those who had been inclined until then not to take him entirely seriously as a composer. Faced with the growing technical mastery and inner assurance of his composing, colleagues now took Schumann into the repertory: Gade, Hiller, Liszt (as Kapellmeister in Weimar), Rietz, Spohr, Taubert.

Schumann's own conducting appearances also helped to make his name better known. He directed not only his own works (starting with *Peri*) but also those of others as a choral conductor in Dresden and Düsseldorf. In this capacity he appeared in public in his own right (no longer merely the

husband of the celebrated pianist), and gradually an ‘image’ formed of the artist that was an odd mixture of charm, authority and nonconformity.

Schumann’s reputation as a composer also spread outside the borders of Germany during his lifetime (preceded, as in his homeland, by his editorial activities). It would be inaccurate, however, to picture knowledge and fame growing and spreading steadily and evenly: rather, a kind of underground career coexisted with occasional recognition by the musical authorities. France was perhaps the country where Schumann’s influence was first noticed and also proved most enduring. Kastner wrote of ‘des partisans zélés parmi les artistes’ already in the 1830s. Berlioz, for example, became acquainted with the piano music through Liszt, who, having cautiously tested the water in his recitals, confined himself to private and publicizing initiatives, while Alkan first heard it played by Clara Schumann. The further dissemination of the music during the 1840s was brought about partly by the championship of personal acquaintances: Kirchner in Switzerland,⁵ Gade in Denmark, Norman in Sweden, Anton Gehrke in St Petersburg, and possibly Hiller, too, in Italy.⁶

Schumann’s journeys abroad helped both the music and the composer personally to become better known. He made a great impression when he and his wife visited Russia together in 1844. Not only were some of the more important works performed but he also made contact with leading lights on the Russian musical scene: Henselt, L’vov, Wielhorski; and by chance the fourteen-year-old Anton Rubinstein, later one of the most important interpreters of Schumann, heard the Piano Quintet. The journey to Vienna in 1846 was unsuccessful insofar as Clara Schumann failed to build on her earlier triumphs – but at least, rather as literary figures responded positively to Wagner in Paris at a later date, reactions were aroused in the writers Eichendorff and Stifter. This visit does not appear to have been the occasion of Schumann’s contact with Hebbel, who later (despite the disastrous experience of *Genoveva*) may have sought closer collaboration with him.⁷ It was only in the 1850s and later that Schumann’s music found a more sympathetic audience in Vienna. However, in Berlin (where he conducted *Peri*), Prague (where the Piano Concerto was performed, as well as other works) and Zwickau (in what amounted to a Schumann festival), he was welcomed by enthusiasts who had already formed groups of ‘Schumannianer’. The long-planned concert tour of England did not take place, despite Mendelssohn’s personal recommendation of *Peri* and Queen Victoria’s interest in Schumann’s music. On the other hand, when Schumann visited the Netherlands early in 1854, where Verhulst had been busy, he found a more broadly based reception already awaited him and his triumphal tour made him feel that his music was almost more at home there than in his homeland.⁸

One index of the recognition on a professional level and the spread of Schumann's reputation is the dedication of compositions to him. This rested more or less on knowledge of his *œuvre* but should not be read as the token of especial veneration in every case. Clara dedicated three published works to Schumann (Opp. 3, 11, 20) and more in private. Sometimes dedications were a matter of returning a compliment: the case of Clara Wieck's Op. 3 and Robert Schumann's Op. 5 is similar to that of Schuncke's dedication of his *Grande Sonate*, Op. 3, of about the same date as Schumann's *Toccata*, Op. 7. Other composers who responded in kind to dedications from Schumann were Bennett, Chopin, Gade, Henselt, Liszt, Moscheles and Reinicke. Brahms, the dedicatee of the *Conzertallegro*, Op. 134, composed his Schumann Variations, Op. 9 (1854), as a token of friendship and sympathy for Clara Schumann; while the Sonata, Op. 2, was dedicated to her, he did not dare as yet to place Robert Schumann's name at the head of one of his works, he told Schumann in a letter (mid January 1855). Numerous younger composers, whether actual pupils or not, dedicated compositions to him as a sign of their respect: Bargiel, Dietrich, Heller, Carl Ritter,⁹ Smetana, Verhulst,¹⁰ Julie von Webenau.¹¹ Kirchner's *Grüße an meine Freunde*, Op. 5 (1855),¹² was perhaps already an expression of his veneration of Schumann, and a whole series of posthumous works (*Neue Davidsbündlertänze*, etc.) certainly were. Private *Albumblätter* should also be taken into account,¹³ and even poems, by Böttger, Hebbel and others. Such dedications are very informative, especially the fact that the majority of them were of sonatas,¹⁴ none of salon music or virtuoso pieces: this demonstrates the significance and standing Schumann had acquired, as well as showing that his views had become well known and respected.

It is now, as a composer to reckon with, that Schumann's position in history becomes a subject for consideration. After Mendelssohn's death he can be reckoned a national institution: the closing scene from *Faust* was performed in Weimar, Dresden and Leipzig in 1849 as part of the celebration of Goethe's centenary. First in Germany and then elsewhere in western Europe, Schumann's standing as the leading representative of 'pure' music, the heir of Beethoven, was unchallenged, even by the adherents of Wagner, for some time to come. Official honours confirmed his position.¹⁵ Furthermore, Schumann now had a growing consciousness of working for the public arena and a tangible audience. Works of 'applied' art, music composed for political or pedagogical motives, show that he calculated effects and listeners' expectations, and also that he was sufficiently in command of his music to be able to choose varying degrees of difficulty, demands and means. When he put himself in the position of a recipient of his own music and undertook alterations and augmented orchestrations, or revised earlier works for new editions, he concerned himself with accommodation

as well as technical improvements. Works such as the *Clavierstücke [Album] für die Jugend* (1848) or *Waldscenen* (1850) were very successful with a wide spectrum of the public. But whenever he turned to the project of promoting the *große Form* (and with it the *große Musik*) the broader public showed no great willingness to follow him.

The addition of more and more new genres to his *œuvre* meant that its reception multiplied and polarized: the piano pieces were regarded as either the equals of the works for chamber and orchestral ensembles or as promising prospects, sometimes even as the truly interesting category, when compared with the apparent conservatism of the later works. While some thought a period of mastery had begun, others had doubts about the aesthetic and technical foundations; while many welcomed the consideration given to practical requirements, there were some to whom the new works represented an unwelcome diversion. The New Germans, at bottom not a school at all, could not agree on their attitude to Schumann: was he a progressive or not? ‘His’ *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* became a battleground, even more so than the field of composition itself. Despite his growing fame, Schumann in his last years found himself under attack on three sides: not only by the rising Wagner–Liszt party but also, still, by the Classicists (perhaps also by the political right in Germany), and thirdly by the critics who had followed his path with sympathy but did not like the late works. It is unlikely, however, that Schumann’s own view would have been that composers of his own age, or younger, were catching up with or overtaking him by means that he had helped to develop but they now used to greater effect;¹⁶ the crucial thing is that he was still considered worth arguing about. With the rallying cry of *Neue Bahnen* Schumann sounded one more well-timed fanfare, then the *Gesammelte Schriften* in 1854, two years before his death, appeared like a posthumous publication. His mental collapse added a new dimension to the reception – and where renewed romanticization did not celebrate madness, all questions remained open for the foreseeable future.

Did Schumann found a school?

Very gradually the circle of Schumann’s influence widened. The programme insofar as it was felt to be representative, the innovations in his music, the quality of his work (this must not be overlooked even when focussing on sociological and psychological motivation) combined to make him a trend-setter, a teacher despite himself, a focal point for analogous aspirations, an authority. He had manifested early a talent for friendship, for attracting those of like mind (despite not being particularly extrovert by nature): schoolfriends, fellow-students, the network of colleagues growing

up around the journal; the circle of friends of both Schumanns, who kept open house, which led to more activities in the wider community; the choirs and *Kränzchen* that Schumann conducted, the artists' colonies, pupils and disciples in Leipzig, Dresden and Düsseldorf. The *Davidsbündler* were to some extent an idealization of a loose-knit circle that really existed, but it also served as a model for real associations, bringing together individuals in small, conspiratorial groups in Schumann's name: Schumann himself got to hear of meetings of such informal bodies in Berlin, Hanover (the *Kafferbund*, or 'League of Bumpkins'), Paris and Prague. In Weimar, the *Davidsbündler's* declaration of war on the Philistines was interpreted as an honourable early phase in the campaign of the New Germans. The role of the Philistines in this was assigned to a ubiquitous 'association of mediocrities'. The foundation of the Neu-Weimar-Verein in 1853, with 'Murls' such as Cornelius, Joachim, Bülow and Raff among its members, forms a link between the *Davidsbündler* and the Wagner societies that followed in due course.

Doubt is sometimes expressed as to whether Schumann was a particularly gifted teacher, but he had a talent for imparting instruction and the capacity for empathy. His institutionalized teaching activity at the Leipzig Conservatory (1843–4) does not appear to have been attended by any outstanding success, but throughout his life he exerted influence by example and suggestion on people of his own age at first, on younger adherents later – a school where regular instruction was the exception although a series of private pupils came to him regularly. There were pupils who later turned away from him, while others remained loyal; some in whom Schumann's influence amalgamated with that of others and some whom he rendered immune to other influences; finally, there were some in whom the influence does not reveal itself at first sight. But of none could it be said that his influence had no effect at all.

He gave formal lessons to Dietrich, Ehlert, Meinardus, Reinecke and Carl Ritter. Kirchner seems to have been profoundly marked by the personal association (it began when he was very young), to his detriment.¹⁷ But none of these had a particularly forceful personal voice. Reinecke continually adopted Schumannesque turns of phrase and preferred the genres that were also Schumann's favourites. Ritter later fell under Wagner's spell and abandoned composition for literature. Other influences – Liszt's, among others – mingled in Meinardus. Clara Wieck-Schumann passed through several stages: for all her independence of judgement she turned into something very like a pupil and as a composer she remained so. From 1840 onwards no clearcut distinction can be made between her influence and her husband's: possibly pupils were attracted by her, but obtained things from him as well through the sheer proximity. Albert Dietrich remained a Schumannianer,

even when he thought he was moving in step with Brahms. Close ties, verging on a pupil–teacher relationship, existed with Bargiel, Brahms, Eduard Franck, Grimm, Joachim, Louise Japha-Langhans and Heinrich von Sahr. The band of followers embraced a whole series of other fellow musicians, of Schumann’s own age and younger. Isolated encounters could have lasting consequences, as in the cases of Cornelius, Louis Ehlert and Smetana.¹⁸ There was never any personal contact with Heller, a devoted adherent, but letters were exchanged intermittently, with enthusiasm on Heller’s side at least.

Many writers, from the 1830s onwards, were convinced of the existence of a School of Schumann, for good or ill. The epithet ‘Schumannianer’ might be used as a mark of approval or disapproval. Brahms was long described as one, and not just because of *Neue Bahnen*. He declared brusquely, in one of his misanthropic fits and probably in response to a silly question, that all he had ever learnt from Schumann was how to play chess, but he also said something very similar about his revered teacher Marxsen. Brahms maintained a close and lifelong relationship with Schumann, and with his wife and widow. As composer, performer and co-editor of the *Gesamtausgabe*, he remained permanently involved with Schumann’s music. As a general rule, he later carefully avoided direct reminiscences, but the association revealed itself at many times on different levels. The first of Schumann’s *Märchenerzählungen* seems to prefigure Brahms – Brahms played it in public. The two serenades contain clear traces of Schumann. The D minor Piano Concerto relates to Schumann in a number of ways; *Ein deutsches Requiem* plainly commemorates not only the composer’s mother but also Schumann.

Contemporaries take sides

Admiration for Schumann also united composers who did not have any direct contact with him. His contemporaries found much to debate in the Schumann phenomenon, matter both for applause and for rejection. Of the older generation, Berlioz remained largely unmoved, despite several encounters, whereas Meyerbeer could not be indifferent after Schumann’s review of *Les Huguenots*. Just how far the close attention he paid to contemporary music included Schumann remains to be examined. The string quartets won the respect of the Thomaskantor Moritz Hauptmann. Spohr conducted the First Symphony and at least considered mounting a production of *Genoveva*, but he was alarmed by the dissonances in Schumann’s later compositions. Moscheles was a declared admirer and even Schumann’s work of the 1850s held his interest.

Of course, the debate began in Schumann's own generation during his lifetime. Norbert Burgmüller (born 1810) died too soon to take any note of Schumann's early compositions. Camille Stamaty (1811) went to Leipzig in 1836 to study with Mendelssohn but he associated with Schumann too; the consequences of his stay can be observed in his pupil Saint-Saëns, at the latest. Hermann Hirschbach (1812) was a collaborator on Schumann's journal and strove to outdo Schumann both as composer and as musical commentator. Chopin appears to have remained largely uncomprehending, perhaps under the influence of a 'Parisian' aesthetics; it is not clear how much Schumann impinged on him as either critic or composer.¹⁹ He did not live to witness the first phase of more general reception of Schumann in France. Mendelssohn's case was different in every way. Something like a friendship developed, despite his reservations about the journalist, and he belongs with others of his generation – Ferdinand David, Henselt, Hiller²⁰ – among those who helped Schumann's music become better known. Already an established figure himself, Mendelssohn gave the premières or early performances of several of Schumann's orchestral works, was involved in the *Variations*, Op. 46, took an active part in the rehearsals for *Peri* and played the Piano Quintet in private. He was probably acquainted with much more, but perhaps felt like Schumann's mentor rather than anything else. His influence on Schumann is often mentioned, but it is hard to say whether the opposite also holds good: that is, whether Schumann's music could be said to have impressed Mendelssohn in a way that took effect in his own music: it is another of the 'situations' that have yet to be investigated. That the completion and publication of the 'Scottish' Symphony can be traced back to the success of his own First Symphony was more than a figment of Schumann's imagination, at all events. Later, when the dispute between the Schumannites and the Mendelssohnians began to dissolve under the impact of Wagner, the influences of the two composers sometimes merged.

Schumann outlived Mendelssohn and Chopin by just long enough to make it possible to rank him with the 'moderns'. Yet after his death, it seems as if Wagner, Liszt and Verdi belonged to a later generation altogether, though they were scarcely any younger. General reception of Schumann set in when those three embarked on a development into the unknown, in which Schumann – in the nature of things – could take no part. The 'star-blessed friendship' Pfitzner imagined between Schumann and Wagner might have been realizable in the heavens, but on earth there could be no meeting of temperaments (at the very least). *Das Paradies und die Peri* probably made a real impression on Wagner – he seems to have been drawn to the motive of redemption, the atmosphere and certain technical aspects. Schumann the conductor repelled him, however, and he probably found the personality antipathetic too. The more the Wagnerian position became fixed as a

historical one, the more it excluded other composers' aspirations towards the same ends – this applied to Liszt, Mendelssohn and Verdi; only to Chopin, who composed solely for piano and moreover picked the right time to die, did Wagner do justice, within limits.²¹ There are two passages in the Singers' Contest in Act II of *Tannhäuser* that can be related musically to Schumann – but they are the contributions of Wolfram, whose style of lovesong is mocked by Tannhäuser as insipid and feeble. Whereas Mendelssohn's style was already formed when he became aware of Schumann, Wagner's style in the 1840s was still unstable. He seems to draw close to Schumann in the sketches for *Siegfrieds Tod*, and in a short essay (1852) on Wilhelm Baumgartner's songs, a (local-)political polemic targeted against Franz Abt, he approves Schumann's direction, even though he does not expressly name him. Wagner called Schumann's orchestral music uninteresting (he owned a copy of the Second Symphony, at least), unlike Mendelssohn's, he saw no more in it than something that followed in Beethoven's footsteps without a Beethovenian purpose. On several occasions he ruled against performing any of it and refused to be swayed by the arguments of Schumannianer in his circle (Cornelius, Kienzl, Kirchner, Liszt, Schemann).

Liszt's generosity of spirit had exactly the opposite effect: his sympathy for the New German programme did not entail any prejudice against Schumann. However much the personality amused him, Liszt was convinced of his artistic stature. Although in his glory days as a virtuoso pianist he made only halfhearted attempts to champion the music in performance, for all his talk of Schumann as one of the very few new figures who interested him, he appears to have wanted to make the omission good later. As ducal Kapellmeister in Weimar, Liszt conducted Schumann's major works and even staged performances of *Manfred* and *Genoveva*. Furthermore, he vigorously promoted Schumann's music in his writings (among other things he translated the *Haus- und Lebensregeln*), his transcriptions and his teaching activities.

After Schumann's death

The 1850s witnessed the slow spread of Schumann's reputation outside the immediate circle of his influence. The successive appearance of a number of works (some of major importance), either sent to press by himself or published after his death, created rather the same impression as if he had been still active. Much of the 'music of the future' appeared on the scene shoulder to shoulder with Schumann's music;²² it was possible at this period for him to be claimed for the New German school (which also sought to recruit Brahms and Joachim) or to be rejected with it.²³ Personal initiatives

played an important role: personal friends of Schumann and newly won friends of his music alike were active as propagandists throughout half Europe (and revealed his influence in their own work). As well as those already named, there was Louis Ehlert in Berlin, Erkel in Budapest, Herbeck in Vienna, Eduard Langer in Moscow, L'vov (and Anton Rubinstein) in St Petersburg, Smetana in Gothenburg; there were performers on the international stage such as Hiller, Joachim, Lind, Rubinstein, Stockhausen; and some journalists: Ambros, Bagge, Hanslick. More substantial accounts of Schumann's life and work began to circulate at this time. Lobe, who published an inadequate biography at the time of his leaving the *AMZ*, was followed by Riccius in 1850, Neumann in 1855, Müller von Königswinter in 1856 and Wasielewski in 1858, as well as the first major assessments of his achievement *in toto*: by Liszt in 1855; Ambros, Bagge, Debroy van Bruyck in 1858. Already by the end of the decade the first monographs on individual works appeared, on *Peri* and *Faust*. Graf Laurencin hailed Schumann as one of the great composers of the new era, implying in an 1859 essay, intended as a riposte to Hanslick, that the resistance of Viennese musicians to Schumann was still considerable. In the same year, however, Bagge reported that Schumann was at the zenith of his popularity in Vienna.²⁴ Still in Vienna, Robert Volkmann (born 1814) showed the first signs of Schumann's influence in the 1850s – having managed to resist it during his time as a student in Leipzig. Not much later the first clear signs appeared in the work of contemporaries elsewhere: Kirchner, Baumgartner and Joseph Carl Eschmann in Switzerland; Alkan, Gounod, Lalo and Saint-Saëns in France. Still in the 1850s, the youthful Massenet (born 1842) happened upon some of Schumann's piano pieces, but when he played them his listeners were dismayed. The prior influence of Mendelssohn was necessary to prepare Gounod for that of Schumann's music, but the signs can be seen in *Faust* (1852–9) and *Roméo et Juliette* (1867). Around 1860 Schumann was still not acceptable to the general public, however: in 1861, while Clara marvelled at how well Parisian musicians knew his works, a performance of the Third Symphony was hissed there.²⁵ Only during the following decade did that change.

A whole group of musicians of Brahms's generation were excited to some degree by Schumann's music. Hans von Bülow (born 1830), who knew Schumann as a young man, was later one of the many swayed by Wagner's critique, but he never completely renounced his youthful enthusiasm for Schumann.²⁶ In the case of Ludvig Norman (born 1831), who had also known Schumann and been encouraged by him, reminiscences became apparent already in 1850, while he was a student in Leipzig. Bernhard Scholz (born 1835), champion of Brahms and composer of *Golo*, an opera on the same subject as *Genoveva*, was also active on Schumann's behalf in

Frankfurt – he succeeded in gaining Clara Schumann for the Hoch Conservatory. The ‘Order of the Black Cat’ founded by him in 1862 was in the tradition of the *Davidsbündler*. Adolf Jensen (born 1837) had hoped to study with Schumann, but although he came under the spell of Schumann’s music only in the mid 1850s, it lasted for the rest of his life. Max Bruch (born 1838) was too young to benefit from Schumann’s personal acquaintance;²⁷ like Reinecke he was one of the eclectics who never abandoned the foundations of Mendelssohn and Schumann conjoined. Schumann was one of the mainstays of his repertory as a conductor and reminiscences are encountered everywhere in his work.

By the end of the decade the frontier between New Germans and Schumannianer was clearly marked. *Neue Bahnen* was already defensive against the rising clamour of the New Germans’ publicists, although it was perceived by its writer in other respects as a rallying call rising above party differences. The 1860 *Erklärung* of the four arch-Schumannianer, Brahms, Grimm, Joachim and Scholz, should have attracted a larger circle of signatories (Ehlert, Radecke), some of them members of the Schumann societies that have been mentioned above, and it might have succeeded in stimulating a public discussion, but once it had been prematurely leaked it was tainted by its being perceived as a reactionary manoeuvre. For Wagner, who saw himself as a contender for the position of sole original genius of his age, the debates with Schumann’s supporters became increasingly irksome. He found some tortuous and grudgingly approving phrases for Schumann’s gifts in his essays, but adopted the conviction of some individual Schumannianer that Mendelssohn had had a detrimental influence on their idol and thereafter circulated, by word of mouth and in writing, the formulas that his own followers would make their own. What was intended as the *coup de grâce* was delivered by Wagner’s protégé Joseph Rubinstein, whose article ‘Über die Schumannsche Musik’ published in *Bayreuther Blätter* in 1879 took care of dissent even in the Wagner camp. Humperdinck²⁸ reported a remark of Wagner’s from 1882, in which he summarized his personal relations with Schumann: ‘Justice impossible, odious stickwagger’²⁹ – a definitive dismissal of any kind of association with the outmoded concept of ‘absolute music’.

To the world outside Wagner’s personal fiefdom, these were minor squabbles of no general significance. The crop of books about Schumann that sprang up in the 1860s – Reissmann, Reimann, Wasielewski (the second edition of the biography, *Schumanniana*) – bore witness to the growing general interest. Schumann’s works were now to be found throughout Europe, carried on a tide of editions,³⁰ reissues with new title-pages, licensed editions and arrangements: Schumann entered the repertory. Contrary to the opinion later voiced by Nietzsche, Schumann was already a figure of European importance by now. Nietzsche’s musical horizons were not European, for all

his enthusiasm for *Carmen*. At first, he was as much in thrall to Schumann as he later was to Wagner, but he came to believe that parting from Schumann showed him to be not only older but wiser, casting off his little-German perceptions. Other commentators (Ehlert, Tchaikovsky) were in no doubt, however, that it was Schumann who stamped his impression on his age, even the remainder of the century. At all events, the 1860s can be termed the age of Schumann, just as the 1870s are the age of Wagner.

Yet there was something undemanding and old-fashioned about the Schumann of the committed Schumannianer when placed in the vanguard of opposition to the New Germans. By this time the Romantic revolution looked like a new Classicism, no longer the newest thing on the musical scene.³¹ Adherents of Schumann, in Germany at least, determined the academic climate. Whether or not they would have marginalized themselves without assistance is uncertain. It is possible to speculate that the loss of Schumann was the reason for this state of affairs, while the leaders of the New Germans were still alive and continuing to develop. Brahms, himself trapped as a Schumannianer to some extent (and therefore perceived by many as a better substitute for Schumann), was not a natural leader. Now, if not earlier, a 'right' and a 'left' emerged in Schumann reception: one a line through Reinecke–Brahms–Bruch–Pfitzner–Schoeck, the other sustaining a decidedly non-imitative relation to Schumann and embracing such as Musorgsky, Debussy, Mahler and Berg. These groupings are not intended to denote movements or parties. *Leipzigerisch*, already in Schumann's lifetime, was used combatively by the New Germans as a synonym for unprogressive – and certainly the conservatism of Leipzig grew more entrenched the longer it lasted. Yet Leipzig was the place to hear the music of Mendelssohn, Schumann and Gade, and since students from every nation under the sun were drawn to the Leipzig Conservatory from 1843 onwards the city was in effect an entrepot of the greatest importance. As the man on the spot, Schumann represented modernity to all those who returned home from Leipzig, until Wagner arrived on the scene: indeed, in some places he and Wagner continued to be regarded as equally modern for some time to come. As a whole, however, his music was gradually absorbed into the general fund of musical language and form, constituting the *lingua franca* of the nineteenth century.

When composers took up Schumann now, it was indirectly or for indirect reasons: reception was a matter of free choice. The Schumann tradition did not impinge on the musical education of Cornelius (born 1824) but he showed a lifelong interest in the music, even finding merit in *Genoveva*. Schumann was the reason why Cornelius was able to resist surrendering himself body and soul to Wagner. Nureddin's first scene in *Der Barbier von Bagdad* is pure Schumann. Cornelius's exact contemporary Bruckner

performed several pieces when he was a choirmaster in Linz. His studies with Kitzler introduced him to Schumann as well as to the modernism of Mendelssohn and Wagner. He mentioned 'Kind im Einschlummern' in his lectures on account of the non-resolution at the end; and individual passages that can be traced back to Schumann are found throughout his work, from Psalm 146, through the F minor Symphony and the G major Overture, to the finale of the Seventh Symphony. If Bruckner called Schumann's symphonies *Sinfonietten* (rather than *Sinfonien*) and felt that they lacked a true *adagio* character, it must surely be traced back to Wagner and his followers. It did not prevent him from looking to Schumann in his search for answers to the problem of the finale. Hermann Goetz (born 1840) was a more wholehearted Schumannianer, as his Piano Trio, Op. 1, of 1863 reveals.

In France, Louise Japha-Langhans played the chamber music in the 1860s, Clara Schumann resumed her recital-giving and the conductor Pasdeloup included Schumann in his concert programming. The greater general interest in the music was reflected in the press coverage (Scudo, Kufferath). From this period onwards, some composers were active in editing and arranging Schumann: Bizet, Chevillard, Debussy, Delage, Dubois, Fauré, Gevaert, Godard, Saint-Saëns. Pieces 'alla Schumann' began to appear, traces can be discerned everywhere, in Bizet, Fauré, Widor – even in César Franck (born 1822), albeit that his major works, in which the influence of Schumann is explicit, date rather from the 1880s. Schumann figured prominently in Franck's composition teaching, and Schumannianer were still to be found among his pupils (those of Brahms's generation, that is): Lacombe (born 1837), de Castillon (1838). Writers, musicians and musical amateurs united in the *culte Schumannien*. Even Wagner reception in France acknowledged the presence of Schumann in the background, up until the 1880s.³²

The other country where Schumann made a major impact was Russia. Interest boomed during the 1880s, the decade of the first Russian symphonies. The compositions of two Westernizers, Anton Rubinstein (born 1829) and Tchaikovsky (born 1840), reveal the consequences of an intense preoccupation with Schumann's music. Tchaikovsky also frequently wrote about Schumann and translated the *Musikalische Haus- und Lebensregeln* into Russian (for the second time, following Stasov's version), and he orchestrated two of the Symphonic Etudes and the *Ballade vom Haideknaben*, Op. 122, No. 1. Schumann had a bearing on the innovators, too. Not one of the national schools can be imagined without its relationship to the German musical tradition; what they claimed as their heritage was something that had been learnt in Germany (notably in Leipzig). Schumann himself registered the rise of young musicians all over Europe and recommended the study of folk songs. Stasov apostrophized the Mighty Handful itself as a Russian League of David. Rimsky-Korsakov recalled that the musical and

artistic taste of Balakirev's circle inclined towards Glinka, Schumann and Beethoven's late quartets, but while Liszt rated mention Wagner scarcely ever did. And so the signs of Schumann's influence are often to be found in Borodin, Cui, Musorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov. An edition of Schumann's piano music appeared in the late 1860s, edited by Balakirev and Nikolay Rubinstein; Herman Laroche referred in his review to Russia's having its own Schumann cult. Eventually Wagner reception set in, leading to an aesthetic division, but Schumann continued to play a significant role for many Russian composers for many years to come.

By the end of the century Schumann reception had gone through analogous phases in every country in Europe and on the North and even South American continents. Local differences – whether the efforts of Antonio Bazzini (born 1818), who had known Schumann in Leipzig, to acquaint Italian audiences with German instrumental music, or the number of English and American composers who studied in Germany – do not amount to any essentially new phenomena. It would undoubtedly be enlightening to up-end the history of music in the second half of the century, and look for the traces Schumann's music undoubtedly left behind in those countries (despite the dominance of opera in Italy and the unassailable position of Mendelssohn in England).

Setting aside the epigones and eclectics who are to be found everywhere and at all times, the generation born in the 1860s (with the possible exception of Sibelius) started out as the last almost directly connected with Schumann, before it progressed to *Gründerzeit* Modernism, Im- and Expressionism and 'New Classicality', and consigned Schumann to history. The evidence of early close attention is not wanting. This is the generation that witnessed Schumann's gradual transformation into a 'classic', his canonization in a *Gesamtausgabe* and the definitive end of the division between 'New German' and 'absolute' musicians. Now, if not earlier, Schumann's music in general filled the role of an ontogenetic stage in the evolution of a composer or a stylistic period distinct from everything new or merely specific. Richard Strauss's recoil from the 'Classicist' positions of his youth proved not to be definitive – any more than his New German position did. Mahler made his debut as a pianist with Schumann, played the chamber music in private, and still returned to him regularly in his maturity. He set great store by his revised orchestration of the four symphonies and the *Manfred* Overture, and from the early songs onwards his own compositions frequently reveal allusions and reminiscences of Schumann.³³ The early songs of Hugo Wolf likewise follow in Schumann's footsteps: he inherited Schumann's literary sensibilities and set the same poets, sometimes in conscious rivalry. Pfitzner's passion for Schumann emerges not only in the numerous echoes:³⁴ he was also a Schumann conductor of the first rank

(as the surviving recordings demonstrate). He did not go in for re-touching, but he did devise an orchestral accompaniment (with instrumental interludes) for some of the choral works for female voices. He reworked a number of romantic operas, both musically and dramaturgically, but decided after mature reflection that it would be impossible in the case of *Genoveva*.

The style of the titles Satie gave his works honoured Schumann's tradition; without making any direct allusions, his deployment of evocative sonorities brings Schumann to mind. In the case of Debussy, besides echoes in the early Piano Trio, we should recall the arrangements of the Studies in canonic form, Op. 56, for two pianos, and of 'Am Springbrunnen' (one of Impressionism's primal images) from Op. 85; perhaps the enthusiasm for Russia can also be seen as an indirect contact with Schumann's music. Anton Arensky's Piano Trio, Op. 32 (1894), for instance, is peppered with Schumannisms. The form of Glazunov's reception provides evidence that Schumann had become the yardstick for Classicists. There are reminiscences of Schumann up until the Fifth Symphony. Glazunov orchestrated part of *Carnaval* and considered re-orchestrating the symphonies. Isaac Albéniz often played Schumann's concerto and his own First Piano Concerto contains Schumannesque traces. The young Busoni made arrangements of Schumann's Concert-Allegro, Op. 134, for two pianos, and of 'Abendlied' from Op. 85, for clarinet quintet (perhaps at the request of his father, a clarinet player), and it is clear that Schumann's contrapuntal works made an impression on him.

The last Schumannianer from the mid nineteenth century survived into the twentieth (Bruch, Reinecke). While certain pieces had long been absorbed into the domestic repertory or drifted down to the level of light entertainment, Schumann gradually vanished from the view of creative artists. He can be taken for granted as a predecessor for Reger (born 1873) – although his point of departure was in Brahms. 'Der Himmel hat eine Träne geweint', Op. 35, No. 2, retraces the outline of a song by Schumann (though not the setting of the same poem in the Heine *Liederkreis*). Like many other conductors, he re-touched Schumann's symphonies for his own performances.

In the eyes of the Viennese School Schumann did not belong to the canon as Schubert and Brahms did, for example, because he did not offer them any contact points either in his language (like Schubert) or in his technique (like Brahms).³⁵ Alexander Zemlinsky (born 1871) made a four-hand piano reduction of *Peri* and performed the *Scenes from Faust* in Prague. Webern was involved in the rehearsals of the latter, and later in his career conducted Schumann in Mahler's re-touched versions. Schoenberg (born 1874), however, was roused to ire not by Schumann's 'poor' orchestration but by the failure to examine the conventional opinion that it was poor.³⁶

The ghost of Schumann certainly haunts some of his early songs.³⁷ As a teacher, Schoenberg claimed to have liberated Berg from his inveterate habit of thinking instrumentally and cited Schumann as an example of a composer whose work was always songlike³⁸ – perhaps an autobiographical hint. In fact, Berg is the real Schumannianer of the Viennese School: the surviving juvenilia include two fragmentary cycles of variations on themes of Schumann, and the echo-reprise of the Carinthian folk song in the Violin Concerto evokes the second ‘Wie aus der Ferne’ in the finale of the *Davidsbündlertänze*. Perhaps this is the reason why Berg liked the Schumannesque First Symphony of Borodin. In the controversy with Pfitzner, the other Schumannianer among contemporary composers, Berg took a decidedly progressive stance compared with Pfitzner’s worn-out Romanticism. His pupil Adorno orchestrated pieces from *Album für die Jugend* (*Kinderjahr* 1941, a typical exile’s work) and wrote the afterword for an Insel-Verlag edition of the Eichendorff *Liederkreis* as late as 1960. Edward Steuermann, in the year of his death (1964) started a set of variations on a Schumann theme for two pianos. According to Adorno he had an especially high regard for *Kreiseriana*. Rudolf Kolisch remarked on instrumental peculiarities of Schumann’s chamber music (playing on the bridge) and campaigned against the distortions in American editions of the violin sonatas.

Schoenberg’s contemporary Novák (born 1870) began with Schumanniana: *Variations on a Theme of Schumann* and *Ballad on Byron’s Manfred*, Op. 2, for piano. Déodat de Sévécac (born 1873) opened his nostalgic collection of ‘petites pièces romantiques’ *En vacances* (1912) with an ‘Invocation à Schumann’. Ravel orchestrated parts of *Carnaval* as well as Musorgsky’s *Pictures at an Exhibition* – itself decidedly in the line of descent from Schumann; and Ravel is yet another whose earliest compositional essays include some Schumann variations. As composer, Artur Schnabel (born 1882) belonged to the *avant-garde* but his inventive performance directions are in the Schumann mould. Always labelled a ‘late Romantic’, Othmar Schoeck (born 1886) was another pronounced Schumannianer: some of the songs contain direct allusions – and demonstrate that the musical language was no longer actually usable. By contrast, the take on Schumann of Modernists such as Bartók, Hába and Prokofiev shows a transforming power. At all events, in Bohemia and in France,³⁹ in Switzerland and in Hungary, in Russia and in Italy, the effect of Schumann was felt well into the twentieth century.

Schumann was not forgotten: his music was heard in the concert hall, the home, the conservatory. At times pieces like *Träumerei* seemed to be ubiquitous, but journalism and literature, the existence of Schumann societies (even in America), Schumann monuments and Schumann

museums also bore witness. This was all a matter of respectful preservation of a tradition, of course. Publication of posthumous works not included in the *Gesamtausgabe* served to consolidate his position in history. The ‘anti-Romantic’ mood of the 1920s caused a breach in reception. In the 1930s Schumann was suddenly hailed as a national hero and the Romantic artist was exhumed – both labels serving to cover all manner of deceit and distortion. Schumann’s love of his German homeland was presented as his essence, his critique of Meyerbeer was placed in the foreground, his closeness to Mendelssohn was partly dismissed as unimportant, partly denied. Just as Handel’s oratorios were aryanized, so too *Peri* was de-Christianized, to end not with the repentant sinner but with the youth’s blood-sacrifice in the cause of national freedom. The process of revision and reinterpretation culminated in the bombastic Berlin world première of the Violin Concerto in 1937: it marked the official severance of Schumann from Mendelssohn in that the piece was substituted for Mendelssohn’s now suppressed concerto.

Schumann today

The misuse of Schumann by the National Socialists made a certain reserve understandable after the war, at least in Germany. In certain regions reception evolved only cautiously. It took decades for academia to work off the burden left by the moral and musicological catastrophe that became associated with the name of Wolfgang Boetticher. The series of previously unpublished works continued to appear, and from time to time tentative steps were made to see Schumann in a clear, objective light.⁴⁰ Renewal of academic interest was spurred by various anniversaries (especially 1956), with emphases falling differently in the eastern and western halves of Germany, in the nature of things. There is no mistaking the upswing that began in the 1970s, which was connected with new assessments. After the relative stagnation fostered by the ‘objective’ approach of the post-war period, the way was open for a rediscovery of the composer, along with the music and aesthetics of the nineteenth century as a whole. Popular prejudices could be swept away and the late works, in particular, could at last be rated as they deserved. Since then research has expanded, in the USA as well as in Europe. Substantial special studies, source studies and editions of sources, the *Neue Gesamtausgabe* now in progress (in addition to several ‘Urtext’ projects) have stimulated interest in fragments and sketches as well. A major biography has yet to be published, the new image of Schumann has yet to be consolidated. As ever, reception is still of two kinds: the regressive, conservative and conservationist, and the progressive, ‘Schumann-our-contemporary’ tendency,

and both are found in academic and in popular writing, in performance and in composition. Performance now goes as a rule, it is almost safe to say, hand-in-hand with musicology, and complete recordings of whole segments of the oeuvre have brought back to life pieces that had become neglected, and others that had never entered the repertory. Earlier versions of canonic works have become acceptable alternatives. The period-performance movement has put the question of Schumann's orchestration on a new level.

Composers, too, have been able to approach Schumann again,⁴¹ but on completely new terms. When Hindemith (incognito) adapted the solo part of the Violin Concerto to make it 'more rewarding' for the 1937 première, it was in response to a commission from the soloist, Kulenkampff, and the performance was entirely within the bounds of early twentieth-century conceptions of making a big effect. When he conducted the Mass, among other things, after the war, it was an act of creative curiosity. If the discovery of Schumann's 'revolutionary' side ties in with the reappraisal of the avant-garde in the early twentieth century, the reassessment of the late work belongs in the context of a specific interest in the complex, the physical, the material – and perhaps also the spiritual. The approaches are as varied as the compositional ventures: the common factor is that nostalgia and reheated Romanticism scarcely play a part any more; rather, a modernity is perceived in Schumann and is emphasized: reflectiveness, multi-layeredness, intertextuality, ambivalence, fragmentation, awkwardness, extremism.

At the present time, general interest in Schumann seems somewhat overshadowed by the marketing of Clara Schumann – with consequences that remain to be seen.

Conclusion

From vague impressions to a shaping of the conception of music, from altered perception to provision of models, Schumann delivered everything that could be expected of significant music. His music changes imperceptibly and reveals different aspects according to different readings, interpretations, and forms of actualization. A historical pattern emerges from the *trouvailles*, references or usages. The stages in the history of Schumann reception run parallel to stages in the historical development of composition, music and culture, to changes in the aesthetic paradigms. The confrontation takes place everywhere: in composition, performance and acceptance by the public, editing and publication, lastly in writing about music and the successive 'new media', and the process is always affected, of course, by whether the image is formed from the music on the printed page, from performance, recordings,

musicological studies, journalism or literature, or from visual media, as well as by whether the impression is at first, second or third hand. Schumann is not one of those composers with whom confrontation seems inevitable, such as Bach, Beethoven, Wagner or Schoenberg; no work of his inflames or overwhelms of itself: the recipient must make an active contribution. But precisely because he has not been consistently included in the canon of the greatest masters but has always been an object of individual passion, he has been rediscovered with astonishment again and again – more than Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, even Wagner or Brahms, Schumann's stock, like Berlioz's, has always been subject to fluctuation. Individual segments of his total oeuvre vary more in the general estimation than is the norm, the points at which sections of the public latch on to him vary more than usual, every new movement discovers a Schumann to suit it: Beethovenian and New German, Romantic and Realist, Classicist and Progressive, Impressionist and Expressionist, Constructivist and Post-serialist.

As it affects composers, reception, as a rule, is not confined to explicit statements, verifiable personal contacts, study, experience of performance, unambiguous reminiscences (comparable motivic material, harmonic progressions, compositional idiosyncrasies, formal situations or structures); an influence may be more general or it may be entirely concrete, rather than direct borrowing it can take the form of an overall alteration in a composer's attitude. Context, the stage of stylistic evolution, can play a determinant role in the various kinds of reception but so can historical distance (permitting or preventing direct incorporation in the recipient composer's own musical language), and purely conceptual confrontation centres on the positions held by the protagonists on questions of aesthetics or music history – in Schumann's case the key terms might be diatonicism, integration, construction of variants, poeticization. Reception was at first made easier and more enticing for other composers by the fact that Schumann over time developed a 'style' that invited imitation. If a composer makes history by the dissemination of personal stylistic characteristics then Schumann was an important figure in the history of music. Additionally, other composers have taken themes by Schumann as the basis for sets of variations (some have already been named), or arranged and transcribed works by him (a form of close study in itself); an innumerable throng of direct *hommages* (reflected in titles and subtitles such as 'alla Schumann', 'Andenken an Schumann', 'Schumanniana' etc.) continued to be composed until well after the turn of the century, and references taking many forms picked up again in the second half of the twentieth century. A catalogue with any pretensions to completeness would be extremely long.

Schumann's not directly generic titles sparked further stylistic development, mostly on account of their 'poetic' quality. The forms were either

directly adopted (intermezzo, humoresque, fantasy, novelette, sketch) or adapted in some way. Schumann's example doubtless led to titles of the type 'Overture, Scherzo and Finale' or 'Something Scenes' becoming fashionable, even in the case of specific titles such as *Papillon* (Fauré) and *Davidsbündlertänze* (Kirchner), or combinations such as John Ireland's *Leaves from a Child's Sketchbook*. Schumann served as a model for other composers in virtually every genre he wrote in (with the exception of opera), and not just in those he invented. This influence lasted longer in some genres than in others. It is strongest in the Lied (Arthur Seidl proclaimed Schumann the forefather of the Lied in the modern age),⁴² in the lyrical piano piece and in cycles of small forms of that type (including *Liederspiele*, *Rose*), but the Piano Quintet, music for young players, smaller choral works with orchestral accompaniment (especially the ballads) all left their mark. Even Schumann's Latin church music seems to have been studied. And other composers realized some of Schumann's projects: a German requiem (Brahms), an oratorio about Luther (Meinardus, *Luther in Worms*), a textless opera (Hiller, *Operette ohne Text*), and his idea of a series of overtures to, or about, the great dramas of world literature – was taken up by many a composer.

Many of Schumann's achievements were recognized to have a wider significance, and contributed decisively to the aspirations of his time; along with specific details of his musical language other composers adopted principles and tendencies that he had discovered or invigorated: a song-like quality informing structural building blocks, the lyric piece transferred to chamber music, the solo concerto redefined, the folk-like recognized as a poetic characteristic, music designed to appeal to children (not just easier pieces for use as teaching material), the secular oratorio and the secularization of church music. All this can be regarded as already entailed in the idea of 'poeticization', which emerges even more distinctly with respect to literature, in the greater integration in the relationship between words and music (taking the texts more seriously and seeking a specific music for the specific atmosphere of a Byron, an Eichendorff, a Heine and so on) and in meeting the challenge of 'big' subjects. Then there are certain 'tones' in Schumann's music that were not entirely new but came to exert a special influence: nature and its moods, melancholy, nostalgia, exoticism. Poetry also informs the 'scenes', 'pictures', 'tales', as they are actually called. Poetry is the key word in the overall conception of music – but the new status of music as an equal partner, rather than an attractive aid to identification, also had consequences; ambiguity was poetic; the play with quotations, ciphers, inner voices, subtexts was poetic; and so was the 'music for the eye' in the appearance of the music on the page, and the 'paratexts' of published editions.

Poeticization, finally, has formal consequences: through-composition in opera and oratorio, fusion and hybridization between genres, the amalgamation of *adagio* and *scherzo* characteristics in the intermezzo⁴³ (a movement included in cyclic structures by countless composers since Schumann's day); the one-movement symphony (Hermann Hirschbach thought of writing one⁴⁴ but Schumann influenced Arensky, Mahler,⁴⁵ Mangold, Nicodé, Schoenberg, Strauss; and Liszt's piano concertos and some of his symphonic poems can be mentioned here as well).⁴⁶ The French symphony, or *sonate cyclique*, owes its existence to Schumann's new conception of the symphony with cyclic organization of the movements. Motivic combination, innovations in thematic disposition: changing the focus of attention in the development section, introduction of new ideas after the exposition, 'synthetic coda themes',⁴⁷ two different trios in the scherzo. In harmony: rejection of academic rules (taking lessons in counterpoint from Jean Paul Richter); liberalization and broadening of range in tonal organization; expansion of dissonance in the diatonic context (chromaticism as a means of adding spice to diatonicism); greater prominence for ninth and eleventh chords; stabilization of passing notes as chord notes. Typical consequences: secondary dominants (e.g. the II then III degrees) above dominant pedal points, emancipation of the progression V–IV, discovery of the subdominant.

Other composers' reception of Schumann is shown in other ways besides their own music. Large numbers of them⁴⁸ have also expressed their responses to him in literary forms, from miscellanies and reviews to poems, single chapters in symposia, and entire monographs. In Schumann's own work, writing was one facet of his overall programme of poeticization. There are examples of direct imitation of his style of journalism, but there is also the line, leading first from Hoffmann's *Serapionsbrüder* to Schumann's *Davidsbündler*, and from there onwards to Liszt's *Baccalaureus der Tonkunst*, Debussy's *Monsieur Croche* and Satie's many masks.⁴⁹

Even composers who did not belong to any particular party found reasons to criticize Schumann. For example, his approach to certain subjects was repeatedly found to fall short in significance, encouraging the critic to produce a more powerful treatment of his own in order to show how Schumann should have done it. This happened with *Faust*, *Manfred*,⁵⁰ *Des Sängers Fluch*, *Julius Caesar*, and settings of Eichendorff, Goethe, Heine and others. The criticism, too, took not only musical form but also verbal (usually among the followers of Wagner: Bruckner, Draeseke), even literary. The arguments were not always very carefully chosen. When Bülow spoke of 'Schumann's intervallic howling', at least he referred to an actual trait of the music, pinpointing a specific harmonic loading of large intervals in late Schumann.⁵¹ But composers, too, have sometimes merely repeated received

ideas without testing them, as when Boulez dismisses the fughettas as merely imitative – which is the last thing they can be called.

The reception of Schumann by other writers on music was always simultaneously the reception of his own writing and his aesthetics. From the first, he was much read, cited and also much imitated by the critics. To this day, Schumann's judgements serve as a reference point at every level of writing about music. He made music itself a subject for reflection but never reduced it to the merely aesthetic or technical: when professional critics are influenced by literature it is revealed in the significance given to the form of a review and in the materialization of the literary aspect in concrete technical conditions. As time passed, changes in attitudes were reflected in the journalism. The chapter on Schumann in the history of criticism is a sorry tale: composers acquit themselves scarcely any better than journalists (save for usually having something they want to say). While Schumann was still alive, he was already being accused of hair-splitting and brooding. The unworldly, impractical aspects of his character seemed to match the eccentricity, fantasy and ineffectuality of some of his later compositions – both these having a tragicomic or perhaps lovable side to them. At the same time, however, the arguments were still concerned with tangibilities. The news of Schumann's mental illness seemed to allow a period of grace to ensue. After his death all inhibitions vanished: now everyone 'knew' that the later works betrayed the signs of a clouded mind, the loss of faculties. The early, inspired, audacious (and so on) Schumann was played off against the exhausted, dried-out, later composer – the dividing line being set arbitrarily. Writers varied between over-meticulous assessment, sceptical prejudice and simple wholesale dismissal. Besides the late-work syndrome, writers fell back regularly on references to the insanity, some embarrassed or dismissive, some impressed or even fascinated. Before long, Schumann was the 'schoolboy of musical history', to be patronized and treated more roughly than possibly any other composer. An endless series of condescending verdicts offers more material for students of the psychology of reviewing than for musical analysis. An anthology could be compiled of the daftest and diametrically contradictory opinions on Schumann, uttered about every single work but also about his character. Generalizations such as: the children's composer, the singer of lovesongs, the intrinsically lyrical temperament and so on, are supported by spontaneous reactions or mere hearsay rather than by any reasoned argument based on thorough investigation. The unexamined acceptance and re-use of such clichés still permeates comments on Schumann, from academic writing via journalism, the broadcast media and teaching, to fiction.⁵²

Among musicologists, the gathering of biographical information (the editions of Wasielewski's life, Jansen's and Erler's editions of the letters) and

the study of sources (from 'DAS' to the *Gesamtausgabe*, variant readings of material in the *Gesammelte Schriften*) have always served to reinforce a general picture. Research has reflected contemporary concerns: positivism and the 'great man' school of biography, sociology and psychology, structuralism and cultural studies have all made their appearances in turn in musicology as elsewhere. The decisions taken in the old *Gesamtausgabe*, for instance (which pieces to include, and in which versions), rested on aesthetic dogmas that had developed gradually and were not to be overthrown by editorial principles. But composers, interpreters, teachers and musicologists have worked on editions of Schumann's music for more than 150 years, comparing variant readings, implementing different criteria, inserting supplementary material, taking textual decisions, and thereby they have underpinned the aesthetic preferences and idiosyncrasies of their own day.

The living presence of Schumann's music in performances has followed analogous conceptions over the years, and here too constant change can be observed. The number of interpreters involved in this process grew as the music became more widely known, including numerous composers – Britten, Holliger and Maderna in the second half of the twentieth century, for example, to say nothing of the pianists among them. It seems likely that the two activities – performing and composing – had an effect on each other, as is the case generally with performance and composition in any given period. The state of performance history is already illustrated by the fluctuations in the repertory themselves, the variations in opinions as to the quality of individual pieces: Op. 52, for example, once a favourite with audiences, later almost disappeared from the concert hall; or Op. 133, hitherto neglected, but now discovering admirers. Today, however, as a general rule, even stock that has gathered dust for years has found its way on to recordings if nowhere else, and recordings also enable an airing to be given to such relatively impractical works as the original version of the Andante and Variations for two pianos, Op. 46, with the accompaniment of two cellos and horn. Certain pieces or genres seem to have been of paradigmatic importance in the development of Schumann interpretation: at first the Piano Quintet and Piano Concerto and certain songs; the piano music contributed to a 'poetic' style of playing the piano, just as the song collections assisted in the development of a dramaturgy for song recitals. In the latter part of the nineteenth century it was the symphonies and oratorios, and the fate of the Violin Concerto in the second half of the twentieth may be said to reflect the alterations both in views of the late work and in performance practice as it affects Schumann's music.

The effect made by a piece by Schumann has always depended on the version being performed. Both in the composer's lifetime and since, the process of revision (re-touching, new arrangements, re-orchestration) has

never ceased. Like the performance statistics, these versions also show that the separate sectors of the oeuvre have not been equally popular at all times. The most popular piece by Schumann in the nineteenth century was probably *Abendlied*, which circulated in countless arrangements – Joachim’s may have done most to make it popular but Busoni, Raff, Saint-Saëns, Svendsen and Wilhelmj all played their part. *Träumerei* replaced *Abendlied* in the twentieth century as the *pièce de résistance*, in every conceivable scoring.⁵³ Arrangements are a means of becoming better acquainted with Schumann’s music not only for the arrangers but also for music-lovers and ‘users’ of all kinds. They make manifest the changing of pieces to meet the altered needs of one age after another. In its successive new guises, *Träumerei* has determined the image of Schumann and the conception of music for generations – and, vice versa, its new clothes have been tailored according to those changing conceptions. It seems characteristic that *Träumerei* today does not enjoy the prominence it did a hundred years ago (unless resistance to the more flowing motion appropriate to the piece points to some deep psychological fixations).

With regard to the re-touching of original orchestrations, it is hard to separate admiration for Schumann from criticism as the motive. Anton Rubinstein and Elgar both considered doing it; Mahler, Reger, Szell, Weingartner and others all did it. The Third Symphony was rescored by both Glazunov⁵⁴ and Frederick Stock.⁵⁵ Acting in good faith, interpreters have allowed themselves interventions that they did not always own up to, in the interests of richer colouring or emphasizing what each regarded as the essential – or they have decided independently to perform ‘original’ versions (Pfitzner, Bernstein). The principles justifying the versions have corresponded to the maxims governing the other aspects of the interpretation. Frequently the size of the hall has been a consideration, but all too often it has been a matter of simple falsification, as in the case of attempts to treat Schumann *à la* Beethoven (Furtwängler’s well-known recording of the Fourth Symphony), Weber, Spohr (giving the last movement of the Violin Concerto *alla polacca* rather than as a slow *polonaise*), or Wagner (tempo modifications and rubato). Today the guidelines of historical performance practice (which also entails restoring the original sound) have extended their reach as far as Schumann. The growing ambition to complete works left unfinished by their composers, on the other hand, is creating a climate in which the ideal of authenticity has been so far dispelled that currently gradual distinctions are emerging between original and new versions (sometimes, as in the case of Mahler’s re-orchestrations, the ‘new’ version is regarded as historical in its own right).

The general public’s image of Schumann is a mixture of first impressions and simple habit, their own attempts to play his music and experiences in

the concert hall, good and bad performances, admired performers and their identification with the music, aesthetic commonplaces, fashion, marketing, early teaching and adult classes, programme notes, biographies, portraits, films and television programmes. This does not apply exclusively to Schumann, however – any more than it is possible to judge the extent of the public's contribution to reception history.

In view of all this, Schumann was one of the most influential composers in the history of Western music. It is to Schumann (his works or only a particular image of him) that we refer but if we try to pin down his influence he breaks into thousands of facets, sinks into the sand, and the reception of Schumann in particular becomes impossible to separate from that of Western classical music in general. Of course the works can be brought out for inspection once again; it all depends on who does it whether they sound as fresh as on the very first occasion, as they always do, or as they never have before; whether they have nothing new to say or reveal completely unexpected aspects, demonstrate their indisputable historical importance or rest on their reputation as cultural heritage. The 'children's composer' makes the first impression many receive; he really does lay the foundations for their musical education, now as in the past. He is moreover one of those composers from whom all of us, whatever our age, can learn what music is.

Notes

This essay is indebted to numerous earlier studies; here I will mention only the chapter on reception in Arnfried Edler's book on Schumann and the reports from the Arbeitstagungen in Zwickau.

1. See Bonnie Lomnäs *et al.*, *Auf der Suche nach der poetischen Zeit. Der Prager Davidsbund* (Saarbrücken, 1999).
2. Robert Schumann, *Gesammelte Schriften über Musik und Musiker* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1854; reprint ed. Witt epilogue, Gerd Nauhaus, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1985); 'Einleitendes'.
3. In Saphir's *Humorist*, 171, 20 October 1838.
4. Pp. 345ff.
5. Kirchner involved himself in first performances of Schumann in Switzerland from his arrival there in 1844. The Piano Quintet was an instant success and other major works followed in quick succession. Schumann was to be a dominant figure in Swiss concert halls during the second half of the century.
6. The earliest impressions of Schumann in Italy are reflected in the *Dodici studi*, Op. 15 (1843) of Stefano Golinelli (1818–91), dedicated to Hiller.
7. Alois M. Nagler, *Hebbel und die Musik* (Cologne, 1928).
8. Letter to Strackerjan, 17 January 1854 *Robert Schumanns Briefe. Neue Folge*, ed. Gustav Jansen (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1904), pp. 390–1.
9. Sonata, Op. 5, 'in memory of his immortal teacher'.
10. String Quartet, Op. 12 – before Schumann's dedication to him of his Op. 52.
11. Heinrich von Sahr's Piano Trio in C minor, Op. 7, which Schumann heard in 1852, might also be listed, but it was not published until 1860.
12. Reinhold Sietz, *Theodor Kirchner. Ein Klaviermeister der deutschen Romantik*, Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts, 21 (Regensburg, 1971), pp. 100f.

13. For example, Sechter's *Fuga* or a *Konzert-Adagio* by Wilhelm Immanuel Schüler.
14. Including the dedication by the publisher, Haslinger, of the first edition of Schubert's last sonatas.
15. See Kapp, 'Schumann nach der Revolution. Vorüberlegungen, Statements, Hinweise, Materialien, Fragen', in Bernhard B. Appel, ed., *Schumann-Forschungen 3: Schumann in Düsseldorf. Werke – Texte – Interpretationen* (Mainz, London: Schott, 1993), pp. 315ff.
16. Helmut Kirchmeyer, 'Robert Schumanns Düsseldorfer Brahms-Aufsatz *Neue Bahnen* und die Ausbreitung der Wagnerschen Opern bis 1856. Psychogramm eines "letzten" Artikels' (= *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 73/6) (Berlin, 1993), on a first version of this article see [note 14], pp. 329f., 338ff.
17. He declared, at the Schumann Festival in Zwickau in 1860, without being contradicted, that 'of all those present I loved Schumann the most faithfully and am also closest to him in spirit'; quoted here from Sietz, *Theodor Kirchner*, p. 137.
18. The young Anton Rubinstein has already been mentioned.
19. The well known letter to Tytus Woyciechowski (12 December 1831) about a review of his Op. 2 does not concern the article by Schumann but a much longer one by Friedrich Wieck.
20. Hiller embraced Schumann not only as a friend but also as a composer; he created professional opportunities for him and also conducted the première of the Piano Concerto and the first complete performance of the *Scenes from Faust*.
21. See Werner Breig, 'Wagner und Chopin', in Wulf Konold, ed., *Deutsch-polnische Musikbeziehungen* (Munich, Salzburg, 1987), pp. 54ff.
22. See, for example, Richard Stern *Erinnerungsblätter an Julius Stern* (Leipzig, 1886), pp. 158ff., 181ff.
23. Franz Brendel, 'Alfred von Wolzogen, Musikalische Leiden der Gegenwart', *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*, 1857.
24. 'im Vollglanze seiner Beliebtheit'. Reinhold Seitz, *Aus Ferdinand Hillers Briefwechsel* (Beiträge für rheinische Musikgeschichte, 28), p. 143.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 176.
26. His *Königsmarsch* for Munich (1880), despite some Lisztian flourishes, is a late testimony to his Schumannesque foundations.
27. He may have heard him as a boy in Cologne, conducting a symphony in 1852.
28. The Witch in *Königskinder* has a passage towards the end of Act 1 reminiscent of the witch Margaretha's 'Du läßt die arme Frau allein' in the first finale of Schumann's *Genoveva*.
29. 'Gerechtigkeit unmöglich, widerwärtiger Stockmusikant'; see H. J. Irmen, ed., *E. Humperdincks Briefe* (Köln: Volk, 1975–), 2, 118.
30. Including the first 'critical edition', by DAS (Dr Adolf Schubring).
31. This applies generally to Classicism in entertainment music, operetta etc.
32. Adolphe Jullien wrote, in *Richard Wagner. Sa vie et ses œuvres*: 'Schumann, que tout le monde musical reconnaît actuellement comme le plus grand musicien symphoniste après Beethoven' (Paris, 1886), p. 304.
33. Reinhard Kapp, 'Schumann-Reminiszenzen bei Mahler', in *Musik-Konzepte Sonderband Gustav Mahler*, pp. 325ff.
34. The opening of the opera *Die Rose vom Liebesgarten* is reminiscent of the opening of *Der Rose Pilgerfahrt*.
35. Nevertheless, the pianist and writer on music Rudolf Réti, who was very close to the Viennese School at times, published a series of satirical sketches in *Musikblätter des Anbruch* in its first year (1919) under the title 'Neue Davidsbündler'.
36. 'New music, outmoded music, style and idea', in *Style and Idea. Selected Writings*, ed. Leonard Stein (London, Boston, 1984), pp. 113ff.
37. Postlude of Op. 1/2, modelled on the postlude of *Dichterliebe*; 'Erwartung' from Op. 2, an echo of *Vogel als Prophet*.
38. In a letter to Emil Hertzka, 5 January 1919.
39. In France, Schumann remained one of the models for young musicians to follow: see Olivier Messiaen, *Vingt leçons d'harmonie* (Paris, 1939).
40. Karl Heinrich Wörner, *Robert Schumann* (Zurich, 1949).
41. See Kapp, 'Schumanns Aktualität', *Correspondenz. Mitteilungen der Robert-Schumann-Gesellschaft e.V. Düsseldorf*, 12 (1991); Wolf Frobenius, 'Schumann in der Musik nach 1950', in Frobenius, ed., *Robert Schumann: philologische, analytische, sozial- und*

- rezeptionsgeschichtliche Aspekte*, Saarbrücker Studien zur Musikwissenschaft, n.F. 8 (Saarbrücken, 1998); and Jörn-Peter Hiekel's contribution to the present volume.
42. *Moderner Geist in der deutschen Tonkunst*, Deutsche Musikbücherei, 5 (Regensburg, 1912), pp. 159f.
43. Christian Gottlieb Müller may have contributed to the idea; see *Briefe und Gedichte aus dem Album Robert und Clara Schumanns*, ed. Wolfgang Boetticher (Leipzig, 1979), p. 141.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 87 (1838).
45. Part II of the Eighth Symphony.
46. Liszt orchestrated Schubert's *Wanderer Fantasy*, one of the models for Schumann's D minor Symphony, but there was a special reason for Liszt's dedication of his B minor Sonata to Schumann (apart from responding to Schumann's dedication of the Fantasy, Op. 17, to himself): Liszt had taken part in the concert at which the first version of Schumann's D minor Symphony was performed for the first time.
47. In Michael Struck's phrase.
48. Ambros, Berg, Boucourechliev, Cornelius, Cui, Dukas, Ehlert, Flothuis, Gál, Grieg, Haas, Hiller, Holliger, von Holstein, Jemnitz, Kienzl, Killmayer, Knab, Koechlin, Leibowitz, Liszt, Moscheles, Pfitzner, Pousseur, Reinecke, Réti, Rihm, Rubinstein, Ruzicka, Schoenberg, Tchaikovsky, Weingartner.
49. It would be interesting to compare Berlioz's criticism with Schumann's and describe the interaction between them.
50. Only with Tchaikovsky's *Manfred* Symphony was confrontation with Schumann not the primary motive.
51. Whereas Wagner's disciple Joseph Rubinstein found fault with Schumann's notorious two-bar phrasing – a characteristic he shared with Wagner, among others.
52. A very recent example is Eva Weissweiler's 'biography' of Clara Schumann, in which speculation is unimpeded by any factual knowledge.
53. K. Csipák and R. Kapp, 'Träumerei', *Musica*, 35 (1981), 438ff.
54. His version is lost.
55. See Walter Damrosch, *My Musical Life* (New York, 1937), p. 361.