

13

**Reflections on
the Last Years: *Der Kuhhandel*
as a Key Work**
DAVID DREW

for Christopher Shaw

The eulogy spoken by Maxwell Anderson at a memorial concert of Weill's music in the summer of 1950 and the obituary published by T. W. Adorno in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of 15 April 1950 are diametrically opposed in both spirit and content. Each is informed by highly personal feelings; but only in Anderson's case are they manifest:

I find these words difficult to write, difficult to say. Kurt Weill was not only my friend and neighbor. We had worked so closely together, had exchanged ideas and criticism so constantly, that in losing him I am crippled and lost. Something has gone out of this spring for me, and out of this year, that will not return. There is only one thought that comforts me at all. I have sometimes thought I would like to have known great men of genius whose work I especially admired. I would have liked to have known John Keats or Franz Schubert, and many others. Well, for fifteen years I have had a very great man for my neighbor and friend. How helpful and how loving and keen he was as a person, the world will never know. That goes when a man dies and cannot be recaptured. But how great Kurt Weill was as a composer of music, the world will slowly discover—for he was a much greater musician than anyone now imagines. It takes decades and scores of years and centuries to sift things out, but it's done in time—and Kurt will emerge as one of the very few who wrote great music. I wish you could have known him—for his wit, his gentleness, and the swift intuition that took him to the heart of every subject. That is no longer possible. But he left his music for us, and his music will keep his name and his spirit alive. It will not console us who have lost him; but it will live—long, long after we are forgotten, along with our grief.¹

Anderson's testimony to Weill's human qualities reflects his experience of the last fifteen years of Weill's life, and yet it is strikingly consistent with

1. Maxwell Anderson's untitled and undated typescript is in the Maxwell Anderson Collection of the Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas in Austin. A carbon copy is in the Weill/Lenya Archive of the Yale University Music Library.

that of Heinrich Strobel,² whose contacts with Weill had been confined to the ten years previous to Anderson's. We need, perhaps, to remind ourselves of the great affection in which Weill was held by many people in many walks of life; for the quality of the man does indeed have some bearing on the quality of the music. But Anderson's path between man and music was, of course, his own private one, through the woods of South Mountain Road, and private it should remain.

Adorno, for his part, chose a public forum and wrote as a public figure par excellence: behind him, the recovered might of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, ahead a successful career in the Federal Republic. Although his personal acquaintance with Weill went as far back as 1928, there is no mention of it; nor is there any trace of the extraordinary insights that had distinguished his account of Weill's music during the years of their closest acquaintance—that is, from 1928 to 1931. The obituary's function is strictly occlusive:

The profile of this composer, who died in America, is scarcely touched by the concept of a composer as such. His gift, like his influence, resides much less in musical capacities . . . than in an extraordinary and original feeling for the function of music in the theater. Not that his gifts were dramatic, as, for instance, Verdi's were. On the contrary: the interpolatory character of his numbers, which stopped the action rather than carried it forward, and his espousal of the idea of "epic theater" challenge the traditional view of the dramatic.

Weill was a pupil of Busoni. The lack of real craftsmanship, from the simplest harmonization to the construction of large forms, was his inheritance from a school which was more aesthetic than strictly technical. That may account for a certain monotony in his style, despite all the versatility: music can only develop properly from the problems of the *métier*. On the other hand, he brought to bear, from the outset, a literary taste that freed him from the naiveté of "good musicians," . . . The collaboration with Brecht not only determined his outward success. He owed to Brecht the intellectual authority for the initiation of his work; but also, and above all, he owed to him a method that ran counter to every kind of artistic consolidation and at the same time unceasingly submitted every bar to the demands of the performance.

He . . . tried to write grand opera. The most pretentious was *Die Bürgschaft*. He no doubt realized the inadequacy of that and yielded to the constrictions and enticements of exile, without fully counting the cost. . . . Little remained of the surrealist; with a shy and crafty innocence that was disarming, he became a Broadway composer modeled on Cole Porter and talked as if concession to the commercial field were no concession, but only a

2. Heinrich Strobel, "Erinnerung an Kurt Weill," *Melos* 17 (May 1950): 133–36; reprinted in David Drew, ed., *Über Kurt Weill* (Frankfurt, 1975), pp. 146–51.

pure test of "skill" which made everything possible even within standardized boundaries.

Weill believed himself to be a kind of Offenbach of his century, and as far as swiftness of social-aesthetic reaction and lack of real substance go, the analogy is not without foundation. But the model was not repeatable. The grimness of reality has become too overwhelming for a parody to measure up to it. . . . What seemed to him the expression of his time was for the most part only the admittedly troubled and hence all the truer echo of its progress. But perhaps he had something of the genius of those who lead the great fashion houses. He had the ability to find melodies appropriate to the annual shows; and this supremely ephemeral thing in him may last. [my translation]

So urbane is the tone that the destructive force of the content could almost be overlooked. Readers more familiar with Weill's music than with the labyrinthine workings of Adorno's mind might well dismiss the obituary as lightly as Weill himself seems to be dismissed. They would be ill advised to do so.

In the immediate background of Adorno's obituary is the *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, published in 1949, less than a year before Weill's death. Perhaps because the tactical weapons used in the obituary are different in kind as well as in size from the strategic ones with which Adorno attempted in the *Philosophie* to demolish the neo-classical Stravinsky, they seem relatively harmless. No Freudian searchlights are trained on Weill's work (though they usefully could be); no complicity with authoritarian tendencies is hinted at (though it might be). With such skill does Adorno observe the diplomatic niceties proper to the occasion that it is hard to believe that his intentions are in any way aggressive. What, for instance, could be more "disarming" than the "shy and crafty innocence" with which he inserts the name of Offenbach, apparently on Weill's own authority?

In Adorno's commentary on Weill from 1928–31, the name invoked is Mahler's, not Offenbach's. Times changed, however, and so, of course, did Weill. On the assumption that Adorno knew or had at least heard about some of Weill's post-1933 work, the conclusion he reaches can be fairly put to the test by selecting for special consideration the work that seems best qualified to support Weill's alleged view of himself as a modern Offenbach. Without doubt, that work is the operetta *Der Kuhhandel* of 1934. Its German libretto—a most remarkable one—is the work of the Hungarian-born Robert Vambery,³ who had been Auf-

3. Robert Vambery was born in Budapest in 1909 and now lives in Los Angeles. In 1928 Ernst Josef Aufrecht engaged him as dramaturge at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm. For Aufrecht's music theater enterprise, Vambery made German versions of Donizetti's *La Fille*

richt's *Chefdramaturg* at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm from 1928 until 1933. The greater part of the score was drafted in Louveciennes in 1934. With the conclusion early in 1935 of an agreement for a first production in London, *Der Kuhhandel*—by then nearing completion in voice-and-piano score but still with vital aspects of its operetta form unresolved—was swiftly converted into the likeness of an English musical comedy and blessed with the irrelevantly royalist title, *A Kingdom for a Cow*. Several important numbers from *Der Kuhhandel* were discarded unorchestrated; other numbers in more popular style were inserted in their place and elsewhere.⁴ *A Kingdom for a Cow* duly opened at the Savoy Theatre, London—the home of Gilbert and Sullivan's Savoy operas—on 28 June 1935. It was well received by the press, but shunned by the public. The production closed after three weeks. The end of *A Kingdom for a Cow* was also the end of *Der Kuhhandel*, for Weill never returned to the German-language version. But it is that, rather than the London travesty, which mainly concerns us here. The only number said to have been written and composed for London yet consistent with the style and structure of the German version is the choral prologue.

The prologue tells of an island that was once inhabited by a "simple and happy race." In 1497, the Spaniards landed on the east shore, shot the menfolk, ravished the women, burnt the crops, and started "a new and better government." Later that year the Portuguese landed on the west shore and did likewise. Such were the origins of today's republics of Ucqua and Santa Maria, to which the Waterkeyn Armaments Corporation of Cleveland, Ohio, has now sent its chief salesman, Leslie Jones. When the curtain rises, Jones has already paid an abortive visit to Ucqua.

du Régiment and (in February 1933) Gilbert and Sullivan's *The Pirates of Penzance*. *Der Kuhhandel* was his first independent venture into the theater, and it has remained his last. As a political commentator, Vambery contributed to *Die Weltbühne* and other journals. After settling in America in the late 1930s, he taught for a time at Columbia University, where he was associated with the world premiere in 1941 of Britten and Auden's "operetta," *Paul Bunyan*.

4. The history of *Der Kuhhandel* and the circumstances and reception of *A Kingdom for a Cow* are examined in detail in my forthcoming *Kurt Weill: A Documentary Biography* (Faber & Faber); the bibliographic aspects and musical problems are treated in my forthcoming *Kurt Weill: A Handbook*. The appendix lists the numbers in the two versions of the work and indicates the relationship between them. The copyright in *Der Kuhhandel* was assigned to Heugel et Cie. (Paris) in 1934 under the terms of Weill's general agreement and was reassigned to Schott (Mainz) in 1978. No published edition is yet in view. *A Kingdom for a Cow* was covered by a sub-publishing agreement of 1935 between Heugel and Chappell (London), which published two putative hit songs in sheet-music form ("Two Hearts" and "As Long As I Love") and announced a book of piano-vocal selections that, in fact, did not appear. The entire holograph material for the two versions, with the exception of a few minor items, is now in the Weill/Lenya Archive.

On his arrival in Santa Maria he is ordered by Waterkeyn to buy the national newspaper, publish reports of a massive arms purchase by Ucqua, and then proceed to the office of the Santa Marian president, an ex-university professor of staunchly liberal and pacifist views and therefore—Waterkeyn concludes—undoubtedly a fool and probably venal as well. Sure enough, Jones easily traps the president into accepting an ill-concealed bribe and ordering munitions which the impoverished nation cannot afford and which (to his credit) he has no intention of using.

When Jones presses for payment, the president institutes a Public Welfare Tax, which has to be levied twice in order to pay the “commission” demanded by General Conchas, Santa Maria’s dreaded war minister and leader of the paramilitary “Strong Hand Fellowship.” In a desperate attempt to keep Jones happy without entirely betraying his own principles, the president allows Conchas to exercise his newly conscripted army close to the Ucquan frontier and then calls a peace conference which will end with a gala dinner for the Ucquan delegation (Act I finale). Jones swiftly organizes and subsidizes a coup d’etat by General Conchas, who seizes power while the gala dinner is in full swing, insults the Ucquan delegation, and vows to defend the national honor against the “traditional enemy.”

The effect these mighty events have on the lives of ordinary people is illustrated by the star-crossed romance of two simple villagers, Juan and Juanita. Juan’s sole means of livelihood is an obliging milk-cow from which, however, he is twice separated by the bailiff, who distrains upon it in lieu of the two installments of the Public Welfare Tax which Juan has scorned to pay. After a short spell as a railway porter, Juan finds himself conscripted into the general’s brave new army. As luck would have it, he is selected by Ximenes, the minister of information, as the nation’s representative in a “symbolic referendum” designed to convince foreign bankers that the general and his policies enjoy full democratic support. Trained to say “Yes” to every question which General Conchas puts to him, Juan decides on another course, and, when the great moment comes, gives the general a resounding box on the ears. He is saved from the firing squad, and Santa Maria from war, by the discovery that none of the weaponry supplied by Waterkeyn is in working order. General Conchas promptly proclaims to the defenseless Santa Marians the virtues of peaceful coexistence and, amidst popular rejoicing, pardons Juan and gives a vote-winning blessing to the happy couple.

Der Kuhhandel is the first of Weill’s stage works to contain an element of sociopolitical journalism. It belongs to the tradition founded by Offenbach and his colleagues and revived during the 1920s by Karl Kraus in his revisions of Offenbach’s librettos. Kraus, indeed, is the spiritual father of *Der Kuhhandel*. Although he and Weill might have con-

ceived such a work in 1932 (the year of their brief collaboration in Berlin),⁵ *Der Kuhhandel* itself could only have been written after March 1933. Its reflections on the subjects of dictatorship and war belong to the European era that began with the Nazi seizure of power.

Santa Maria is much less remote from that event than from the never-never lands traditionally colonized by operetta. Echoing as it does the title of Kleist's novella, *Die Verlobung in St. Domingo*, Weill and Vambery's subtitle, "Die Verlobung von Santa Maria," points directly to the island of Hispaniola in the West Indies and hence to the Republic of Haiti and the Dominican Republic (whose capital is Santo Domingo). The settlers—established on the western shore by Columbus when he discovered Hispaniola on his first voyage in 1492 and then on the eastern shore when he returned a year later—had shown as little concern for the welfare of the natives as the prologue of *Der Kuhhandel* suggests (with some poetic license); and it was in their manly spirit that General Molino Trujillo of Dominica staged a successful "revolution" just three years before Hitler's. Trujillo appointed himself president and was to remain in that office until relieved of it by an assassin's bullet in 1961. His notoriously unjust, corrupt, and incompetent regime made much of its aggressive designs on Haiti and would not have survived but for regular injections of American capital.⁶

While the Caribbean background provided Weill and Vambery with the exotic color upon which operetta thrives, the European foreground would have been unmanageable in operetta terms without the kind of *reductio ad absurdum* afforded by Caribbean politics. On that level the frame of General Conchas is ample enough to contain both Mussolini and Goering, and Ximenes can prove an apt pupil of Goebbels

5. At the Breitkopf Hall in Berlin on 11 January 1932, Karl Kraus gave a recital whose first part comprised selections from Raimund, Wedekind, and Peter Altenberg; the second half was devoted to excerpts from the *Mahagonny* opera, with Weill at the piano. This was the furthest Weill went in accommodating himself to the matchmaking ambitions of Universal Edition and its opera chief, Hans Heinsheimer. From a Viennese point of view, and indeed from Heinsheimer's broader one, a creative collaboration with Kraus would have been highly opportune, now that the collaboration with Brecht had apparently come to an end. The rapport with Kraus established by Schoenberg and his circle had already been inherited by the younger generation in the person of Krenek, whose flirtations with operetta in the late 1920s (notably in his one-act opera *Schwerkewicht*, of which there are echoes in *Mahagonny*) owed as much to Kraus in one sense as his Kraus song cycle, *Durch die Nacht*, of 1931—his first tentatively dodecaphonic work—did in another. But neither in his investigations of Kraus's writings nor in his work with the great man himself did Weill find what he was looking for. There is no record of any contacts subsequent to the 1932 recital.

6. The first critical account of the influence of American capital on Latin American politics is a work that clearly had a direct influence on *Der Kuhhandel*: Joseph Freeman and Scott Neary's *Dollar Diplomacy: A Study of American Imperialism* (New York: 1925).

long before he apes that master of public relations by applying to the general's seizure of power the term "nationale Erhebung" (national rebellion), which Goebbels had coined for Hitler's. Previously Ximenes and the general had established an "understanding" with the president, who embodies the less admirable traits of the Social Democratic leadership in the Weimar era, and seems—amidst the Wilhelmstrasse pomp and ceremony of the Act 1 finale—to be well on the way toward exchanging the role of Friedrich Ebert with that of the aging Hindenburg. As for the ruling classes, they applaud with equal fervor the president at the start of the first finale and the newly emerged dictator at the close. When the crowds emerge in the second finale to watch the parades that Ximenes has organized in the general's honor—much as Goebbels had organized the so-called "Day of Potsdam" for Hitler in March 1933—they are apparently at one with the regime and certainly incapable of identifying themselves with the unexpected result of the "symbolic referendum."

Since there is no collective will to support Juan's individual gesture of resistance to tyranny, the general can only be defeated by a *deus ex machina* whose absurdity is commensurate with his own. As a means of averting bloodshed and preserving the conventions of operetta, the rusted weaponry supplied by the Waterkeyn Corporation is serviceable enough. Comparison with the manner in which Richard Strauss and Josef Gregor contrived a happy ending for their tentatively antiwar opera *Friedenstag*—the outline of which was sketched by Stefan Zweig in August 1934, only a few months after the inception of *Der Kuhhandel*—reveals a direct parallel and an important difference. In both works the final crisis is resolved by a timely stroke of fortune rather than by a structural development; and "peace" is then restored and celebrated amidst a flourish of C major. But whereas in *Friedenstag* some form of *deus ex machina* was indispensable to a drama that had no ideological or dialectical basis, in *Der Kuhhandel* it was merely a tactical rather than strategic device, and the central argument is unscarred by it. The argument is not so much about militarism or authoritarianism as about the problem of effectively opposing both without in some sense becoming tainted by either. Rejecting as ineffective (or at least as idealistic and impractical) the concept of passive resistance advanced by the judge in *Die Bürgschaft* (Act 2, new scene), *Der Kuhhandel* satirizes the armaments trade in order to introduce the question of disarmament and relate to it the need for security in a dangerous world.

In 1921, a League of Nations commission on disarmament reported that munitions firms had sought to control and influence the press and public opinion and to spread alarmist reports about military

and naval programs.⁷ During the 1914–18 war there had been collusion between representatives of the armaments industry on the two sides, and the American branch of the industry had traded impartially with both sides until the United States itself entered the war. An “observer” was dispatched by three American firms to the Geneva Naval Conference in 1927 with instructions to use every means, including falsified press reports, to block or inhibit impending disarmament agreements. Covert links between armaments and newspaper interests continued to be influential after the first International Disarmament Conference convened in Geneva in February 1932. That conference, and its successor which opened in October 1933 and adjourned eight months later, achieved little. Germany resigned from the conference—and from the League of Nations—in October 1933, and the third disarmament conference, which met in May 1934, was the last. Germany had already published military estimates for the first phase of the rearmament cycle and in March 1935 announced the reintroduction of conscription. On 21 May, however, Hitler delivered a “peace speech” whose imagery of “rivers of blood” and general air of humanitarian concern would have gladdened the heart of the president of Santa Maria.

The year of the Nazi seizure of power, 1933, was also the year when the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to Sir Norman Angell, whose standard work, *The Great Illusion* (1910), was reprinted that year and dominated pacifist thinking until the end of the decade. Other notable publications during 1933 were Fenner Brockway's *The Bloody Traffic* and Beverley Nichols's *Cry Havoc!*, which opened with a skillful exposure of the armaments industry and all its works. (Nichols was later approached to undertake the English adaptation of *Der Kuhhandel*, but he declined.)

7. Most of the sources for the present account of inter-war disarmament politics would have been accessible to Vambéry and Weill in 1934–35. Beverly Nichols's *Cry Havoc!* (London, 1933) was an international best seller; its principal source was *The Secret International*, a documentation published in London in 1932 by the Union of Democratic Control. 1932 saw the publication in Paris of Jean Huteau's *Les Industries de Mort*, which was followed two years later by Jean Galtière-Bossière and René Lefebvre's *Les Marchands de Canons*. In England the campaigning publisher Victor Gollancz initiated a series of books on the armaments question with Fenner Brockway's *The Bloody Traffic* (1933); Routledge followed suit in 1934 with H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighen's *Merchants of Death*. Phillip Noel-Baker's *The Private Manufacturers of Arms* (London, 1936) appeared too late to influence *Der Kuhhandel*, but it is representative of the climate of opinion, as are the *Hearings of the Special Committee Investigating the Armaments Industry*, 73d Congress of the United States (Washington, 1934–35) and the *Minutes of Evidence Taken before the Royal Commission on the Private Manufacturing of and Trading in Armaments* (London, 1936). The techniques employed by the Waterkeyn Company and its representative in *Der Kuhhandel* are unmistakably modeled on those of Sir Basil Zaharoff; see Donald McCormick, *Pedlar of Death: The Life of Sir Basil Zaharoff* (London, 1965).

It was in the spring of 1934—just when *Der Kuhhandel* was beginning to take shape—that the armaments industry, in open defiance of international agreements, intervened in Bolivia's and Paraguay's dispute over the Gran Chaco territory and supplied both sides with the modern weapons they lacked. On 25 May 1934 many thousands died in Gran Chaco.

By then armaments salesmen had won their place in the popular demonology of the time. While cartoonists in the bourgeois press showed salesmen counting their profits from the carnage in Grand Chaco and major publishing houses were issuing such inflammatory titles as *Les Industries de Mort* and *Merchants of Death*, the Left had no need to exert itself in publicizing the notion that Marx's "werewolf capital" was abroad again. Nationalization of the industry—to which Leon Blum's Popular Front government finally resorted in 1936—was already being prepared by some of the more liberal advocates of capitalism. In 1933, Sir Arthur Salter had remarked: "Peace can exist under capitalism provided that no section of the industry can get into a position in which it can dictate the public policy. This danger exists in the armaments industry."⁸

In *Der Kuhhandel*, the business of selling arms is inseparable from the business of funding political reaction: Jones pays the general's debts just as the Ruhr industrialists paid the bankrupt Nazi Party's debts in 1932. In "The Ballad of Pharaoh," sung by Juan and his fellow workers in a railway freight-yard, an implied critique of capitalism serves as the functional link between the work's otherwise uneasily related indictments of dictatorship and rearmament. Since the workers are not aware that the unlabeled crates contain armaments, their militancy requires an objective value: whatever they carry on their backs is immaterial to their perception of labor conditions in Santa Maria. The first part of the two-part "Ballad of Pharaoh" begins as a call for deliverance, led by Juan, but becomes, in effect, a call for strike action. In his mediating arietta, "Seit ich in diese Stadt gekommen bin," Juan renounces urban industrial society and ends by declaring that he will return to the village where, thanks to the obliging cow, he is self-supporting. Then follows the second and intensified half of the ballad which effects the transition from class politics to national and (in Biblical guise) racist politics.

The fundamental difference between *Der Kuhhandel* and *A Kingdom for a Cow* is epitomized by the replacement of "The Ballad of Pharaoh"

8. Quoted by Sir Norman Angel, *The Great Illusion*, rev. ed. (London, 1933), p. 190. Sir (James) Arthur Salter (1881–1975), economist and statesman, held many positions within the British government but first won prominence during World War I as the organizer of world shipping. From 1922 until 1931 he directed the Economic and Finance Section of the League of Nations. Appointed professor of political theory and institutions at Oxford in 1934, he was elected to Parliament in 1937.

in the latter by a cheerful ditty entitled "San Salvatore" and by the removal of the introductory dialogue in which the workers complain about their miserly wages. The railway workers in *A Kingdom for a Cow* seem altogether content as they blithely whistle the refrain that links the verses of "San Salvatore."

In the most cogent section of his notes on the *Mahagonny* opera, Brecht said of the culture and entertainment industry that it is "conditioned by the society of the day, and only accepts what keeps it going in that society. We are free to discuss any innovations which do not threaten its social function—that of providing an evening's entertainment."⁹ To have ignored the fact that an evening's entertainment had always been the primary social function of operetta was hardly the kind of intellectual folly to which the authors of *Die Dreigroschenoper* would have subscribed. The "innovations" discussed by Weill and Vambery were not, in fact, incompatible with "an evening's entertainment" in, say, the Paris or Prague of 1934. What ensured that *Der Kuhhandel* would be unacceptable to a West End management in London without the excisions and additions that converted it into *A Kingdom for a Cow* was not so much the restoration of Offenbach's subversiveness (after its highly ingenious diffusion by Gilbert and Sullivan) as the consolidation, on the dark side, of that which Offenbach had found in the revolutionary Mozart. Together with the humane irony which, in the Weill of these and earlier years, invariably rescues satire from cynicism and therefore allows cynicism itself to be satirized, there goes an acute sense of the present perilousness of every ideal and endeavor. Music and text together proclaim not only that the war jokes of Johann Strauss's *Der lustige Krieg* or Offenbach's *La Grande Duchesse de Gérolstein* have lost their license, but also that the paths of true love can no longer convincingly be shown to lead to some last-minute revelation that will enable the impoverished lovers to live sumptuously ever after. The wedding of Juan and Juanita depends on only ten *duros*. But even that has to be earned, and there is no reason to suppose that the economic hazards that bedevilled the courtship will cease with the sound of wedding bells. In the world of *Der Kuhhandel* (but no longer in *A Kingdom for a Cow*), great and small alike are visibly and audibly living on the edge of disaster.

Yet *Der Kuhhandel* is Weill's first attempt to write "light music" as the man in the street understood it (until that particular street turned out to be a cul-de-sac). Within the strophic numbers, extreme contrasts of character or tonality are rare. Most of the music is firmly diatonic, with the

9. Bertolt Brecht and Peter Suhrkamp, "Anmerkungen zur Oper *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*," *Versuche* 2 (Berlin, 1930); trans. by John Willett in *Brecht on Theatre* as "The Modern Theatre is the Epic Theatre" (New York, 1964), p. 34.

major mode predominating and the relative minor as the favored contrasting area. All the numbers in medium and fast tempo are based on popular rhythms: traditional (Offenbachian) waltzes, marches, and can-can are balanced by Latin American rhythms appropriate to the milieu—a fandango for the general, a tango-refrain for the “Ballad of the Robber Esteban,” a calypso-cum-rumba for the betrothal rite, and several zarzuela-like passages in the finale. (In *A Kingdom for a Cow* the balance was tipped toward the Latin American side by the last-minute insertion in the second finale of the tango from *Marie galante*.)

In *Der Kuhhandel* the influence of European jazz idioms is confined to the bailiff's song and the lover's Boston, “Auf Wiederseh'n.” Since this was a dangerously meager ration in relation to the demands of the entertainment industry, it was doubled in *A Kingdom for a Cow*, where “San Salvatore” has a jazzy ground rhythm, and the new version of “The Song of the Cow” is a Left Bank Blues (and so it still sounds when transformed into “The Song of the Guns” in *Johnny Johnson*). Entirely missing from *Der Kuhhandel*, at the stage when Weill interrupted work on the German version and turned his thoughts to London, was any kind of popular song in the commercial sense. It was surely for that reason rather than for any artistic one that Weill arranged “Le Roi d'Aquitaine” from *Marie galante* as a duet and cobbled it on to the end of the opening scene, to which it manifestly bears no musical relationship. With that as his precedent he then composed two new or partly new numbers: “As Long As I Love” (whose lyrics by Desmond Carter have the memorable second-line rhyme “I live for my love”) and the “Ballad of the Robber Esteban.” Both are solos for Juanita—the first in a monochrome musical-comedy idiom flecked by a single Weillish chromaticism at every recurrence of the refrain's dominant harmony, the second a would-be *Schlager* that fails to match the precision of Vambery's pastiche folk song but faithfully reflects the platitudes of the English adaptation. The fact that these are the only extant solos for Juanita emphasizes their lack of any real relationship to the musical and aesthetic premises of *Der Kuhhandel*. Excrescences from Weill's commercial work of 1934, they are quite distinct from any of the numbers that were written before *A Kingdom for a Cow* was thought of.

The style and language of the original *Kuhhandel* numbers are new in the sense that neither is a “natural” development from the works of 1930–33, and yet both are organic in the sense that they have their roots in those works. Thus, the duet “Auf Wiederseh'n” begins in the C-minor manner of *Die sieben Todsünden*, but develops from its opening material a refrain in G major whose melodic/harmonic substance and wayward phraseology have no precedent in Weill. An analogous feat is accomplished in the tonally related quartet “O trüber Tag!” From an idea in C minor reminiscent of the Commissar's motif in *Die Bürgschaft*, Weill devel-

ops a refrain in G major unlike anything in that opera or indeed elsewhere in his music. Yet the voice is unmistakably Weill's, both in the expressive ambiguity of the dominant "resolution" and in the concomitant destructiveness of the final B-flat minor cadence—an event so alien to the world of musical comedy that it seems to encapsulate the reasons why the entire quartet was excluded from *A Kingdom for a Cow*.

More extensive evidence of Weill's self-renewal is provided by the two interlinked numbers sung by Juan and his fellow workers in the railway depot—"The Ballad of Pharaoh" and Juan's arietta. The *martellato* rhythm and open fifths that initiate "The Ballad of Pharaoh" stem from the *Konjunktur* music of 1927, while the harmonic extensions through third-related triads again recall *Die Bürgschaft*. But the force that binds them together is a new type of melody, one that proudly displays its Jewish origins (see ex. 1). The developments are neo-Handelian, but the shadows of *Die Bürgschaft* are soon dispelled by the resounding confidence of the ballad's triadic harmony. Metaphorically as well as literally, the major triad has a dominant function throughout the ballad: it persistently opposes the negative forces derived from the minor third stresses of *Die Bürgschaft* and finally overwhelms them. It seems that by identifying himself with the Jewish rather than with the German people, Weill in 1934 could reach the militant conclusion he had withheld from *Die Bürgschaft* in 1931.

The two parts of the ballad are bridged and illuminated by Juan's arietta, whose *molto cantabile* line and continuously developing single-span form contrast with the abrupt phrases and graphically repetitive movements of the work song. As a sequel to the first part of the ballad, the arietta expresses Juan's joy at his own imminent freedom from the labor market, a joy tempered by regret that his comrades will be left behind; as a prelude to the second part it explains why he renounces class war in favor of Tolstoyan verities. Its musical kinship with The Mother's arioso in D minor from *Der Jasager* and Jenny's "Havanna Lied" in *Mahagonny* may reflect the fact that the text incorporates domestic and maternal images comparable to theirs. But the basic musical idea and feeling could only have arisen from *Der Kuhhandel*. Like the betrothal rite, the arietta is in E major, a key traditionally associated, in opera and in lied, with spiritual or emotional havens, real or imaginary. When David Orth at the end of *Die Bürgschaft* has assured Mattes that he is being carried away to safety, the tonality reaches the threshold of E major, only to withdraw by way of a cadence as deceptive as Orth. In the achieved E major of the arietta, Weill recalls the Schubertian accompanimental rhythm of the Orth-Mattes duet, as if paradoxically to underline the genuineness of the values represented by Juan's village home; but in the development he averts any latent threat of sentimentality by means of a tonal shift to the flat side, which

alerts the listener to a tension between anticipated or recollected consolations and present dangers. The closing reaffirmation of E major does not suggest any permanence in the village idyll to which Juan is returning.

The level at which irony operates here is deep enough to allow the arietta to be accepted at face value as a directly appealing lyrical number. That, surely, is why it was admitted to *A Kingdom for a Cow*, while its counterpart, Juan's wry meditation on the theme of guns before butter, suffered the same fate as "The Ballad of Pharaoh" and had to give way to an inferior substitute. Brief though it is, the "Song of the Cow" has many fresh things to say about the "relative" values of E-flat major and C minor—of butter and guns. The harmonic shading, the tonal balance, and the orchestral texture created by grumbling basses and high-lying, night-sky counterpoints—all these are of a much finer imaginative order than anything in the second version, which keeps to a blues-tinged C minor and aspires no higher than an easily apprehensible and somewhat Pucciniesque pathos.

Such were the limits of seriousness in *A Kingdom for a Cow*. The theater that rejected certain elements on purely musical grounds demanded others that Weill would clearly have preferred to do without. Nothing in the incomplete *Kuhhandel* score, not even "The Ballad of Pharaoh" or "O trüber Tag," would have been quite so alarming to his prospective backers in London as the parsimonious and eccentric dispensations of romantic ingredients. Operetta, disqualified by its nature from appealing to the piety or religiosity of its time, traditionally had to content itself with advertising the divine and redemptive power of "romantic love"—"Die Liebe ist eine Himmelsmacht," as *Der Zigeunerbaron* declares. Since Weill had paid his last creative tribute to the ideals of romantic love in the period leading up to his studies with Busoni, the fact that Juanita's love songs are inferior to Juan's social ones is due to more than a quirk of inspiration. Juan is singing of circumstances and contingency, which for Weill are fundamental topics, whereas Juanita is left with folksy or commercialized affirmations of love's omnipotence.

Just how little the authors cared for the love songs is confirmed by the character and history of the opening scene by the trout stream. After the courtship has been presented symbolically—Juan's trout-fishing and the catch that Juanita rejects—there is a brief and conventional marriage proposal, whereupon the German libretto notes that "a duet will follow." But no organic continuation ever evolved. Weill's voice-and-piano sketch is firm until the marriage proposal, but then loses itself in meretricious chromatic sequences suggesting a bridge to a refrain but having no clear tonal destination. There the sketch ends. When Weill returned to it at the time of negotiations for the London production, he merely extended the bridge and attached to it a duet arrangement, in F major, of the D-flat

major ballad "Le Roi d'Aquitaine," which he had meanwhile composed for the heroine of *Marie galante* to sing as she watches over an old and dying Negro. Although this sweet-scented pastiche of a *café-concert* waltz may have charmed potential backers of *A Kingdom for a Cow*, it makes no musical sense as a sequel to the freshly imagined and classically poised setting of the trout-fishing scene. Here, with imagery developed from *Der Silbersee* and *Die sieben Todsünden*, Weill recaptures a springtime mood absent from his music since the days of *Frauentanz*. A bright stream of waltz figures issues from a B-flat major source, pursues its tonally unpredictable course (with occasional pauses, as if at some pool) until at last it arrives at the remotest possible key, E major, which is later to be that of the betrothal rite (and, later still, as we have seen, of Juan's homeward-looking arietta). So striking is this curtain-raiser, and so effectively does its impressionistic *allegro giusto* movement contrast with the narrative pacing of the choral prologue, that its *Marie galante* appendage seems to cripple the whole work. Fortunately—and it is not the only good fortune of this kind—Weill's unpublished manuscripts contain material for an extended waltz-duet whose character and proportions are exactly those of the remainder of the scene.¹⁰ With that as its conclusion, the whole scene is in balance with its structural counterpart, "Der Mädchenraub," the betrothal rite.

In "Der Mädchenraub" Weill accomplishes a doubly unexpected feat: first, in creating a frankly popular number with climax and coda fulsome enough for *Das Land des Lächelns*; second, in reconciling this with something of the classical restraint of *Der Jasager*. It is almost as if the formalities and stern exactions of the betrothal rite were being interpreted as aspects of Noh-theater. Indeed, after the lover has abducted his beloved and defied her parents, the subservience he demands of her is

10. In the sense that it seems to epitomize the structural problems left unsolved or actually aggravated by *A Kingdom for a Cow*, the opening scene of *Der Kuhhandel* was the starting point for the performing edition of the score that I prepared in 1970–72 in collaboration with Christopher Shaw, who was responsible for orchestrating—with exemplary fidelity to Weill—not only the important numbers left unorchestrated (some seventy pages of full score) but also the "new" first-scene duet and various shorter numbers (another fifty pages of full score). The material for the latter had been culled from sketches dating from the period 1935–37 that either related directly to *Der Kuhhandel* or had clear musical affinities with it. The musical aspects of the performing edition were, of course, inseparable from dramaturgic and textual considerations; but the tentative revision of the text on which Josef Heinzemann and I collaborated and which we submitted to Robert Vambery with a view toward production in a West German municipal theater did not meet with Vambery's approval either in principle or in substance. All materials relating to the Shaw-Drew "performing edition" and to the tentative revision of the text were therefore withdrawn. Subsequent attempts to establish a performing edition agreeable to all parties have so far been fruitless.

defined by a catechism curiously analogous to that of The Teacher and The Boy in *Der Jasager* and is granted in that same mode of *Einverständnis*:

- Juan*: Will you leave your father?
Juanita: I will leave him.
Juan: And forget your friends?
Juanita: I will forget them.
Juan: And none know but me?
Juanita: None but you.¹¹

The terseness of this is already anticipated by the ensemble's abrupt start (see ex. 2). The same motif recurs when Juan first suggests they spend the night together (see ex. 3). The contrasting music is in feminine character and a more popular style (with major-minor harmony, added sixths, and leading-note suspensions). But when the lovers join together in a duet, their music—begun by Juan—denies them the rosy illusions of operetta, for the bass tritone (see ex. 4) seems rooted in the realism of Juan's obdurate questions:

- Will you live with me in a single hut?
 Will you eat with me from a single plate?
 Will you lie with me on a single couch?

In *A Kingdom for a Cow*, this became:

- Simple is my fortune, but will you share it?
 Humble is my dwelling, but will you share it?

Poverty and concupiscence were evidently not considered suitable topics for a London audience in 1935. The fact that there are no explicit declarations of love in the original scene contributes to its strange atmosphere and also to its sense; for it allows the emphasis to fall on the social rather than the romantic significance of the ritual, so that the tenderness and passion with which the music is nonetheless informed seem already to have survived adversity and been strengthened by it.

Juan and Juanita declare their love for the first and last time when they are separated and then only in the anguished coda to their "letter duet" in the Act 1 finale. The duet itself mainly concerns the nature and circumstances of their separation. It takes the romantic relationship for granted and concentrates on the social one in which Juan and Juanita appear as sole representatives of the common people whose destinies are

11. "Der Mädchenraub," holograph rehearsal score, pp. 14–15; the text (my translation) as set by Weill differs slightly from that in the original libretto (untitled photocopy in the Weill-Lenya Research Center with pages numbered 5–115; "Der Mädchenraub" is on pp. 31–34).

being decided by the events at the state banquet. Exemplary as the simplicity of their gravely tranquil music sounds when it is first juxtaposed with the banquet music, its effect is greatly enhanced when the two musics are combined. The crowning stroke is reserved for the close of the first finale, long after the lovers have faded from view. As the banquet guests applaud the coup d'état in a *pomposo* chorus ("Die starke Hand hat Gott gesandt"), the orchestra replies with a *fortissimo* reprise of the "letter music." This reminder of what is at stake in ordinary human terms raises the finale to a level to which neither Offenbach nor Johann Strauss had cause to aspire, and yet it remains true to their formal conventions. At the close of a predominantly ironic and parodistic structure, Weill has contrived to refer to the reality of political oppression with a gesture so simple that one is surprised at its moving effect until one notes the dignity and complexity of the feeling behind it.

The divergence from Offenbach is always most striking in those passages where the political background or foreground seems to call for satire. The music for Santa Maria's Prussianizing national anthem is a notable example, for it is first heard in an orchestral version as preface to the choral prologue. Without the rampant folly of its text it reveals no satirical intent but evokes the patriotic matter of early Wagner to such (mock-) serious effect that the final scene of *Lohengrin* seems about to be replayed with some latter-day German leader acknowledging the acclaim of his liegemen and summoning them to battle against the enemies of the Reich.

Too "good" to be parody of something so deplorable, the introductory version of the anthem relates in spirit to the two *recitativo* speeches delivered by the president. In the first, the old muddler declares his sacred obligation to the cause of peace with such passionate conviction that his music's recollection of the Pilgrims' Chorus in *Tannhäuser* seems spontaneous rather than parodistic; in the second he concludes his announcement of a Public Welfare Tax with a musical reference, via the so-called "Johannistag" motif, to Pogner's Address in *Die Meistersinger*. Conceptually, the device of comparing the president's view of public welfare to Pogner's fulfills all the requirements of Offenbachian satire. Musically, however, its effect is transformed by a lyricism which grows out of Wagner's as if of its own accord, and it ends by indicating the humane sense behind the president's hypocrisy.

For obvious reasons, Weill seems to have found the general harder to approach than the president. Of the surviving attempts at his blood-and-thunder entry song, the one that finally reached *A Kingdom for a Cow* is certainly the most convincing in its fusion of the sinister and the comic. Were the original setting of the German lyrics not missing, it might clarify Weill's attitude toward a figure whose representative significance had the

most direct bearing on his own predicament. There is perhaps a trace of hostility in his second (fandango) setting of the general's drinking song in Act 2, but none at all in the number entitled "Das Erlebnis im Café," a brilliantly successful Offenbachiade which only Weill could have written. The pleasure he had in composing it is so much a part of what the song conveys that he might almost be suspected of having momentarily forgotten that the general is not the buccaneering bon vivant he would like to be taken for.

In fact, Weill can well afford to be charitable: with great cunning, he has reserved for the relatively insignificant person of the bailiff all the opprobrium which, according to the antifascist conventions of the day, should have been heaped on the general. By tackling the phenomenon of authoritarianism at the level of petty officialdom rather than at the summit, he is able to achieve his ends without destroying the operetta conventions. Like the Lottery Agent in *Der Silbersee*, the bailiff has only one number; and it, too, is all-important.

"The Song of the Bailiff" is political cabaret self-inflated into operetta for satirical purposes and raised to a higher power by the quality and critical efficacy of its composition. The four bars of arrogantly strutting harmonies which open the song (see ex. 5) are sufficient to expose the insolence of the refrain (see ex. 6a) and the cheapness of its oily chromaticism. It so happens that a very similar refrain (see ex. 6b) was concocted in 1929 by the Berlin Agitprop troupe Kolonne Links for a song satirizing politically biased film censors. The fact that the resemblance is explained by a common resemblance to Yellen and Ager's 1927 hit, "Ain't She Sweet?", tells us everything about the aims of the Agitprop song but nothing about the bailiff's song that has not already been unmasked by example 5. In that sense it is wholly characteristic that the bailiff's first mention of his official role is associated with a transposition and harmonic "ennoblement" (intensification) of his chromatic motif. For a moment, the dignity of his office has got the better of his sense of personal outrage. But as soon as he reminds himself that Juan's threats of physical violence are, in effect, threats both to the state itself and to the civil and military powers at its command, his music throws dignity to the winds and breaks into a *stringendo*, *poco a poco* jazz development of the chromatic motif which culminates, *allegro molto*, in a fanfaronade of blue thirds as the bailiff gives warning of what will befall anyone who dares to raise a hand against him.

The villagers' choric reiteration of his warning gives the bailiff time to regain his composure. Drawing himself to his full height—and 5'1" would be ideal for the part—he concludes with a brief homily about his fatherland and the common weal. The effect of the words alone is ludicrously sentimental; but Weill recognizes in them a reflection of a uni-

versal feeling, if not of his own loss, and, with a generosity that transcends all caricature, allows that the bailiff too is a human being—no worse, perhaps, than Juan's schoolmaster father, a die-hard conservative nationalist who believes what he reads and reads what he believes. The *molto espressivo* character of the bailiff's peroration is a victory of heart and mind over justified prejudice. Snatched from the tight grip of mockery, it sounds genuine and is convincing for purely musical reasons: the substance for it is derived, astonishingly, from the song's opening material. The feat of composition is precisely matched to the depth of understanding. Cabaret, operetta, and indeed Offenbach are left far behind.

A brief orchestral coda reinstates the song's critical functions and dismisses the bailiff from the scene. The anger contained in it is part of the essence and the genius of the song, and it is not, in principle, disproportionate to the dramatic situation. There is, however, a further reason why Weill invested so much in this, the only number of a "minor" character. During the last two winters of the Weimar Republic, Germany's rural economy suffered appallingly from the effects of the world crisis. As distraint orders and compulsory land auctions became the order of the day, and both the national and the *Länder* governments failed to fulfill their welfare obligations, commentators from left and right warned of an incipient peasants' revolt. One of the earliest and most widely reported incidents occurred in the state of Baden, where the Weill family had its roots. In November 1931 an impoverished allotment farmer named Baetz shot and killed the local bailiff who had arrived with a distraint order upon his only cow. Baetz was charged with murder and committed to a mental institution. Bailiffs now took to carrying arms and often had to be given police protection. Friedrich Wolf's play *Bauer Baetz*, with music by Hanns Eisler, was written in 1932 to promote the KPD's (Kommunistische Partei Deutschland) United Front policy for revolutionary workers and peasants. After its first performance in December of that year, no one in the literary and intellectual circles with which Weill was familiar could for long have remained ignorant of the fatal meeting between Baetz and the bailiff.

Everything the bailiff's song has to say about the role of *Beamtentum* in furthering the interests of authority irrespective of its legitimacy is applicable to the Prussian tradition as a whole. Perhaps because that tradition had so often been reviewed by Weill's music in the Weimar years, the Weill of the antimilitarist "Song of the Cow" is contemplative rather than aggressive. Even the "O trübe Tag" quartet is circumspect until its fierce cadence. The main thrust is reserved for the work's conclusion—the second finale, an extended structure that merits detailed consideration in light of its potentially "overwhelming" subject matter.

The music that begins the second finale is like a breath of the old

Berliner Luft from the last golden summers of the pre-1914 era. As one column after the other marches into the town square, Weill observes the simple-minded melodic sequences with amused affection and gives no hint of danger, whether past, present, or future. There is a slight darkening of tone when General Conchas arrives singing the refrain of his entry song from Act 1, but it is not sustained; as soon as he begins his (unpitched but rhythmically notated) militarist harangue, the holiday mood is restored by a vamped accompaniment in E-flat major. To conclude the initial stage of the finale, the general announces the one-man referendum to the music of the ex-president's Wagnerian recitative—last heard as a peace speech at the gala dinner in Act 1 and still sounding amiable enough despite the new scoring for trombones, tuba, and harp.

Weill's musico-dramatic plan for the second finale has two reciprocal functions. On the one hand, a traditional form of light music is interposed like a scrim between the scene itself and its ugly contemporary background in order to make possible a denouement strictly within the chosen operetta framework; on the other, a consistently cheerful opening not only creates tension through contradiction of the expectations aroused by the previous scene (in which Juan and Juanita's feelings about the general and his referendum are expressed in an angry duet in D minor) but also ensures that when the crisis comes, an elementary musical contrast will—if properly composed—provide the necessary emphasis. And so it does. Juan's act of rebellion is presented in musical terms strong enough to ensure that its symbolic significance is protected from the low comedy, yet light enough not to distort the more precarious balance of the operetta form. After a sustained open fifth has underpinned the fateful question, Juan boxes the general's ears on a *fortissimo* downbeat which momentarily suggests the earlier "oompah" accompaniment but then reels back in slow and thunderstruck waltz time—*diminuendo a pp*. These eight bars establish the key of C minor and prepare the way for a strangely hallucinatory choral waltz in which the populace wonders how best to react to the untoward result of the referendum.

C minor—hitherto associated only with "O trüber Tag" and some incidental music for the military maneuvers at the start of Act 2—now replaces E-flat major as the principal key of the second finale. It is not, however, intended to convey a tragic feeling, either at this time or later on. By reducing the rate of harmonic change (with the aid of prolonged pedal points), lowering the dynamic norm to *piano*, and adopting an exotic (*zigeuner*) melodic idiom, Weill contrives to shift the action into a dream-world where all emotions seem unreal and questions of probability irrelevant. The change is achieved with so light a touch that one may overlook its importance. In fact, it is the first move toward providing a structural and imaginative justification for the otherwise unprepared

trick with the defective weapons. The clinching move is the setting (in the major of the new tonic) of the pleas for clemency sung in the name of the virgins of Santa Maria by Mme. Odette's whores as they emerge from her nearby establishment dressed in bridal white and bearing garlands (see ex. 7). The display of C-major innocence is so outrageous that henceforth nothing can safely be taken on trust. It even allows for games to be played with Juanita's "Ballad of Esteban": having been reminded of the ballad by Juanita, the general obligingly sings it in counterpoint to the music of example 7. But then, as if to show what rubbish the ballad is, he ends by brusquely repeating the order for Juan's immediate execution.

While the firing squad goes to collect the rifles from the arsenal, Juan and Juanita begin a farewell duet in C minor whose music does not take itself as seriously as they do. Despite the swooping lines and weeping appoggiaturas, an air of unreality is suggested by the close harmonic relationship with the previous waltz chorus. The monotone interjections of two dignitaries who are worried about missing their siesta are another sign that the tears will soon be over. Sure enough, a grief-laden series of falling sequences leads to F major and a lively mock-fugal chorus (in four dummy parts) for the members of the firing squad as they return from the arsenal brandishing their useless rifles.

The subject of the disarmament "fugue" (see ex. 8) belongs to the same simple-minded family as the sequential parading tune at the start of the finale. Although the counterpoint is hardly intended to bear examination, the effect it creates in the context is perfectly judged. After the tearful C minor, the tonal and textural contrast is comic enough in purely musical terms to supply what is necessarily missing from the libretto; and, like all local solutions that are truly inspired, it has long-term consequences. Having devised a countersubject that introduces a new and, for the moment, unexplained quality of skittishness, Weill turns to the comic pathos of men whose symbols of virility have suddenly failed them and gives them the remaining vocal entries a *cantabile* accompaniment which extracts the maximum plangency from a harmonic emphasis on the submediant and supertonic elements in the underlying root progression (I–VI–II–V). Finally, there arises from that modal emphasis a *fortissimo* climax in which Juan and Juanita conclude their farewell duet as if now in D minor, while the soldiers in unison roar out their F major "fugue" subject and Mme. Odette's young ladies do their utmost on behalf of the skittish countersubject. A codetta brings this amazing ensemble quietly to rest in G major, with the combined chorus reiterating the words which began it—"Excellenz, es ist fatal."

Although Weill saved the whole rifle episode from becoming "fatal" in quite another sense, the danger is not yet over. A work that sprang from a fundamentally serious concern with reality has now been forced to

escape into a storybook realm of playful fantasy; and there it promises to end, without further thought of its original obligations, yet faithful to the code of traditional operetta. Given the choice of genre, one could argue that any other kind of conclusion would be inappropriate; and it is certainly true that after the rifle episode, and at this late stage in the libretto, no explicit restatement of the work's serious themes is artistically practicable. Nevertheless, the music is still free to express its own thoughts and, hence, to remind us that the questions of war and peace in Santa Maria are not altogether divorced from those in the world outside. There is, however, some delay before Weill can take advantage of that freedom.

Structurally, the firing squad's hushed cadence in G major seems to lean toward an immediate conclusion in C major. But what actually follows—after a few spoken lines and the general's return to the platform for his second speech—is a literal repeat of the E-flat major vamped figure. As a mere signpost indicating the hollowness of the general's sudden espousal of peace and goodwill, the reprise serves its dramatic purpose. Musically, however, it marks a temporary break in the flow of Weill's invention. Apart from the appropriately unctuous setting of the words with which the general pardons Juan, there are no fresh ideas for some while. The effect of scrappiness, especially on the tonal level, is confirmed by the ensuing reprise, in its original E major, of the love duet (example 4) from the betrothal rite. If, as seems likely, Weill would have preferred to ignore the conventional and indeed commercial need for such a reprise, that could well explain the awkwardness of the whole passage following the firing squad's cadence in G major and the unseemly haste with which the music of the enraptured lovers is dismissed by the orchestra, which bursts in on their final cadence, establishes a new *vivace* tempo, and then hurtles down to the long-awaited key of C major.

The sense of release is immediate, and the dramatic reason for it confirmed as the soldiers sing that they now have neither weapons nor honor nor security, but at least they are *happy* (see ex. 9). The skittishness of the "countersubject" in the disarmament fugue is now explained; and the melancholy, which also was there, has apparently disappeared. With a neatly prepared leap to the flat submediant key—whose own flat submediant *harmony* pretends to provide a retrospective enharmonic justification for the E major of the previous "romantic" reprise—the lovers take the stage again and jubilantly proclaim that they each have five *duros*, making the ten they need for a new cow. As if to remind them that Santa Marian fiscal policies are always liable to upset such calculations, Weill abruptly divides the metrical scheme into irregular twos and threes that never add up to more than seven. It is only when the threes are ousted that the lovers are allowed to conclude with a triumphant ten-bar phrase.

The phrase moves back to C major (closing on a prolonged domi-

nant seventh) and seems to promise an immediate return to the frivolities of example 8. But at the very point where the finale would thus have become irrevocably trapped on the level of entertainment, Weill re-establishes the essential connections and does so by the most radical means available to him: he reverts to a much earlier idea whose function had been satirical and transforms it into something that proves strong enough to sustain and bring to an unexpectedly moving conclusion everything that is fundamental to the work's serious purposes. The passage gives final and conclusive evidence of the way his inner feelings have tended throughout the work to neutralize his anti-German intentions.

The theme of the closing passage is a variant of the one that dominated the mock-Prussian parade at the start of the finale. In that context and setting, its *raison d'être* was the comic discrepancy between its aspirations and its technical capacity. Flat-footed, short-winded, and yet—through sheer obtuseness—invincibly and touchingly proud of itself, it knew of no other way to halt its descending sequences than to start them again a fourth higher. Thus, a single 4-bar phrase was made to grow like some diminutive stage-army whose soldiers no sooner reach the wings on one side than they must run around to join the end of the column before it comes into view on the other side. The possibility of making an endless loop was evident from the start (see ex. 10). The tune had seemed unfit for anything but its original purpose of cheerfully mocking the general's "Day of National Uprising"; and having served that purpose well, it had been discarded. That it should now reappear, in C major, as the immediate sequel to the lovers' "10 duro" duet, is already surprising; that it should do so in an augmented and reharmonized form which conveys the parting words of the general with such quiet and touching dignity that they sound like some quixotic farewell to arms—though on paper they merely express disappointment at the turn of events—is something that has to be heard to be believed, and heard, moreover, in the formal context of the entire finale. For instance, the new harmonization arises from the same I–VI–II–V root progression that lent so strange a poignancy to the soldiers' fugal complaints about their useless weapons; and the similar feeling in the general's music is enhanced by the ruminations of the violins, high above the vocal part and its soberly walking bass. If the music evokes the world of example 10, it is only to hint (as the text does not) that the general has already begun to see beyond it and may yet prove worthy of better things. Satire that refuses to destroy the destructible adversary is characteristic of *Der Kuhhandel* and worthy of Weill. (And how typical of *A Kingdom for a Cow* that this chivalrous gesture toward the general was omitted.)

The process of transforming and reorienting the idea in example 10 culminates in a choral hymn. Its subject is not "peace" but "joy," not

“Friede” (by now a discredited word) but “Freude.” While the new variant of example 10 is taken over by the orchestra in an ampler and structurally different harmonization, the chorus of townspeople reaffirms the words of example 9 in a fresh setting: “We have no honor, guns or security, but we do have (an immense) joy.” The fact that the new setting sounds notably more sagacious than example 9 is partly due to the breadth and demeanor of the accompanying music; but the decisive element is the one implicit in its own melodic and dynamic structure, which lays equal emphasis upon the losses of weapons and military honor while reserving the main stress for the consequent lack of security. The climax is reached at the word “Sicherheit” (security) in the third 8-bar phrase of what still promises to be a 32-bar variation on the march music in example 10. The climax not only emphasizes the word itself but also engulfs the joyful march tune and its striding bass and precipitates an immediate flight from the “security” of the home key, the major mode, and the 32-bar unit. As example 11 shows, the tension produced by associating the word “Freude” (joy) with a falling phrase that lands on a minor triad is then increased by the melodic/harmonic clash in the second falling phrase and is not resolved until the final phrase—again a falling one—which leads back to example 8’s chirpy C major. The slip of the pen in the holograph vocal score that has the townspeople singing “keine” instead of “eine Riesenfreud” seems true to the music’s expressive sense, for the unmistakable implication of the whole passage is that, whereas the soldiers are indeed “immensely joyful,” the now defenseless civilians are rather less so.

By stressing the loss of security with such firmness that for a moment the rejoicings collapse, Weill at one stroke dissociated *Der Kuhhandel* from the ostrich attitudes of so many peace campaigners of the day and ensured that the finale could fulfill its obligations for the work’s fundamental seriousness of purpose. The effect is already apparent when the merry strains of example 9 are resumed by the entire company at the end of example 11. What had originally seemed to be a form of musical make-believe appropriate to the toy-town armies of traditional operetta has now acquired a critical context and a human dimension. Example 11’s warnings about the future delimit the merriment of example 9 in such a way that Weill can now with good conscience allow the civilians to take part in it; whatever their doubts about the general’s “true and lasting peace,” they have at least been saved from the immediate threat of war.

In that sense a rumbustious conclusion on the theme of example 9 would have been an artistically justifiable response to the requirements of operetta. But Weill goes on to complete the thematic symmetry indicated by example 9’s return and gives it a wholly serious function; his closing paragraph reaffirms the C major “hymn to joy” which example 11 had

prematurely interrupted and this time sustains it to the very end: not by eliminating the previous stresses, but by redistributing them so as to suggest that a balance had been struck between natural high spirits and reasonable doubts. In place of the expected harmonic crisis at the word "Sicherheit," a slight but still sufficient stress is exerted by contrapuntal means, whereupon the melodic line slowly ascends, instead of falling swiftly as it had in example 11. Meanwhile, the bass line has been restricted to marking the changes of harmony every four bars, thus emphasizing the fact that the root progression, I-VI-II-V, is identical with the one that had already compared the general's *pianissimo* "farewell to arms" with that strange moment of sadness in the firing squad's fugato; and it is the general we are particularly reminded of now, since it is "his" instrument, the tuba, that gives the bass line its distinctive color.

The slow ascent of the melodic line after the harmonically secure setting of "Sicherheit" coincides with the dominant stage in the I-VI-II-V progression; and since the words are by now as familiar as the harmony and since the phrase is marked *crescendo* throughout, it is reasonable to expect an "immense" tonic downbeat on the very last word, "Riesenfremd." But having removed one kind of stress from "security," Weill places another kind on "joy" (see ex. 12). The flat submediant interpolation has the effect of recalling the lovers and their jubilant A-flat major duet and thus suggesting that theirs is a truly "immense" joy of the sort that can safely be celebrated by everyone (including even the general, or so the tuba's merry runs suggest). It is left to the orchestra to confirm C major with a vehemence that reminds us how ambiguous, by comparison, were the closing festivities of the Second Symphony and how self-questioning the gentle affirmation of hope at the end of *Der Silbersee*. It is indeed the most exuberant ending to any of Weill's works since the early 1920s; one has to go back as far as the *Sinfonia Sacra* and its closing "Hymnus" to find anything remotely comparable in that respect. Even so, the joy it expresses is not, as we have seen, unqualified. Moreover, the conventions of a "happy end," as operetta traditionally sees it, have been complied with only up to the point where a powerful expressive need asserts itself and is answered. Without such a need, structural integration of the kind Weill finally achieved would have been beyond his or any other composer's reach.

Comparison with the closing chorale of *Die Dreigroschenoper* shows that in the operetta's "hymn to joy" any residual irony has been subordinated. Whereas the structure of the chorale is decisively influenced by the irony it conveys, that of the hymn is designed to restore the symmetry which irony had previously disturbed. The differing degrees and levels of integration do not, however, indicate differences of expressive intensity; and they are only partly attributable to the structural consequences of the irony, since the chorale's comprehensive motivic organization would have

been incompatible with the more relaxed and traditional melodic structures of *Der Kuhhandel*. In any case, it is not through motivic working that the chorale's irony is first revealed. The salient features are tonal: first the chorale's C-major answer to Peachum's C-minor admonitions, and then the undermining cadential retreat to the subdominant.

A similar tonal procedure and expressive effect could well have figured in *Der Kuhhandel*, but not at the end and especially not via C major. In *Die Dreigroschenoper*, that most "just" and homely of keys had from the start been robbed of its moral connotations and forced to become a neutral and vagrant observer of human frailties. Since there was insufficient dramatic or philosophical justification for its apparent recovery of righteousness at the start of the final chorale, it was only by pointedly retreating from it that Weill could indicate the absence of those reassurances with which many classical and romantic composers had associated it. But in *Der Kuhhandel*, C major undergoes a fundamental change. When first established by the trio, "Schlafe, Santa Maria," it seems even more lethal than it did in *Die sieben Todsünden* and much further removed from its traditional associations. In homage to the Offenbach of *Hoffmann* rather than the operettas, but for purposes that are strictly political, Weill uses the convention of the lullaby to strip C major of any honorable intentions. As the president, his domestic advisor, and his war minister sing, in close imitation, of their need for the nation's trust—which only a moment before they shamelessly betrayed—and as their *berceuse* for Santa Maria and its democratic institutions wafts through the night air, the music's lyricism is wholly charming yet purely Mephistophelean. The only outward sign of evil intent is a stealthy move from C major to C-sharp minor and back again; but in case the listener should overlook it and be puzzled by the music's apparent blandness, a brief orchestral ritornello evokes Brecht's image of the sharks by citing the opening motif of the "Moritat." Although the substance of the lullaby-trio is very different from that of the "Moritat," the quotation indicates the type of audience Weill was thinking of in 1934, since it would have been noticed only by audiences familiar with the stage, film, or recorded versions of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. (The "Moritat" did not begin a life of its own until 1955.)

So perversely fascinating is the effect of the lullaby that it almost seems to account for the harmonic impotence of the subsequent "Ballad of Esteban," which uses or misuses C major as an emblem of the innocence and *Volkstümlichkeit* that the general longs to be reminded of. So it is no wonder that the next we hear of C major is from Mme. Odette's whores (ex. 7). The wonder is that they prove to be its salvation. For their pretense of innocence is oddly and humorously childlike; and from that to the frank naiveté of example 8 is only a short step. With the final episodes, C major at last wins back its traditional strength and virtue.

It says much for Weill's character that such a conclusion was reached

at a time when he might forgivably have despaired of the world around him and of his own situation in it. In the context of his German works it represents a fulfillment of the fleeting C major passages in *Die Bürgschaft* (Act I finale) and *Der Silbersee* (Fennimore's entry) and thus a safe crossing to the opposite and happier side of the latter's symbolically frozen waters. Within *Der Kuhhandel* itself, the story of C major epitomizes the whole drama; and its conclusion confirms that *Der Kuhhandel* was—in its essence—an expression of artistic and intellectual convictions.

The same could hardly be said of the *Kingdom for a Cow* numbers (except for the choral prologue, whose origins are in any case rather obscure).¹² In a qualitative and chronological sense, they are successors to the purely popular numbers Weill had written for *Marie galante* after completing the main part of the *Kuhhandel* draft. If his financial circumstances had allowed him to complete every detail of *Der Kuhhandel* before they forced him to embark on *Marie galante*, and if a German-language production of *Der Kuhhandel* had materialized in, say, Zurich or Prague, he would, at worst, have been none the poorer, and posterity would have been the richer.

A Kingdom for a Cow was the unhappy result of an attempt to superpose the conventions of modern musical comedy on an incomplete formal structure that had been designed according to the quite distinct if related conventions of operetta. For the very reasons that had ensured the decline of operetta and the rise of the musical, the two sets of conventions were incompatible. There was never any hope of success for *A Kingdom for a Cow*—especially in the London of Noel Coward and Ivor Novello—so long as the pacing and the greater part of the structure of *Der Kuhhandel* were retained. Meanwhile, the adoring public that continued to support the D'Oyly Carte Company's monopoly of Gilbert and Sullivan was open to approaches only from composers and librettists who obeyed the strict rules of Savoy opera but were clever enough to turn them to their own advantage. The last composer to accomplish that feat was Walter Leigh (1905–1942), who wrote his first “comic opera,” *The Pride of the Regiment*, in 1931, shortly after returning to England from three years' study in Berlin with Hindemith. Of that background there is no trace: with a forgetfulness of recent events typical of the English musical theater of its day, *The Pride of the Regiment* harks back to the Crimean War and interweaves its romance of the upper-middle classes and harmless politico-military comedy about General Sir Joshua Blazes, his prime minister, and a villainous traitor to the Russians. Such were the frontiers that *A Kingdom for a Cow* breached. In his second and more celebrated comic opera, *Jolly*

12. The problematic origin of the choral prologue is discussed in my forthcoming *Kurt Weill: A Handbook*.

Roger, which was produced at the Savoy Theater two years before *A Kingdom for a Cow*, Leigh and his librettists retreated to seventeenth-century Jamaica for a pirate comedy very much simpler than Gilbert and Sullivan's and more "modern" only because of some echoes from the recently revived and hugely successful *Beggar's Opera*. The scene is a model of British decorum and gives not the slightest hint that its composer might have chanced upon *Die Dreigroschenoper* during his wanderings in Berlin.

An English adaptation of *Der Kuhhandel* that emulated the home-spun virtues of *The Pride of the Regiment* and *Jolly Roger*, and treated the political content accordingly, would have been easier to accomplish than a wholesale popularization and would perhaps have stood a better chance of success with the Savoy Theater public. The only audience in London for anything resembling the original *Kuhhandel* was the one created in the shadow of the world crisis, the one for which Ashley Dukes had adapted and staged plays by Kaiser, Toller, and Feuchtwanger at his little Mercury Theater (opened in 1933) and which now, in 1935, supported Rupert Doone's Group Theater and its first Auden-Isherwood production, *The Dog beneath the Skin*.

For such a public in 1935, sets in the approved Piscator style, with blow-ups and projections of topical news photographs, were no longer a novelty. But the photo-montages which Hein Heckroth—a gifted associate of Caspar Neher—incorporated in his original set designs for *A Kingdom for a Cow* so alarmed the management of the Savoy Theater and the representatives of the celebrated couturier Schiaparelli (who was providing the financial backing and the costumes) that Heckroth was obliged to redesign the sets in conventional style. For the same reasons, the original idea that the part of General Conchas should be played as a parody of Goering was dropped in favor of broad comedy. The tendency of the production, especially toward the end of the rehearsal period (when the original director was replaced), was reflected in the advance publicity, which might have been expressly devised to ensure that the "serious" public stayed away.

As a mere by-product, already faulty in itself and then made doubly so by faulty marketing, *A Kingdom for a Cow* was unprecedented in Weill's career. The production process that gave it an appearance of completeness left it without some of the structural supports that ensure the survival, against all odds, of the unfinished *Kuhhandel*—a "work-in-progress," but a work for all that. In its incompleteness and also in what it nevertheless completed, *Der Kuhhandel* was the unquiet resting place between the old way and the new. From *Die Bürgschaft* it inherited part of its underlying thesis about the relationship between authority and violence; to *Johnny Johnson* and *Knickerbocker Holiday* it handed over the task of

developing this line of discussion in an American context. When the possibility of continuing such developments was, in effect, preempted by the outbreak of the Second World War, the only implications of *Der Kuhhandel* that could still be worked out were formal and generic. For that purpose the fantasy world of *Lady in the Dark* proved ideal: its through-composed dream sequences provided opportunities for sustained invention in popular idioms which had not been available since *Der Kuhhandel*, while the compositional experiment with irrational continuities substituted for the missing level of sociopolitical reality.

In that sense *Lady in the Dark* was literally a tour de force and could not be repeated. Once Weill had assessed the professional consequences of its success, it was to the Offenbach tradition that he returned. A "Nell Gwyn" operetta with political overtones was one of his favored projects;¹³ and another, based on F. Anstey's novella, *The Tinted Venus*, had begun to develop as a "European" operetta before it came to grief and was swiftly reconstituted as the all-American *One Touch of Venus*—a putatively conventional "musical" whose subversive and anarchic elements were so skillfully packaged that they went almost unnoticed. Formally speaking, Weill's evident longing for a return to Offenbachian principles remained unassuaged by *One Touch of Venus*: hence the Columbus escapade in *Where Do We Go from Here?* and hence *The Firebrand of Florence*. It was in *The Firebrand*, written and staged well before the end of the Second World War, that Weill ventured a brief but highly significant reaffirmation of the unsoldierly sentiments which had informed so many of his European works and the first of his American ones; and yet it was there that he allowed the sorry history of *A Kingdom for a Cow* to repeat itself, with peculiarly painful variations.

The period between January 1941 and February 1945—that is, between the triumph of *Lady in the Dark* and the disaster of *The Firebrand*—was the latest and longest of the three periods in which Weill might conceivably have risked coupling Offenbach's name with his own (and the risk would have been doubled in the presence of Adorno or of someone known to him). That he would at any time have described himself as "the Offenbach of his century" is beyond the bounds of credibility unless the words were exclaimed with ironic bravado after his first year in France—which was the time of *Der Kuhhandel*. The only known instance of the collocation is, however, in a letter of 1928 from Weill to his publisher in which he objected to a critic's thesis on "Weill als Humperdinck" and proposed "Weill als Offenbach" in its stead.¹⁴ His admiration for Offen-

13. The "Nell Gwyn" project originated in September 1942; see also note 18.

14. Weill to Universal Edition, 17 October 1928.

bach is frequently attested in his critical writings from 1925 on;¹⁵ but this particular expression of it seems calculated to disarm rather than persuade. Hostile as he must have been to any exposure of his musical origins by association with so passionate a Wagnerian as Humperdinck, he adduced an obviously heterodox figure, regardless of the fact that his own creative connections with Offenbach (unlike those he once had, and was to have again, with Humperdinck) were extremely tenuous. Aside from the can-can in *Zaubernacht* and some snapshots in *Der Zar lässt sich photographieren*, there was nothing for Weill to point to but an arguably "Offenbachian" attitude, far behind the actual notes, in parts of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Nor were the connections strengthened during his remaining years in Germany. Indeed, except for one or two passages in *Der Silbersee*, everything that followed *Die Dreigroschenoper*—from *Das Berliner Requiem* to the Second Symphony—tended increasingly to contradict what little sense there had been in Weill's counterthesis. By February 1933, "Weill als Offenbach" was sufficiently devoid of meaning to recommend itself only as a crudely racist jibe.

Such was the background from which the tribute to Offenbach in *Der Kuhhandel* derived its psychological necessity and its moral justification. It was only in the precise circumstances of Weill's awakening to the realities of exile, in France and in the year 1934, that a work of this type and this bearing was conceivable. Adorno was, of course, right to remark that the Offenbach model was unrepeatable (though incomprehensibly wrong in his prior reference to "lack of real substance"). The Weill of *Der Kuhhandel* understood this, just as the Weill of *Der Zar* had understood what Walter Benjamin, in his great essay on Karl Kraus,¹⁶ defined as the "secret" of Offenbach: "how in the deep nonsense of public discipline—whether it be of the upper ten thousand, a dance floor, or a military state—the deep sense of private licentiousness opens a dreamy eye." The Anatolian Venus whom Weill at last brought to musical life in 1943 embodied that same subversive secret and was knowingly the agent of its anarchic consequences. But except for a brief respite in Mme. Odette's establishment, the villains of *Der Kuhhandel* have not time to spare for venery; they are fully occupied with meaner and more dangerous pursuits, and their sense of life's urgencies is of quite another order.

Viewed from its Offenbachian side, *Der Kuhhandel* seems to have been tailor-made for the dummy that used to be wheeled out whenever Weill's name was mentioned in the presence of the young and impres-

15. See Kurt Weill, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. David Drew (Frankfurt, 1975), pp. 42, 84, 146–47, 152, 156–57.

16. "Karl Kraus," in Walter Benjamin, *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York: 1978), pp. 239–73.

sionable. Topical and political in exactly the way that his German works were once reputed to be but never are, it lends substance to the favorite illusion of his false admirers in that it is, up to a point, indisputably parodistic. And yet every musical idea that is dispatched to the playing fields where parody traditionally lays its booby traps finds itself rerouted toward the front-line trenches and sooner or later is mown down—whether by a sense of the hostile realities it is consciously confronting, or by an unseen adversary from behind the lines, who is none other than Weill himself, instinctively defending the German heritage he is trying to disavow.

As if fearing that *A Kingdom for a Cow* might somehow be annexed by his “German” works, via the German origins of *Der Kuhhandel*, Weill began a tunneling operation as soon as he arrived in the United States and extended it, inch by inch, for the next ten years. Musical materials extracted from *A Kingdom for a Cow* are to be found in every one of his Broadway scores before *Street Scene* and also in two of his three film scores.¹⁷ The fact that none of the *Kuhhandel* material excluded from *A Kingdom for a Cow* was ever drawn upon in this way is certainly no coincidence. Even if the reasons are purely stylistic, they emphasize on the one hand the conclusive nature of *Der Kuhhandel* and on the other the transitional functions Weill retrospectively discovered in *A Kingdom for a Cow*.

While *Lady in the Dark* was built on the formal experience of the two *Kingdom for a Cow* finales (and used one of the waltz melodies from the first of them), *One Touch of Venus* (which used a waltz tune from the second finale) abandoned the formal conventions of operetta but played the parody game for all it was worth as cabaret. Although Broadway’s and Hollywood’s love affair with the singer Grace Moore had led to a brief rehabilitation of European operetta in the early 1940s, and indeed to Weill’s brief involvement with *La belle Hélène* and the Nell Gwyn project, the Weill of 1942 found Offenbach sadly “dated” (or so he told the producer Russell Lewis)¹⁸ and seems to have acted accordingly in the up-to-

17. The main borrowings are listed in my *Kurt Weill: A Handbook*.

18. During summer 1942 the Broadway producer Russell Lewis invited Weill to undertake a reorchestration and elaboration of Offenbach’s *La belle Hélène* for a production starring Grace Moore. Weill, who was then working on the first version of *One Touch of Venus*, declined the orchestration commission and successfully recommended Darius Milhaud in his stead. The possibility that he might nevertheless write one or two additional “hits” for *La belle Hélène* continued to be discussed, and for Weill, this was a means of mentioning his own operetta projects: *Venus* in passing, and then a Nell Gwyn project of his own, outlined in detail in a letter addressed “Dear Russel” [*sic*] and written from Beverly Hills on 30 September 1942. (In the Weill/Lenya Archive this letter is misfiled under Russell Crouse, another Broadway producer with whom Weill had been corresponding since 1938.) On 14 November 1942 Weill wrote to Russell Lewis: “I saw *La Vie Parisienne* and was quite shocked how stale and dated the Offenbach music sounded. It will take a great deal of musical

the-minute style and tempo of *One Touch of Venus*. This is surely the period in which Weill is most likely to have coupled his name with Offenbach's within the hearing of Adorno, and it lasted until *The Firebrand* failed so signally to reestablish the very type of operetta against which *Der Kuhhandel* had marched and Karl Kraus had railed. Apart from their indebtedness to *A Kingdom for a Cow*, the one thing *Lady in the Dark*, *One Touch of Venus*, and *The Firebrand of Florence* had in common was the avoidance of any topic that threatened to be "too overwhelming" for parody.

Karl Kraus's image of the tragedy of mankind played by the characters from an operetta had been inspired by the first act of that tragedy and suited it perfectly. He did not live to witness the second, but the entr'acte gave him a foretaste of it, and it was enough for him. He died in July 1936 a broken man. The previous November he had chosen the operetta *La Créole* for his last Offenbach "reading" in public. Although he added a satirical verse about Hitler, it was perhaps only a gesture of valedictory defiance. In an issue of *Die Fackel* published while Weill and Vambery were at work on *Der Kuhhandel*, Kraus had remarked that, while the spirit of Offenbach's music is immortal, in the world of Hitler and Stalin it was no longer possible to update his texts.¹⁹

By 1934 the questions so lightly brushed aside by Offenbach's *Brigands* and Peachum's beggars had become the questions of mankind's survival. It was surely the experiences of the previous year that compelled Weill to accept, for the first time in any dramatic work, the necessity of a protagonist who was not only unambiguously committed to ideals of freedom and justice (as Kaiser's Czar had been) but also prepared to defend them "heroically." The prologue's apparently satirical apposition of noble savage and ignorant conqueror allows the innocence of the opening scene by the trout stream to have a normative function in relation to the entire work, while the entry of the serpentine arms salesman is clearly seen for what it is. Not until *Love Life* (1948) and its opening evocation of Mayville, New England in 1791 did Weill attempt a comparable image of prelapsarian harmony at the start of a dramatic work. The serpent in the Thoreauesque Eden of *Love Life* has the same instincts as in *Der Kuhhandel* but is altogether more experienced. As soon as it reveals itself—in the guise of nineteenth-century capitalism—the values established at the start

showmanship to revitalize this music." A Grace Moore/Russell Lewis *belle Hélène*, orchestrated by Milhaud, conducted by Efreim Kurtz, with a new book and lyrics by Edward Eager and Alfred Drake, was duly announced in the press (clippings dated 12 December 1942 and 2 January 1943 from unattributed sources are in the Library of the Performing Arts at Lincoln Center, New York), but the production itself never materialized; neither did Weill's promised contributions nor his Nell Gwyn project.

19. See Paul Schick, *Karl Kraus* (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1965), pp. 133–36.

are abruptly called into question. From then on, the decline is continuous and increasingly precipitous, so that the final tentative reminder of the principles established at the start figures only as a hope against hope. If *Love Life* were not so despairingly in earnest, it could be mistaken for a parody of Noel Coward's *Cavalcade* in the baleful light of Adorno's negative dialectics.

Although its musical substance is indefensible from Adorno's post-Schoenbergian standpoint, *Love Life* is the only creation of Weill's American years to exhibit, in however primitive or compromised a form, any of the characteristics Adorno had admired in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, *Happy End*, and *Mahagonny* during the three years when he was observing Weill at close hand and with a freshly discovered sympathy. The nature of that sympathy is peculiar to Adorno and scarcely discernible if his writings on Weill in the period 1928–31 are read as music criticism rather than as signs and signals of his own development in the relevant areas of philosophy, politics, sociology, and Benjaminian cultural criticism. In the 1950 obituary, however, the only hint of personal involvement is the reference to Offenbach.

At first reading it is impossible to determine whether the obituary's frosty sparkle is merely a surface effect designed to attract the readership of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, or whether the subsoil, too, is frozen. Certainly there is no evidence of that warmth which in later years was characteristic of Adorno's obituary tributes to such men as Eduard Steuermann or Winfried Zillig. But unless we refuse to grant that Adorno might in the circumstances have had as much reason to be cryptic about Weill as had Maxwell Anderson to bare his heart, any quotation from the obituary that is allowed to stand without reference to the suppressed background must, in the different light of today, misrepresent his reticence as a form of subterfuge. Insofar as the obituary prompts investigation of *Der Kuhhandel*, so does it merit further consideration in the light of it.

The period bounded at the one end by the world premiere of *Die Dreigroschenoper* and at the other by the Berlin premiere of the *Mahagonny* opera had been as crucial for Adorno as for Weill.²⁰ After three years'

20. As yet, there is no definitive biography of Adorno. Gerhard P. Knapp's *Theodor W. Adorno* (Berlin, 1980) gives the fullest account of his career available at present, but it is none too precisely documented; as far as dates and other details are concerned, it should be compared with the shorter outlines in Gillian Rose, *The Melancholy Science: An Introduction to the Thought of Theodor W. Adorno* (London, 1978) and Martin Jay, *Adorno* (London, 1984). Thomas Mann's famous tribute to Adorno in his study of the genesis of *Doktor Faustus* (Mann, *The Story of a Novel* [New York, 1961], p. 43) begins with a biographical note which incorrectly states that Adorno was for some years the editor of Universal Edition's modern-music monthly *Anbruch*—an error reproduced in most of the literature on Adorno. The history of Adorno's relations with Weill has yet to be recounted and remains nebulous between 1933 and 1942. Adorno himself—in conversation with me in 1960—was evidently

study in Vienna with Alban Berg, Adorno returned to the University of Frankfurt, where in 1924 (at the age of 21) he had earned his doctorate with a dissertation on Husserl. A second dissertation, combining neo-Kantian and Freudian disciplines, had been started in Vienna and was completed in Frankfurt. Having duly submitted it to the university as his inaugural dissertation, he withdrew it on the advice of his mentor.

The decisive shift toward Hegel, Marx, and sociology which Adorno accomplished in 1928 was his reaction to new associations that developed first in his native Frankfurt, both at the university and at the Institute for Social Research, where his lifelong collaboration with Max Horkheimer was established. The intellectual and artistic links between Frankfurt and Berlin in Weimar Germany were such that his extramusical interests would have been sufficient to make him a regular visitor to the German capital even if his musical responsibilities had not obliged him to establish a second base there.

disinclined to revive memories of unhappy meetings in the U.S. after his arrival in 1938. A two-page typescript letter to Weill, dated 31 March 1942 and written from Adorno's address in Brentwood Heights, Los Angeles (but using the official letterhead of the Office of Radio Research in New York), begins: "Lieber Weill, es wird Sie erstaunen nach so langer Zeit und einem verunglückten New Yorker Rendez-vous mit einem Mal von mir zu hören." ("Dear Weill, you will be astonished to hear from me all of a sudden after so long a time and an ill-fated rendezvous in New York.") The letter, which is now in the Weill/Lenya Archive, was prompted by Brecht's predicament in California and his hopes for an all-black production of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Adorno makes a case not only for the production but also for a "refunctioning" (*Umfunktionalisierung*) of the music. In a subsequent letter to Lenya, Weill described Adorno's pleas as "completely idiotic" and stated that he had sent a reply that Adorno "will not forget in a hurry." No copy of Weill's letter to Adorno has yet been traced, nor is there any record of further contact during Weill's lifetime. Yet the words with which Adorno ended his 31 March 1942 letter—"Ihnen und der Lenja alles Liebe/Ihr alter/Theodor W. Adorno"—were certainly no empty formality. Whatever wounded pride there may have been behind Adorno's 1950 obituary, his attempt to make amends in the article he wrote for the program book of the 1955 production of *Street Scene* in Düsseldorf is touching and wholly honorable; the article, entitled "Nach einem Vierteljahrhundert," is in fact a "refunctioning" of the obituary that is intellectually consistent with the original yet altogether warmer in tone and more positive in tendency. The dexterity with which Adorno skates across the American years without even mentioning *Street Scene* did not go unnoticed by the young theater and ballet critic Horst Koegler, who, in the face of the almost unanimous hostility of the German press, bravely sprang to the defense of *Street Scene* and identified Adorno as the arch-enemy. (See Koegler, "Der Vortrupp der Musicals," *Der Monat* [January 1956]: 68–71.) The typescript of Adorno's masterly reply, "Vortrupp und Avantgarde," is in the Weill/Lenya Archive at Yale. Whether Adorno actually heard and saw the Düsseldorf production of *Street Scene* is not revealed and is, in fact, immaterial. (If he did, his reactions may perhaps be gauged from those of Caspar Neher, who designed the production but nevertheless gave Lenya to understand that the music was wholly alien to him.) In the sense of Adorno's envoi of March 1942, it is revealing that he and his wife were most gracious to Lenya on her visits to Germany in the 1950s and that Adorno's distinguished pupil Carla Henius was one of the first academically trained singers to take on the role of Anna I in *Die sieben Todsünden*.

Berlin, for Adorno in 1928, was epitomized on the one hand by Schoenberg and his masterclass at the Prussian Academy of Arts, on the other by a group of variously unorthodox Marxists, most of whom had academic or literary links with Frankfurt. The senior member of the group was the philosopher Ernst Bloch (1885–1977),²¹ who was at the time living in Walter Benjamin's apartment, while Benjamin²²—a distant relative of Adorno, though they did not become closely acquainted until 1928—lodged with his parents at their home in the Grünewald. Benjamin had first met Bloch in Switzerland in 1919, shortly after the publication of Bloch's first major philosophical work, *Geist der Utopie*. To a friend he had written that the book was remarkable, but its author much more so. If that somewhat artificial distinction helped preserve their close friendship until Benjamin's death, it was only in the sense that music—as integral a part of Bloch's philosophy as of Schopenhauer's—was the one art to which Benjamin's unique critical intelligence and imagination had no ready access. A so-called “philosophy of music”—more properly, a philosophy *through* music—forms the central and largest section of *Geist der Utopie*. It was that which earned Bloch the lifelong friendship and admiration of Otto Klemperer²³ and that which must have excited the eighteen-year-old Adorno when he first read *Geist der Utopie* in 1921.²⁴

The 1918 edition of *Geist der Utopie* is to German philosophy what Kurt Pinthus's historic anthology, *Menschheitsdämmerung* (1920), is to German poetry—“a document of expressionism.” In its revolutionary and

21. Except in academic circles, Bloch remains largely unknown in the English-speaking world, where the dearth of adequate translations is today as crippling for Bloch as it was for Adorno twenty years ago. The first full-length book on Bloch, however, is in English: Wayne Hudson, *The Marxist Philosophy of Ernst Bloch* (London, 1982). Apart from the biographical outline, this is a highly technical work intended for the specialized reader. Two short monographs published in Germany—the first by Ernst Bahr (Berlin, 1974) and the second by Sylvia Markun (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1977)—are expressly intended for the general reader. A selection of Bloch's musical writings, entitled *The Philosophy of Music* and with an introduction by me, was published by Cambridge University Press in 1985.

22. Walter Benjamin (1892–1940) won posthumous fame in the 1960s and is today widely accepted as one of the major critical minds of the twentieth century. In the copious literature on Benjamin there are no significant references to Weill; yet their mutual friends and acquaintances were too numerous for there not to have been some contacts between them in the period from 1929 (when they were almost certainly together in Le Lavandou with the Brechts during the summer when *Happy End* was uncomfortably gestating) until perhaps as late as 1933, when Benjamin was in Paris.

23. Klemperer's first reading of *Geist der Utopie* and his introduction to Bloch through Furtwängler are described by Peter Heyworth in *Otto Klemperer: His Life and Times*, Vol. 1: 1885–1933 (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 111–12.

24. Adorno described his early experiences of Bloch in “Henkel, Krug und frühe Erfahrung,” an essay included in Siegfried Unseld, ed., *Ernst Bloch zu ehren* (Frankfurt, 1965); Bloch's informal recollections of Adorno are in Arno Münster, ed., *Tagträume vom aufrechten Gang* (Frankfurt, 1977), pp. 50–51.

quasi-Christian socialism it is a direct forebear of the first edition (1921) of Johannes R. Becher's pageant, *Arbeiter, Bauern, Soldaten*, from which Weill selected the motto of his First Symphony. But whereas Becher in his 1923 revision of the pageant removed the entire metaphysical superstructure and attempted a strictly Marxist-Leninist version of the remainder, the equally "revolutionary" Bloch retained in his 1923 edition of *Geist der Utopie* everything essential to the original version and merely elaborated or developed it.

That inclusiveness was predicated on Bloch's definition of "the spirit of Utopia" as harbinger of socially progressive tendencies at all times and in all cultures—a version of that "dream of a thing" about which Marx wrote to his friend Ruge in 1843.²⁵ Within the framework of his unwavering atheism Bloch included a large part of the heritage of Christianity and elements from other religions, among which Judaism was prominent although not preponderant. Bloch's heretical development of a form of Marxist metaphysics was coordinated with an equally unorthodox and "open" form of aesthetics that comprises manifold variations on the social and cultural dichotomies he first experienced during his formative years in industrial, plebeian Ludwigshafen and across the river in patrician Mannheim. The fascination Bloch had for genuinely popular culture and also for *Kitsch* was as foreign to Adorno as his penchant for theological debate. Yet Bloch remains at the back of Adorno's mind from 1928 onward, just as surely as Benjamin remains at the front, challenging, urging, and exemplifying. It was most probably Adorno who introduced Bloch to the pages of Universal Edition's *Anbruch*, the journal of modern music edited in Vienna by Paul Stefan. Bloch's first essay, "Wagner's Rettung durch Karl May" (again, Mannheim versus Ludwigshafen), appeared in January 1929. The second, on the "Lied der Seeräuber-Jenny," followed two months later; it was dedicated to Weill and Lenya.

Die Dreigroschenoper and its success were together responsible for altering relationships and redefining aims within the left-wing intelligentsia in Germany and Austria. The enthusiasm of Otto Klemperer (who had famously embraced Lenya and Weill a year before Bloch met them) was representative as far as the musical world was concerned; and there was more than a symbolic significance in the fact that he first encountered Karl Kraus at one of the many performances of *Die Dreigroschenoper* which he attended during its first season. The meeting may not have had any direct bearing on the Kroll Opera's revolutionary 1930 production of Offenbach's *Les Contes d'Hoffmann* (for which Bloch wrote

25. Karl Marx, *Die Frühschriften*, ed. Siegfried Kröner (Stuttgart, 1978), p. 171. Bloch's references to the September letter are numerous; see, for example, *Atheismus in Christentum* (Frankfurt, 1968), pp. 344–48, where a whole chapter is developed from it.

the introductory essay). But it was certainly the origin of the later Kroll production of *La Périchole* in Kraus's own updated version; and the introductory essay for that was provided by Benjamin. Was it not somewhere on the well-trodden route between the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm and the Kroll that the notion of "Weill als Offenbach" first began to take shape? To Kraus's way of thinking (not to mention that of Vambery, his young admirer at the Schiffbauerdamm)—it would have been wholly acceptable. For Bloch and Benjamin it might have had at least a passing attraction.

Although the triangular relationship among Bloch, Benjamin, and Adorno was based on the linear one between the two older men, Adorno's role was by far the most intense and complex. The intervention of Brecht in 1929, and the profound intellectual friendship which then sprang up between him and Benjamin, had far-reaching effects on Adorno and certainly influenced his attitude toward Brecht, and hence toward Weill, for the remainder of his life. Adumbrated in his first notice of *Die Dreigroschenoper* and completed by his writings on *Mahagonny*, his defense of Weill is inseparable from his commitment to the Schoenbergian revolution and his lifelong belief that the exhaustion of the tonal system, parallel to the exhaustion of bourgeois society and the capitalist system, had determined the historic necessity of atonality (which in turn justified the "atonal" structure of his own philosophy, as he saw it). Acceptance of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, *Happy End*, and *Mahagonny* in the context of his passionate rejection of Hindemithian and Stravinskian neoclassicism was grounded on exclusively negative inferences: for him the philosophical and sociological value of Weill's work lay in its exposure of the senselessness of continuing to compose in a tonal idiom. His lofty scorn in later years for Sibelius and Britten is only to be understood in that polemic sense—a sense that *seems* to be lacking from his 1950 obituary of Weill, with the result that his reference to "the lack of real craftsmanship, from the simplest harmonization to the construction of larger forms" is altogether baffling until one recognizes it for what it is: an empty and long-discarded shell in which, if one puts one's ear to it, one can hear the minuscule reverberations of a marvelously clear and fruitful thesis that had been exploded two decades before by Weill's obstinate refusal to follow the dialectical course Adorno had prescribed for him.

By then the thesis had already fulfilled its revelatory and germinating functions on the highest levels—above all, in relation to Bloch. If Benjamin's is the name most often cited by Adorno in his post-1928 work, Bloch's is the one that holds sway between the lines. The practice begins in Adorno's writings on *Die Dreigroschenoper*, which presuppose, make room for, and render indispensable, those of Bloch. The contrast is impressive. Fully aware of the significance of Schoenberg, but untroubled by a need

to justify himself in the eyes of any camp or party, Bloch entered the field as an inspired amateur. His musical intentions, like Schopenhauer's, belonged to the antennal system of his philosophy and could neither obstruct it nor be inhibited by it: spontaneity of reaction, which increasingly eluded Adorno, was always characteristic of Bloch. Unmindful though Bloch sometimes was of the risks inherent in free-wheeling imagination, the rewards can be great, and where Weill is concerned they are beyond compare. Already in his essay on "Pirate-Jenny" Bloch diverged from the triumphantly one-sided Adorno and established for the first time and with a minimum of fuss the essential fact that the dynamics of Weill's art depend on certain extreme polarities and are characterized by rapid oscillations between them. Although the insights deriving from this perception are inevitably very different from Adorno's, it is significant that he did not tackle the topic of *Mahagonny* until after Adorno's death.²⁶

It was, however, in their reactions to *Die Bürgschaft* that Bloch and Adorno first parted company, though surely in a friendly way and quite without the hard feelings of later years in very different contexts. Adorno was to have written the first article on the work for *Anbruch*, but, like its promised predecessor on *Der Jasager* (musically the forerunner of *Die Bürgschaft*), it did not materialize, for reasons clearly discernible in the 1950 obituary. Instead, there appeared in *Anbruch* Bloch's "Fragen in Weills *Bürgschaft*,"²⁷ perhaps the single most important contribution to the understanding of Weill that was published during his lifetime and certainly far removed from anything that Adorno could or would have written about the work from the Existentialist-Marxist-Schoenbergian standpoint he had by then made his own.

The "secret" Bloch penetrated was at the furthest possible remove from the one that Benjamin, and Siegfried Kracauer after him,²⁸ had gleaned from Offenbach. Weill, who was as secretive in the philosophical areas as he was candid in the erotic one, had inserted it on the long-lost title page of the First Symphony but did not disclose it again until the

26. Bloch lectured on *Mahagonny* in Tübingen in the 1960s. There are many references in his writings—most notably, as far as the present topic is concerned, in "Etwas fehlt . . . Über die Widersprüche der utopischen Sehnsucht. Ein Gespräch mit Theodor W. Adorno," in Rainer Traub and Harald Wieser, eds., *Gespräche mit Ernst Bloch* (Frankfurt, 1975), pp. 58–77.

27. "Fragen in Weills *Bürgschaft*," *Anbruch* 14 (November–December 1932): 207; reprinted in Drew, *Über Kurt Weill*, pp. 82–84. A slightly different version of the article appeared in the program book for the 1932 production of *Die Bürgschaft* in Düsseldorf that was conducted by Jascha Horenstein.

28. Siegfried Kracauer, *Jacques Offenbach und das Paris seiner Zeit* (Amsterdam, 1937). Kracauer (1889–1966) was an important link between Bloch and Adorno, and, as sociologist, essayist, and editor, he was an influential figure in the intellectual life of Weimar Germany. Weill owned the first edition of his book about Offenbach.

events of 1933 drove him into an isolation more nearly complete than any he had previously experienced. As a form of self-therapy and creative renewal after the crisis, *Der Kuhhandel* necessarily unlocks several doors.

The largest of them is the one that opens onto the railroad freight-yard scene. Here are assembled the hopes and intentions that had fought their way through every major work and most of the minor ones for the previous thirteen years. As the two complementary halves of "The Ballad of Pharaoh" turn on the axis of the arietta like a revolving stage through 180 degrees, the trompe l'oeil backcloth that had been concealing (even in *Der neue Orpheus*) Weill's promised land ever since 1921 is momentarily removed, and the young Marx who was creating his own form of exodus theology is reunited with his Pentateuchal archetype. In his magnum opus, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, drafted in the United States during the Second World War, Bloch wrote: "The intervention of Moses changes the substance of the salvation that had made up the external, wholly achieved goal of the pagan religions, the astral mythical ones in particular. Now, instead of the achieved goal a promised one appears . . . and instead of the visible nature-God there appears an invisible one of justice, and of the kingdom of justice."²⁹ From the vantage point of Werfel and Weill's *Der Weg der Verheissung*,³⁰ "The Ballad of Pharaoh" might seem prophetic in another sense. But in *Der Kuhhandel* there is no latent theology; the hopes it contains are restricted to this world.

Der Kuhhandel even discounts the pacifist utopia. The deus ex machina, like the leaders of yesterday and today, makes a farce of disarmament. It is only the music which protests that the question must nevertheless be taken seriously—and in principle no less seriously in 1935 than in 1945. If, for Adorno, Auschwitz was the nadir in the decline of the West and the determinant of his postwar philosophy and aesthetics, Hiroshima, which casts far fewer shadows both in Adorno's Kierkegaardian hell and in Bloch's future earthly paradise, is no less the consequence of events whose grimness had become "too overwhelming for parody." That *Der Kuhhandel* survives even such an enormity is a tribute to its authors' prescient recourse to the absurd.

Like the open ends of *Der neue Orpheus* and *Der Silbersee*, the final cadence of *Der Kuhhandel* insists upon a possible future, despite and because of the demonstrated failure of all panaceas. Neither sentimental nor cynical, but concrete, realistic, and observant, it proclaims, with all the power its tonality can muster, the necessity of persevering with the strug-

29. Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* (Frankfurt, 1959), p. 1454; the present translation is slightly adapted from that in Hudson, *The Marxist Philosophy of Ernst Bloch*, p. 188.

30. *Der Weg der Verheissung*, written and composed in 1934–35, is the original version of *The Eternal Road* and stands in the same relationship to it as *Der Kuhhandel* does to *A Kingdom for a Cow*.

gle for those age-old ideals which the stage picture is displaying in such manifestly imperfect and transitory forms. The energies latent in that cadence and the perceptions that helped generate them are surely a truer measure of Weill's achievement in the coming years than any that Offenbach could provide.

Examples

Allegro non troppo molto energico

Juan

Als Is - rael in Ae - gyp - ten _ war

Männerchor

Juan

Pha - ra - o, Pha - ra - o Lass das Volk jetzt frei!

The image shows two systems of musical notation. The first system is for the vocal soloist Juan, with lyrics 'Als Is - rael in Ae - gyp - ten _ war'. The second system is for the Männerchor (Men's Chorus) and Juan, with lyrics 'Pha - ra - o, Pha - ra - o Lass das Volk jetzt frei!'. Both systems include a vocal line and a piano accompaniment. The tempo is marked 'Allegro non troppo molto energico'. The key signature has one sharp (F#) and the time signature is 2/4.

Example 1. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 7: "Die Ballade vom Pharao," part 1, opening.

Allegro molto

Juan *p*

Hier bei der Mün-dung die-ses Flus-ses

wol-len wir die Nacht ver-bring-en denn der Sturm hat al-le

Boo-te zer-bro-chen

pp

mf

Example 3. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 5: "Der Mädchenraub," mm. 138–46.

Allegro molto
p

Willst du mit mir woh - nen in ei - ner Hüt - te

pp

Example 4. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 5: "Der Mädchenraub," mm. 211-14.

Andantino (un poco largo)

f

Example 5. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 12: "Triffst du mich Abends in der Schenke" (Song of the Bailiff), opening.

a. *mf*

Triffst du mich a - bends in der Schen - ke, Dann kannst du

mich ver - hau'n mein Sohn.

b. *Foxtrott-Tempo*

[beschnitten wird ...]

Het - ze ge - gen den Staat, was ro - te Ten - den - zen

hat, wo zum Streik man hetzt, wer die Kir - che ver - ketzt,

Example 6.

a. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 12, mm. 6–10.

b. "Hetze gegen den staat" from Ludwig Hoffmann and Daniel Hoffmann-Ostwald, *Deutsches Arbeitertheater, 1918–1933: Eine Dokumentation* (Berlin, 1961), no. 15.

T

379 Mädchenchor *p espr.* Allegretto (♩ = ♩) 383

In weis-sem Kleid, mit grü-nem Kranz, in leich-tem Tan-zes-schrit - te, nah'n

(str.)

Example 7. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 24: Finale II.

Soldaten (1. Gruppe) *p*

Ex-cel-lenz, es ist fa - tal es wird Sie si - cher sehr ver -

Sld. (1. Gr.)

dries - sen. Der Lauf ist krumm, mein Ge - ne - ral, man kann mit dem Ge-wehr nicht

(Legen die Gewehre dem General an Füssen) *p*

Sld. (1. Gr.)

schies - sen. Ex-cel-lenz, es ist fa-tal, es wird Sie

Soldaten (2. Gruppe) *mf*

Ex-cel-lenz, es ist fa - tal es wird Sie si - cher sehr ver -

Sld. (1. Gr.)

si - cher sehr ver-dries-sen man kann mit dem Ge-wehr nicht schies-sen, Ex - cel -

Sld. (2. Gr.)

dries - sen, der Hahn ist ab, mein Ge-ne - ral man kann mit dem Ge-wehr nicht

G₁

Sld. (1. Gr.)

lenz es ist fa - tal.

Sld. (2. Gr.)

schies - sen.

Soldaten (3. Gruppe)

Ex-cel-lenz, es ist fa -

Example 8. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 24: Finale II ("disarmament fugue").

713 1. und 2. Soldat

f

Wir ha-ben kei-ne Eh-re, wir ha-ben kei-ne Ge-weh-re, wir

3. Soldat

f

Wir ha-ben kei-ne Eh-re, wir ha-ben kei-ne Ge-weh-re, wir

(Str.)

ha-ben kei-ne Si-cher-heit, wir ha-ben ei-ne gros-se Freud'. Wir

ha-ben kei-ne Si-cher-heit, wir ha-ben ei-ne gros-se Freud'. Wir

Example 9. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 24: Finale II.

Chor (Veteranen)

f

Mit den Fah - nen un - srer Ah - nen na - hen

mf

sim.

wir, die Ve - te - ra - nen.

Example 10. *Der Kuhhandel*, no. 24: Finale II, "alla marcia," mm. 28–35.

807

S.
Wir ha - ben kei - ne Si -

A.
Wir ha - ben kei - ne Si -

T.
Wir ha - ben kei - ne Si -

B.
Wir ha - ben kei - ne Si -

S.
cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir

A.
cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir

T.
cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir

B.
cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir

cresc.

Example 11. Der Kuhhandel, no. 24: Finale II.

S. *ff*
 ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir ha - ben kei - ne

A. *ff*
 ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir ha - ben kei - ne

T. *ff*
 ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir ha - ben kei - ne

B. *ff*
 ha - ben ei - ne Freud'. Wir ha - ben kei - ne

S.
 Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

A.
 Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

T.
 Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

B.
 Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

898

S. Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben

A. Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben

T. Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben

B. Si - cher - heit, wir ha - ben

The first system of the musical score consists of five staves. The top four staves are for the vocal parts: Soprano (S.), Alto (A.), Tenor (T.), and Bass (B.). Each staff contains a vocal line with lyrics. The Soprano and Alto parts have a melodic line with a slur over the first two notes and a sharp sign on the final note. The Tenor and Bass parts have a more rhythmic line with a slur over the first two notes. The fifth staff is the piano accompaniment, featuring a steady eighth-note bass line in the left hand and chords in the right hand.

S. ei - ne Freud.

A. ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

T. ei - ne Rie - sen - freud'.

B. ei - ne Rie - sen

The second system of the musical score consists of five staves. The top four staves are for the vocal parts: Soprano (S.), Alto (A.), Tenor (T.), and Bass (B.). Each staff contains a vocal line with lyrics. The Soprano and Alto parts have a melodic line with a slur over the first two notes and a sharp sign on the final note. The Tenor and Bass parts have a more rhythmic line with a slur over the first two notes. The fifth staff is the piano accompaniment, featuring a steady eighth-note bass line in the left hand and chords in the right hand. The piano part includes dynamic markings such as *ff* and accents.

Example 12. Der Kuhhandel, no. 24: Finale II.

Appendix

Der Kuhhandel

ACT 1

- 1a. Siehst du keine?

- 1b. Denn Einer ist Kleiner
- 2a. Wenn der Husar zu Pferde
sitzt
2. Friedensrede
3. Leise, nur leise
4. Schockschwerenot!
- 4a. Die Wohlfahrtssteuer

5. Der Mädchenraub
6. Auf Wiederseh'n

7. Die Ballade vom Pharao,
1. Teil: "Lass das Volk jetzt
frei!"—Arbeitslied
8. "Seit ich in diese Stadt
gekommen bin"
9. Die Ballade vom Pharao,
2. Teil
10. Das Erlebnis im Café: "Heute
abend ging ich ins Café"
11. "Schlafe, Santa Maria"
12. "Triffst du mich abends in
der Schenke"
13. "O trüber Tag"
14. "Es zog zu Salomon"
15. I. Finale

ACT 2

16. Soldatenmarsch and
Zwischenspiel
17. "Wehe über Land und
Meere"

A Kingdom for a Cow

1. Prologue
- 1a. Fishing Scene
- 1b. Duet, "Two Hearts"

- *2. Peace Speech
3. Trio, "Hush, Not a Word"

- *3a. The Public Welfare Tax
- *4. General Conchas's Song,
replaced by:
4. A Military Man
5. Wedding Scene
6. "Goodbye My Love"
7. "San Salvatore"

8. Arietta, "Since First I Left
My Home"

9. "Sleep on, Santa Maria"
10. "If You Should Meet Me"

11. "As Long As I Love"
12. First Finale

13. Soldier's March (shortened)

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 18. Ballade vom Räuber Esteban,
"Wenn der Wind geht" | 14. Ballad of the Robber
Esteban |
| 19. "Schön war die erste
Flasche"—Fandango | 15. "A Jones Is a Jones" |
| 20. National Hymn (reprise) | 16. "Life Is Too Sad" |
| 21. "Ich habe eine Kuh gehabt" | 16a. Fandango and Tango |
| 22. "In der Zeitung steht
geschrieben" | 17. "A Year Ago I Had a Cow" |
| 23. "Fünf hab ich und fünf hast
Du" | |
| 24. II. Finale | 18. Second Finale |

*Denotes that the number was completed in rehearsal score but not orchestrated.