Introduction

‘Der Fliegende Holländer’ is in many ways the most astonishing of Wagner’s early operas.’ Thus opens Donald Francis Tovey’s analysis of the work’s overture in the fourth volume of his Essays in Musical Analysis. ‘At its first performances’, he goes on, ‘[it was] a work nobody could even pretend to understand.’ Tovey’s bold claims may be overstated, for Wagner’s fourth opera has a firm grounding in nineteenth-century operatic traditions, as many have pointed out. In at least one respect, however, Tovey’s comment rings absolutely true: the overture to Der fliegende Holländer remains one of the most innovative and challenging musical forms in the orchestral repertoire of the 1840s.

The present essay offers an analysis of the form of the overture. To this end, I will use analytical tools inspired by the ‘new Formenlehre’ of the last two decades in conjunction with loosely conceived notions of narrative and intertextuality. Although both of the new Formenlehre’s competing theoretical systems – William Caplin’s theory of formal functions and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s theory of sonata form – are primarily designed for the analysis of music from earlier decades, their application to a mid-nineteenth-century work needs no apology. As far as Hepokoski and Darcy’s work is concerned, the possibility of its application beyond the late eighteenth century – the main focus of the Elements of Sonata Theory – and, for that matter, its ability to interact with narrativity and intertextuality are built into the theory itself. Yet even though Caplin in Classical Form strictly limits his scope to Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, there is no reason why his theoretical concepts cannot be carried over into the later nineteenth century as well. Therefore, throughout this essay I will combine Caplin’s form-functional terminology with Hepokoski and Darcy’s dialogical approach to sonata form, complementing the eighteenth-century norms these theories imply with an awareness of the more specific conventions of mid-nineteenth-century sonata form.

One aspect of this article that does perhaps require legitimation is that I analyse the overture’s form not in isolation, but as part of a constellation that also includes Wagner’s published programme for the overture as well as the stage action and a few key musical events in the opera. My decision to cast the analytical net more widely is inspired by the nature of the genre of the operatic overture in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. As orchestral works,
operatic overtures from this era are very much part of the symphonic tradition, sharing many of its generic conventions and formal strategies. This is all the more so since, after 1825, the younger but related genre of the concert overture rapidly gained prominence, especially in the hands of Mendelssohn and Berlioz. Perhaps because of its frequently programmatic nature, the concert overture became a locus of formal innovation to an extent unseen in the more traditional symphony. In 1835 Schumann famously referred to Mendelssohn’s overtures as presenting ‘the idea of the symphony in microcosm’, thus suggesting the genre’s potential to become an alternative to the symphony after Beethoven. This increased prestige of the concert overture is reflected in operatic overtures from the same decades, especially because, in nineteenth-century concert practice, the boundaries between the two types of overture were fluid.

At the same time, an opera overture obviously is intended to be interpreted not in isolation, but in relation to the larger work of which it is a part and whose title it shares. Although any number of valuable observations may be made in studying an overture on its own terms, not to consider the opera while analysing its overture unavoidably means leaving the picture incomplete. To the extent that an operatic overture adopts the programmaticism typical of the concert overture, the opera that follows it provides its (partial) interpretation.

What is needed, therefore, is a double ‘symphonic-operatic’ perspective. Few mid-nineteenth-century operatic overtures are more appropriate topics for a study that adopts this stance than Wagner’s overture to Der fliegende Holländer of 1841. In Thomas Grey’s words, it is ‘a kind of instrumental encapsulation of the drama’ that follows; and, as any opera-goer will confirm, thematic and motivic connections between the opera and its overture abound. So manifold are the links between the two that it is tempting to project the dramatic action of the opera onto the symphonic narrative of the overture and conclude that both tell the same story, first in brief, then in detail.

The seemingly clear-cut relationship between the overture and the opera is, however, complicated by the programme that Wagner published on the occasion of a concert performance of the overture in Zurich in 1853. While the narrative of this programme easily maps onto the form of the overture, it differs from the stage action in the opera in crucial respects. This suggests that the relationship between the overture and the opera is not that of summary and complete version; rather, the overture operates as a background against which events in the opera are thrown into relief. The overture and the opera tell two different versions of the same story, and Wagner can tell the story of the opera the way he does only because he had first told it in a different way in the overture.

As we shall see, the difference between the narratives of the overture and the opera centres on the contrasting images of the feminine they project: passive in the overture, active in the opera. The topic of the feminine in Der fliegende Holländer is perhaps an all too familiar one, having been discussed by Hepokoski in relation to the overture and by Carolyn Abbate for the opera. If I revisit both authors’ work, it is not because I intend to reopen yesterday’s musicological
debates, but rather because it harbours unused analytical potential. I will take the contrasting images of the feminine – and their concomitant narratives – as a starting point for a detailed discussion of Wagner’s use of musical form. In the overture, manipulation of form is what articulates the narrative in the first place, while the changes to the narrative in the opera, although conveyed primarily by other means, are underscored by the reworking of aspects of that same musical form at crucial moments in the drama. Both the overture’s form and the opera’s dramatic design, moreover, gain in significance through an intertextual dialogue that Wagner sets up between his opera and its model in Weber’s Der Freischütz (1821).

In what follows I will proceed in three steps. I begin with a descriptive overview of the overture and its programme, and of the ways in which they relate to each other as well as to the opera; this will serve as a background to the analysis that follows. Next, I focus on the form of the overture and its narrative implications. Finally, I show how aspects of that form are relevant for the understanding of two crucial moments in the opera: Senta’s ballad in Act II and the end of Act III. Throughout, I will move back and forth between analysis and interpretation, and the path connecting the two will rarely be unidirectional; the interpretation provides a context for the analysis at least as much as it is a result of that analysis.

Overture, Programme and Opera

In January 1841 Wagner published an essay titled ‘De l’ouverture’ in Maurice Schlesinger’s Revue et gazette musicale de Paris. In it he explains what, in his view, a successful operatic overture should accomplish. ‘The main challenge in ... the overture,’ he writes, ‘is to render the drama’s characteristic idea through independent musical principles.’ He adds: ‘The composer will do well for the intelligibility of the dramatic intention if he works into his overture characteristic motives, figures or rhythms borrowed from the opera.’ The overture to Der fliegende Holländer may well have been intended as a realisation of the guidelines put forward in the essay, for connections between that overture and the three acts of the opera are unusually close. The column on the left in Table 1 shows the main sections of the overture. For now, I list these in a neutral way and without any form-functional interpretation: one could say that the form that emerges from this overview is a succession of contrasting illustrative tableaux. The column on the right lists the correspondences between the overture and the opera. Nearly all the themes and motives from the former recur in the latter, where they are associated with specific characters, situations and events. Entire passages have been transplanted, literally or almost so, from the overture to the opera – or, according to Wagner’s own account of the opera’s genesis, the other way around. The most significant parallel between the overture and the opera is that they have identical endings. In the version of Der fliegende Holländer most often performed today, the overture’s closing 22
Table 1 Correspondences between the overture and opera in *Der fliegende Holländer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in overture</th>
<th>Corresponding passages in opera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| bars 1–64 (Allegro con brio) | - combination of arrival of the Dutchman’s ship (Act I, No. 1, bars 259–276) and opening of the Dutchmen’s chorus (Act III, No. 7, bars 478–496)  
- same material also recurs in Senta’s ballad (Act II, No. 4, bars 311ff.)  
- ‘Holländer’ motive (bars 3–5) recurs throughout the opera  
- ‘storm’ chords (bars 13–15) return repeatedly in the opening scene of Act I (e.g. bars 13–15) |
| bars 65–78 (Andante) | - Senta’s hummed tune (Act II, No. 4, bars 159–162) and Senta’s ballad (Act II, No. 4, bars 349–363, etc.);  
- also sporadically (and fragmentarily) later in Act II (as the ‘Erinnerungsmotiv’ for redemption) |
| bars 79–96 (Animando un poco) | - before the Dutchman’s monologue (Act I, No. 1, bars 289–306) |
| bars 97–120 (Tempo I) | - Dutchman’s aria: ‘Wie oft in Meeres tiefsten Schlund’ (Act I, No. 2, bars 40–63) |
| bars 121–147 (Accel.) | - symphonic development of previously introduced material, only indirectly connected to the opera |
| bars 149–166 [rehearsal letter D] | - Dutchman’s aria: ‘Wie oft in Meeres tiefsten Schlund’ (bis) until ‘nirgends ein [Grab]’ (Act I, No. 2, bars 81–99) |
| bars 167–174 | - symphonic development of previously introduced material, only indirectly connected to the opera |
| bars 175–202 [rehearsal letter E] | - Act I, opening scene (Daland’s crew) (bar 27, etc.) |
| bars 217–327 | - symphonic development of previously introduced material, only indirectly connected to the opera |
| bars 328–346 [rehearsal letter L] | - Senta’s ballad (Act II, No. 4, bars 445ff.)  
- end of opera (Act III, No. 8, bars 393–411) |
| bars 347–376 | - expansion of previous section; only indirectly connected to the opera |
| bars 377–398 | - end of opera (Act III, No. 8, bars 411–437) |

bars return verbatim at the end of the opera. This is not a coincidence, but a deliberate strategy on Wagner’s part. Between 1843, when the opera was first performed in Dresden, and 1860, when Wagner modified the score for the last time, the composer repeatedly altered the end of the overture. Without exception, he carefully copied those changes into the score of the opera. Motivic and thematic connections between the overture and opera are, of course, central to my argument: they are what allows us to speak in the first place of narrative parallels between the two.
The column on the left in Table 2 summarises Wagner’s 1853 programme for the overture.13 This programme constitutes a typical *per aspera ad astra* narrative that leads from a hopeless and grim situation at the beginning to the long-aspired-to salvation at the end. Structurally, its initial framing narrative – the Dutchman approaches the coast, hears the promise of redemption and comes ashore – is interrupted by a framed narrative that is marked by a shift to the past tense (indicated by the outlined box in Table 2). When the narrative switches back to the present tense and thus seemingly back into the framing narrative, the effect is a non sequitur in relation to the point at which the framing narrative was left. The Dutchman is now no longer ashore, but back on the open sea, where he first terrifies the crew of another ship and then sets sail for a light that ‘breaks through the night’. This light turns out to emanate from the woman who will eventually redeem him.

Correspondences between the 1853 programme and the dramatic action of the opera are surprisingly limited. The initial paragraphs of the programme clearly parallel the opera’s opening scene: in the opera, too, there is a storm, the Dutchman’s ship lands and the Dutchman comes ashore. The framed narrative in the programme also corresponds directly to the opera. Its text is reminiscent of the Dutchman’s monologue in Act I (especially the opening words ‘Wie oft’), as is the music that corresponds to it in the overture. When the programme moves out of the framed narrative, however, the parallelism to the opera’s stage action disappears. Not only does Wagner’s text leave unmentioned the Dutchman’s encounter with Daland and his daughter Senta, the appearance of her lover Erik and any of the other key moments in the opera, it also relates events that do not occur in the opera. Only at the end of the programme is a direct correspondence to the opera re-established.

By contrast, it is not hard to map the successive stages of the programme onto the course of the overture, as is shown in the column on the right of Table 2. The storm music (initially strong, then abating) at the beginning; the much quieter lyrical, almost angelic tune at bar 65; and the pensive music at bar 79 clearly correspond to the programme’s opening stages.14 The folk-like tune in bars 203–216 can be understood as standing for the ‘merry carefree singing’ of the other ship’s crew, while its distortion and combination with earlier material represents their flight from the terrifying Dutchman. The ‘light’ for which the Dutchman sets sail is represented by the fourfold fragmentary return of the lyrical melody from bar 65, the Dutchman’s collapse by the diminished-seventh chord at bar 320 and his subsequent rise by the jubilant apotheosis of that same theme.15 Intervening passages in the overture that are less evocative can easily be aligned with stages in the programme, either because of their position between passages which are immediately identifiable or, ultimately, because the same music later reappears in the opera (although that last interpretative strategy was obviously not an option for the audience attending the 1853 concert performances of the overture, for whom the programme was originally intended).
Table 2 Outline of Wagner’s programme from 1853 mapped onto the overture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Das furchtbare Schiff des ‘fliegenden Holländers’ braust im Sturme daher; Es naht der Küste und legt am Lande an, wo seinem Herren dereinst Heil und Erlösung zu finden verheißen ist;</td>
<td>The terrible ship of the ‘Flying Dutchman’ is tossed about by the storms; it approaches the coast where it lands, and where its captain has been promised he might one day find happiness and salvation;</td>
<td>bar 1</td>
<td>(Allegro con brio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wir vernehmen die mitleidsvollen Klänge dieser Heilsverkündigung, ... däuber und hoffnunglos lauscht ihnen der Verdammt;</td>
<td>We perceive the sympathetic strains of this promise of redemption ... the accursed ones listen, sombre and despondent;</td>
<td>bar 65</td>
<td>(Andante)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müde und todessehnüchtig beschreitet er den Strand, während die Mannschaft, matt und lebensübermächtig, in stummer Arbeit das Schiff zur Ruh’ bringt.</td>
<td>Tired and longing only for death he steps ashore, while his crew silently battens down the ship, likewise exhausted and weary of living.</td>
<td>bar 79</td>
<td>(Animando poco a poco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft erlebte der Unglückliche schon ganz das gleiche! ... wie oft mußte er furchtbar enttäuscht sich wieder aufmachen zur wahnsinnig irren Meerfahrt! ... A spry and hearty ship sails by; the Dutchman harks to the merry carefree singing of its crew ... he causes his ship to storm furiously past theirs, terrifying and intimidating that happy crew into silence and light ...</td>
<td>How many times has not the unfortunate one gone through with this routine! ... How many times, bitterly disappointed, has he not had to set sail once again on his endless, senseless sea-voyage! ...</td>
<td>bar 97</td>
<td>(Tempo I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüstig und gemächlich streicht ein Schiff an ihm vorbei; er vernimmt den lustig traulichen Gesang der Mannschaft ... während jagt er im Sturm vorbei, schreckt und scheucht die Frohen, daß sie in Angst verstummen und fliehen ...</td>
<td>A spry and hearty ship sails by; the Dutchman harks to the merry carefree singing of its crew ... he causes his ship to storm furiously past theirs, terrifying and intimidating that happy crew into silence and light ...</td>
<td>... bar 203</td>
<td>[rehearsal letter F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da bricht ein Licht in die Nacht; ... Es verlischt, und wieder strahlt es auf; der Seemann faßt den Leuchtstern fest ins Auge und steuert rüstig durch Flut und Woge auf ihn zu. Was ihn so mächtig zieht, es ist der Blick eines Weibes, der voll erhobener Wehmut und göttlichen Mitgefühls zu ihm dringt ...</td>
<td>Then a light breaks through the night; ... For a moment it is extinguished, then flares up again; the seafarer fastens his gaze on this beacon and steers for it with vigorous determination through wave and current. What draws him on so powerfully is the glance of a woman, radiating a sublime pity and divine sympathy ...</td>
<td>bar 285</td>
<td>(un poco ritenuto) [rehearsal letter J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vor dieser göttlichen Erscheinung bricht der Unselige zusammen, wie sein Schiff in Trümmer zerschellt; The wretched man collapses before this divine apparition, just as his ship shatters into pieces;</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>bar 313</td>
<td>(a tempo) [rehearsal letter K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doch den Fluten entsteigt er, heilig und hehr, von der siegprangenden Erlöserin an rettender Hand der Morgenröte erhabener Liebe zugeleitet.</td>
<td>But the Dutchman rises from the waves, safe and sound, the victorious redemptrix leading him by the hand toward the rosy dawn of sublime love.</td>
<td>bar 322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It would be a mistake simply to equate Wagner’s 1853 programme with the narrative of the overture. Written after the fact, it constitutes a particular reading of the overture’s narrative – albeit a highly authoritative one. Moreover, a narrative reading of the overture is not dependent on the existence of the programme and might equally well be produced solely on the basis of the overture’s correspondences to the opera. The programme is nonetheless significant for two reasons. First, it sheds light on the relationship between the overture and the opera, showing that the former allows for a reading of its narrative which is relatively independent of the dramatic action in the latter. A second reason is that technical analyses of mid-nineteenth-century works by mid-nineteenth-century authors are relatively rare and, in the case of Wagner’s Holländer overture, non-existent. What one finds instead is a wealth of programmatic or poetic readings of pieces. To a certain extent, these readings serve a function similar to that of technical analyses: they are verbal elucidations of what is going on in the music. It is tempting, therefore, to look for analytical potential in Wagner’s programmatic narrative. This is not to say that the 1853 programme is his ‘analysis’ of the overture, but merely that, at least in this case, it seems legitimate to use a programmatic narrative as a way into a technical analysis.

The overture can be read as a narrative, independently of either the programme or the opera. The question whether it also constitutes a narrative on its own terms – one which is independent of both the programme and the opera – is perhaps irrelevant: as I argued above, its title alone is likely to invoke, if not the specific narrative of the opera, at least the rudiments of the tale on which the opera is based. Nonetheless, it is worth emphasising that much recent music theory would probably answer the last question in the positive, arguing that the existence of a verbal narrative is no precondition for musical narrativity. This position seems especially appealing in relation to a composition such as the Holländer overture: one reason it might appear to be inherently narrative is that musical processes are presented in it in a dramatised or problematised way. As we will see, Wagner’s overture does not unfold in the way in which we expect it to, and certain aspects of its formal organisation are strikingly unusual. At the same time, such an inclusive view of musical narrative does not clarify how narrative is more than a metaphor for, say, ‘form’, ‘process’ or ‘form as process’. In that sense, a narrative analysis of Wagner’s overture is tantamount to an analysis of its form.

Form and Narrative in the Overture

Given the generic conventions of the overture in Germany during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the obvious expectation is that the Holländer overture will be in sonata form, all the more because, in his essay ‘De l’ouverture’, Wagner distances himself from the alternative option of the pot-pourri overture. Most analysts of the piece have indeed invoked a sonata-form framework, usually describing bars 1–96 as the exposition, bars 97–329 as the development and bars 330–398 as the recapitulation and coda.
Others, however, have voiced reservations. One of those is Hepokoski, who has referred to the overture as an ‘extraordinarily provocative sonata deformation’.20 Hepokoski’s succinct analytical comments on the overture focus on its exposition, which, he argues, is a ‘two-block exposition’. The main theme and transition on the one hand, and the subordinate theme and closing group on the other, are grouped together into two starkly opposing blocks that contrast in thematic content, key, tempo, instrumentation and expression.21 Crucial to Hepokoski's reading is that these expositional blocks are not hermeneutically neutral. The first (fast, furious and in the minor mode) he interprets as ‘masculine’, the second (slow, lyrical and in the relative major) as ‘feminine’: ‘there can be no dispute about the gendering of this most stereotypical of mid-19th-century expositions: the first theme represents the tormented Dutchman ... , the second, the long-desired Senta’.22

In the context of the gendering of the overture’s themes, Hepokoski refers to Adolf Bernhard Marx’s often-cited description of the thematic dualism in a sonata-form exposition as ‘masculine versus feminine’.23 Marx did not publish this description until 1845, four years after Wagner composed his overture. It is not inconceivable that Marx’s idea had been in the air for a number of years before he wrote it down; however, the more important argument here seems to be that neither the layout of Wagner’s exposition nor the gendering of its themes is unprecedented in the repertoire.

The most important precedent Hepokoski cites is the overture to Der Freischütz. He is not alone in drawing attention to the parallels between Weber’s and Wagner’s overtures: one of the first to do so was Liszt, who in 1854 pointed out that ‘one could observe a certain analogy between the peroration in [Wagner’s] overture and that in the overture to Der Freischütz’.24 Similarities between Weber’s and Wagner’s overtures are indeed not limited to their expositions, but extend across the overtures in their entirety and, as I will argue below, into the operas themselves.

Table 3 compares the formal organisation of the two overtures. As in Wagner’s exposition, the principal themes in Weber’s are clearly gendered and retrospectively identified with the male and female protagonists later in the opera. The main theme returns in the final section of Max’s aria ‘Durch die Wälder, durch die Auen’ in Act I (from bar 165 onwards, just before the words ‘Doch mich umgarnen finstre Mächte’), while the second subordinate theme is first heard in the opera sung by Agathe in her aria in Act II (‘Leise, leise, fromme Weise’). Likewise, the jubilant apotheosis of the subordinate theme following a sudden peripeteia at the end of the Freischütz overture is strikingly similar to one of Wagner’s moves in his overture. In two instances, Wagner intensifies Weber’s strategy: he heightens the contrast between the two blocks of the exposition and places the apotheosis of the subordinate theme before the return of the main theme, thus lending additional weight to the return of the former immediately after the development.25
## Table 3: Comparison of Weber's *Freischütz* and Wagner's *Der fliegende Holländer* overtures; bar numbers in parentheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Weber, <em>Freischütz</em></th>
<th>Wagner, <em>Der fliegende Holländer</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLOW INTRODUCTION (1–36)</td>
<td>i → HC</td>
<td>i → HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPOSITION (37–158)</td>
<td><strong>I</strong> &amp; <strong>III</strong> → HC</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate theme group</td>
<td>(no cadence)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate theme 1</td>
<td>(96–122)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate theme 2</td>
<td>(123–159)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT (159–218)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECAPITULATION – CODA (219–342)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apotheosis of subordinate theme</td>
<td>(330–376)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECAPITULATION – CODA (330–398)</strong></td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERKLÄRUNG</strong> of subordinate theme</td>
<td>(380–398)</td>
<td><strong>III</strong> → i: HC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Wagner does more, however, than merely copy and intensify Weber’s model. As early as the exposition there is a fundamental difference between his overture and Weber’s, a difference that takes on additional significance in view of the similarities between the two pieces. In Der Freischütz, the subordinate theme group enters in an unusual way after two bars of ‘juggernaut’ caesura fill that turn an abrupt half cadence (HC) into a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) in the relative major. Its end, though, is conventional: the subordinate theme group concludes with a PAC in the same key which is elided with the beginning of the development (Ex. 1).26

In contrast to Weber’s subordinate theme group, Wagner’s single subordinate theme is set up in a highly conventional manner following a lengthy standing-on-the-dominant initiated by an HC in the tonic (Ex. 2). The more striking moment in Wagner’s exposition is its conclusion: the relative major of Wagner’s theme is short-lived and never confirmed by the expected cadential closure.

The theme, in the form of a sentence, begins in a completely regular manner (Ex. 3): a four-bar compound basic idea (bars 65–68) is followed by a slightly varied repetition with a different instrumentation (bars 69–72). The continuation (bars 73–76), by contrast, is anything but conventional: it is disproportionately short compared to the preceding presentation, and its opening F major chord is immediately reinterpreted as a substitute for a first-inversion tonic chord in D minor, which initiates an expanded cadential progression (ECP) leading to an HC in that key.27 The extended repetition of this progression has a premature dominant arrival (PDA) at bar 78, confirming the move from F major to D

Ex. 1 Overture to Der Freischütz: tonal plan of the exposition

Ex. 2 Overture to Der fliegende Holländer: tonal plan of the exposition
Ex. 3 Overture to *Der fliegende Holländer*, bars 65–96

**PRESENTATION**

compound basic idea

\[\text{Andante}\]

\[\text{ritard.}\]

\[\text{a tempo}\]

\[\text{compound basic idea (repeated)}\]

---

**CONTINUATION**

---

**CONTINUATION (REPEATED)**

---
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If bars 1–96 are indeed to be heard as a (deformational) sonata-form exposition – and I will soon argue that this is not the only possible interpretation – then their tonal structure surely is their most outstanding feature. Not performing what Hepokoski and Darcy have termed the ‘essential expositional trajectory’ (‘to propose the initial tonic and then ... to move to and cadence in a secondary key’), they violate one of the most fundamental axioms of sonata form. On Caplin’s terms, the absence of a PAC even jeopardises the status of bars 65–96 as a subordinate theme altogether. Both Caplin and Hepokoski and Darcy are, of course, writing about Classical form. However, even though expositions with weakened or even without cadential closure had become a more viable option by 1841, writing a subordinate theme group that leads back to the tonic is still an unusually bold move. The tonal situation at the end of the subordinate theme is identical to that in the bars that immediately precede it. The subordinate theme merely feigns a move to the relative major; on a deeper structural level, the entire exposition resides firmly in the tonic.

The consequences for the status of the subordinate theme are momentous. When it is over, the form continues as if it had never even been there: the theme appears as a slow interpolation that interrupts the surrounding allegro but fails to influence its tonal course. Indeed, it would not be impossible to bypass the subordinate theme altogether and connect bar 64 directly to bar 97. The interpretation of the subordinate theme as formally passive is confirmed by its treatment later in the overture: it is invariably presented as the immutable goal of processes which are themselves associated with main-theme material. Even when it finally appears in a jubilant apotheosis in the tonic major immediately after the development (significantly, however, pianissimo and over 6/4 harmony), this is the result of a breakthrough which is entirely the doing of main-theme material. To be sure, this transformation of the subordinate theme occupies a prominent position in the form. Yet the conceptual space in which it appears has been wrenched open by the head of the main theme in the preceding bars.

The unusual nature of the subordinate theme has obvious programmatic ramifications. Bearing in mind its gendering, not only its surface characteristics but also its tonal structure and treatment in the form can be connected to nineteenth-century musical stereotypes of the feminine, as discussed by Lawrence Kramer and others. Given its tonal position in the exposition – a temporary and unconfirmed F major within a larger D minor – one could say that the woman it represents is consistently seen through the eyes of the Dutchman, who is himself represented by the formally much more active main-theme material. One might go as far as to claim that the subordinate theme – like the woman it represents – is a mirage that exists only in the Dutchman’s mind.

Wagner’s own reading of the overture highlights the subordinate theme’s passive behaviour. Initially, his programme does not mention a female character,
but merely a ‘promise of redemption’; when, later in the programme, this ‘promise’ is identified with a woman, she remains unnamed. What is crucial is that she does not move: it is the Dutchman who ‘steers for [his goal] with vigorous determination through wave and current’.

There is one point in the overture where tension arises between the subordinate theme’s treatment in the form and its gendered interpretation. At bar 377, the apotheosis of the subordinate theme leads to a PAC, undeniably influencing the course of the form. Structurally, the PAC achieves the overture’s tonal trajectory; what follows in the last 22 bars – the return of the main theme and the final transfiguration of the subordinate theme – is entirely post-cadential. This apparent inconsistency may be explained by referring to two other, perhaps overriding, considerations. First, maintaining the large-scale parallelism between the overture and the opera was of great importance to Wagner. As noted before, the end of the overture is imported directly from the end of the opera, where it is essential that the subordinate theme achieve its proper PAC. The overture, in other words, borrows this cadence from the opera. Within the overture itself, moreover, the contrast between the ‘cadence-less’ subordinate theme in the exposition (which thus becomes a ‘failed’ exposition, in Hepokoski and Darcy’s terms) and the successful PAC that concludes its apotheosis helps articulate the overall narrative path from darkness to light.31 Given this narrative, avoiding a PAC in the tonic major at such a rhetorically and structurally important moment cannot have been a viable option for Wagner; the need for a PAC here trumps the way the subordinate theme is normally treated elsewhere in the piece.

The absence of an essential expositional trajectory from the early stages of the overture is, however, more than just a foil for what will happen in the recapitulation, a situation purposefully left defective so that it can be ‘corrected’ at a later stage; rather, it has far-reaching consequences for the way in which the subsequent portions of the form play out. Earlier I suggested that interpreting bars 1–96 as an exposition is not the only option: Tovey, in the analysis cited at the beginning of this essay, heard them as an introduction. For him, the ‘main body of the overture’, which he describes as ‘a very broad sonata exposition’, begins only at bar 97.32 Tovey’s reading is not to be dismissed. No listener who hears bars 97ff. can get away from the feeling that this is where things really get going – an impression due as much to the return of the fast tempo and the passage’s firm rooting in the tonic D minor as to the fact that it begins with a literal transposition of a segment from the Dutchman’s monologue in the first act of the opera (from the words ‘Wie oft im Meeres tiefsten Schlund’). The effect in the monologue is similar to that in the overture: after an orchestral introduction, a recitative and an orchestral transition, the aria proper begins here.

The emphasis on the tonic is not the only aspect that casts doubt upon an interpretation of this music as the beginning of a development;33 the entire formal structure of bars 97–216 is closer to that of an exposition, indeed constituting a more orthodox sonata-form exposition than the preceding 96 bars, as Ex. 4 shows. The passage begins with a main theme in the form of a large-
scale sentence (bars 97–128), comprising an eight-bar complex basic idea, its varied repetition and sixteen bars of continuation that lead to a PAC in the tonic. The lengthy transitional passage which follows (bars 129–203) concludes with a standing-on-the-dominant in the relative major. This is followed by the entry of an F major subordinate theme (the Sailors’ Song; see again Table 2), which is also in the form of a sentence and concludes with a PAC. An expanded repetition of the continuation merges into a passage which clearly functions as a development and in which different themes and motives are juxtaposed, sequenced and fragmented.

In Tovey’s analysis, the exposition is preceded by a long introduction. This interpretation has one important advantage: it explains the tonal structure of bars 1–96, which, beginning in the tonic and concluding on the dominant, is indeed typical of an introduction. But it has problems as well: for one thing, the unit Tovey hears as an introduction comprises two sections in different tempi. To be sure, so-called multi-tempo introductions are not unheard of in the first half of the nineteenth century; examples range from Beethoven’s Fidelio overture (1814) to several of Berlioz’s overtures of the 1830s and ’40s. All of these begin with a brief fast unit that is followed by the more substantial slow body of the introduction. But this is exactly the difference: in Wagner’s overture, the opening allegro section is much longer; it seems too long and too substantial to be discounted as a ‘mere’ introduction. Moreover, motivic connections between the supposed introduction and Tovey’s exposition are significant: the latter recycles much of the motivic content of the former, especially at crucial positions in the form. New motives do appear (for instance at bars 101ff., 141ff., 153ff. and 157ff.), but they are consistently embedded in larger formal units that begin with material originating in the first exposition.

It seems, therefore, that we are dealing here not with an introduction and an exposition, but with two expositions, or at least with a dissociation of function and structure: the first unit functions as an exposition, while the second has the structure of an exposition. Whereas the former goes through the rhetorical gestures and achieves much of the ‘work’ we normally associate with a sonata-form exposition (especially when it comes to the presentation of the main thematic material), only the latter features the expected succession of specific
lower-level formal units in a specific tonal relationship. An additional complication is that the first of these units – the one functioning as an exposition – has the tonal structure of an introduction. As a result, the impact of the second exposition on the further course of the form is limited. Although the development, beginning at bar 217, uses material from both the first and the second exposition, its rhetorical goal is the fourfold fragmentary restatement of the subordinate theme from the first exposition. In this sense, it functions as the development to both expositions, perhaps starting as (mainly) the development of the second exposition and then gradually becoming (mainly) the development of the first. Moreover, at bar 330 the development is followed not by a recapitulation of the putative structural exposition, but by the apotheosis of the subordinate theme from the earlier, functional exposition. And although the recapitulatory characteristic of this apotheosis is undeniable, there is another strong recapitulatory gesture when the main theme finally returns, even though that seems to coincide with the coda.

It bears emphasising that I hear the apotheosis of the subordinate theme as a recapitulation and therefore interpret Wagner’s overture as a variant of the so-called sonata form with reversed recapitulation. This is contested theoretical territory. In Elements of Sonata Theory, Hepokoski and Darcy have mounted a fierce critique of the very concept of a reversed recapitulation. Arguing that it is inappropriate for the description especially of eighteenth-century sonata forms, they have introduced the alternative concept of the ‘Type 2’ sonata. In this sonata type, the return of the subordinate theme (in their terms, ‘S’) is considered a ‘tonal resolution’; the (optional) return of the main theme (‘P’) coincides with the coda. In Hepokoski and Darcy’s view, the portion of the form that comes after the end of the development is emphatically not a recapitulation: given the rotational basis of their theory, a recapitulation can by definition be launched only by a return of the main theme. In the context of the present discussion, it is important that Hepokoski and Darcy also advocate the application of the ‘Type 2’ terminology to similar forms from the nineteenth century, even though they admit that this sonata type grew increasingly rare after 1770 and is never discussed in the nineteenth-century theoretical literature. In my opinion, this difference in context is too important to allow for the transfer of the ‘Type 2’ concept beyond the earliest decades of the nineteenth century. Although it is certainly possible (and accurate) to describe Wagner’s Holländer overture as a ‘Type 2’ sonata, or at least as a deformation thereof, I think it unlikely that his audience – even the most sophisticated listeners – would not have heard it against the generic background of the overwhelmingly more common ‘Type 3’ (the ‘textbook’ sonata form), or that the emphatic return of the themes from the exposition in the tonic would not have carried any recapitulatory connotations.

Regardless of how one wishes to assess the situation in the specific case of Wagner’s Holländer overture, changing the order of themes when they reappear after the development is a compositional decision of the highest significance. This
decision is the last in a dazzling series of manipulations of sonata-form expecta-
tions. On the one hand, Wagner’s overture undeniably presents a succession of
clear sonata-form cues, as shown in Table 4: the ‘functional’ exposition right at
the beginning, which is retrospectively undermined by the HC in the tonic that
concludes it; the more orthodox ‘structural’ exposition from bar 97, which
remains without consequences for the rest of the form and ‘drowns’ in the
development that follows it; and the ‘inverted’ recapitulation–cum-coda that takes
the place of a more traditional recapitulation. Yet these different sections fail to
come together in one well-formed sonata form, as the vertical non-alignment of
large-scale units in Table 4 suggests. In this sense, Wagner’s Holländer overture
strains the sonata-form referential framework to a degree that, for an operatic
overture written by a German composer in 1841, is utterly remarkable.

This formal organisation is echoed by the narrative structure of Wagner’s
1853 programme. There is a clear parallel between the form’s smaller-scale
structural sonata-form exposition, which is inserted into a larger framing sonata
form, and the programme’s framed narrative, which is interpolated into the
larger framing narrative. Moreover, the onset of the second exposition marks the
transition to a new formal level – a form within the form, so to speak. By leaving
this interior form incomplete, moving back to the level of the first exposition in
the course of the development and then effecting a breakthrough that leads to an
apotheosis instead of a recapitulation – a recapitulation at an even higher level –
Wagner’s overture projects through musical means the same per aspera ad astra
narrative that is made verbally explicit in the programme.

Senta and the Subordinate Theme in the Opera

The overture’s symphonic narrative, and thus its musical form, serve as a foil for
the dramatic action in the opera, which differs from the overture in a number of
crucial respects. Senta, the female protagonist, takes on a much more active role in the opera than is suggested by the treatment of the ‘feminine’ subordinate theme in the overture. In this way, the stage action alters the image of the feminine that was presented in the overture and in so doing reinterprets its narrative.

The crucial moment in this respect is Senta’s ballad in Act II. Its significance is hard to overstate: it is her grand number, the centrepiece of the opera and, if Wagner’s own account in ‘Eine Mitteilung an meine Freunde’ is to be believed, the seed from which the entire opera sprang. As Abbate has shown, moreover, its presence relates the Holländer to a number of so-called vampire operas, one of the eerier subcategories of Romantic opera (examples include Giacomo Meyerbeer’s Robert le diable as well as Heinrich Marschner’s Der Vampyr, an opera Wagner conducted in Würzburg in 1833). A vampire opera, Abbate writes, typically contains a number that is ‘textually reflective’: ‘one of the characters ... sings [a] narrative song not knowing that he will be an actor in the tale that he tells’. This is, of course, exactly what happens in Senta’s ballad. Yet Wagner distances himself from the Romantic tradition as soon as he invokes it. As Abbate notes, ‘Senta’s song is ... forever set apart from any of its predecessors by what happens in its final seconds, an explosion in which Senta interrupts and usurps the third choral refrain and identifies herself with the redeeming heroine’.

Abbate’s observations are entirely to the point, but she leaves it to the reader to consider the ballad’s broader ramifications. These are considerable, from both a dramatic and an analytical perspective, and highlight the ballad’s intimate connection to the overture. In the dramatic plan of the opera as a whole, Senta’s atypical thirst for action in the ballad is but one element in a series of pointed reversals that continues the intertextual dialogue with Der Freischütz which began in the overture. In its internal structure, the ballad offers an almost explicit corrective to the treatment of the subordinate theme in the overture’s first exposition, a corrective that is then confirmed at the very end of the opera. I will discuss both aspects in order.

At first sight, Senta might appear to be the prototypical Wagnerian heroine. Like the subordinate theme in the overture, she is characterised by attributes that are easily deciphered as stereotypical codes for the nineteenth-century feminine: as soon as she appears on the stage, she is portrayed as a dreamer; throughout the opera, she acts as an agent of redemption, and her behaviour repeatedly verges on the hysterical – a characteristic which became so closely associated with the type of the Wagnerian heroine that in 1860 Eduard Hanslick described Senta as ‘Agathe translated into Wagnerian, that is: become “hysterical”’. As we have already seen, Hanslick was not the only early commentator to observe a link between the two operas. The dependence of Der fliegende Holländer on Weber, and on German Romantic opera in general, was a hot topic among critics in the 1850s and ’60s. Even more than in the overture, parallels to Der Freischütz in Wagner’s opera at times become uncannily specific, both in the
overall dramatic structure and in the textual, scenic and musical details. As in the overture, however, Wagner is not content to copy Weber’s model: he carefully creates a critical intertext between his and Weber’s operas by pointedly invoking and even intensifying his model, while at the same time distancing himself from it. Wagner’s *Holländer* is, in other words, a ‘strong misreading’ of Weber’s *Freischütz*, a classic case of Harold Bloom’s revisionary ratio of clinamen. In the opera’s second act, Wagner misreads Weber in order to characterise Senta as a woman who is fundamentally different both from Agathe – *pace* Hanslick – and from the image of the feminine that he constructs in his own overture.

Parallels between Senta and Agathe are obvious. Both young women are given away to a suitor by a domineering father: Agathe by Cuno to the hunter Max, Senta by Daland to the Flying Dutchman. In the overall layout of *Der Freischütz*, the gender differentiation is articulated by a contrast between outside and inside: the forest of Act I, where we encounter the male characters, and the living room of Act II, where we first meet Agathe and her companion, Ännchen. The setting of Wagner’s Acts I and II parallels that in *Der Freischütz*: Act I, introducing Daland, the Dutchman and their respective crews, is set in the open air, whereas the second act, introducing Senta, her nurse Mary and the spinning girls, is set in Daland’s living room. A striking additional parallel is that a portrait plays a central role in both interiors: a picture of the family’s primogenitor that has ominously fallen off the wall onto Agathe’s head in Cuno’s living room and the portrait of the Flying Dutchman that so obsesses Senta in Daland’s.

Wagner strengthens this contrast between the outer and inner acts by an inversive textual relationship between the sailors’ chorus that ends the first act and the girls’ chorus that opens the second. The sailors sing: ‘I am at sea, far from home; my darling longs for me; wind, blow more, so that I can be home soon’; the girls respond: ‘My darling is at sea, far from home; he is thinking of me; o, spinning wheel, if you could only produce wind, he would be home right away’. As shown in Table 5, several almost literal textual parallels make this relationship even more explicit.

Both passages are also connected motivically. A transformation of the neighbour-note motive with double-dotted rhythm in the sailors’ chorus returns as the head motive of the girls’ tune (see Ex. 5). This rhythmic figure is, of course, present throughout the opera, so its relevance here may seem limited. However, the motivic link between the sailors’ and the girls’ choruses is made explicit in the orchestral introduction to Act II, where the boisterous call of the sailors is domesticated before the listeners’ ears.

There are also differences between *Der Freischütz* and *Der fliegende Holländer*, and these appear all the more pointed because of the parallels Wagner so clearly constructs. Unlike Agathe, Senta does not feel at home in her father’s living room. From the outset, she is portrayed as different from the other girls. While they spin and sing, she silently stares at the portrait of the Dutchman. As has often been pointed out, she is the only one of the girls whose sweetheart is not a sailor, but a hunter.
Table 5 Inversional textual relationship between the sailors’ chorus at the end of Act I and the girls’ chorus at the beginning of Act II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sailors’ chorus</th>
<th>Girls’ chorus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mit Gewitter und Sturm aus fernem Meer, <strong>mein Mädel</strong>, bin dir nah! [...]</td>
<td><strong>Mein Schatz</strong> ist auf dem Meere draus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Über turmhöhe Flut vom Süden her, mein Mädel, ich bin da! [...]</td>
<td><strong>Er denkt nach Haus an’s fromme Kind</strong> [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ach lieber Südwind blas’ noch mehr! Mein Mädel verlangt nach mir!</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ach gäb’st du Wind, er käm’ geschwind!</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the wings of the storm, from distant lands, beloved, home I fly! [...]</td>
<td>My lover sails the ocean foam,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the billows that break on southern sands, beloved, here am I! [...]</td>
<td>And thinks of her who spins at home [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blow southern breezes strong and kind! My loved one awaiteth me!</td>
<td>Ah couldst thou blow him home to me!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex. 5 Motivic connection between the sailors’ and girls’ choruses

Senta’s isolated position among the girls is reflected in her music. When Mary takes her to task for her inactivity, all Senta does is hum an as-yet wordless tune (Ex. 6). The tune is familiar: it is the beginning of the subordinate theme from the overture. It is heard here for the first time in the opera and is the first thing she sings – a crucial step in the identification of this tune with her character. In key as well as in tempo, meter and melodic style, it contrasts markedly with what the other girls are singing. Although mediated by a common-note diminished-seventh chord, this slow, lyrical C major interpolation intrudes into the second act’s fast and rhythmic A major environment as a foreign element.

In the larger plan of Act II, the hummed tune is the first adumbration of Senta’s ballad. This number, too, contrasts markedly with its environment, not only in style and thematic content, but also tonally (Ex. 7). The G minor in which it begins is radically juxtaposed to the A major close of the preceding section. This abrupt whole-tone shift is a calculated effect. Originally written in
A minor, the ballad was transposed down only to accommodate Wilhelmine Schröder-Devrient, who sang the role of Senta in the first performance. The transposition is, however, not limited to the ballad itself: it begins 28 bars before, from Senta’s line ‘Lasst mich’s euch recht zu Herzen führen’. In exploring the rationale behind this decision, it is intriguing to see which path Wagner does not choose. In the original version, the section before the ballad had ended in B major. Had Wagner transposed only the ballad and left the immediately preceding section unaltered, the result would have been what neo-Riemannian theory calls a ‘PLP operation’ and thus the juxtaposition of the two ‘hexatonic poles’ B major and G minor – an ‘uncanny’ harmonic relationship that Wagner would exploit to great effect in his later works. Wagner’s decision to include in the transposition the section that precedes the ballad is, however, hardly any less effective. It allows him not only to maintain the local shift down a whole tone and from major to minor when the ballad begins – a progression no less striking than that involving hexatonic poles – but also to enlarge it into a structural contrast between the central key of the first scene and that of the ballad. The shift from
A major to G minor is so momentous that it reverberates throughout the ballad: the first four-bar phrase of each of the ballad’s three strophes conspicuously lapses back from G minor to A major.

Both thematically and structurally, the ballad is a distinct echo of the overture. Its orchestral introduction brings back material from the overture’s first expositional block (specifically from bars 1–5, 21–23 and 30–31). Senta’s unaccompanied intoning of the Dutchman’s motive is followed by three strophes separated from each other by a return of the opening of the orchestral introduction as a ritornello. Each comprises two separate sections. Only the first eight bars of the first section, presenting the bulk of the narrative, use new material. The next group of fifteen bars recycles material familiar from the overture. As Arthur Groos has considered, this unit is not so much part of the narrative as a comment on it, thus gaining ‘strong refrain-like qualities’. Structurally, it leads to an arrival on the dominant of G minor, which sets up the strophe’s contrasting second section (what Abbate calls the ‘refrain’). This section not only brings back the subordinate theme from the overture’s first exposition, but also, at least in strophes 1 and 2, behaves very much like that theme from a formal point of view. Following a dominant arrival in the home key, it begins in the relative B♭ major but then fails to achieve cadential confirmation in that key. Instead, it falls back on an HC and, later, even on a PAC in the tonic G minor, which is elided with the return of the ritornello. The B♭ major to which the refrain aspires never materialises; the ballad, like the Dutchman whose fate it relates, is caught in a never-ending cycle of recurring events (Ex. 8).

The third strophe initially follows the pattern established by the two preceding ones. At the end of its refrain, however, Senta actively intervenes in the formal course of the ballad; she refuses to remain the servant of its closed, in principle never-ending, strophic form, takes the helm and alters the ballad’s course. As if by sheer strength of will, she forces the refrain into a breakthrough to a cadential progression in B♭ major. After her temporary silence, during which the other girls sing the theme’s presentation phrase, Senta leaps up from her seat, starts singing again and, as Abbate puts it, ‘usurps’ the continuation.

For the first time since the overture, we hear the subordinate theme (or at least part of it) in its jubilant transformation: and in contrast to the corresponding passage in both preceding strophes, it is harmonised firmly in B♭ major. As was the case in the previous strophes and in the subordinate theme in the
overture’s first exposition, an ECP underlies the entire continuation (Ex. 9). The crucial difference is that here the initial tonic of that progression is prevented from being reinterpreted as the mediant of its relative minor key because it is substituted by a secondary dominant applied to a ii\(^6\) chord. Once this pre-dominant chord is in place and leads to the expected dominant, the goal of the progression is clear. Twice the cadence is evaded, first by the insertion of
a $V^\frac{3}{2}$ chord that elicits an expanded repetition of the entire progression along the lines of the classical ‘one more time’ technique, then by another and varied restarting of the progression after the lengthy $V^\frac{5}{2}$ in bars 99–106. To be sure, even with this third cadential progression, a real cadential arrival does not materialise: the cadence is deceptive, its final tonic being substituted by a diminished-seventh chord on $\hat{6}$. Yet I interpret this as the result of the shocked reaction of Senta’s audience. In her mind – at least in her melodic line – there is a fully satisfactory PAC.

The significance of this powerful gesture cannot be overestimated. Senta’s breakthrough provides the ballad with the same kind of closure that would occur at the end of a sonata-form exposition. Indeed, the local harmonic progressions at the very end of this passage, with its multiple ECPs and evaded cadences, are reminiscent of typical harmonic progressions at the end of a subordinate theme group. From that perspective, the ballad constitutes a corrective (or, if one observes that its final cadence is deceptive, an attempted corrective) to the
structure of the overture’s first exposition. This musical corrective parallels a corrective at the level of the narrative. Before she starts her ballad, Senta stares at the Dutchman’s portrait. The Dutchman exists only as seen through her eyes, in the same way that, in the overture, she existed only as seen through his. In the ballad she tells the story of the Flying Dutchman (essentially the story of the overture), makes it her own and turns it into the story of the opera. The ballad in its traditional closed version is everybody’s song: Mary has often sung it (‘Wie oft doch hört’ ich sie von dir’, Senta reminds her). The other girls like it too, and when Senta sings it, they are touched to the extent that they start singing along and even take over the refrain. But when Senta suddenly sings her new version of the refrain, the others can no longer follow and react in shock (‘Hilf Himmel! Senta!’).

Once she realises that she, and no one else, is capable of singing the proper cadence to her theme, Senta is in command, and she continues to act accordingly for the rest of the opera. Unlike the female protagonists in other German Romantic operas, she is not a passive, immobile character; and contrary to the subordinate theme in the overture’s first exposition, she is more than just a symbol of the redemption the male protagonist has to attain. In the rest of the opera, Wagner consistently portrays her as a strong woman who takes initiative and deliberately decides to act as the agent of the Dutchman’s redemption. Unlike Weber’s Agathe, Senta does, after all, have a choice: she could have chosen Erik over the Dutchman. This is not to say that Senta’s agency is wholly undisturbing: requiring her to use her agency to kill herself, Wagner presents the listener with no less crude a case of male chauvinism than if she had been portrayed as an unresisting commodity in the hands of men. Under the veil of her apparent autonomy, Senta – in Wagner’s words, ‘das Weib der Zukunft’ (‘the woman of the future’) – is a woman who wants at all costs to do what the male protagonist needs.

Senta’s PAC does not fully materialise until the very end of the opera. Near the end of Act III, the Dutchman proposes to leave her alone, let her return to her petit bourgeois existence and set sail forever and ever. She tries to hold him back, but when she does not succeed and sees the Dutchman disappear, she throws herself off a cliff. The moment that she does this is accompanied by a deceptive cadence, initiating a series of ECPs and evaded cadences that eventually lead to a PAC in D major. The music that is sounded over these cadential progressions is the apotheosis of Senta’s theme, thus connecting the opera’s final moments to the central event of the drama: the return of the apotheosis functions as a large-scale recapitulation of the all-important breakthrough at the end of the ballad. After the completion of the opera, this recapitulation was, as we have seen, copied into the end of the overture, where it functions as a prefiguration of the opera’s denouement.

My goal has been to shed light on the techniques – in the broadest sense of the word – Wagner uses to convey his dramaturgical message. As I have shown, he
carefully sets up an intertextual dialogue with German Romantic opera in general and with Weber’s *Freischütz* in particular. It is against this background that he plays with the conventions of musical form. Through the manipulation of formal and cadential plans, he constructs two contrasting images of the feminine: one passive and immobile, the other active and undertaking. It is perhaps not too much of a stretch to claim that these images create a double narrative perspective: the Dutchman’s vantage point in the overture, Senta’s in the opera. Because of the different narratives that the overture and opera project, the former is more than simply a summary of the latter. Instead, Wagner uses the overture, and the narrative it projects through its musical form, as a foil against which events in the opera stand out. Senta’s agency in the opera, already unusual in itself, becomes all the more striking in comparison to the more stereotypically nineteenth-century symphonic narrative of the overture; the fact that, in the opera, Senta’s theme leads to a PAC is meaningful only because the same theme had failed to achieve the expected cadential closure in the overture’s first exposition.

Throughout this article I have moved back and forth between details of musical structure and the broader picture of Wagner’s opera. Readers critical of this approach may argue that my interpretation of the relationship between the overture and opera is valid (or, for that matter, invalid) regardless of the analysis I have presented. To be sure, listeners hardly need to study the overture’s formal and cadential plan, or the treatment of cadences at crucial moments in the opera, to understand that they are being presented with two contrasting images of the feminine, and thus two different narratives. In that sense, it is less that my interpretation is the outcome of my analysis than that my analysis is triggered by my interpretation, which contextualises, deepens and enriches it. Such an analysis in context does not only allow us better to understand Wagner’s fourth opera, the way it relates to operatic traditions of the preceding decades and how intimately technical musical details of the overture are bound up with the essence of the opera’s meaning. It also reveals that the same relationship of model and corrective that exists at a broad, non-technical level is mirrored in the opera’s technical dimension. The relationship between *Der fliegende Holländer* and the tradition of German Romantic opera, specifically *Der Freischütz*, crystallises in the relationship between the form of Wagner’s and Weber’s overtures (and, more generally, in the relationship between Wagner’s overture and the conventions of sonata form in the first half of the nineteenth century); and the relationship between the stage action in Wagner’s opera and the narrative projected by its overture crystallises in the opera’s and the overture’s contrasting treatments of the subordinate theme.
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6. The symphonic aspect of the overture genre is particularly relevant to a discussion of Wagner’s operatic overtures because, as Strohm has emphasised, Wagner started his career as a composer of programmatic concert and theatre overtures. See Reinhard Strohm, ‘Gedanken über Wagners Opernouvertüren’, in Carl Dahlhaus and Egon Voss (eds), Wagnerliteratur – Wagnerforschung (Mainz: Schott, 1985), pp. 69–84.


11. In 1840, hoping in vain for an audition at the Paris Opéra, Wagner quickly completed three separate numbers – Senta’s Ballad, the sailor’s chorus from Act III and an early version of the ‘Spuk-Gesang’ of the Dutchman’s crew (also from Act III) – in a French translation specially made for the occasion. Wagner composed the complete opera in the summer of 1841 and wrote the overture in the autumn of the same year while orchestrating the rest of the score. Compare Richard Wagner, Mein Leben, ed. Martin Gregor-Dellin, 2 vols (Munich: List, 1963), vol. 2, pp. 212–14.

12. Grey makes a similar point in ‘Text, Action, and Music’, p. 37. This is not to say that the 1860 version should be considered a ‘Fassung letzter Hand’.


14. Bar numbers always refer to the 1860 version of the overture.

15. In 1853 the overture still lacked the Tristan-like elaboration of the jubilant theme (bars 347–371 in the final version) and the redemptive conclusion (bars 389–398), both of which Wagner added only in 1860.

16. Compare Burnham’s comment on nineteenth-century narrative interpretations of Beethoven’s Eroica: ‘We must not for a moment think that the symphony is about these narratives, for it is precisely the other way round: these narratives are about the symphony’; Scott Burnham, Beethoven Hero (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), p. 25. I would argue that Wagner has it both ways: his narrative is about the overture as much as the overture is about the narrative. On different modes of analysis in the nineteenth century, see the preface to Ian Bent (ed.), Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century, 2 vols (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
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ABSTRACT

In this essay I analyse the form of Wagner’s overture to *Der fliegende Holländer* (1841) as part of a constellation that also includes the composer’s published programme for the overture as well as the stage action and a few key musical events in the opera. To that end, I use analytical tools inspired by the ‘new Formenlehre’ (William Caplin’s theory of formal functions and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s theory of sonata form) in conjunction with aspects of narrative and intertextuality. I argue that Wagner’s innovative use of musical form in the overture functions as a background against which events in the opera are thrown into relief, so that both can be understood as two essentially different versions of the same narrative. In the overture, sophisticated manipulation of the conventions of musical form generates a symphonic narrative, while changes to the narrative in the opera are articulated by the reworking of aspects of that same musical form at crucial moments in the drama. Both the overture’s form and the opera’s dramaturgical design gain in significance through an intertextual dialogue that Wagner sets up between his opera and the model of Weber’s *Der Freischütz* (1821).