**INTRODUCTION**

by Elmar Juchem

Zaubernacht was Weill’s first theatrical work to be completed and staged professionally. After the work’s premiere in Berlin in 1922 and a subsequent production in New York City in 1925, the orchestral score and parts disappeared. The children’s pantomime remained virtually unknown for eighty years until, in a moment of serendipity, the original (and presumably only) set of orchestral parts resurfaced in a vault at Yale University in 2005. For reasons that remain unclear, the New York performance replaced the two vocal numbers that originally opened and closed the otherwise wordless pantomime. The first of these has survived intact; the second, however, known to have been forty-two measures in length, survives in fragments only, which are not sufficient for inclusion in this edition. Although Weill incorporated some of the music of Zaubernacht in his Quodlibet, op. 9, an orchestral suite explicitly based on the pantomime that he prepared in 1923 and Universal Edition published in 1925, the ordering of musical material there does not reproduce that of Zaubernacht. Only now, therefore, is it possible to assess and perform Weill’s first theatrical score in its original orchestration and continuity.

I. Prehistory and Genesis

A number of sources indicate that Zaubernacht was the brainchild of its scenarist, Wladimir Boritsch, an elusive theatrical figure and occasional poet from Russia, the spelling of whose surname changed as he moved from country to country: Eipuru in Russia (1891–1918), Borici in Lithuania (1919–21), Boritsch in Germany (1921–24), and Boritch in the United States (1924–54). His path resembles that of tens of thousands of Russians escaping the turmoil of revolution, civil war, hunger, and pogroms in their country. Between 1921 and 1923 Berlin hosted as many as three hundred thousand Russian citizens, among them a fair number of well-known artists. After relations warmed between the German government and the Soviet Union in the wake of the 1922 Treaty of Rapallo, and particularly after November 1923, when the hyperinflation that had enabled an affordable life for those with access to foreign currency ended, many Russians, Boritsch among them, moved on to other destinations.

Because no biographical sketch of Boritsch has been published, information can be gleaned only from archival sources. U.S. immigration records provide valuable biographical data about Weill’s early collaborator, who arrived in New York on 30 March 1924. The records indicate that he had been born in 1891 in the Russian town of Starodub, close to the borders of Belarus and Ukraine, where Jews had a large and ancient presence; his full name is given as “Wladimir Scheersohn [sic] Boritsch.” 1 Asked for the name of his closest relative in his last country of residence, Germany, Boritsch identified a cousin named Salomon Jacobson, who lived in Berlin at Viktoria-Luise-Platz 3—a building, coincidentally, directly across from Ferruccio Busoni’s luxurious apartment at number 11. Berlin had been Boritsch’s home for two and a half years, as can be gleaned from a report in the newspaper Rul, one of several Russian-language dailies published in Berlin at the time. On 2 October 1921 the paper announced Boritsch’s arrival in Berlin, adding that he planned to establish a children’s theater in Berlin, something he had accomplished in 1918 in Petrograd, a hotbed for not only revolutionary activities but also experimental theater.2

V. Borics prepared a performance of his pantomime for children titled Stebuklingo naktis, Galkauskas wrote the music for this piece. On 27 September 1919, the production opened in the municipal theater and was subsequently repeated. During these performances, the composer himself performed the music. The newspaper [Vilenskij kurjer] reported: “The public liked the production very much. Galkauskas’s music was subtly bright and illustrated the wakening of the toys in the still of the night; the artist Varnas had designed original masks . . . . the light composition of all pieces created the feeling of a toy kingdom for the audience.”3

One can only speculate on how Weill’s and Boritsch’s paths may have crossed. Weill’s years as a “disciple” of Busoni’s master class (1921–23) are some of his least documented, in that few records and correspondence—rich for the years 1917–20 and from 1924 on—survive.4 The fact that Boritsch’s cousin and Busoni were neighbors could have provided the opportunity for Boritsch to meet Busoni or his students. Among the latter, a likely candidate for Boritsch to approach would have been Wladimir Vogel, who had emigrated from Russia to Berlin in 1918 and whose progressive leanings may have appealed to Boritsch.5 As Tamara Levitz has observed, Weill’s and Vogel’s relationship as classmates was amicable rather than competitive, so Vogel may well have introduced Weill to Boritsch or passed on an offered commission.6 At any rate, students in Busoni’s master class would have considered composing music to a pantomime a worthwhile endeavor. Busoni is known to have emphasized that pantomime in opera can provide the composer with the opportunity for self-contained musical numbers (in particular dance idioms) that are unencumbered by words. The master class, on contractual break at the end of December 1921, did not resume until 22 June 1922, when Busoni began to focus his teaching on Mozart and chamber music.7

Weill’s only letter to Busoni from 1922, dated 13 February, does not mention a pantomime but rather Fantasia, Passacaglia und Hymnus. Weill
reports of his music of Mozart and those who followed him, especially Bizet and one of the L'Arlesienne suites. The first documented reference to the Zaubernacht project comes six months later, when in a letter of 1 September 1922 addressed to his sister, Ruth, Weill writes: “After the joys of composing the pantomime, the work will now enter the daunting and upsetting rehearsal process, and I’m afraid that in the coming weeks this will make more trouble than the whole affair might be worth. But even that will be a lesson…” Further work in this situation is very difficult, especially since the full score for the pantomime will keep me busy for the next three to four weeks.”

Weill probably started to compose the music to Boritsch's scenario of Zaubernacht in the summer of 1922. Neither sketches nor a continuity draft for the work have been preserved. Before Weill was able to write out the full score, the exigencies of preparing a staged production required his providing rehearsal material for the dancers. The surviving holograph piano-vocal score appears to be just that. Although the score's many instrumental cues give it the appearance of a piano reduction of the full score, a comparison with the instrumental parts indicates that Weill must have created it before he finished the orchestral score. This sequence of events is implied by the different tempo markings in the two sources, but conclusive evidence can be found in rebarred measures and in music that appears in the piano score but not in the instrumental parts; these passages were subsequently canceled in the piano score (see Critical Report, “Source Descriptions,” as well as critical notes to mm. 114, 404–405, 737, 904, 931 passim). With what can be presumed to have been consideration for performance practicalities, Weill scored the pantomime for a nine-piece ensemble, an imaginative combination of one flute and a bassoon joining five string players (Vn I, Vn II, Br, Vc, Kb), piano, and percussion. Weill's continuous score, roughly one hour long, also included two short vocal numbers for the character of the Toy Fairy: the opening “Lied der Fee” and a closing number. Although a cover or title page for the piano score has not survived and the full score is lost entirely, one of the five copyists who excerpted the parts may have preserved Weill's original title when he wrote the words “Musik zur Pantomime ‘Die Zaubernacht’” on some of the parts; the other copyists simply wrote “Die Zaubernacht.” But all billings of the work in Germany displayed the title without the definite article, a decision that Weill adopted when he referred to his work after its premiere. Given that Weill assigned op. 6 to his Fantasia, Passacaglia und Hymnus, which was composed in spring 1922, and op. 8 to his String Quartet, which he began at the end of 1922, number 7 would seem to be the obvious candidate for Zaubernacht. Nowhere, however, do sources transmit an opus number for the work.

Preparations for the production of Zaubernacht were well under way by September 1922, as Weill's letter to his sister indicates, and the choice of Franz Ludwig Hörrt as stage director evinces yet another connection with Busonius' circle, for it was Hörrt who had staged the lavish production of Busonius' “theatrical capriccio” Arteciochina at Berlin's Staatsoper in May 1921, after which he and Busoni had remained in close contact. It may, in turn, have been Hörrt who suggested the soprano Elfriede Marherr-Wagner, who had joined the Staatsoper's roster in 1916, for the role of the Toy Fairy. Mary Zimmermann, a former dancer and choregrapher at the Deutsches Opernhaus in Charlottenburg, who had established her own ballet school in Berlin, created the choreography for the work's many dance sequences. The surviving handbill (see Plate 9) shows that at least ten of Zimmermann's students (newspapers described them as children) were in the cast. Three professional actor-dancers of Russian origin—Olga Valery, Larissa Alexeyeva, and W. Konstantin, all of whom had performed in Berlin for some years—were cast as the Boy, the Girl, and the Chinese Doctor. Ivor Karmann, whom a newspaper identified as “a professor,” played one of the violin parts, indicating a high level of musicianship within the nine-piece ensemble. Zaubernacht found a home in the Theater am Kurfürstendamm, the same venue that would host Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny in December 1931. Built by Oskar Kaufmann, a celebrated architect of theaters, the house, which had a seating capacity of 865, had opened only in October 1921; it was operated by the Robert-Bühnen, that is, Eugen Robert, as a non-subsidized enterprise. Rafael Larto, the designer of both sets and costumes, had been active in Berlin's Russian theater circles; he may also have been associated with the Berlin Secession, an art association that, coincidentally, had had its quarters at what would become the address of the Theater am Kurfürstendamm before itself relocating a few blocks west when the theater was built.

It is unclear how Weill's and Lenya's recollections of their first meeting—on the occasion of her auditioning for the production—fit into this picture. An account of that meeting appeared first in the New York Post on 20 October 1943; Weill recounted a more detailed version in an interview for the New York Post's “Week-End Magazine” on 18 September 1949: “We were doing a children’s ballet in Berlin, and we were looking for a girl 15 or 16 who could dance, sing and act. One day someone brought in a young lady who I thought was charming. I was playing the piano in the pit. After she'd tried out, she went away and I asked the director where she'd gone. ‘She'll be back,’ he said. I looked for her, but she didn't come back.” After Weill's death, Lenya recalled that the Swiss director Richard Révy, her mentor at the time, who had been considered for the stage director, had suggested that she should audition; when he failed to secure the job, she declined a role. Lenya, who had just turned twenty-four at the time, may have auditioned for the role of either the Boy or the Girl.

II. Premiere and Reception in the Press

Even though Boritsch was a newcomer to Berlin and Weill still a student with no major credits, the production apparently achieved a considerable degree of professionalism and, consequently, attention. A press release must have been sent to local newspapers, as nearly all of Berlin's dailies carried similarly couched brief news items announcing the premiere. For example, on 17 November 1922 the Neue Berliner Zeitung: Das 12-Uhr Blatt informed its readers that a children's theater named “Märchentruhe” (Chest of fairy tales) was to open the following day at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm with a program consisting of Zaubernacht by “Dr. W. Boritsch,” with music by Kurt Weill, and a shadow play. Die goldene Gans, after Grimm; additional performances would be held on 25 November and 2 December, for which tickets were already on sale. Comparable announcements turned up in the Russian dailies Rot, Dni, and Nakanune. A small paid advertisement, presumably arranged by the Robert-Bühnen, appeared in the Berliner Tageblatt on 17 November.

Other preparations for the premiere on 18 November included mailing printed invitations. On the back of one, sent to a young fellow composer, Weill added a handwritten note: “Dear Dr. Brav, please come see this performance—delivered with forces—of my children's pantomime. I hope we can get together soon.” Weill's humorous tone downplayed expectations, as he was sending the invitation to someone who was not only a friend but also a potential reviewer. Ludwig Brav worked as a part-time music critic for a small monthly journal, Der Fechter, published by the Robert-Bühnen. However, no review by Brav or any in that journal has surfaced.

As is appropriate for a production intended primarily for children, the premiere of Zaubernacht took place in the afternoon. Weill and Boritsch attended the opening, as did Weill's erstwhile teacher and mentor from Dessau, Albert Bing. Busoni apparently did not. A Swiss student in Busoni's master class, Robert Blum, later recalled that he was the only classmate present when the curtain rose at 4 P.M. Leitz has noted the oddity of Busoni's absence, given the fact that Weill adhered in Zaubernacht to many of his mentor's teachings: “[Weill] had turned to the genre of pantomime, adopted a ‘fairy-tale’ subject as a libretto, developed his ballet partly in closed numbers, used a reduced ensemble and transparent orchestration, as well as bells, contrapuntal techniques, and colorful, fairy-tale-like sets.” However, Busoni's health was deteriorating at the time, and he may have wanted to conserve his energies for his own Berlin premiere two days later, on 20 November 1922, when Ernest Ansermet was scheduled to conduct the Violin Concerto, op. 35a, with Josef Szigeti as soloist. None of the press reports of the Zaubernacht premiere, not even a
paper that ran separate reviews of Weill's and Busoni's performances on the same page, identified Weill as Busoni's student. This opportunity arose when the first official concert of the master class took place less than three weeks later, on 7 December 1922. It is conceivable that Busoni chose not to be associated with Zaubernacht because it was not a class project proper, or maybe he simply did not wish to distract from Weill's first major public exposure, for his own presence surely would have caused a stir and perhaps even have biased some critics. It is also possible that Busoni attended a rehearsal or a subsequent performance.

Reviews of the premiere appeared in such prestigious papers as the Berliner Börsen-Courier, Berliner Tageblatt, and Vossische Zeitung, and also in Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, Berliner Volks-Zeitung, Berliner Börsen-Zeitung, Germania, Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, and Germany's first and foremost tabloid, B.Z. am Mittag. In most cases, the critics were second-stringers, whose names were not printed in full as bylines. The first two reviews appeared on 19 November 1922, the day after the premiere. "R.W." (probably Richard Wilde) provided a detailed report for the Berliner Börsen-Courier:

It is a pro-Christmas guest performance by Dr. W. Boritsch and his children's theater that he calls “Choir of Fairy Tales.” In the beginning a young gentleman in tails jumped out of this chest, announcing a cancellation: the shadows that had been hired for the shadow play Die goldene Gans had caught a cold—the wicked November weather—technical difficulties . . . Miss Friedel Hintze appeared as a replacement for the shadows and narrated, rather straightforwardly, Andersen's fairy tale Die Prinzessin und der Schweinestroh. And then a pantomime followed: Zaubernacht, its idea of nocturnally enlivened toys also going back to Andersen, authored by W. Boritsch, and set to music by Kurt Weill. Perhaps a new path to children's theater. Most plays offered to the little ones either are not fully adjusted to their understanding or are of low taste and questionable pedagogical value. Hence it is a remarkable idea to steer the freewheeling imagination of children towards pantomime, to which they can add words as they please, and which will be more rewarding than pompous would-be poetry or burlesque clown pranks and fisticuffs. Zaubernacht may set an example and—judging from the enthusiastic response by the little nippers—a successful one at that. Certainly the near little work had sets and costumes (designed by Rafael Larto) full of humor and artistic appeal. Franz Ludwig Höth tailored his stage direction to the work's light-hearted nature, and the cast, most of them children, did their job delightfully. . . .

Weill's music is appealing in its thematic structure, its fresh colors, its liveliness, and its illustrative power that does justice to each of the ever-changing moods, supporting and deepening them. The scoring for a small orchestra is flawless and well calculated in its effects. The young conductor George Weiler brought out the music just right.25

Wilde was primarily a theater critic, as were most of those who reviewed the performance, and they scarcely mention Weill's score. The majority of the critics considered Zaubernacht a success, according particular praise to Höth's imaginative staging, Zimmermann's choreography, and the exuberant cast. Most reviewers also appreciated Larto's sets, which appear to have had a modern touch. Opinions diverged, however, about the appropriateness of the production—as to the pantomime genre in general and the work in specific—for children. Whereas the critics mostly accepted Larto's modernity, some of them considered Weill's music too modern. Larto's modernity, some of them considered Weill's music too modern. The critic of the Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, who called it a “lucid and also quite humorous Weillian music,” and “E. N.” of the Berliner Börsen-Zeitung, who described it as “very pleasing, patently illustrative music.”26

This last-named reviewer, apparently a dance critic, also gave the most detailed synopsis of the scenario and information about the audience:

Afternoon performance at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm! Children whopping with joy, full of expectations. All around one can hear lots of Charlottenburg vernacular—Russian—being spoken. Dr. W. Boritsch, who heads this children's theater, was clever enough to draw for the most part on pantomime. The mute language of this artistic genre is intelligible to these new Charlottenburg children, who have not yet penetrated the German language, or only insufficiently so. Unfortunately the children had some bad luck. The performance was supposed to start with a shadow play, Die goldene Gans, after Grimm's fairy tale. Regrettably, it was announced that the shadows had become “hoarse” and would not be able to perform. Instead, the superb recitatrice Friedel Hintze told Andersen's fairy tale of the princess and the swineherd. But even the best performer telling the most interesting story cannot captivate eagerly anticipating children, especially when they cannot understand it. They listened, but there was not the connection to the stage that materialized later on, when the exuberant children laughed loudly during the action and gave voice to surprise and other expressions of childlike unruliness as the pantomime had its “say”: Zaubernacht by W. Boritsch, music by Kurt Weill. A neat and cleverly wrought Christmas play. Admittedly, the story is not particularly new or original, but for children who naturally don't have years of experience as theatergoers and who have not seen all those ballets on the adult stage involving dolls (beginning with Coppélia and Puppchen), the plot is surely new enough. Franz Ludwig Höth of the Staatsoper has staged it so well and interestingly that even grown-ups will be able to enjoy it. During the magic night a Toy Fairy—this is the only sung part, performed by Elfriede Marher-Wagner of the Staatsoper—appears in the dreams of a pair of sleeping siblings—the slim Boy is played by the ravishing Olga Zmier, the charming Girl by the delightful Larissa Alexeyeva—offering them the most glorious toys: the Ball, the Jumping Jack, the Horse, the Kitchen Stove, the Doll, the Bear, the Chinese Doctor, and the roundbottom Roly-Poly. Finally, a thick volume of Grimm's fairy tale "Hansel and Gretel" appeared on stage, and from the book's pages emerged the delicate pair of children and the wicked Witch. All of these characters, portrayed by protégés of Mary Zimmermann's ballet school, performed very beautiful and droll dances, and it was hilarious to see the Kitchen Stove dancing with the Doll or the Ball jumping in circles around the clumsy Bear. All those little things were full of ideas, created in equal part by the stage director, the choreographer Mary Zimmermann, and likewise Rafael Larto, who was responsible for the sets. . . . The children greeted the performance with lively applause.27

The reference to Josef Bayer's and Josef Haßstreiter's Die Puppenfee (The Doll Fairy, 1888) was an appropriate analogy to Zaubernacht, as that extremely popular ballet surely adumbrated much of Boritsch's scenario. Die Puppenfee tells the story of dolls who come to life in a toy store and obey a fairy who wakes them at midnight; the work features a few exotic characters, among them a Chinese doll. Boritsch could have seen a performance of Die Puppenfee (expanded with music by Riccardo Drigo) in St. Petersburg in 1903; Weill could have seen a performance in Dessau in 1911.28 Tchaikovsky's Shishkebabich (The Nutcracker, 1892), on the other hand,
could not have been a model—at least not for Weill—for the work failed to trigger many subsequent performances after the lukewarm reception following the première in St. Petersburg. Part of the criticism stemmed from the fact that the roles of the children were, in fact, performed by children. Although the Bolshoi Theater staged the work with adult dancers in 1919, a complete staging outside Russia did not occur until 1934 in London. George Balanchine, in his now famous choreography of 1954, returned to the idea of casting children in the roles of the children.

When Yuri Ofrosimov reviewed Zaubernacht for Rul a week after its opening, the Russian theater critic introduced a different perspective. Although he had come from Moscow to Berlin in 1920, his review sheds some light on the situation in Petrograd at the time Boritsch left that city. In his assessment of the work, however, Ofrosimov struggled, just as some of his German colleagues had, to differentiate between the views of children and adults:

The idea of a theater designed expressly for children is not new. In fact, it might not be better to renew or even dispense entirely with the arbitrary, hasty set design. A large audience was regularly offered for Thomas and Easter? One recalls that a children’s theater organized according to such principles was supposed to be created in St. Petersburg in 1918; its repertoire already comprised works by Kuzmin and Gumilyov. Blok, Remizov, and Meyerhold were closely associated with its projects—but for some reason the theater never got off the ground. In the end only a few Krylov fables were staged by a touring company that played in various theaters.

Today there is the “Children’s Theater” in Moscow, but from the fragmentary reports that reach us it is hard to gauge what sort of institution that may be. In Western Europe, the idea of establishing such a theater has never been realized; in fact, it has never come up. Hence V. Borich’s attempt in the theater in Kurfürstendamm is a first.

The experiment is a good one, and it would be a shame not to embrace it; but its realization is not entirely successful. Let’s be upfront: the “little” audience present at the performance showed a level of enthusiasm only rarely seen—there was no end to the jubilation. To say the least, the audience was grateful to a fault, but this very fact demands far more attention when it comes to the selection of works and the unavoidable introductory announcement at this matinee, “Due to technical difficulties, the management apologizes” etc.

The idea of staging a play around pantomime can succeed only when a powerful plot substitutes for the words, which are indispensable to children. But this was precisely what was absent in the “specifically childish” content of the pantomime, Zaubernacht, with its usual tropes of toys coming to life, falling asleep, and awakening. There was a plot, though it was but a series of episodes of a dancelike, entertaining character, and it was no surprise that my neighbor wondered, “How can children keep quiet for such a long time? I couldn’t do it . . .”—and indeed, they all kept quiet for a long time—one hour and a quarter; so the pantomime ought to be shortened, though several very amusing tricks save it.

Kurt Weill’s very interesting music is suitable for children only because it does not overload the stage action; it serves instead as a backdrop. But it doesn’t really stimulate the imagination, and the lack of a simple melody makes it difficult for children to comprehend it.

About half of the performance consists of dances, often technical routines that are of little interest to children. Grow-up eyes will find Mary Zimmermann’s school pleasing, as her students stand out in comparison to the apprentices of the average German “concertographic studio.” Among the “mimic” performers, Valery stood out in her cleverly portrayed stylized “Boy,” and Alexeyeva, with her expressive face and body movements, in hers of the “Girl,” though the former could do with greater thoroughness and dedication, and the latter with more simplicity, because her role is not that of an ingénue coquette!

Larot’s costumes are amusing enough, but for this production for children his set design ought to be more realistic and less stylized . . . . The performance gave the overall impression that it is still “raw” and in need of polish. A little tinkering will improve much and, of course, a change in the program should do even more—because the participants of this real, good, and genuinely artistic “children’s theater” are already in place.

Despite scattered criticism of his music as being unmelodious or too modern, which may actually have gained him respect among his peers, Weill had ample reason to be pleased with the press’ reaction to his work. The fault line that would soon divide German newspapers and critics in their assessment of his music did not yet exist, and he must have been encouraged by the praise for his effective score.

The second performance of Zaubernacht proceeded as planned, but the third performance, scheduled for 2 December, fell victim to an actors’ strike motivated largely by the inflation that had been rampant in Germany since June 1922. On the evening of 25 November, just hours after the second performance of Zaubernacht, wage negotiations between the Genossenschaft deutscher Bühnenangehöriger, representing the actors, and the Bühnenverein, the Association of German Theaters, failed, and Berlin’s actors began a walkout that left most of the city’s theaters dark for precisely two weeks. According to the Russian dailies, the third and supposedly final performance of Zaubernacht—to which they referred by the Russian title, “Volshebnaya noch”—took place at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm on 16 December 1922; Rul noted, however, that further holiday performances would be held at a different location. At least one such performance during the holiday season did take place, again at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm, on 30 December 1922.

In response to Zaubernacht’s modest success but limited exposure, Weill created an orchestral suite in April 1923 that he titled Quodlibet, op. 9, and gave the explanatory subtitle “Vier Orchesterstücke aus einer Kinderpantomime.” The work did not follow the sequence of events in Zaubernacht; instead, Weill grouped sections according to musical considerations, and he scored the effective potpourri for double-wind symphony orchestra. The work’s dedicatee, Albert Bing, conducted the premiere of Quodlibet on 14 June 1923 in Dessau, and the suite enjoyed numerous concert performances during the 1920s.

III. Premiere of The Magic Night in New York

In February 1924, when Weill began to negotiate his contract with the Viennese publisher Universal Edition, he at first excluded Zaubernacht, stating that “a large local publisher and licensor of stage works has just obtained . . . . the right to perform the pantomime Zaubernacht, which will be performed in New York this fall (first performed here at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm in 1923 [sic]).” About two months later Weill reported to Universal Edition that he had not finalized the deal for Zaubernacht with the publisher, Die Schmiede, and he indicated that he would reexamine the work for larger forces if the U.S. performance were indeed to become reality. In a letter of 3 June 1924 Weill announced, “as I’ve just learned from the impresario and author of the book, Dr. Wladimir Boritsch[,] . . . my children’s pantomime will probably be produced by [Mikhail] Fokine in New York. As soon as I hear something definitive about this performance, I will create a new orchestral score for Mozartean forces (the full score for the performance here had only nine instruments). Would you be interested in taking over the piece now, and would you be willing to help to make this New York production happen? All the material except the full score is already in America.” On 7 July 1924 Weill sent a final letter about the project: “The scenario and the piano reduction of the pantomime Zaubernacht are in New York with the impresario Dr. W. Boritsch, c/o Shidlow, 130 William Street; I should receive the detailed English-language scenario any day now, and I will forward it to you immediately.” Universal Edition’s reply to Weill’s letters from this period do not survive; one can only assume that the publisher expressed little interest in adding the work to its catalogue, for there is no evidence for further correspondence on the subject. Weill’s association with Zaubernacht appears to have ended here; there are no documents to suggest that he was involved with the New York production that eventually opened in December 1925.

Boritsch had boarded the SS Conte Rosso in Genoa, Italy, on 18 March 1924, equipped with a letter of recommendation from Busoni, dated February 1924: “In Magic Night Dr. Boritsch has composed a pleasing and effective production, particularly suited for children’s and Christmas plays. In addition Mr. Kurt Weill has written an orchestral accompaniment which I consider admirably successful, melodic, and in character. The production is earnestly recommended to all stages wishing to offer their public a light yet artistic piece.” Plans for a production in the fall of 1924 came
to naught, probably because Boritsch was unable to secure sufficient spon-
sorship. Within one year, however, he had won the support of major pa-
tron in New York and found a suitable venue at the Garrick Theatre. Underwriters for the production of *The Magic Night* included Mrs. August
Belmont, Mrs. Otto H. Kahn, Henry Rogers Winthrop, Charles Dana
Gibson, Theresa Helburn, and the famed actresses Laurret Taylor and
Ethe1 Barrymore. Multimillionaire Otto Kahn had bought the Garrick
Theatre in 1919, lending it to the Hedging Theatre Guild, coproduced by
Theresa Helburn.

The production of *The Magic Night* that premiered on 27 December
1925 differed significantly from the event in Berlin. The work was chore-
ographed not by Fokin, as Weill had thought, but by Michio Ito, and
Boritsch himself directed the work. He introduced a number of changes,
among them the excision of Weill’s “Lied der Fee” and closing farewell
song, replacing them with the settings by Galkauskas, which were titled
“Prologue” and “Epilogue.” An unknown arranger, perhaps Lazar Weiner,
the conductor of the production, orchestrated Galkauskas’s piano settings
for Weill’s forces.39 Because the Garrick Theatre was smaller than the
Theater am Kurfürstendamm (650 seats to that theater’s 865), Weill’s or-
chestration for nine instruments sufficed. According to the program, the
New York production also introduced two new characters, Yawn and
Stretch, at the beginning of the pantomime, as well as a large-scale ballet
of Good Dreams and Bad Dreams; Weiner composed the music to these
new sections. The program notes expressly stated that “this particular pro-
duction is designed especially for the youngest children.” As in Berlin, *The
Magic Night* was to be preceded by a shadow play version of *The Golden
Goose*, but ironically, as in Berlin, this portion of the program had to be
canceled at the last minute.

In preparation for the premiere, Boritsch issued several slightly exagger-
ated statements, among them the claim that he had successfully established
three children’s theaters in three different countries.40 Probably in an effort
to forestall some of the criticism that the Berlin production had encoun-
tered, Boritsch, in an interview given to the *New York Times* on the edu-
cational aspects of his enterprise, emphasized that the pantomime was
targeted to very young children:

> Parents who are worried by the fondness of their children for moving pic-
tures, even very young children, may learn something to their advantage
from Dr. Wladimir Boritch. It is a matter of psychology. “The child un-
derstands pure action best,” he says, “and likes picturesqueness most.”

Words have as yet a significance and charm somewhat limited, but the vi-
sual sense is acute and the imagination far nimbler than it will be by and
by in taking up the cues of suggestion. If the moving picture addressed it-
self only to this child mind, it would do little harm, possibly much good.
But it addresses primarily adolescents and adults, who live in the world of
matters of fact and occupations. The more keenly the child responds to this
pantomime medium, the more surely his mind becomes sophisticated.
Even when the moving picture is otherwise unobjectionable, it quenches
the faculty of primitive imagination.

In his Children’s Theatre Dr. Boritch appeals directly and exclusively
to the child mind, confident that by delighting it and strengthening its
sway he is making a contribution of value to education and to character de-
velopment. Differences between good and evil that are stamped upon the
earliest imagination persist through a lifetime and exert an influence which
is powerful because largely subconscious. Though clarified by mature
reason and corroborated by experience, they yet owe much of their vigor
and color to the fact that they first took substance in the age of myth and fairy
tale. In establishing esthetic sensibilities a properly child-like theatre is im-
portant. Too often plays for the young have been carelessly mounted and
crudely acted. The colors on Dr. Boritch’s palette and the tempo of his ac-
tion are those that most delight the wide eye of childhood; but he is mind-
ful that primitive art has a beauty and a rhythm of its own, that esthetically
also the child is father of the man. In an age when sophistication invades
the cradle and the pulse of life beats like a drum, his effort is to prolong
childhood, to develop and deepen its peculiar faculties to the utmost and
to blend them into the maturer moral fibre.41

Boritsch had expressed similar views in an extensive interview published in
the same newspaper on 25 May 1924, about two months after his arrival
in New York.

The press reaction to *The Magic Night* was generally positive, although
the reviews provided even less information about the music than had the
Berlin critics. The reviewer for the *New York Evening World* offered the
following report on 28 December 1925:

> With two performances, afternoon and evening, at the Garrick Theatre yesterday, the first step were taken toward the establishment of a perma-
nent theatre for children. This beginning was made under the auspices of
the Playhouse for Children, Inc., which has Michel Barroy for its manager
and announces a notable board of patrons.

> The double bill arranged for the opening performances included a shadow play, *The Golden Goose*, contrived by Dr. Wladimir Boritch from
a Grimm fairy tale, and a pantomime ballet, *The Magic Night*, the work of
Dr. Boritch, with music by Kurt Weill [sic].

> It was the pantomime which formed the principal feature, the shadow play
being used as a curtain raiser.

> In *The Magic Night*, two children, a boy and a girl, go to sleep to their
mother’s lullaby. They have good dreams and bad dreams. Then, following
the visit of a fairy queen, they have a vision in which the Ball, the Clown,
the Kitchen Stove, the Doll, the Bear, the Chinese Doctor, and the Soldier
appear, along with Haensel, Gretel and the Witch. All these visitors dance,
gambol, and cut quaint capers, and the children seem to themselves also
to take part in the revels.

> This pantomime is picturesquely set, brightly and fittingly costumed
and, under Dr. Boritch’s own direction, very briskly and smoothly pro-
duced. We found it delightfully entertaining, last night, as did the young-
sters who formed a considerable portion of the audience. It well may prove
a happy opener for the Playhouse project.

On the other hand, “A.S.,” writing for the *New York World*, gave a hu-
morous and mildly cynical assessment of the whole venture:

> With *The Magic Night* the Garrick was transformed yesterday into the
earnest aspect of “a playhouse for children” as distinguished from a mere
playhouse where children may go if they like.

> We must confess that we approach these sanctums of carefully organ-
ized juvenile entertainment with a certain trepidation—the trepidation
of one who, years ago, was inevitably dragged to these pantomimes for tiny tots by conscientious elders, the sort of elders who beamed down at you
from the next seat, watching eagerly to see how you “took it.” With the de-
fensive hypocrisy of nine going on ten, we always said it was beautiful, but
our secret enthusiasms were all for the gory adventures of *The Prisoner of
Zenda*, where the grown-ups were too busy “taking it” themselves to worry
about our reactions. That half-forbidden mood of helpless rebellion came
back in full force at yesterday’s performance.

> It is a venture launched by Dr. Wladimir Boritch, who has conducted
similar playhouse for children in Petrograd and Moscow. This imported
production is a deft and colorful piece of work, a triumph of Russian aes-
theticism with music in overtones from Tchaikovsky and settings in the
purple and vermilion of Boris Anisfeld. Its pantomime celebrates the
tart so usual tendency of toys to come to life while the children are sleep-
ing. These toys were about as childish as Stravinsky and they behaved
with that sophisticated and determined artlessness which fools grown-ups
sometimes but not a first-nighter aged five. However, the adults’ enjoyment
made for a merry afternoon, accompanied by a dutiful patter of small
hands from the children for whom it was intended.

> A shadow play, *The Golden Goose*, was to have preceded the pantomime
but was omitted at the last minute. The explanation, given by a gracious
patroness before the footlights, was that the naughty, shy shadows didn’t
like to come out in the afternoon, but that they wouldn’t be afraid to dance
to the evening show. Another less engaging theory was that the naughty,
shy operators couldn’t work the lighting effects until something had been
done to the shadow midgets. You may take your choice of these alibis with
the assurance that the shadow goose will appear at all following per-
formances.

*The Magic Night* ran for five performances; an evening performance fol-
lowed the afternoon premiere on 27 December, after which the curtain
rose on the following three afternoons.

Boritch’s plan to establish a permanent children’s theater in New York
appears to have shared the same fate as had his endeavors in Petrograd,
Vilnius, and Berlin. Although press reports announced in March 1926 that
the Playhouse for Children, Inc., would open in the fall, the project was
postponed in October, and after that it seems to have died altogether.42
A manuscript copy of Weill's holograph rehearsal score, written on Ameri- can music paper and copied presumably shortly after Boritsch's arrival in New York, lists on its outside back cover several addresses of Boritsch. Aside from three addresses in the Bronx, the New York City borough where Boritsch lived during his years in the United States, there is also one address each in Paris and "Haifa, Pal.," but it is not known whether Boritsch at- tempted to produce Zaubernacht in France and what was then Palestine.

IV. Subsequent Commentary on Zaubernacht

In October 1927 the music critic Heinrich Strobel published an essay about Weill in which he discussed the premieres of Weill's one-act operas Der Protagonist (1926) and Royal Palace (1927) at the state operas of Dres- den and Berlin, respectively, and the recent succes de scandale of Mahagonny: Ein Songspiel (1927) in Baden-Baden. In a passage about Weill's early in- strumental music Strobel called attention to Zaubernacht:

The strong dramatic tension inherent in this absolute music could release itself only in the theater, for which Weill wrote a piece back in 1922: music for a pantomime, Zaubernacht, extraordinarily light in its bow, lively, and delicate in the sonic treatment of the small orchestra. . . . Though cer- tainly not weighty, and though outside the realm of drama, this work is of utmost importance as a developmental stage, because here for the first time we see a changed attitude toward theater. For the student of Busoni, stage and music could be combined only on the basis of play. This personal de- velopment represented liberation from the coloristic and intellectual ele- ments that had ultimately made absolute music making during late romanticism impossible—liberation from those musico-dramatic ties that had gradually destroyed all immanently evolved forms of music in the thea- ter and subjugated music into complete obedience to texts created ac- cording to purely literary principles.\^[\textsuperscript{43}]

In his observations, Strobel echoed some of Weill's own comments, pub- lished a year earlier in the occasion of the premiere of Der Protagonist: "The intense concentration of Russian theater taught me two things: that the stage has its own musical form whose laws derive organically from the unfolding of the action, and that something significant can be said on stage only with the simplest, most modest means."\^[\textsuperscript{44}] Even in later years Weill as- serted that his experience with Zaubernacht had a decisive impact on his career—which of course eventually included more than thirty stage works. In one interview he called it "a stepping stone to success"; in another he spoke of it as the work in which his style "finally and permanently reverted to and subjugated music into complete obedience to texts created ac- cording to purely literary principles.\^[\textsuperscript{45}]

In his observations, Strobel echoed some of Weill's own comments, pub- lished a year earlier in the occasion of the premiere of Der Protagonist:

"The intense concentration of Russian theater taught me two things: that the stage has its own musical form whose laws derive organically from the unfolding of the action, and that something significant can be said on stage only with the simplest, most modest means."\^[\textsuperscript{44}] Even in later years Weill as- serted that his experience with Zaubernacht had a decisive impact on his career—which of course eventually included more than thirty stage works. In one interview he called it "a stepping stone to success"; in another he spoke of it as the work in which his style "finally and permanently reverted to and subjugated music into complete obedience to texts created ac- cording to purely literary principles.\^[\textsuperscript{45}]

V. Disappearance of the Score

It is generally believed that Weill's full score of Zaubernacht was among the unpublished holograph scores he left behind when he fled Nazi Ger- many in March 1933; except for the First Symphony, all of those scores are now lost. After Weill's death, Lenya and her second husband, George Davis, embarked on a quest to trace lost materials and find information about Weill for a biography. They visited Boritsch, who at some point be- fore he died in September 1954 gave them Weill's holograph piano score to Zaubernacht, but he kept the original set of orchestra parts and the copy- ist's manuscript of the piano score. Then in the late 1950s Marie Boritch, who was apparently Boritsch's second wife, showed these materials to David Drew.\^[\textsuperscript{46}] In March 1959 she donated them to Yale University, where they were supposed to become part of the newly established American Music Theatre Collection (whose advisory board counted Lenya among its members). The quarterly Yale University Library Gazette announced the acquisition in its July 1959 issue;\^[\textsuperscript{47}] however, the library's accession process was disrupted by the illness of the American Music Theatre Collection's first curator, Robert Barlow, who died in 1966. Instead of depositing the Zaubernacht materials in the acquisitions safe, library staff members placed them in a safe in the office of the assistant university librarian, James T. Bab. After his retirement, the safe, which was presumed to be empty, was moved to the library's basement, where it was soon forgotten.\^[\textsuperscript{48}] The chances of rediscovering these Zaubernacht materials were further ham- pered by the fact that in later years Marie Boritch could no longer remem- ber to which institution she had donated the materials; she vaguely but erroneously recalled that it had been Brandeis University.

In the late 1990s the British composer and orchestrator Meirion Bowen approached the Kurt Weill Foundation for Music to request permission to reconstruct Weill's orchestration of Zaubernacht on the basis of the scattered instrumental cues in the holograph piano-vocal score. In his subsequent reconstruction Bowen added a clarinet and harp to the ensemble but omit- ted the double bass that had been part of the original scoring (possibly he was tempted to believe that Weill's inconsistent use of abbreviations for "Klavier"—variously "Klav." and "KL."—could have meant that the score called for both piano and clarinet; similarly, Weill's notation "wie Harfe" may have led him to believe that the original scoring also included a harp). Bowen's version of Zaubernacht received its premiere in a concert perform- ance on 1 June 2000 in Cologne; a staged production choreographed by Milan Sladek followed in March 2003, produced in Dessau and Düssel- dorf, with subsequent performances a year later in Essen. The Capriccio label released a recording of Bowen's reconstruction in 2002, performed by the Ensemble Contrasts Köln under the direction of Celso Antunes.\^[\textsuperscript{49}]

Zaubernacht's original set of parts resurfaced in the fall of 2005, when staff members of the Yale University Library Business Office needed to move a safe in the basement of Sterling Memorial Library. The safe had been hiding behind several filing cabinets in a locked cage within a locked room of the basement. Because the safe's combination had been lost, staff members had to call in a locksmith. When opened, the safe revealed a vari- ety of materials, all of which were transferred to the Manuscripts and Archives Department, which, in due time, turned over the music manu- scripts to the Music Library.\^[\textsuperscript{50}] In August 2006, the Music Library informed the Kurt Weill Foundation about the discovery, and staff members of the Foundation were able to identify the parts as those created for the first pro- duction in Berlin in 1922.

VI. Observations on the Score and Vocal Numbers

Even if one were to disregard Zaubernacht's prehistory, a cursory glance at Weill's music reveals that he must have had the scenario in hand when he began to compose. As befits the pantomime genre, Weill created prominent musical motives to identify and characterize the roles—though he did not assign each character's motive to a single instrument (as Prokofiev would do in Peter i volk [Peter and the Wolf] in 1936). In one case Weill explicitly wrote into his rehearsal score the words "Thema der Puppe" (theme of the Doll), and he identified a variation of that motive as "Thema der kranken Puppe" (theme of the ailing Doll). All the character-related motives appear and reappear when the characters do. The scenario also called for a number of solo dances, for which Weill employed a variety of dance types: slow and fast waltzes, various marches (Reiter- Geschwind- and Trauermarch), cancan, fox-trot, and gavotte.

Weill's musical language is firmly rooted in tonality—despite the irri- tations it caused a few of the theater and dance critics. When Adolf Weißmann, one of Berlin's most prominent music critics, reviewed a per- formance of Fantasia, Pasacaglia und Hymnus in March 1923, he observed that Weill was by no means an "atonaler Radikalinski," and that though his
music in that piece seemed gloomy, that was only right because, as he explained, it had captured "the colossal tragedy of these desperate times." Weil himself observed, "This barely 23-year-old ... has already written rhythmical, effervescent music, brimming with life, for a pantomime." Compared to Weill's Symphony (1921) and the extent portions of his Fantasia, Posauctia und Hymus, the music for Zaubernacht does indeed appear more energetic. And, unlike those earlier pieces, it does not push the boundaries of tonality, nor does it recall the earlier pieces' brooding expressionism. Occasional dissonances that may have caused some frowns—such as the bouncy chromaticisms in a waltz "played" onstage by the Boy, who picks up a harmonica (see m. 1247 ff.)—are dramatically moti vat ed, and Weill "apologizes" for these playful excursions by resolving them into cadence. Throughout the Zaubernacht score Weill emphasizes melody and transparency, clearly following Busoni's call for a "young classicism" and responding directly to the task at hand: that of creating music that will be accessible to children.

David Drew has observed that Zaubernacht contains a number of self-borrowings. This practice—which would become one of his trademarks—allowed Weill to resurrect material from earlier compositions that he deemed superseded (in only a few instances during his career would he use self-borrowing to create an intertextual allusion). In Zaubernacht Weill incorporated substantial portions of the second and fourth movements of his String Quartet in B Minor. Most prominently, he lifted the theme of the Girl (Zaubernacht, m. 252ff.) wholesale from the Quartet (second movement, m. 36ff.), even retaining the original key. Weill also borrowed material from an earlier fox-trot, often referred to as "Algi-Song," which appeared three times in Zaubernacht (including in the Beat's dance, m. 911ff.). Antony Beaumont has suggested that Weill's use of a timpani ostinato in Quodlibet may have been inspired by a pervasive ostinato in Busoni's Turandot. The ostinato in Busoni's opera occurs prominently at the end of the first scene, at the point when the first suitor is being beheaded offstage; similarly, Weill uses his ostinato in Zaubernacht at the point when the Bear is being hunted offstage (mm. 1062ff. and 1090ff.).

For reasons unknown, Weill revised "Lied der Fee," the first of Zaubernacht's two vocal numbers, but it is not clear whether he did so shortly before the premiere or during the pantomime's limited run in Berlin. Weill wrote out the parts himself, but only those for bassoon and piano survive (see Plates 11 and 12). The original "Lied der Fee," as it appears here in mm. 37–82, comprised forty-six measures, preceded by a four-bar slow introduction. Weill replaced these fifty measures with a recomposed version comprising only thirty-five measures. One can only speculate about what could have triggered this revision: perhaps the original vocal part was too difficult for anyone but a trained opera singer; perhaps Weill heeded some of the criticism following the premiere and simplified the song for the target audience; perhaps Boritsch wanted to use his Russian text for subsequent performances, and Weill accommodated this wish as best as he could. There is no evidence that explains why Boritsch discarded even Weill's revised version in New York: either he did not approve of the new setting or the material was already incomplete by then.

Other aspects of the two vocal numbers are also shrouded in mystery. Boritsch, whose literary publications evince poetic aspirations, appears to have written the original Russian lyrics as they are preserved in the surviving materials of Galkauskas's settings. There is no documentation, however, for the authorship of the German text of "Lied der Fee," which is an adaptation—rather than merely a translation—of the Russian original. Upon arriving in the United States Boritsch conspicuously entered "German" in response to the "Race or people" question in the immigration questionnaire and also claimed to be able to read and write German in addition to Russian. But two pieces of information indicate that he was probably not responsible, at least not solely, for the German adaptation of the Russian text: In the manuscript of Galkauskas's settings, a French translation is inserted above the Russian text; below it is the beginning of a German translation, but this one is flawed and full of misspellings, and it peter ous after only a few lines. The linguistically well-crafted (if uninspired) text of "Lied der Fee," on the other hand, doubles the number of syllables and organizes them in alexandrines, a poetic meter not encountered as often in Russian literature as it is in German and not used in Boritsch's cycle of poems, Lyubovnyi krug. Like the Berlin program, which gave neither author nor translator credit, the 1925 New York program, too, though crediting the poet Babette Deutsch with the translation of the lyrics, did not specify an author and identified the work merely as "a fairy pantomime by Wladimir Boritch."

Little can be said about the second vocal number—titled "Proshchaly-quality" and responding directly to the task at hand: that of creating music that will be accessible to children.

VII. Editorial Challenges and Solutions

The rediscovery of the original set of parts (Im) and a copystist's manuscript (Vm) of Weill's rehearsal score (Vh) at Yale University in 2005 made this edition of Zaubernacht possible. Editorial challenges abound, however, caused first and foremost by lacunae: missing are Weill's full score, his continuity draft, and all sketches, as well as an authoritative scenario. The loss of actual music in the case of the Toy Fairy's farewell song poses an unsurmountable challenge for this edition: collectively, the instrumental parts preserve Weill's orchestral setting, but there is no part for the soprano who sang the number. The page that contained her music for the farewell song was removed from Vh, and none of the extant sources includes either the vocal line or the lyric (though in all likelihood the full score and continuity draft would have contained this information). As the song is not performable, the editors consequently have no choice but to omit it from this edition, but Weill's instrumental accompaniment and all clues to the vocal line are made available in the Critical Report (see pp. 56–58). Fortunately, it is possible to link the ends created by omitting the Toy Fairy's farewell song with a minimally invasive procedure that requires no more than changing a quarter rest to an eighth rest. The text and melody of the Fairy's opening song, "Lied der Fee," survive in Vh, and the edition can compile it in combination with information from Im. But, as discussed above, the sources for Weill's revised version of the "Lied der Fee" are incomplete, and this edition includes only Weill's original "Lied der Fee."

The most important task the editors faced was evaluating the alterations present in all the sources. Especially Im and Vh contain large numbers of markings in blue, red, and purple crayon, as well as others in ink and pencil. Alterations range from added articulation marks to changes so drastic that scraps of paper—some with newly written-out music, others blank to obscure chaotic cuts—were pasted in to ensure legibility. These alterations were clearly introduced at various stages in the work's production history and they are in a variety of different hands, but it is impossible to isolate the changes and establish when, where, and why each was introduced or who was responsible.

In dealing with these alterations, the editors have distinguished between two types of changes: (1) cuts and (2) all other changes. This edition simply rejects all cuts applied to Im, a decision based on the lack of an authoritative scenario and a complete set of stage cues. Because the stage cues contained in Vh do not allow a critical edition of Zaubernacht's scenario, it would be arbitrary to adopt cuts marked in the music that resulted from changes to a scenario whose scenic realization can no longer be reconstructed. Many of the cuts—they appear to have been introduced in great
haste—are also musically problematic and could only be adopted with additional editorial intervention. The first layer of Im is not, however, completely disconnected from the staging process: it is the closest representation of the state of the full score at the point when the copyists extracted the parts, a time when piano rehearsals with the onstage performers had begun—and—as can be gleaned from the many measures omitted in Im and subsequently canceled in Vh (where some of the omitted measures transmit stage cues)—had already started to inform the full score.

The guiding principle for addressing all other changes results from a process of elimination. Because Weill was not involved in the New York production, the edition seeks to exclude all changes made at that time, insofar as they are identifiable. Here Vm becomes a crucial source, because it was created in New York and served, in all likelihood, as a score for the conductor Lazar Weiner. The copyist who created Vm omitted hundreds of measures in the copying process, so it is reasonable to assume that all alterations subsequently entered into Vm and also present in Vh and Im were made in New York. It also seems safe to assume that all English-language entries found in Vh or Im originated in New York.

Editing the musical text of an edition from instrumental parts also entails a number of problems inherent in the source. With no information available about the instrumentation order in the full score, the editors have arranged the orchestral score to conform to the most common model for orchestral music: woodwinds (high-low), percussion, keyboard, vocal part, and strings (high-low). The different notation habits peculiar to the five copyists who extracted the parts from Weill’s full score led to a number of inconsistencies among the parts. Although many of these are insignificant, the editors have had to resolve such issues as how to print tempo markings and performance indications. Furthermore, the copyists invariably introduced errors during the copying process. Weill tended to be somewhat imprecise in notating his pitches, yet in instances of ambiguity a copyist had to make a decision one way or the other. Thus a note that appears to have been written clearly in Im may actually be an incorrect pitch. In these cases Vh can be helpful, but the information offered by Vh needs to be balanced against the possibility that Weill changed the music—as he did in a number of unrelated instances—when he orchestrated the work. Editorial decisions of this kind can be made only on a case-by-case basis, and the editors document every such action in the Critical Report.

Without an actual copy of a scenario and only incomplete and sometimes cryptic stage cues found in Vh, it is impossible to provide a critically edited, performable scenario. That said, the editors have included a “composite scenario” based on Vh, with additional information taken from newspaper reports and a very few deducible editorial additions. In order to make this process transparent, the Critical Report presents the information found in Vh in an appendix (see pp. 61–63). The decision to include a scenario emphasizes the fact that Zaubernacht is a stage work; even a skeletal scenario helps us to understand the mechanics and spirit of the work as well as its genesis and truncated performance history.

VIII. Performance Issues

Future stagings of Zaubernacht may indeed choose to follow the scenario offered here, but choreographers will find no clues in this edition for the many passages of pure dance. Alternatively, stage directors and choreographers may wish to create an entirely new scenario that corresponds to the character of Weill’s music. Some repeat marks in the score serve as obvious vamps for accommodating stage action (e.g., m. 1090f); of repeat of larger sections also offer flexibility in establishing a desired running time. Although this edition rejects all cuts found in Im, information about cuts introduced for Hörth’s and Zimmermann’s staging in 1922 can be gleaned from the passage in the Critical Report under “General Issues” subheaded “Structural Emendations.”

Conductors will have to address the issue of seating the unconventional instrumental ensemble. Several models are possible, as the combination of two woodwinds, percussion, piano, and five strings allows for both balance and separation. As in many of his scores, Weill’s placement of slurs tends to delineate musical phrases but not necessarily indicate binding articulation (e.g., bowing). This approach is only seemingly casual: Weill here actually adheres to Busoni’s idea of a ‘young classicality’; performers may wish to think of a Mozart score when performing Zaubernacht. The percussion part requires special attention. Weill’s writing for the part is fairly dense, and it appears that the players in Berlin and New York had difficulty performing all the music, as the original part contains many cancellations in red crayon that facilitate switches between instruments. It may therefore be advisable to divide the part among two percussionists.

Finally, the role of the “Stehaufmännchen” deserves comment. In 1925 the program of the New York production translated the character’s name as Roly-Poly. That term and the old-fashioned toy itself have begun to fade out of public memory in the English-speaking world, unlike in Germany, where the term enjoys continued popularity (largely because it has entered figurative speech), or in Boritsch’s native Russia, where the toy is known as “Nevalyashka” or “Vanka-vstanka.” A roly-poly or cork tumble is a toy in human form with a round bottom and a low-placed weight inside; when tipped over, it automatically regains its upright position.

With its mixture of mime and dance, Zaubernacht offers the potential for a variety of staging concepts. Although it might be an overstatement to label the work a Zwischengattung—Weill’s creative, playful, and often provocative signature blend, or juxtaposition, of genres—his first stage work already appears to contain more than a hint of what was to come.

Notes

2. Rud’s report of Borich’s arrival in Berlin is indexed in Chronik russischer Leben in Deutschland 1918–1941, ed. Karl Schögel et al. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999).
4. Cf. Pavel Lavriniec, “Stanovniki ruskoj literaturnoj zhizni v Viliune i Kauno poise Perev omennoj voyyi,” in Baltijsko-russkij zhurnal, vol. 1, ed. Boris Ravdin and Lazar Fleishman, Stanford Slavic Studies 27 (Stanford, Calif.: Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University; Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Slavic Special- ties, 2004). On p. 45 Lavriniec writes: “In June 1921 the Kaunas-based Free Lithuania counted V. Borich among its staff, and its bibliographic section mentioned the publication of his book of poems, Love Circle, in Vilnius in 1920. Its author, who was Ta- mos for the production of personally composed artistic pantomimes and children’s performances” (in Vilnius), lived in Kaunas in March 1921, according to Echo (2 March 1921, no. 49), and on 16 March 1921 he gave a lecture on Čiurlionis. . . . In April 1921 Borich organized a literary-music ‘intimate evening of fairy tales’ in Kau- nas, where he read both the poetic and prose versions of his own fairy tales and also those of E. K. Metner. In early 1921 Borich released his tale Miraculous Kingdom in Vilnius, and in March 1920, during the Polish administration of Lithuania, he had also organized an analogous ‘intimate evening’ of fairy tales together with Sasha Cherny.”—“Čiurlionio Viespas, dainos iki jo 1921. g.,” published in the number of the journal which included a translation by George E. Hudson.”“Қаунасская Весна: истории и воспоминания” (Vilnius: Kaunas, 1991).
bilingualic poetry, he wrote his first book, *Liebe* (1920), and his second, *Die drei Gänse* (1921), which was published in 1922 in Berlin. The latter was followed by a number of other poems and plays, including *Die Stadt* (1923), *Die Dreigroschenoper* (1928), and *Marx* (1931). In 1933, he moved to the United States, where he continued to write and perform his work. In 1942, he was arrested by the Gestapo and spent the remainder of the war in a concentration camp. After the war, he returned to Germany and continued to write until his death in 1945.

The works of Max Brod have been translated into many languages and have received widespread critical acclaim. His plays, in particular, have been performed in numerous productions around the world. Brod was a member of the German Resistance during World War II, and his work has been associated with the opposition to the Nazi regime.

**Summary:** Max Brod was a German writer, poet, and playwright who was known for his satirical and anti-authoritarian themes. His works have been translated into many languages and have been performed in numerous productions around the world. He was a member of the German Resistance during World War II.
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Drew recounts his visit to Marie Boritch in his *Handbook*, 140.


49. For details of the sequence of events see Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy, “From the Depths of the Library . . .,” *Kurt Weill Newsletter* 24, no. 2 (Fall 2006), 6.


54. See Beaumont’s liner notes for his recording of *Quodlibet*, op. 9 (combined with Weill’s two symphonies) on Chandos CHSA 5046 (released 2006), 11.


56. For the Russian lyric, see Critical Report, p. 55.
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