

# INTRODUCTION

by Stephen Hinton

- I. Overview
  - i. In the shadow of *Die Dreigroschenoper*
  - ii. Authorial attribution
  - iii. Textual fluidity
- II. Genesis
  - i. Inception
  - ii. Creation
  - iii. Rehearsal
  - iv. Rehearsal as creation: the ending and the instrumentation
- III. Editorial Challenges and Solutions
- IV. Reception
  - i. Premiere
  - ii. Afterlife
- V. Performance Practice

---

## I. Overview

### i. In the shadow of *Die Dreigroschenoper*

When *Happy End* had its premiere at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm in Berlin on 2 September 1929, it drew frequent comparison with its immediate predecessor, *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Created by the same collaborative team as *Happy End*—Bertolt Brecht, Elisabeth Hauptmann, Kurt Weill, Caspar Neher, Erich Engel, Theo Mackeben, and the Lewis Ruth Band—*Die Dreigroschenoper* had opened to great acclaim in the same theater the previous season. One of the reviews of the new work bore the title “*Dreigroschenoper* No. 2.” Another described it as nothing more than a repeat of the earlier piece’s “recipe”—a “rehash,” in the words of opera critic Oscar Bie. Yet another saw it as an attempt “to develop further the stage style of *Die Dreigroschenoper*.”<sup>1</sup> Yet for all the obvious similarities between the two “plays with music”—such as the common gangster theme, the idea of “epic theater” that informed both dramaturgy and staging, and the extensive use of Weill’s popular song style—many critics noted telling differences. Chief among these, of course, was the *mise-en-scène*, which had moved from nineteenth-century London to twentieth-century Chicago. One critic wrote that this amounted to the “Americanization” of the earlier work.<sup>2</sup>

Another big difference between *Happy End* and *Die Dreigroschenoper* is how each creates its own antithesis or counterpoint to the gangster milieu. In the earlier work it is Peachum’s army of beggars that performs this function. In *Happy End* it is the Salvation Army, and in particular, the show’s lead female role, Lieutenant Lilian Holiday. The contrived resolution of the plot—the theatrical *deus ex machina*—is also quite different in each case. In *Die Dreigroschenoper*, the gangster Macheath receives a pardon from the queen in a final scene that self-consciously relies on operatic convention. *Happy End*, by contrast, aspires toward the condition of cinema. As the Prologue forecasts, the story will end happily (*happendlich*), just like a Hollywood movie (*hollywoodlich*).<sup>3</sup> Such is the piece’s ironic view of the world, its *Weltbild*, which allows for innocence to triumph over guilt, for the female representative of that innocence (*das Girl*) to win over the nefarious criminals, and—in the final tableau—for religion to enter into an alliance with big business.

Since its inception, *Happy End* has had to exist in the long, seemingly inescapable shadow cast by its predecessor. *Die Dreigroschenoper*, whose fabled opening night had taken place on 31 August 1928, remained the talk of the town one year later. The production had received some 280 performances in its first season; many other theaters were staging the work; and it was already having a broad cultural impact beyond German borders.<sup>4</sup> (Further performances would be added to the Schiffbauerdamm’s total following *Happy End*’s brief month-long run.) If expectations were high because of its predecessor’s huge success, the new piece failed to live up to them. As widely reported in the press, the opening night ended in tumult and controversy, mainly because of the agitprop character of the final scene, which concluded with the cast singing “Hosiannah Rockefeller” against a backdrop of the giants of American capitalism—Henry Ford, J. P. Morgan, and John D. Rockefeller—canonized on stained-glass windows as St. Ford, St. Morgan, and St. Rockefeller. Critical reception was mixed. Reviewers generally panned the play, especially its ending, while at the same time singling out members of the cast for special praise, above all Carola Neher as Lilian. It was reported that several of the musical numbers garnered encores.

News of audience reaction to the premiere reached even the United States. The United Press (“UP”) report from 3 September, which was carried in multiple newspapers, began as follows: “One of the bitterest demonstrations and near riots ever witnessed in a Berlin theater broke out here last night at the opening performance of *Happy End*.” Describing the play as “a most bitter satire on American life,” the report noted that “the demonstration started after the curtain was raised on the final scene.” In addition to the church setting with its “colossal glass paintings,” the report described how an “inscription above the altar read: ‘Bethlehem’s Steel Is Best.’” It also mentioned that “the protests were met by passionate applause from the rest of the crowd which filled the theater.”<sup>5</sup> The critic for *Time* magazine observed that “outraged bourgeois first-nighters bellowed ‘Outrage!’ ‘Sacrilege!’ Socialist defenders of the play shouted ‘Splendid!’ ‘Colossal!’”<sup>6</sup> The *New York Times* also carried a review. The paper’s Berlin theater critic, C. Hooper Trask, first reminded readers of the popularity of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, “an entertainment of so sturdy a nature that it was palatable to both the snobs of Kurfürstendamm and the solid middle class burghers of Neukölln.” He then accurately and presciently noted that “there is no doubt that *Happy End* is a failure here and it will be taken off in a short time.” Nonetheless he “personally found it a very pleasing way of spending an evening”: “I personally feel that it would make an interesting production on Broadway.”<sup>7</sup>

### ii. Authorial attribution

Another factor informing the critics’ expectations, again related to *Die Dreigroschenoper*, was the curiosity piqued by critic Alfred Kerr’s well-publicized charge of plagiarism against Brecht. In May 1929, less than four months before the premiere of *Happy End*, Kerr had published an article entitled “Brecht’s Copyright,” in which he chided the playwright for failing to acknowledge the German translator of the Villon ballads he had used in the earlier piece.<sup>8</sup> The fact that *Die Dreigroschenoper*, presented as an adaptation of John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera*, had included “interpolated ballads by François Villon and Rudyard Kipling” was clearly stated in

the playbill. Brecht, in response to Kerr's charge, brashly excused the omission of the translator by referring to his own "fundamental laxity in matters of intellectual property."<sup>9</sup>

Matters of intellectual property were clearly front and center with *Happy End*, as much for the critics attending the premiere as for the creators themselves. In presenting itself as—to quote the playbill (see Plate 14)—"a magazine story by Dorothy Lane" in a "German adaptation by Elisabeth Hauptmann," the production not only invited comparison with the earlier work, itself an adaptation; it also raised questions about the original story and the identity of its author. The September edition of the house gazette of the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, *Das Stichwort*, informed its readers on the front page that "the content of the play *Happy End* follows the short story 'Under the Mistletoe' by Dorothy Lane (published in *J. L.'s Weekly*, St. Louis, Mo.). The adaptation for the German stage is by Elisabeth Hauptmann. The songs are by Brecht and Weill. The sets by Caspar Neher."<sup>10</sup> We now know for certain, as a number of critics already suspected at the time, that the "magazine story" on which *Happy End* was purportedly based was pure invention, as were the name of the author and that of the publication in which the story had allegedly appeared, "J. L.'s Weekly" (St. Louis, Mo., happened to be the city where Hauptmann's sister resided).

These fictions served several purposes. On one level, they gave the impression of *Happy End* being based on a pre-existing source as with Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, thereby evincing an aesthetics of "neoclassicist" reworking that was prevalent at the time. On another, they enhanced its fashionable *Amerikanismus*, however artificial and therefore inauthentic both the story and its author would turn out to be. On yet another level, they created a significant red herring for critics to ponder, as many did, some at considerable length. Last but not least, the fictional American writer and her story functioned as a theatrical conceit for the purpose of demonstrating a "fundamental laxity in matters of intellectual property" of a wholly different kind from that charged by Kerr. The laxity here lay not in suppressing sources, as had been the case with those *Dreigroschenoper* translations; rather, it was deceptively giving credit where credit was not due. This opportunity to leave critics guessing, and in so doing to reframe the issue of intellectual property, was surely among the reasons for the conceit of Lane's story having been invented in the first place. Moreover, given that work on the production of *Happy End* began in earnest in May 1929, it may well be that invoking a fake "short story" from a fake magazine came in direct reaction to Kerr's article that same month. In any event, "Under the Mistletoe" was not mentioned in Hauptmann's contract with the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, signed several months earlier; nor would the subtitle "a magazine story by Dorothy Lane" be used again. For example, the 1932 typescript of the text, which is discussed below, contains the following on its title page: "Happy end / By / Dorothy Lane / German Adaptation by / Elisabeth Hauptmann / Songs by / Bert Brecht and Kurt Weill." No longer playing the role of the invented author of the invented story, Lane now serves as a pseudonym for the author of the whole play that Hauptmann had "adapted"—that is, as a pseudonym for Hauptmann. This, in fact, is how "Dorothy Lane" was originally intended to be used according to Hauptmann's contract.

It is also worth noting how authorship of the sung portions of the work was credited in the playbill. Poet and composer appeared there with only their last names, as they did in the notice in *Das Stichwort*: "Songs: Brecht und Weill"—stylized, in other words, as a song-writing duo, established and well known to audiences thanks largely to the success of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. (The genre of "song" contributed another prominent element of *Amerikanismus*, of course.) *Das Stichwort* also included the text of the piece that would subsequently become the work's most celebrated number: "Song vom Surabaya-Johnny." Authorship of the poem is credited—again, without first name—to "Brecht: (Nach Kipling)," thereby giving critics yet another reason to discuss matters of intellectual property. The Kipling poem in question is "Mary, Pity Women!" on which "Polly's Lied" had also been based in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, although it was cut from the orig-

inal production (as discussed below, "Polly's Lied" was briefly considered, but then dropped, for *Happy End*). By contrast, although Kipling was not acknowledged in the playbill for *Happy End*, critics were aware of the origin of "Surabaya-Johnny"—indeed, several of them wrote about it—after previewing the song's lyrics in *Das Stichwort*. Erich Kästner would even create a cabaret-style parody called "Surabaya-Johnny II" ("freely after Kipling and Brecht") in which the titular Johnny is accused of not being *echt* ("genuine") because he is "by Brecht," whose family name is "& Co.!"<sup>11</sup>

Brecht was also listed in *Happy End's* playbill as co-director together with Erich Engel. Based on rumors they had heard, however, several critics reported that Engel had removed himself from the production prior to opening night. This was true: Engel had had a bitter falling out with Brecht over the third act. As a consequence, Brecht alone supervised the later stages of the rehearsal process, which involved a substantial rewrite of that act. He also deserves recognition for having proposed to Hauptmann the idea for the piece, and he should share at least some of the credit for the contributions of "Dorothy Lane." Recalling some three decades later the division of labor, Hauptmann stated that "the song texts were by Brecht (but he helped considerably with the text of the play)."<sup>12</sup> Hauptmann, in turn, appears to have helped with the lyrics, as her markings on lyric sheets indicate, and she may also have been the author of the Salvation Army songs (the "Heilsarmeelieder," as Weill referred to them).

### iii. Textual fluidity

*Happy End* was a team effort. "I remember well how this play actually came into being during the 'rehearsal period,'" wrote Theo Lingen in 1970 on the occasion of the 70th birthday of Brecht's widow, Helene Weigel.<sup>13</sup> Lingen and Weigel were fellow cast members in *Happy End*—he as gang member Jimmy Dexter, and she as "Die Dame in Grau" (nicknamed "Die Fliege")—whose roles grew as the play materialized in rehearsal. (Conversely, other roles shrank in the course of the play's evolution.) The open-ended, collaborative approach described by Lingen was part and parcel of what the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, in its announcement of the upcoming production, called the "ensemble idea": "All the actors involved, with the exception of Homolka, are retained by the theater on an ongoing basis so that they can participate in the experiment being undertaken to realize the ensemble idea to the fullest extent possible."<sup>14</sup>

The nature and extent of this creative process is graphically documented in the large and diffuse collection of manuscript sources held in Hauptmann's and Brecht's archives. Although these typed and handwritten sources are impossible to order on a precise timeline, it is clear that the script underwent countless revisions, many of them substantial, during *Happy End's* convoluted genesis from initial idea to opening night and beyond. Indeed, because the group of sources documenting the later stages of the process depart to such an extent from those representing initial drafts, one could be forgiven for thinking that they belong to separate projects as opposed to representing a protracted sequence of radical rewrites. This textual fluidity manifests itself, albeit to a lesser degree, in the musical sources as well.

There are few, if any, parallels in Weill's oeuvre for such a chaotic creative process both before and during rehearsal, and for the concomitant lack of sources that transmit what was actually performed on opening night. Even though revisions undertaken during rehearsal were more the rule than the exception for Weill, and even though his Broadway works underwent changes not only during the rehearsal period but also, as remains customary, during tryouts, it is hard to deny that the genesis of *Happy End* represents an extreme case. The "ensemble idea" as described by Lingen surely promoted a blurring of the boundary between "creation" and "rehearsal." Again, comparison with *Die Dreigroschenoper* is instructive. Although neither *Die Dreigroschenoper* nor *Happy End* was published in full score until decades after its original production—in 1972 and 1980 respectively—a libretto of the former appeared shortly after the premiere, along with a complete piano-vocal score and numerous individual songs in

various arrangements. This was not the case with *Happy End*. The play, including all but one of the song texts, was first published in 1977, in a posthumous collection of writings by Elisabeth Hauptmann titled *Julia ohne Romeo* (Tp). The genesis of this version of the text and its relation to the other sources remains somewhat murky. What we do know for certain is that none of the extant sources presents a complete rendering of the play as it was performed in September 1929. The *Julia ohne Romeo* version was derived, as acknowledged in an endnote, from the typescript prepared by the theater agency Felix Bloch Erben in 1958 (Tt5). This source was itself based on the script (Tt3) that dates from spring 1932 as Hauptmann and Brecht sought to create a version for theatrical circulation; Hauptmann then lightly revised it in the 1950s (Tt3a). As for the pre-premiere textual sources, none can be considered complete, and all of them contain cuts and numerous handwritten emendations and paste-in revisions. In terms of the music, although a few individual songs from *Happy End* were published and/or recorded in various arrangements at the time, a *Klavier-Direktionsstimme* (the piano part including the vocal lines and some instrumental cues) did not appear in print until 1958, following a new production of the work in Munich that same year.

The most glaring departure of the post-premiere sources from what we know from reviews was performed in 1929 is the ending with the canonized American capitalists, which is entirely missing in the 1932 typescript. That this part of the work met with widespread disapproval was likely among the reasons for its excision. Another plausible reason for removing it has to do with the connection between *Happy End* and two of Brecht's subsequent works, *Der Brotladen* (1929–30), left unfinished, and *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe* (1930–31), first published in 1932 as the thirteenth of Brecht's *Versuche*, the term he used to describe his collected theatrical "experiments" created with various "collaborators." The preface to *Die heilige Johanna* states that it "grew out of the play *Happy End* by Elisabeth Hauptmann."<sup>15</sup> In addition to naming Hauptmann as the sole author of the earlier work, it lists her as one of three collaborators on the new one, the others being Hans Hermann Borchardt and Emil Burri. Both *Der Brotladen* and *Die heilige Johanna* borrow extensively for their concluding scenes from the text of "Hosiannah Rockefeller" in *Happy End*, and all three works examine the relationship between religion and society under capitalism, with the role played by the Salvation Army as a central theme. *Der Brotladen* and *Die heilige Johanna* reuse the text of "Der kleine Leutnant des lieben Gottes," the Salvation Army march from *Happy End*. *Der Brotladen* also reuses "In der Jugend goldnem Schimmer," and *Die heilige Johanna*, "Geht hinein in die Schlacht."

There is another significant borrowing from *Happy End* that should be mentioned here. It can be found in the revised version of *Die Dreigroschenoper* which Brecht published in 1931 (in another volume of the *Versuche*). Among the various notable changes is a moment in the final scene where Macheath adopts the provocative peroration from *Happy End* spoken by Die Dame in Grau comparing the work of criminals with the business of church-going members of the capitalist establishment:

Was ist ein Dietrich gegen eine Aktie? Was ist ein Einbruch in eine Bank gegen die Gründung einer Bank? Was ist die Ermordung eines Mannes gegen die Anstellung eines Mannes?

[What is a picklock compared with a share certificate? What is breaking into a bank compared with founding a bank? What is murdering a man compared with employing a man?]

One of the persistent myths surrounding *Happy End* is that these oft-cited lines were adopted from *Die Dreigroschenoper*, whereas the opposite is in fact the case.

The significance of these later borrowings is equivocal. On the one hand, they suggest that Brecht had moved on from *Happy End*. On the other, the parts he preserved were largely those responsible for the original production's lack of success, which was the chief reason for moving on. To detractors and well-wishers alike, the ending of *Happy End* came across as

incongruous. To Alfred Kerr, author of the plagiarism article and decidedly in the detractor camp, it appeared "pasted on" (*angepappt*). To Herbert Jhering, an early supporter of Brecht and sworn enemy of Kerr, the final scene had "the effect of a tableau from a completely different work, one that no longer belongs to a school play or to the outline of a play script but, rather, to a *chef d'oeuvre*." The piece had become "more demanding [*anspruchsvoller*] than planned"; it "straddled boundaries," going beyond "entertainment" (*Unterhaltung*) into the realm of "didactic theater" (*Lehrstück*).<sup>16</sup> In that formal sense of genre, the ending marked a departure for Brecht, one that would take more decisive and consistent shape in other works written around the time of *Happy End*, such as the two *Lehrstücke* for the chamber music festival in Baden-Baden (*Der Lindberghflug* and *Lehrstück*) and, of course, *Der Brotladen* and *Die heilige Johanna*.

Unlike *Die Dreigroschenoper*, Brecht did not include *Happy End* among the *Versuche*; instead, in the context of his published oeuvre as a whole, he treated it merely as a source of material to be cannibalized for the other "experiments." The extent of his creative contribution was likely the principal factor, although it was probably not the sole one. In addition to receiving billing for the songs "by Brecht and Weill," he "helped considerably with the text of the play," as Hauptmann acknowledged; this included his input as director during rehearsal, especially toward the end. Why then, despite having been an integral member of the collective, was he prepared in his editorial note for *Die heilige Johanna* in the *Versuche* to give all of the credit for *Happy End* to Hauptmann, whereas with the publication of *Die Dreigroschenoper* in that series he took nearly all such credit for himself, according her a byline only at the end as one of the three "Mitarbeiter" (collaborators)? Here the piece's lack of success likely plays a role. According to Brecht scholar John Willett: "*Happy End* has long been one of the great Brechtian problems, since Brecht's anxiety to wash his hands of it (following its failure) started a long process of mystification."<sup>17</sup>

Already at its premiere, serious questions arose about the viability of the piece as a whole, as evinced not only by numerous negative reviews, including those from otherwise sympathetic critics, but also by comments from Weill in his correspondence with his publisher, and by reported efforts to revise the spoken dialogue. The *Time* reporter, whose source remains anonymous, quoted Brecht's own reservations about the piece: "There has been some talk of the police closing our play, but the play will not close. The 'saints' will remain too, only we will make some changes in the text to make it absolutely clear that the play is anti-capitalistic, rather than anti-American." (Brecht would make a similar claim for two other collaborations with Weill, stressing how their significance transcended any American setting: the contemporaneous opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* and the somewhat later ballet *Die sieben Todsünden*.) But there are no documents concerning *Happy End* that would allow an accurate reconstruction of what, if anything, changed during its month-long run.

Several critics stated that the opening-night performance on 2 September 1929 lasted some three and a half hours, in part no doubt because of the various encores of musical numbers that many of the reviews mentioned, and in part because of the tumult that erupted at the end. According to one reviewer, Paul Wiegler (*B.Z. am Mittag*), the "battle" (*Kampf*) between opposing forces lasted a full ten minutes. According to another, Rolf Nürnberg (*12-Uhr-Blatt*), there were thirty-three curtain calls, protests notwithstanding. From opening night through 6 September, newspaper listings for *Happy End* gave only the beginning time of 8:00 P.M. From 7 September through the final performance on 1 October, however, they included the ending time of 10:30 P.M. How the running time was shortened, if it was, by a full hour is hard to say in the absence of reliable sources. The director and theater critic Bernhard Reich, who had worked with Brecht before and who attended the final week of rehearsals in the capacity of script doctor, recalled that the dress rehearsal "dragged on" because "the breaks between the scenes and acts lasted an eternity."<sup>18</sup> Presumably the stage crew and actors were able to execute the set and costume changes more efficiently after a few performances. Perhaps the dia-

logue was tightened, too, as one of the edited rehearsal scripts (Tt2) seems to indicate, though its various cuts were not reflected in the 1932 text (Tt3). Whether musical numbers were also cut or at least reduced in some way is unknown, though it is hard to imagine that a few of the more popular songs did not continue to be repeated in some form.

## II. Genesis

### i. Inception

The impetus for a sequel to *Die Dreigroschenoper* came as much from the general manager of the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, Ernst Josef Aufricht, as it did from Weill, Brecht, and Hauptmann. Aufricht describes the genesis in his memoirs:

After the success of *Die Dreigroschenoper* Brecht and Weill agreed with me that we should open the next season with a play using the same ensemble. Brecht, together with his assistant Elisabeth Hauptmann, had devised a story about a Salvation Army girl and a gangster boss. The figures were taken from American popular fiction. Two acts had been drafted; the title was *Happy End*.<sup>19</sup>

Not everything described here can be verified from the available sources. Nor is the timeline entirely clear. The initial idea for the play appears to have been Brecht's, yet he was also feeding off Hauptmann. He was certainly aware of the short story she had published in *Uhu* in April 1928, "Bessie soundso: eine Geschichte von der Heilsarmee," whose Salvation Army theme and sober scrutiny of religiosity in the modern world would find their way into *Happy End*. As Astrid Horst has noted, there is an incomplete typescript of "Bessie soundso" ("Bessie What's-Her-Name") in the Brecht-Archiv that is marked "Short story by E.H. Corrected by Brecht."<sup>20</sup>

In a frequently cited letter to Hauptmann, which survives only in part and is undated, Brecht proposed to her a collaboration in which she would "craft a little play" from "a story line" that he would create for her:

Dear Bess: I was wondering today whether you wouldn't like to partake of the Massary business? I'd supply you with a story line etc., and you would craft from it a little play, rough and ready, even fragmentary, if you like! A partly touching, partly comical thing for around 10,000 marks! You would have to sign for it, but this would naturally be of enormous benefit to you. The whole thing could work very well through plain openness and a kind of touching modesty!!  
 Story line roughly as follows:  
 Setting: Salvation Army and gangster bar.  
 Content: Struggle between good and evil.  
 Punch line: Good triumphs.<sup>21</sup>

"Massary" here is Fritzi Massary, the Austrian-born soprano and one of the best-known operetta singers of the period, who around the time of Brecht's writing was starring at Berlin's Metropol-Theater in *Die lustige Witwe*, a hugely successful production of Lehár's operetta directed by Erik Charell using an updated libretto and done in the style of a revue. For his proposal to Hauptmann, Brecht evidently had music in mind, and he goes on in the letter to single out as one of the songs "Das Lied vom Branntweinhändler," a poem he had published in his collection *Hauspostille* in 1927. By linking "Massary" with "business," he was presumably imagining a play that included musical numbers with popular appeal, perhaps something in the operetta mold, like *Die Dreigroschenoper*. (Several critics had made a point of likening the earlier work to operetta.)

The contract drawn up between the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm and Elisabeth Hauptmann for a production of "Happy end," dated 23 March 1929, states that Hauptmann ("pseudonym Dorothy Lane") would assign the sole rights for the premiere to the theater; that Brecht would be involved; that Weill would compose the music; and that Carola Neher and Heinrich George were engaged (*verpflichtet*) for the main roles. (George would ultimately decline and be replaced by Oskar Homolka.) On 16

April, Hauptmann and Brecht signed an agreement according to which he was to provide all the lyrics, with Hauptmann making it clear that Brecht was free to publish them elsewhere. On 2 May she signed an additional written statement that she would transfer without delay Brecht's share of the royalties (1/3 of what was due to the authors) as soon as she has received 2/3 of the total authors' share; Weill received his share (1/3) separately. And on 11 May Hauptmann and Felix Bloch Erben entered into a contract for the play "Happy End" that specifies she is to pay Brecht one-third of the authors' royalties.<sup>22</sup>

Already on 7 February, however, Weill's publisher, Universal Edition (UE) in Vienna, was asking him about an announcement in the Viennese press about Weill's and Brecht's "new play 'Happy End': "it would be important for us to receive information about it."<sup>23</sup> This announcement was presumably similar to the one that appeared in the *Salzburger Volksblatt* the following day:

The two authors of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, Bert Brecht and Kurt Weill, have finished a new work which bears the title "Happy end." As before, it is a popular piece with operatic traits [*ein opernhafes Volksstück*] that satirizes the type of happy end required at all costs on stage and screen. The new work will again be produced at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm under the direction of Erich Engel with Carola Neher in the lead female role.<sup>24</sup>

Weill appears not to have responded to that request, at least to judge by the UE correspondence files, where the project is not mentioned again until May. But contrary to that press announcement, we know for sure that Brecht and Weill had not "finished" their new work in February 1929—they still had a very long way to go—even if (so the surviving sources also suggest) a significant amount of creative activity had already occurred before Weill reported to UE in May that he had set to music a couple of the selected song texts and had given manuscript copies of those songs to Carola Neher.

Brecht's undated letter to Hauptmann containing the capsule plot summary quoted above continues with a more extensive sketch, furnishing her with some of the material for the earliest drafts of the play in which she adopted some of the characters' actions as well as their traits and names. Those names would be changed. Brecht's letter is not preserved in its entirety, however. The missing continuation, whatever it might have been, poignantly symbolizes the absence of a completed third act that would cause a rift between Brecht and his co-director, Erich Engel, ultimately leading to the latter's departure from the production a week or so before opening night.

Brecht's outline is doubly fragmentary: first, because it has not survived complete; and secondly, because of the nature of what it transmits. Rather than supply a clear narrative to flesh out his three-line summary, Brecht throws out a profusion of ideas in rambling run-on sentences, many of them packed into nested parentheses. The first sentence is an extreme case. Stripped of the long parenthetical insertions, it reads clearly enough: "Into a terrible gangster dive (...) where Ecclesia-Dick is languishing (...) there comes one evening with drum and saxophone a Salvation Army troop." But the intercalations contain numerous plot ideas and snippets of dialogue that Hauptmann would later adopt in some form: a finger still on the floor three days after it had been shot off; Dick's aversion to smoking; and a Chicago-style court of public shame (*Haberfeldtreiben*) with the "guys" (*Burschen*) confessing their disgraceful deeds to "Mimosenbess" and members of her troop. (Dick and Bess would later become Bill and Lilian.) There follows Brecht's cue for music: "The army, surrounded by howling wolves, stands pressed together and sings 'Das Lied vom Branntweinhändler' (*Postille*). Silence ensues and the gangsters await Ecclesia-Dick's outburst." Brecht then describes at length how Mimosenbess provokes Dick before she "sits behind a glass of whiskey and looks at him." "I forgot," Brecht adds parenthetically, "that she said *she wasn't afraid of him*." "He has whisky sent to her," the text continues, but then breaks off—at the point, that is, where in *Happy End* Lilian would eventually sing "Was die Herren Matrosen sagen."

Comparison of *Happy End* and Hauptmann's 1928 short story, "Bessie soundso," reveals a number of common elements, notwithstanding the play's ironic happy end, whose political import relies on utterly different means from the short story's more sober secular conclusion. The story is set against the backdrop of the 1906 earthquake in San Francisco, and it uses that natural catastrophe to highlight the impotence of religion in the face of human tragedy. The titular Bessie, a Salvation Army member whose last name the narrator cannot remember, calls a halt to the religious songs that are being sung to soothe and pacify the crowd trying to flee the city in the midst of the tumultuous earthquake. Exclaiming "Stop that nonsense!" she demands concrete action that is necessary to remove an obstacle—an automobile—blocking the citizens' escape. *Happy End* sends a quite different message about the Salvation Army by highlighting the integral role the organization plays in a capitalist society in which business leaders are no less corrupt than criminals. But both the story and the play include among their common elements a visit by the Salvation Army to a lowlife bar; in both, the Army's members stubbornly persist in promulgating their cause through singing; someone in their "congregation" spits into their offering plate; and the officer who disrupts the status quo is female.

Brecht and Hauptmann were each drawn to the Salvation Army as a vehicle for exploring an abiding theme of their work: the relationship between religion and society. Their knowledge of the institution came from exposure to all manner of relevant publications, including publicity brochures, and even from actual visits to Salvation Army meeting places—all of which fed into the creative process.<sup>25</sup> Hauptmann's identification with her short story extends beyond her protagonist's being female and enacting the underlying moral about "religiosity." The story's title itself was surely no coincidence, Bessie being a common nickname for Elisabeth, and for that matter, the original publication of "Bessie soundso" included a full-page photo of the author dressed as a Salvation Army officer.<sup>26</sup>

With his letter inviting her to "craft . . . a little play," Brecht himself reinforced Hauptmann's identification with the Salvation Army theme by calling the female protagonist "Mimosenbess" (the German word *Mimose* connotes a sensitive plant or shrinking violet; the "Dear Bess" of that letter is how Brecht typically addresses Hauptmann in correspondence at this time, albeit with the formal "Sie" rather than the informal "Du" that they had been using in conversation with each other for years). The final text of the play retains the characterization, while changing the name, when Sam says: "Aber die Seele des ganzen Unternehmens ist doch Hallelujah-Lilian, auch wegen ihres weichen Gemütes Mimosen-Lilian genannt" ("But the soul of the entire enterprise is Hallelujah-Lilian, also called Mimosen-Lilian because of her softheartedness"). He follows up with the rhyming, somewhat lewd remark, taken verbatim from Brecht's letter: "Einer Mimose langt man nicht in die Hose" ("One doesn't get into a sensitive plant's pants").

Among Brecht's early sources was the 1916 collection of essays by Paul Wiegler (1878–1949) titled *Figuren*. (Wiegler also worked as a theater critic; his review of *Happy End* for the *B. Z. am Mittag*, quoted above, was among the more favorable and evenhanded.) Of specific relevance in *Figuren* is Wiegler's essay "Propheten," which examines the connection between business and religion by using as examples the work of, among others, the Mormons and the Salvation Army, the latter a group that had been active in Germany since the end of the nineteenth century. In his account of General William Booth, the Salvation Army's founder, Wiegler writes about the practice of religious conversion that takes place with "the singing of psalms in the open air and signs on walls with the giant caption: 'Come to Jesus now.'" "All of that was there," Wiegler adds, but "it was Booth who perfected the method of 'revival' [*Erweckung*]." Thus Booth

originally worked with the Methodists. But then Miss Catherine Memford, a teetotaler, fell in love with him because in a pious tea party he recited with such enthusiasm the poem "The Grog-Seller's Dream." They married, they had a respectable number of children, and they founded the Salvation Army, the "hallelujah-squad," which wrestled, with furious fervor and rataplan, for the souls of obdurate sinners.<sup>27</sup>

We know from an entry in Brecht's diary dated 31 August 1920 that he was reading *Figuren* at the time, and that he thought it "an excellent book full of nuance and much substance." Expressing his predilection for creatively repurposing religious material, he describes there how he is learning from Wiegler: "I'm fishing out words and colors, which are swimming around in swarms in it. I must write psalms once more. Rhyming holds one up so much. One doesn't have to sing everything to guitar accompaniment." Two paragraphs later in the diary Wiegler's words are evidently still "swimming around" in Brecht's head and being recycled to whimsically expressionist ends. It is not people who need salvation in the community, he suggests in a striking passage, but "depraved" words:

At night finished "The Drunken Forest Sings a Chorale," a final stanza. It is good work. The devil take that which is rational! Words have their own spirit. There are ravenous ones, vain ones, clever ones, bull-necked ones, and unrefined ones. One must establish a Salvation Army for their "salvation," they are so depraved. One must convert them individually, in front of all the people, and take them in an entourage and show them to the people.<sup>28</sup>

James K. Lyon has made a compelling case that it was Wiegler's account of Booth reading the temperance poem "Der Traum des Schnapshändlers" that provided the inspiration for Brecht's "Vorbildliche Bekehrung eines Branntweinhändlers," also from 1920.<sup>29</sup> It is not surprising that he then incorporated this poem into his plot outline for *Happy End*. But Wiegler may also have influenced another work by Brecht that Tamara Berger-Prößdorf has brought into the pre-history of *Happy End*: his *Im Dickicht der Städte*, on which he worked between 1921 and 1927 and which features a Salvation Army officer as a minor character.<sup>30</sup>

Another key source for Brecht's ideas about American culture was Gustavus Myers's three-volume *History of Great American Fortunes* (1910–11), which appeared in German translation in 1916 as *Geschichte der großen amerikanischen Vermögen* (Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag; repr. 1923). Myers's comprehensive study no doubt appealed to Brecht on account of its scathing critique of wealth accumulation in the United States. Indeed, in his contribution to the survey "Die besten Bücher des Jahres," published in *Das Tage-Buch* in 1926, Brecht featured Myers's book on his shortlist, describing it there as a "feast" (*Fressen*) for "lovers of criminological literature."<sup>31</sup> It is not hard to see why he did so. In an especially withering passage about the notoriously corrupt era of Tweed and Connolly (William M. Tweed became the Commissioner of Public Works in New York City in 1869; Richard Connolly was Tweed's comptroller), Myers exposes the false piety of the rich in a way that foreshadows the ironic canonization of Rockefeller et al. in the final scene of *Happy End*:

Every intelligent person knew in 1871 that Tweed, Connolly and their associates were colossal thieves. Yet in that year a committee of New York's leading and richest citizens . . . were induced to make an examination of the controller's books and hand in a most eulogistic report, commending Connolly for his honesty and his faithfulness to duty. Why did they do this? Because obviously they were in underhand alliance with those political bandits, and received from them special privileges and exemptions amounting in value to hundreds of millions of dollars. . . . There cannot be the slightest doubt that the rich, as a class, were eager to have the Tweed régime continue. They might pose as fine moralists and profess to instruct the poor in religion and politics, but this attitude was a fraud; they deliberately instigated, supported, and benefited by, all of the great strokes of thievery that Tweed and Connolly put through.<sup>32</sup>

If Wiegler and Myers were exerting a defining influence on *Happy End*'s inception, Wiegler did so on the origins of the material going all the way back to 1920, and Myers especially on the play's final scene. Hauptmann's "Bessie soundso" certainly deserves acknowledgment as an obvious and important source for Brecht's plot outline and as motivation for his collaborator to produce a stage work along the proposed lines. Yet his own "Branntweinhändler" attests, via a creative reading of Wiegler's *Figuren*, to his longstanding engagement with the Salvation Army theme.

In the wake of the economic depression that followed the Wall Street Crash in October 1929 (barely a month after the production at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm had closed), Brecht and Hauptmann would continue to explore in various ways the connection between capitalism and organized religion. This included revisiting and reworking the *Happy End* material in *Der Brotladen* (1929–30) and *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe* (1930–31).<sup>33</sup> In addition, they considered turning *Happy End* from a play that parodied the movie convention telegraphed by its title into an actual film. In 1930, around the same time that G. W. Pabst's film version of *Die Dreigroschenoper* was being planned, they wrote—though did not complete—a narrative “treatment” based on *Happy End*.<sup>34</sup> Weill, for his part, would entertain the idea of decoupling his music from the play and reworking it instead as a *Songspiel*. As discussed below, the idea came to naught.

## ii. Creation

The surviving pre-premiere materials related directly to *Happy End* are many and varied, ranging from short prose narratives to several different drafts of the script, along with copies of the individual song lyrics in different versions.<sup>35</sup> None of these materials can be dated with any precision; still less can a comprehensive and accurate stemma of their relationship to one another be constructed. Some of the drafts, as preserved, amount to hybrid sources, transmitting texts of the play that mix and match materials from different creative stages. Take, for example, Folder 899 in the Brecht-Archiv. Comprising a total of 129 pages, it holds a composite version of the play occupying the first ninety-nine pages: a relatively late Act I (pp. 1–27, with one of two carbon copies of p. 1 bearing the penciled name “Colani,” about whom more below), followed by early versions of Act II (pp. 28–65) and Act III (pp. 66–99), including a scene between the Governor and Die Dame in Grau (discussed in detail below) that includes a rendering of the “Dietrich” speech in which the Governor delivers some of the lines that would eventually be spoken in their entirety by Die Dame in Grau. Pages 100–129 are a lightly annotated ribbon copy of a late Act III (a carbon copy of which constitutes the first layer of Tt2).

Despite the disorderly fashion in which the materials have been collated and preserved, at once unsystematic and in places anachronistic, it is nonetheless possible to discern the approximate relationship of the different versions of the dialogue to one another. The changing character names are the most obvious clue: in early scripts the male lead is still called “Dick”; later he becomes “Bill.” The female gang leader evolved from the figure of a barkeeper initially named “Saidie,” then becoming “Die Dame mit dem schwarzen Parfüm” (The Lady with the Black Perfume), and next “Die Dame in Grau” (The Lady in Gray), nicknamed “Die Fliege” (The Fly). Another kind of textual clue is offered by the cuts, word changes, and insertions indicating that the materials in question were either created or at least revised during the period of rehearsal.

Even if the distinction between creation and rehearsal is especially blurred in the case of *Happy End*, it would seem on the basis of the pre-premiere materials that Theo Lingen's statement about the play coming into being during the rehearsal period should be qualified as applying especially to the third act—a fact corroborated by other evidence, too. Of particular relevance in this regard is Tt2, a version of the script that bears the name “Colani” (written on the first page of Act III). According to the *Deutsches Bühnen-Jahrbuch* of 1929, Luise Colani was employed as a prompter (*Souffleuse*) at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm. In this typescript, also marked “NF” (presumably indicating *Neue Fassung*; “new version”), the first two acts contain only a few additional markings, mainly cuts made in either blue or red pencil. Those in blue closely correspond to those adopted in the script produced by Bloch Erben in 1932. Someone—possibly Hauptmann herself—has written in pencil at the bottom of one of the pages “blue cuts” (*blaue Striche*), as if indicating that they should remain in effect. The layer of red-pencil markings removes yet further dia-

logue, perhaps indicating additional cuts made at some point during the run (but not adopted in 1932).

The pages of the third act in the “Colani” script corroborate reports that the ending of *Happy End* continued to evolve up to opening night. The play as it was performed in 1929 appears not to have been set down clearly in textual form; or at least, it does not survive as such. With its visual salad of handwritten emendations, pasted-in typed insertions, minimal crossings out, and large-scale cuts, the “Colani” script graphically reflects the creative chaos that characterized the final stages of the rehearsal period. This is still an incomplete version of the play on account of the third act, which transmits neither what was performed on opening night (as we know from the press reviews) nor what found its way into the Bloch Erben script. Although the script's three acts were glued together at some point to form a single, discrete item, the third is typed with a different ribbon color from that used for the other two, suggesting a different provenance and hence a hybrid text. Of all the surviving pre-premiere scripts, Tt2 may come closest to representing the version performed on 2 September 1929; yet it still falls short with its Act III, which documents process rather than outcome. Accordingly, the reconstructed version of that act presented in the Edition has required the synthesis of material culled from a number of fragmentary sources.

That Brecht would have wanted to delegate the task of drafting the book of *Happy End* to Hauptmann is perhaps understandable on a pragmatic level, given the other projects on his plate in the first half of 1929. In addition to working with Weill on the full-length opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*, progress on which had been interrupted by *Die Dreigroschenoper*, he collaborated with Weill and Paul Hindemith on *Der Lindberghflug* and with Hindemith alone on *Lehrstück*, both of which received their premieres in Baden-Baden in late July (on the 27th and 28th respectively). In March, moreover, the month before he got married to actress Helene Weigel, he provided dramaturgical input and numerous textual revisions for a production of Marieluise Fleißer's *Pioniere in Ingolstadt* at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm.

The genesis of *Happy End* exhibits certain parallels to that of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Both began with a book furnished by Hauptmann: a German translation of Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, on the one hand, and a German “adaptation” of a fake American magazine story, on the other. Both, moreover, were modular in conception—an artistic principle that manifests itself on a number of levels and goes well beyond the fact that they were team efforts with contributions from several hands. A key factor here is the use of songs as part of the “epic” design of the production. Given the number of other projects Brecht was working on at the time, he may have made a pragmatic decision to draw on several existing poems for *Happy End* as the basis of the songs to be set by Weill and inserted at strategic points in the play, such as “Das Lied vom Branntweinhändler” as prescribed in the letter to Hauptmann, and the poem written “after Kipling” that became “Surabaya-Johnny.” But the key issue is how they are used: how they interrupt the action; how they do and do not shed light on it; how they are performed literally in a different light (*Songlicht*); how they depend on particular styles of vocal delivery; and, as a result of all these factors, how they relate or not to character and plot. The modular approach is reflected, moreover, in the composer's intention from the outset to treat the songs as individual compositions in their own right. This allows them to function as autonomous satellites of the stage work, and, not coincidentally, to be disseminated separately in popular arrangements, whether as sheet music or in recordings.

As they had done with *Die Dreigroschenoper*, the collaborative team aimed to take a working vacation in southern France, during which Brecht and Weill would collaborate with Hauptmann on the script and the songs, as well as on revisions to the “love scene” in Act II of *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*. In the event, however, their plans had to be altered *en route* because of Brecht's involvement in a car accident near Fulda on 20 May 1929. He sustained a broken kneecap, as Weill reported to UE, and had to be taken back to Berlin.<sup>36</sup> Having continued on to Saint-Cyr-sur-Mer

on their own, Weill and Lenya eventually returned to Germany on 3 July in order to meet up with Brecht and Hauptmann in Unterschondorf am Ammersee, in Bavaria. Except for a brief trip to Berlin, where he met with Otto Klemperer about staging *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* at the Krolloper, Weill remained with the others in Unterschondorf until 23 July. He and Brecht then left for Baden-Baden for the premiere of *Der Lindberghflug*.

The first songs that Weill composed and gave to Carola Neher were “Surabaya-Johnny” and “Die Ballade von der Höllennili.” We know from a letter to Weill from Ernst Loewy-Hartmann (UE), written on 25 July 1929, that Loewy-Hartmann had received both songs from Neher, and that he had taken “Surabaya-Johnny” to Vienna but had left “Höllennili” behind in Weill’s Berlin apartment. This letter was also in response to one from Weill written three days earlier in Unterschondorf in which the composer noted that “You have already two songs for *Happy End* that you can prepare. In all there will be approximately seven songs, among them three or four to be marketed as popular songs.” Weill also said that “I did not send the ‘Bilbao-Song’ because it is not completely certain whether it will find its way into *Happy End*” (Loewy-Hartmann also acknowledged that uncertainty in his own letter), but the composer added that “You will receive it in a few days.”<sup>37</sup>

During the working sojourn in Unterschondorf, Brecht received a letter, dated 11 July, in which director Erich Engel made numerous suggestions for revising the script. With a few weeks to go before rehearsals—which would begin in early August—Engel was referring to a version (possibly Tt1) that still consisted of four acts and whose male lead was still called Dick, not Bill (Acts III and IV eventually morphed into what would be Act IIIa and IIIb). Although Engel had little to say about the first and second acts, the third and fourth still required significant revision. His principal objections were that “the measures taken by Lilian are too lame” and that “as a consequence the reappearance of the criminals in Act IV becomes completely incomprehensible.” “My suggestions,” he continued, “are aimed at a substantial simplification of the plot.” He went on to propose creating a play within a play, with Dick and Lilian’s engagement under the Christmas tree (shades of the fake story’s “mistletoe”) and a closing chorale on “the respectable person” (*vom anständigen Menschen*) “amplified by a megaphone with the force of the ‘Kanonensong’ [from *Die Dreigroschenoper*] satirizing the steadfast good conscience of America.” All of this bears little resemblance to the three-act version that would crystallize during the following six weeks or so. Engel mentioned, too, that Caspar Neher had visited and shown him some sketches for the stage design which “have turned out well” (*sind geglückt*).<sup>38</sup>

The undated reply, sent by Hauptmann, is in two parts. The first, which is typewritten, sketches a new idea for the ending:

The final tableau shows the following (not—as originally planned—the refurbished, elegant bar): a TEMPLE, as described by [Upton] Sinclair in *Oil!*—the Lilian-Temple. It is made of marble and has gold moldings and inscriptions. The stained-glass windows depict the great saints of the States: Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, Morgan, et al. The temple contains the most modern conveniences: loudspeakers fitted into the belly of an angel, detachable organ pipes in which you can mix cocktails, etc. Lilian is an evangelist and is preaching; Dick is preaching, too, while giving stock tips. “Nothing without God.” The old gang belongs to Lilian’s disciples, some of them, such as Saidie and Gerron, start preaching as well. (Recording of American sermon.)

In the second, handwritten part, Hauptmann thanks Engel on behalf of Brecht and relays the latter’s rethinking of the role of “Saidie” as the mysterious “Dame mit dem schwarzen Parfüm,” who would eventually be renamed “Die Dame in Grau” (nicknamed “Die Fliege”):

Brecht thanks you for your letter; he very much likes the “Song of the Respectable Person,” also the disrobing behind a screen. He has not yet fully sorted out the stage set in his mind; the final tableau should be a modern temple instead of the old bar so that the “Bilbao-Song” can be retained. It

is important that in place of Saidie Brecht introduces “the Lady with the Black Perfume,” who makes the whole thing more mysterious and outlandish and somewhat more suspenseful. The gang belongs to the “L.w.t.B.P.” She tussles with Lilian over the men. As soon as it’s sorted out, I’ll write it down and send it to you.<sup>39</sup>

Hauptmann’s letter shows that the conception of an ironically religious paean to American plutocrats was not a last-minute thought, as is sometimes argued and as the draft scripts might suggest, but was already being visually imagined some three weeks before the play went into rehearsal. For the concluding song, “Hosiannah Rockefeller,” which came late in the play’s genesis, Weill would borrow from his 1928 “Berlin im Licht-Song,” thereby making a musical association between American capitalism and the German capital. The letter also explains why there was still some uncertainty in Weill’s mind over whether and how the “Bilbao-Song” would be deployed.

As one of the first songs that Weill set for *Happy End*, and with its text printed prior to opening night in the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm’s house gazette, “Surabaya-Johnny” provides a material link to *Die Dreigroschenoper*. We have seen that it is based on Kipling’s “Mary, Pity Women!” (1896), the poem that had also furnished the lines of “Polly’s Lied.” Although “Polly’s Lied” ended up being cut from the premiere of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, it appeared in the published piano-vocal score, and it was reinstated in the *Versuche* edition of the work in 1931. There was even a short-lived attempt to resuscitate the song in *Happy End*. In an early version of the script (Tt1), Lilian sings “Polly’s Lied” when, having been dismissed from the Salvation Army, she seeks refuge in the “Blatternbar,” as it was then called. But that direct link disappears in subsequent iterations of the script.<sup>40</sup> Instead, Lilian gets to sing a quite different song of female regret, “Surabaya-Johnny.”

“Polly’s Lied” represents a more or less literal translation of the first quasi-refrain of Kipling’s poem.

Nice while it lasted, an’ now it is over—  
Tear out your ’eart an’ good-bye to your lover!  
What’s the use o’ grievin’, when the mother that bore you  
(Mary, pity women!) knew it all before you?

Hübsch als es währte und nun ist’s vorüber  
Reiß aus dein Herz, sag: Goodbye, mein Lieber!  
Was nützt all dein Jammer (leih, Maria, dein Ohr mir!)  
Wenn meine Mutter selber wüßte all das vor mir.<sup>41</sup>

“Surabaya-Johnny,” by contrast, is a much freer rendering of the main portion of Kipling’s poem, in which an abandoned woman vents about her heartless male lover (and, in the English-language original, the father of her child). “Surabaya,” the name of an Indonesian port city, seems to have appealed to Brecht as much for its phonetic qualities as for its cultural exoticism. (“Mandelay” invokes the title of one of Kipling’s most famous poems, “Mandalay,” in which a British soldier, having served in Burma, nostalgically celebrates the lure of the East with the line, “If you’ve ’eard the East a-callin’, you won’t never ’eed naught else.”) But Brecht’s refrain clearly draws on Kipling’s first stanza:

You call yourself a man,  
For all you used to swear,  
An’ leave me, as you can,  
My certain shame to bear?  
I ’ear! You do not care—  
You done the worst you know.  
I ’ate you, grinnin’ there. . . .  
Ah, Gawd, I love you so!

Surabaya-Johnny, warum bist du so roh?  
Surabaya-Johnny, mein Gott, ich liebe dich so.  
Surabaya-Johnny, warum bin ich nicht froh?  
Du hast kein Herz, Johnny, und ich liebe dich so.

In addition to the lament's tone and the gist of its content being retained, the last line of Kipling's Cockney-accented verse finds its way literally into the adaptation. Moreover, the penultimate line ("I 'ate you, grinnin' there") also finds its way into the song at "Ich hasse dich so, Johnny, wie du stehst und grinst." But the text of "Surabaya-Johnny" is still more a paradigmatic case of Brecht's modular approach because it predates even *Die Dreigroschenoper*. In 1927, more than two years before Weill set it for *Happy End*, Brecht included it in a production of Lion Feuchtwanger's play *Kalkutta, 4. Mai*, published that year under his and Feuchtwanger's names.<sup>42</sup> And before she performed Weill's version, Carola Neher had made a non-commercial recording of an earlier setting that Franz Bruinier composed in April 1927.<sup>43</sup>

Weill's correspondence with UE in early August 1929 documenting the genesis of the music for *Happy End* underscores how his own modular approach extended to several of the songs. On 2 August, Weill reported that he was "doing the remaining songs for *Happy End*." "I hope I will be done on time," he continued, "in order for something to be brought out [i.e., published] for the premiere. There will be seven or eight numbers in total." In a handwritten footnote to another letter sent the same day, he mentions that "Marek Weber told me today he would like to have 'Surabaya-Johnny' as soon as possible in order to make a jazz arrangement (apparently for Electrola)."<sup>44</sup> And in a handwritten postscript to a letter dated 4 August, he could confirm that "I have meanwhile completed some seven numbers for *Happy End* and will have copies made of all the numbers (provisionally scored for piano and voice), which you will have at your disposal in a few days. Among them is a grand tango 'Was die Herren Matrosen sagen,' which, it seems to me, has the greatest potential for exploitation of anything of this kind that I have written up to now." He raises the possibility of sending it to Hartwig von Platen "for exploitation in a gramophone recording," and he does the same, in the main body of the letter, for the "Bilbao-Song." He also writes there that Mackeben ("who recently produced the best records of *Die Dreigroschenoper*") has been in touch with Orchestrola and will "do some vocal and instrumental recordings with this company in time for the premiere of *Happy End*."<sup>45</sup> UE promptly responded that the material for "Surabaya-Johnny" had been sent to Leo Blech at Electrola, who had meanwhile moved to Orchestrola, and who had then been asked to forward it to Marek Weber at Electrola. In turn, Weill asked on 12 August for Weber to be given the "Bilbao-Song" and the Tango. He confirmed that there were "six songs and three Salvation Army songs [*Heilsarmeelieder*]" that "could be published as a little piano-vocal score": "Possibly another song will be added, but that will be decided in the next couple of days."<sup>46</sup>

### iii. Rehearsal

Among the handful of memoirs that recount the original production of *Happy End*, those published by impresario Ernst Josef Aufrecht are the most extensive. They are also vividly narrated. For both of these reasons, Aufrecht is frequently cited, or at least channeled, in the literature on the work, even though some of the biographical details with which he brings his story to life, in particular the frequent passages of quoted speech, have to be taken with a judicious grain of salt.<sup>47</sup> That said, the explanation he offers for the replacement of Heinrich George, initially contracted as the male lead, seems plausible:

During the vacation Brecht had amputated a portion of the gangster boss's powers and responsibilities, and created from this portion a role for Weigel, the secret boss of the gang, called the Fly. At the end she marries the Salvation Army officer played by Sigismund von Radecki, known nowadays as an author, a peculiar presence thanks to his enormous height, bald head, and deep bass voice, with which he led the singing of the Salvation Army song, "[Das Lied] vom Branntweinhändler." George refused to play the fragment of a disemboweled role, as he called it.<sup>48</sup>

Rehearsals were hampered, above all, by continual rewriting, which created intense acrimony between Brecht and the director, Erich Engel, and led to

the latter's eventual abandonment of the production. Aufrecht continues the story regarding Brecht's assurances about the ending:

Engel blocked two acts in rehearsal and demanded the third. Brecht could not deliver it. During a fierce discussion they fell out. I had to talk with them in separate rooms. Engel requested that I release him from his contract or do a different piece. Brecht, he said, would never write the third act; the content of the story was already told in two. Brecht called Engel a tired, spent man, repeatedly reminding me of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, which I had accepted unfinished. Inspired by the actors, he had written the ending during rehearsal.<sup>49</sup>

Aufrecht's account of the fraught interaction between Brecht and Engel is corroborated from the playwright's perspective by his undated typewritten letter, which contains the handwritten annotation (by Engel) "received 19 Aug., 11 o'clock in the evening."

I immediately thought that you would just consider the piece complete if it could cost you money not to consider it complete. Your refusal to rehearse this text softened when possible warnings threatened to cost you money given the fresh assertion that you could rehearse this text. You consider this text the right text and yourself the right man for the job as soon as another opinion (such as your earlier one) could spell a loss of money. I don't at all consider you avaricious, but a passive dependency on money (and perhaps also on prestige) *has sufficed to make you unfit for artistically or intellectually responsible work*. Of course, you yourself are unable today to produce even this light little piece, one that breaks new ground in only a very modest way. In order to attain money and fame you will just make old theater out of this piece; you know this marks the end of our collaboration of several years, with which I was thoroughly satisfied, regardless of any trouble I took and quite apart from the outcome, so long as I could believe that it served a broader cultural and intellectual purpose.<sup>50</sup>

Implicit in the catalogue of *ad hominem* attacks is Brecht's expectation that Engel might have indulged further tardiness and been willing to participate in the protracted process of textual revision through opening night. Engel was not so inclined, as surviving correspondence between him and Aufrecht documents. What that exchange makes clear is that Engel had written to Aufrecht the day before he received Brecht's caustic letter; that he soon consulted a lawyer, but initially still agreed "as a concession [*aus Entgegenkommen*] to come to rehearsal"; that Aufrecht also sought the help of legal counsel; and that Engel made his further participation in the production conditional on "being able to carry out my work as director in a manner consistent with my artistic conscience and not being subjected to further intolerable aggressive behavior from Herr Brecht."<sup>51</sup> This last surviving communication was dated 21 August, with just over a week to go before the advertised opening night. Things were evidently not patched over. Initially scheduled for 29 August, the premiere had to be postponed twice, according to the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*: the first time until 31 August "owing to the indisposition of the female lead, Carola Neher"; the second, until 2 September "because of last-minute technical difficulties."<sup>52</sup>

Aufrecht continues the story as regards Brecht's assurances about writing the ending:

I wanted and had to believe him. I had hired an expensive ensemble. Brecht took over as director; Engel withdrew; rehearsals ran smoothly. Only in the fragmentary third act did conflicts arise with the actors. They demanded more text; their parts were not finished. I had a heart-to-heart with Brecht in my office. I accused him of taking me for a ride. We screamed at each other until we lost our voices. Then I became resigned. I gave up admonishing him. I knew how pointless it was. Engel had been proved right; there existed only a fragment of a third act. I was hoping to make the piece work with the fabulous actors and with Weill's music interpreted by Mackeben.<sup>53</sup>

But he goes on to provide some insight into how the third act was revised.

In the final days leading up the dress rehearsal Brecht was surrounded by some odd characters. One of them was called Slatan Dudow, later a prominent figure in East Berlin. Some came from Moscow. Brecht introduced a

Dr. Reich to me as a master of cuts. For an honorarium of 2000 marks he wanted to recommend some to me for *Happy End*.<sup>54</sup>

Both Dudow and Bernhard Reich were close associates of Brecht, and given their political leanings, it is certainly conceivable that both helped shape the rhetoric of the ending (as Aufrecht himself goes on to suggest). Dudow, a Bulgarian-born member of the KPD (the Communist Party of Germany), would soon direct *Die Maßnahme* (1930) and then the film *Kuble Wampe* (1932), both in collaboration with Brecht and Hanns Eisler. Reich, a left-leaning dramaturg, director, and critic who had met Brecht in Munich in 1923 and had moved to the Soviet Union in 1925, recalls his own participation in *Happy End*:

It was a week before the premiere when Brecht enlisted me. Not much could be changed at that point; rehearsals served to solidify what was already in hand. The dress rehearsal was scheduled for the evening before the premiere. It dragged on. The stage sets were assembled for the first time and the costumes worn for the first time. The breaks between the scenes and acts lasted an eternity. Although a sizable audience had come, Brecht was unconcerned about it. He interrupted and had unfinished passages rehearsed until they worked.

The rehearsal began at seven in the evening, and it was not until midnight that Brecht accepted the first act. Despite the interruptions and the stage directions in front of an audience, the actors controlled themselves. But after midnight, when the breaks became longer and the interruptions by the director more frequent, the cast became visibly nervous. Each of them wanted to rehearse this or that place in their part; collegiality ceased, and thespian egoism let itself go.<sup>55</sup>

#### iv. Rehearsal as creation: the ending and the instrumentation

It is at this point in his recollection of the dress rehearsal that Reich recounts at length the story of Helene Weigel's concluding monologue, something also discussed by Aufrecht. The latter's version of events—the one most frequently cited in the literature about *Happy End* and therefore another of the enduring myths surrounding the piece—implies that Weigel's speech was first introduced on opening night:

At the premiere the audience reaction prior to the intermission at the end of the second act was as strong as it had been for *Die Dreigroschenoper*. And then came the third act. Audibly disenchanted, the audience made rustling and coughing noises. I stood behind the stage and counted the minutes. The act was over; a finale had to be sung by the ensemble gathered onstage. Completely unexpectedly, and not trusting my own eyes, I saw Helene Weigel walk to the front of the stage. With a resounding voice and reading from a piece of paper, she exclaimed to the auditorium: "Was ist ein Dietrich gegen eine Aktie! Was ist ein Bankeinbruch gegen eine Bankgründung!" [*sic*] and other vulgar-Marxist provocations. . . . It was the odd characters and their advice that were to blame for Weigel's tirade. They found *Happy End's* ideological underpinnings inadequate.<sup>56</sup>

Reich, by contrast, recalls Weigel practicing her speech at the end of the dress rehearsal:

Weigel was despondent. She asked in a quiet voice whether she could do her monologue again, since she had not yet had a proper rehearsal. . . . A cast revolt broke out: nothing there—the monologue is rubbish, the audience wouldn't listen to it anyway; but those of us standing on the stage the whole evening and carrying the entire play, when have we ever properly rehearsed our final scene?! The stagehands were about to strike the set and pushed Weigel aside. I intervened and demanded that the Duchess's [i.e., *Die Dame in Grau's*] monologue be repeated. That was the cue. Homolka rebelled and exclaimed: "Aha, the red agitator from Moscow!"—it was very amusing. When the storm had subsided, Weigel was allowed to do her monologue again. The rehearsal ended at six in the morning. The auditorium had emptied. Only Brecht and I had held out.<sup>57</sup>

Another piece of personal testimony about the speech that should be taken into account is that of Sigismund von Radecki, the actor who played Lieutenant Jackson. Even though his recollection of events is no more in-

fallible than Aufrecht's, Radecki does point to an aspect of the monologue corroborated by surviving drafts of the script. In a short memoir that first appeared in abridged form in 1964 (two years before Aufrecht's book was published), Radecki recalls that *Happy End* "was a play that Brecht hoped would acquire form during rehearsal by itself, as it were." He writes of those rehearsals as a "difficult time, in which experiments were conducted throughout the night".<sup>58</sup>

At the dress rehearsal there was a huge quarrel in front of the audience that had gathered, such that everyone breathed a sigh of relief because a quarrel like this was supposed to bode well for the premiere. But then it turned out to be a failure anyway. For the subsequent performances Brecht improvised a concluding speech, which I had to deliver alone in front of the audience. I wore the uniform of the Salvation Army and had sewn the text of my short speech into my cap in case I forgot it. I remember it included the sentence "Was ist der Einbruch in eine Bank gegen die Gründung einer Bank! . . ." Older actors said to me afterward: "Brecht knows exactly why he turned to you; a more experienced actor would not take on such an improvised final speech because he would be aware of the risk."<sup>59</sup>

The sources tell a somewhat different story, however, and one that does not directly involve Radecki. Although reviews confirm that it was Weigel alone who delivered the speech at the premiere, in several of the surviving drafts she and the "Governor" (Dr. Nakamura) perform it together as a duologue. The effect of the duet was indeed "improvised," as the two characters appeared to be inventing the lines on the spot and formulating and completing each other's thoughts—an utterly different effect from a single actor reciting lines in the manner of a political stump speech, whether or not from a piece of paper.

By way of illustration, consider the following excerpt from a draft of the reunion scene between *Die Dame in Grau* and the Governor, copies of which are housed in both the Brecht-Archiv and the Hauptmann-Archiv. The latter copy (part of *Tt-misc*) bears the handwritten marking "Frau Weigel." It should be noted that the shared elements that will make up the "concluding speech" in later versions here precede the song "Höllensaidie" (i.e., "Höllennili").

GOVERNOR: (*Pause*) Saidie, Dein sehniger Körper lockt wie damals.

DAME: Ach, Governor, die alten Zeiten sind vorüber. Als ich heute in die Safes der L.C.D. griff, fühlte ich es ganz deutlich: Ein neues Geschlecht von Verbrechern steigt jetzt eben herauf. Nicht in dunklen Kaschemmen, verachtet und verfolgt, sondern geachtet und selber verfolgend wohnt das Verbrechen in den Marmorpalästen der Fifth Avenue.

GOVERNOR: Wir kleinen Handwerker, die mit dem biedereren Brecheisen in der schwierigen Faust erzene Safes erbrechen, in denen nurmehr Aktien und Schuldverschreibungen hausen, werden . . .

DAME: werden von den Großunternehmen verschlungen, unter denen die Banken stehen und die mit ganz anderen, moderneren Methoden der arbeitenden Bevölkerung das Geld aus den Taschen ziehen.

GOVERNOR: Sodass übrigens in diesen Taschen bald nurmehr geballte Fäuste übrig bleiben werden. Was ist ein Dietrich gegen eine Aktie?

DAME: Was ist ein Einbruch in eine Bank gegen die Gründung einer Bank? Was ist eine Brandstiftung gegen den Bau eines Mietshauses?

GOVERNOR: Was ist die Ermordung eines Mannes gegen seine Anstellung?

[GOVERNOR: (*Pause*) Saidie, your sinewy body entices, as before.

DAME: Ah, Governor, the old times are gone. When I was making a grab into the safes of the L.C.D. today, I felt it quite clearly: a new breed of criminal is now in the ascendant. Not in dingy dives, despised and pursued, but esteemed and doing the pursuing, crime now lives in the marble palaces of Fifth Avenue.

GOVERNOR: We petty artisans who, with an honest jimmy in our calused hands, break into bronze safes, in which stocks and bonds will henceforth be held, we . . .

DAME: we are being devoured by the big businessmen who are in charge of the banks and who, with completely different, more modern means, take the money out of working people's pockets.

GOVERNOR: So that all that remains in these pockets are clenched fists. What is a picklock compared with a share certificate?

DAME: What is breaking into a bank compared with founding a bank? What is arson compared with the construction of an apartment building?

GOVERNOR: What is murdering a man compared with employing a man?]

Comparison with other surviving drafts of the final scene reveals how the elements of the speech changed position and even their speaker in the ongoing process of revision. The "Brandstiftung" variant of the rhetorical question contained in the above draft did not make it into the final version. Nor, for that matter, did a couple of playful, quite humorous variants that pit the criminal practices of the crooks against the musical practices of the Salvation Army officers:

Was ist ein Gummiknüppel gegen ein Saxophon?  
[What is a rubber truncheon compared with a saxophone?]

Was ist ein Bleirohr gegen eine Mädchenstimme?  
[What is a lead pipe compared with a girl's voice?]<sup>60</sup>

The rhetorical questions, humorous or not, have a Marxist precedent, echoing a similarly articulated passage from Karl Marx's *Einleitung zu den Grundrissen der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*:

Is the conception of nature and of social relations which underlies Greek imagination and therefore Greek (art) possible when there are self-acting mules, railways, locomotives and electric telegraphs? What is a Vulcan compared with Roberts and Co., Jupiter compared with the lightning conductor, and Hermes compared with the *Crédit Mobilier*? All mythology subdues, controls and fashions the forces of nature in the imagination and through imagination; it disappears therefore when real control over these forces is established.<sup>61</sup>

But the evidence of the sources belies Aufrecht's frequently cited story about Weigel's intervention being "completely unexpected," as does Hauptmann's letter to Engel from July quoted above: the ending of the script of *Happy End* was indeed conceived and subjected to numerous revisions prior to opening night. The final speech may have appeared extraneous or, as Kerr opined, "pasted on" in both its tone and its ideology. In terms of its genesis, however, it emerged in a process of experimental creativity, just as did the play as a whole.

"Hosiannah Rockefeller," which followed Weigel's monologue, was not the only number performed at the premiere but then lost in transmission. Also missing from the 1932 Bloch Erben script is "Das Lied von der harten Nuss." In this case the suppression seems to have occurred more by accident than by design. Documenting an evident attempt to condense the text, the messy third act of the "Colani" script (Tt2) contains an insert that reduces a stretch of dialogue spanning more than four pages to one and a half, with two handwritten versions of a passage about the "cordon" (indicated as "Cordonsatz") added in pencil on separate pages. Whereas the earlier, draft version of that sentence mentions the "Nußsong," the neater of the two inserts omits any such reference. Restoring the musical number in this Edition involved reconciling the condensed section of dialogue with the earlier, longer version which supplies the spoken material for Bill to introduce his song of emotional resistance.

Reincorporating "Hosiannah Rockefeller" as the concluding musical number of *Happy End* similarly required synthesizing several textual layers, in this case from different sources. We have seen that Tt2 transmits neither what was performed on opening night nor what found its way into the

Bloch Erben script. The additional "Weigel" materials proved indispensable here, containing what may well be the latest pre-premiere version of Die Fliege's speech—or at least, the latest that has survived. There are, in fact, three copies of it in the Hauptmann-Archiv (all in Folder 1504): a messy typed draft with predominantly lowercase initial letters (see Plate 13), a clean version of the same, and a carbon copy. This version of the "Dietrich" speech is somewhat more compressed than earlier ones, including the version quoted above, where Die Fliege shares the material with the Governor. Its stage direction "handing over of the flag" (*Übergabe der Fahne*) refers to the passage that comes *after* the speech in the Bloch Erben version. It indicates in Weigel's version, however, that her speech should be inserted after Lilian invites Bill to sign up. In the Edition, the material following "Hallelujah" until the final musical number ("Hosiannah Rockefeller") has been derived from an earlier version in the Weigel materials. The assumption is that the compressed revised speech represents material intended to be inserted between the "handing over" and the concluding dialogue and song.

As a replacement for the conclusion of the Bloch Erben version, which omits the song and ends instead with Bill taking the drum and Lilian the flag, the recreated "original" script not only delivers the titular ending; it also self-consciously and ironically announces it. After Bill hopes "that there might be a happy end" (*Auf dass es ein glückliches Ende geben möge*), Die Fliege's final throwaway colloquialism, "Das sich gewaschen hat," amounts to something like "A happy end and a half!" or, in an even freer translation, "You can say that again!"

Not just the dialogue but also the music underwent revision in rehearsal. In addition to an interview that Weill gave shortly after the premiere of *Happy End* (quoted below), in which he describes his creative collaboration with the musicians of the Lewis Ruth Band and how changes were made to the instrumentation during rehearsal, there is a letter from the composer to Theodor W. Adorno dated 30 August 1929, in which he discusses the music he has written for the show and how it is being rehearsed. "I have been in the theater for the past ten days," he writes, "from ten in the morning until two o'clock at night. Unfortunately there's no other way of putting together a piece such as this." He continues that he has written some musical numbers that "go beyond *Die Dreigroschenoper* and lead more to the style of *Mahagonny*." He then describes his collaboration with the Lewis Ruth Band and how "instructive" it has been for him: "In terms of orchestration I have again tried out completely new things that I have been working on with the orchestra for hours on end. It's very time-consuming, but enormously instructive. I'm convinced that a student of composition could learn more at such a rehearsal (about form and instrumentation) than in a three-year course of study."<sup>62</sup>

The collaboration between Weill, Mackeben, and the members of the Lewis Ruth Band on *Happy End* closely resembled how they had worked together on *Die Dreigroschenoper*.<sup>63</sup> In the case of the earlier work, however, Weill returned to his full score days after the production had opened with the express intention of "writing down certain things for the published edition that I could simply communicate to the musicians by word of mouth."<sup>64</sup> There, too, the music as initially conceived and scored represented a necessarily imperfect attempt at capturing a work whose genesis was intimately bound up with a particular production. With *Happy End*, by contrast, the autograph shows few, if any, signs of the composer having revisited the full score to incorporate the "completely new things" mentioned in the letter to Adorno, and some of which, at least, are reflected in various adjustments entered into the band parts.

The life of *Happy End*'s theatrical debut, unlike that of its predecessor, lasted barely a month. Its later reception history—its afterlife, so to speak—occurred for the most part only after the composer's death. Although Weill did not immediately abandon the work, he would soon make his ambivalence known. In a letter to UE dated 14 October 1929, he urged them to recognize that his music had been "badly integrated" within a "bad play." He also felt that his music had been "completely misjudged." However, he also wrote that "Pieces such as the big 'Salvation Army March'

and the ‘Sailors’ Song’ go well beyond the song style,” thus reaffirming the comment he had made to Adorno about moving “beyond” *Die Dreigroschenoper*.<sup>65</sup>

### III. Editorial Challenges and Solutions

Foremost among the significant editorial challenges posed by the extant materials for *Happy End* is the lack of any source that reliably transmits the text as performed in September 1929. On the one hand, there is copious evidence of the writing and rehearsal processes, some of which reveals that they amounted to more or less the same thing, and none of which exactly corresponds to what press reports tell us was done on opening night—or, for that matter, in any of the subsequent performances during the month-long run. On the other hand, there is the clean Bloch Erben text from 1932, which does not entirely align with those reports either. As far as the 1929 production is concerned, we are dealing textually with a “not yet” and a “no longer”: the pre-premiere versions of the script transmit an unfinished, “not yet” state of the work, particularly as they relate to the ending; the 1932 licensing-agency text transmits a revised, “no longer” version of the work different in significant respects from what actually occurred in performance. For the most part, the materials that would be required to reconstruct the first-night version exist in one form or another, yet some of the crucial details have to rely on circumstantial and anecdotal evidence. Editorial intervention and judgment are, in short, both necessary and essential, and not just to restoring “Hosiannah Rockefeller” to *Happy End*’s ending.

A similar situation obtains for the musical sources. None of them is complete, whether the composer’s holograph full score of the musical numbers (**Fh**), the various holograph piano-vocal scores (**Vh**), or the surviving instrumental parts (**Im**). **Fh**, for example, transmits only ten of the musical numbers (as detailed in the Critical Report, holograph full scores for nos. 4, 9, and 10 are lost). But even when **Fh** survives, it does not tell the full story. As was the case with *Die Dreigroschenoper*, Weill’s own testimony confirms that he collaborated closely with the musicians of the Lewis Ruth Band during rehearsal to refine his instrumentation. In an interview given shortly after the premiere of *Happy End*, for example, he remarked how during the rehearsals for “Surabaya-Johnny” (no. 11) “it occurred to me that the violin could be accompanied by the clarinet playing an octave lower. I had the jazz band stop, changed the score, and the resulting sound has benefited greatly. This would be impossible with a large orchestra,” where “the conductor would instantly say: ‘Are you unable to write for orchestra, since you’re making adjustments to the score during rehearsal?’”<sup>66</sup> This change barely appears in **Fh**. In **Im** for “Surabaya-Johnny,” the alto saxophone does indeed double on clarinet (as well as flute), and the player of the tenor saxophone switches to violin (see Plates 3 and 4, and the version of the song printed in the Appendix). And here the parts have indeed been changed as Weill said: a violin part has been added and the clarinet (replacing the saxophone) plays the same line an octave lower. All such additions are in pencil, apparently entered by the players, not by Weill. But in contrast to *Die Dreigroschenoper*, where the composer, with publication in mind, subsequently revised his full score in light of the changes that had occurred in the theater, few such revisions appear to have been made to the surviving numbers of the full score of *Happy End*. Thus the instrumental parts, insofar as they transmit later stages of the creative process, serve as an important supplement to the composer’s own holograph. But of the six numbers for which parts have survived, only two were used in the theater (nos. 10, 11), and for these two numbers only one full score survives (no. 11). The parts for the other four numbers (1, 4, 8, 9) were copied from an earlier set, although it is not known what kind of instructions the copyists received; for these four numbers only two full scores survive (nos. 1, 8).

Because of these abiding challenges caused by the host of inconsistencies among available sources—largely but not exclusively because of the work’s convoluted genesis—the process of producing this Edition has in-

involved lending considerable weight to non-holograph items. In some cases, the editors have consulted contemporaneous recordings for evidence of performance practice in general, and of details of instrumentation in particular. Especially helpful in this regard are the recordings done by members of the Lewis Ruth Band and conductor/pianist Theo Mackeben (**R1-3**). In the matter of song texts, wherever possible we have privileged the version transmitted by the composer. In one instance, for example, press reviews of the premiere confirm that the moon in the “Bilbao-Song” was “red,” as it is in Brecht’s original text, and not “green” as transmitted in Weill’s holograph full score, in the manuscript piano-vocal score, in the sheet-music edition, and in Lotte Lenya’s various recordings of the number. In this case, while noting the discrepancy, the Edition has opted to preserve Weill’s “green” over Brecht’s “red.” There are numerous occasions, however, where it has been necessary to supplement or amend **Fh**. Because Weill rarely wrote out text underlay for more than a single stanza, lyrics have often been taken from other sources. Nor was the composer infallible in setting down the text underlay that he does provide. Here, too, other sources have had to be used.

The Edition is necessarily “synthetic,” then, insofar as each of its constituent elements—be it dialogue, lyrics, vocal line, or instrumentation—derives to some degree from multiple sources. The importance that attaches to each of these sources, however, varies considerably from case to case, as the Critical Report documents in detail. By way of illustration, here are a few more specific examples.

As far as the play’s dialogue is concerned, the principal philological challenge was the ending. For the rest of the play it has been possible to adopt, with minimal editorial intervention, the dialogue transmitted by the 1932 typescript. Missing from that version of the play is the final musical number and the immediately preceding dialogue, which caused much of the tumult at the premiere. Although the full score of “Hosiannah Rockefeller” survives in Weill’s holograph, both its lyrics and the dialogue have had to be reconstructed from an array of sources (see Plates 10–13 and 18), including fragmentary rehearsal scripts whose handwritten revisions graphically illustrate the creative process through opening night and possibly beyond.

The text underlay proved especially challenging in the cases of the “Bilbao-Song” and “Was die Herren Matrosen sagen” because the additional stanzas depart rhythmically from the first and only stanza that Weill notated. In a letter to his publisher dated 1 October 1929 regarding the sheet-music arrangement, Weill acknowledged the problem and concluded that printing more than one stanza would be impractical because of the cue-size notes required to accommodate the rhythmic discrepancies. Consequently, the Edition has had to insert the lyrics for the second and third stanzas without guidance from any musical source.

In the case of “Surabaya-Johnny,” because the sources reveal more changes to the orchestration than for any other number in *Happy End*, and also because the composer commented approvingly (as we have seen) on some of the changes made during rehearsal, the Edition offers an alternate version in the Appendix. The reported changes to “Surabaya-Johnny” did not make it into his holograph full score—or if they did, which is hard to determine definitively from largely illegible traces, they were later erased. The **Fh** version, with minor editorial adjustments, appears in the Main Text of the Edition; the one in the Appendix illustrates changes made up to and including the 1929 recording by Lenya with Theo Mackeben and his “Jazz-Orchester.” This alternate version, which synthesizes multiple sources, includes the alto and tenor saxophones being replaced by two clarinets, with the second clarinetist switching to violin during the refrain and playing the melody an octave higher than the first clarinet, as Weill reported. One reason for preserving the original instrumentation in the Main Text is that the alternate version, although an improvement according to Weill, requires the one-time use of a violin, which may not be available to many ensembles performing the score. (This also might explain why certain changes made to **Fh** were erased from it in connection with posthumous performances.) Another reason is that the alternate version is hardly

more “authentic” or “definitive” than the first, and thus is not intended by the editors to supersede it. Rather, its purpose is to illustrate in notation the kind of changes that occurred in the time around and immediately after the premiere of *Happy End*, some of which took place at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm while others arose in connection with non-theatrical performances, including the three recordings.

Several issues have made “Das Lied von der harten Nuss” a particularly challenging number to edit. Foremost among them is the state of the sources, which leaves three significant issues to resolve. First, **Fh** has not survived (as is also the case for “Was die Herren Matrosen sagen” and “Der Song von Mandelay”). Secondly, the piano part is missing from the instrumental parts. Thirdly, none of the musical sources transmits the complete lyrics. Partly responsible for this state of affairs, no doubt, is the number’s late addition to the production. The extant instrumental parts certainly leave the impression of work done in haste. They also indicate a title change from “Das Lied von der harten Nuss” to “Nur da nicht weich werden.” Compounding these difficulties is the fact that Weill did not write out a separate vocal part in his piano-vocal score (**Vh**), but instead simply placed the lyrics above the piano part (see Plates 6a–c). As usual, **Vh** contains only one stanza plus refrain (plus repeat marks for subsequent stanzas), with the refrain breaking off before the end. In 1958, both Lenya and Aufricht remembered only one stanza having been performed in the theater, and even Elisabeth Hauptmann recalled just a single stanza before she unearthed the lyric sheets among Brecht’s papers.<sup>67</sup> Placement of the song is yet another issue, as discussed in detail in the Critical Report. Copious pencil annotations in one of the more complete rehearsal scripts (**Tt2**) document numerous revisions of the scene in question, some of them quite substantial (see Plates 8 and 9). Even though the song was retained and identified in that script as “Nußsong,” the 1932 Bloch Erben text (**Tt3**) omitted it. Perhaps the greatest challenge of all is that lack of a part for the pianist among the surviving instrumental materials, which has had to be created here anew, with only the piano part that Weill wrote in the vocal score to go on.

#### IV. Reception

##### i. Premiere

“The season has begun,” the *Prager Tagblatt* announced from Berlin on 5 September 1929: “*Happy End* by Brecht and Weill, the authors of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, was (in the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm) not an undisputed success.” “According to reviews,” the report continued, “the piece is too similar to *Die Dreigroschenoper*.”<sup>68</sup> However much Weill considered this alleged reason for the mixed reception to be a misperception from a musical perspective, it was certainly a commonly held view. The *Prager Tagblatt*’s summation was accurate: in addition to the reviews cited in the opening section of this essay there are numerous others from among the fifty or so published at the time that dwell on similarities between the two works, often to the detriment of *Happy End*.

Critics had shown up in force, curious to see how the ensemble’s new work held up against the previous season’s runaway hit. Apart from Alfred Kerr and Herbert Jhering (mentioned above), two rivals well known for their antithetical views of Brecht’s work, the bylines included such distinguished names as Bernhard Diebold, Monty Jacobs, and Julius Bab. The show even attracted the attention of literary journals, with critical reflections authored by art and film theorist Rudolf Arnheim in *Die Weltbühne* and by publicist and screenplay author Willy Haas in his weekly publication, *Die literarische Welt*. In an essay titled “Krankenkost” (Special Diet for the Sick), Arnheim diagnosed the play as symptomatic of a widespread contemporary condition, which he identified as “people’s lassitude” (*die Müdigkeit der Menschen*). After mocking the suppression of Brecht and Weill’s first names as “boorish” (*burschikos*), he dismissed the idea of “promoting their new work *Happy End* as a magazine story,” calling the decision to do so “characteristic”; he was seemingly unaware either that

Elisabeth Hauptmann was a real person or that she was being properly credited as the principal author: “You avail yourself of a literary genre that is not unequivocally literature; moreover, in order to lend the business an unserious appearance you name as the author a woman and the country of origin an envy-inducing America, where people measure artistic value with a stopwatch and think that Sophocles is a European contemporary of uncertain nationality.”<sup>69</sup>

“Why,” Arnheim asks, “does a piece such as this come about and why is it performed?”

A widespread snobbism is to blame that sees inspiration in having none, yet stupidity does not fall from the sky. This has to do with people’s lassitude . . . for the people of today on either side of the apron are tired because war and inflation have ruined their nerves, and they cannot summon up either the energy or, above all, the desire to establish values or to be able to savor them. We are all caught up in this crisis, but much has to do with your attitude toward its effects: whether you roll up your sleeves and boisterously participate and applaud, or whether you restlessly and unhappily step aside.<sup>70</sup>

Haas, in a keen analysis of the style of *Happy End*, observed how “the concept of ambiguity reigns over everything,” defining this quality as “romantic humor. Something completely subjective, gushingly ironic.” Unlike Arnheim, Haas concluded on a note of approbation for Brecht: “He, by the way, is and remains a real poet, the poet of the cursed, murdering, and murdered creatures before God’s throne.”<sup>71</sup>

The vast majority of reviews, however, came from professional theater critics, as one might expect for a “play with music” (notable exceptions were music critics Oscar Bie, Hanns Gutman, Arno Huth, and Max Marschalk). Here and in general, the overall reception of *Happy End* was mixed. Few were favorably disposed toward the play; in fact, most were downright dismissive of it, reserving their words of praise mainly for the cast, and occasionally for the music. The following review by Paul Fechter, which appeared in the regional *Hannoverscher Kurier* on 8 September, is quoted here at length, not because its writing sparkles like that of some of the more distinguished colleagues (which it does not), nor because it offers any particularly penetrating insights into the production (again, it does not), but because it provides a succinct digest of the issues that frequently occur in the notices, viz. 1) comparing the piece to its predecessor; 2) speculating—here partly incorrectly—about the authorship of the piece; 3) sharing rumors about discord among members of the theatrical collective; 4) drawing attention to the occasional vulgarity of the play’s language; 5) expressing surprise and disapproval also with respect to the politics of the ending; 6) extolling the performances of the principals; and 7) reporting on the sharply divided audience response.

The Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, after having had good fortune with *Die Dreigroschenoper* this past winter, offered a new play among whose multiple authors the name Bert Brecht again stood out. Its title was *Happy End*, and it called itself a magazine story by Dorothy Lane; the German adaptation, according to the playbill, was by Elisabeth Hauptmann, the songs by Brecht and Weill. Since no one thought the two female collaborators actually existed, there was all the more reason to believe the stories about the big quarrel and differences of opinion already apparent during the rehearsals of this collective piece. Erich Engel resigned as director prior to opening night, leaving the job solely to Brecht. He was right to do so; this *Happy End* does not make one happy. A diluted rehash of *Die Dreigroschenoper* without the solid foundation of the two-hundred-year-old classic, once again the criminal underworld, once again parody, once again a happy end, yet everything without humor, without wit, coarse and vapid in spite of all the expended effort. Again one literally had to endure the *Götz* quotation; again one had to experience a woman publicly uttering words that were hitherto the exclusive property of men when they are together. Again there were smutty jokes and brothel songs, yet this time all without vivacity and verve, and moreover, suddenly laden at the end with morality and social ethics. It was shockingly funny, after all the parody, suddenly to receive a lecture about high-minded communism and the great criminals Ford, Morgan, and Rockefeller. The audience did not take it well

and started acting up, and it was right to do so. The gangster boss to whom the Salvation Army girl comes: first he converts her, then she him and his comrades—taken on its own, this story is too silly.

No performance, however good, can come to the rescue. Herr Homolka as Bill Cracker made every effort, as did Frau Neher as Hallelujah-Lilian. They were no more able to persuade the audience than were Herr Gerron, Frau Weigel, or Herr Lorre, who each night is playing a second role here, when he is off-duty in his role of Saint-Just [in *Dantons Tod* by Büchner]. One part of the audience applauded with conviction, another whistled with equal conviction, and this latter part will be proved right over time.<sup>72</sup>

“Now Brecht has copied himself,” wrote Wilhelm Westecker in the *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung*, effectively conflating the comparison and plagiarism themes in a review titled “‘Happy End’ mit unhappy end”:

Copying is always dangerous. Here is where boredom lurks. After all, one does not want to see a *Dreigroschenoper* that has been translated into American, but rather new life, new theater, a new step forward. Yet Brecht and with him the whole Theater am Schiffbauerdamm are treading water. The success of *Die Dreigroschenoper* cannot be repeated simply with the same means—a fact from which the premiere applause, mixed with some whistling, commotion, and a small riot, cannot detract. For the most part this applause was still directed at *Die Dreigroschenoper*.<sup>73</sup>

Despite commending the force of the interpolated songs, Westecker found that the “touching magazine story . . . lives between ‘Broadway’ and *Die Dreigroschenoper* and is strongly inclined toward sentimentality.” Like Haas, he felt that the work was too ambiguous, which for him explained the diverse reactions to the piece and “a terrible clamor in the audience” (*ein heilloser Wirrwarr im Publikum*):

Some understood the “Hosiannah” to be a glorification of capital, and the images of Ford, Morgan, and Rockefeller to be modern effigies of saints, and they applauded. Others understood everything to be a parody and also applauded. Some whistled, protesting against the parody. Others whistled and protested against the glorification. Four camps in one performance! That is how skillfully Brecht left the audience uncertain as to his intentions. It is curious how those applauding opposed one another, and how the two groups of whistlers were whistling at those applauding. The piece ultimately succumbed to this carousel ride of opinions.<sup>74</sup>

While Westecker was willing to concede that the piece’s impact relied on parody, at least in certain parts, he also argued that caricaturing the Salvation Army was “more primitive and cheap” than anything in *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Of the musical numbers, which he otherwise found “musically monotonous and thin repetitions” of the songs of the earlier work, he singled out “Surabaya-Johnny,” which Carola Neher “sang and spoke” with “an amazing richness of expression.” Arthur Eloesser, by contrast, thought she had “inserted a cylinder with very thin pins on it [as in a mechanical instrument] in order to distinguish her Hallelujah-Girl from Pirate-Jenny.” He also felt that the actors had been “abused in favor of servile bustle and the grand spectacle provided by Caspar Neher, which, not without skill, bordered on the cinematic.”<sup>75</sup>

Even Brecht’s apologists found cause for complaint. “Repetitions are always wrong,” declared Herbert Jhering in a review that bore the headline “*Dreigroschenoper*-Ersatz.” He criticized the “length and breadth” of a show that had “lightness as its program,” reminding readers that “wit tolerates only brevity.” Yet as an apologist he appears to have intended his criticism to be productive. Although the “grandly conceived final scene . . . has the effect of a tableau from a completely different work,” it struck him as belonging to a “chef d’oeuvre.” In conclusion he could state that this was “the first truly Berlin-like first night with excitement and electricity, always on the borderline between tumultuous applause and a lurking scandal.”<sup>76</sup>

The detractors had a field day, and none more so than Jhering’s nemesis, Alfred Kerr. In his review, which bore the simple and lethally interrogative title “Happy end?” Kerr underscored his earlier charge of

plagiarism by coining the ingenious bilingual pun “Happy entlehnt” (“happily borrowed”). He even cast doubt on whether Brecht could have written the conclusion: “At the end, as the evening petered out, Helene Weigel, an actress with brilliant articulation, spoke, nay hastily read from a piece of paper, a bit of social criticism. Pasted on. . . . Words that are read—ones, moreover, that can hardly have grown in Brechtian soil. (If they were more inspired, they could be from Tucholsky.)”<sup>77</sup> Kerr’s discussion of Weill is much more favorable, if nonetheless double-edged: “Weill has lured the audience away from new music with older, existing, reliable melodies, albeit in a jazz mask. Yet Weill—Flatterer! He composes enchantingly, at least, what the people like to sing (for an entrance fee). He is very stylish in matters unsavory.”<sup>78</sup>

The play itself did no better by Bernhard Diebold, who wrote a long review for the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, describing *Happy End* as “a copy of the tone [*Stimmungskopie*] of the hit of the previous season with a couple of nice seasonal ideas.” “This time,” he continued, “the politics are tacked on only in a clichéd and senseless way: an appendix next to the usual digestive tract.”<sup>79</sup> Yet in spite of dismissing the politics as an “affront to Bolshevik royalty” (*Bolschewistische Majestätsbeleidigung*), of exposing the rift between Die Fliege’s character throughout the play and her sudden transformation into a “priestess of social love” (*Priesterin der sozialen Liebe*) at the end, and of jumping to defend the Salvation Army, Diebold had plenty of favorable things to say about the production, the actors, and the music: “It is a miracle how a scenic something is conjured out of the dramatic nothing. Kitsch was turned into the irony of kitsch. Art became artificial-cum-artistic fleapit. Magicians with political slogans. Kudos for making something out of nothing.”<sup>80</sup>

Diebold was also one of the few to echo Weill’s observation about stylistic differences from *Die Dreigroschenoper*:

The songs by Brecht occasionally create a rhythmic spark; but only occasionally, when Weill provides him with the appropriate music. The tone has less lyricism than before. It is also coarser in its language: “nur keine Noblesse, sondern ein’s in die Fresse!” goes one of the rhymes in one of the songs. And “in einem Sixpence-Bett werd’ ich donnern hören die See.” That is balladesque and hardly of today. The most powerful thing of all, and a real accomplishment in both music and text, is the entrance march of the Salvation Army: a grand belligerent rhythm for a bowl of soup for the poor. Here something genuine resounds out of all the rubble, and with no inkling of the backward-looking satire later in the play.<sup>81</sup>

Diebold immediately follows this musical characterization with an unqualified panegyric on the lead actress.

Indeed, like Joan of Arc, Carola Neher leads the way carrying the flag as Hallelujah-Lilian; she preaches obsessively the learned doctrines of salvation; she achieves humorous victories with her quiet, matter-of-fact eloquence. But then, compelled by her role, she changes herself with three glasses of whisky into the consummate performer—and we do not recognize Lilian anymore; and Carola Neher plays a second person until she finally reverts to her first one.<sup>82</sup>

Like Diebold, Monty Jacobs engaged in unvarnished invective against Brecht’s contribution, comparing it unfavorably to the poet’s earlier achievements. “Nobody,” he writes, “would give such a large wreath to this theatrical burial if it were not about Brecht.”

The creator of *Baal* and the *Hauspostille* was a profusely talented wunderkind of the new generation. It would appear that *Die Dreigroschenoper*, his first theatrical success, disagreed with him. Thus it is to be hoped that the deserved failure of his new work will have the same effect on him as the penitents’ bench does on his criminals.<sup>83</sup>

“The musical partner, Kurt Weill” Jacobs contends, “may have remained at the level of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. But Bert Brecht this time betrays no ambition other than the urge to repeat the well-earned success in the most comfortable way possible.” Like many of his colleagues, Jacobs singled out

Carola Neher among the performers, discerning a “strangely refreshing goodness of young humanity.”<sup>84</sup>

The daily newspaper of the Communist Party, *Die Rote Fahne*, commended the “political seriousness” that the actors, above all Helene Weigel, brought to the “more market-oriented than ideologically determined” message of the play. Its critic, Alfréd Kemény (byline: “Dur.”), was far less charitable toward Brecht, however, not only calling him an “advertising copywriter” (*Reklamedichter*), but also riffing on the question of his being a “plagiarist” (the word is in bold typeface in the original): “One cannot tell what is original in this dramatic magazine story and what is plagiarism, since the texts of the inserted songs come from the famous plagiarist Bert Brecht. In this mush, ‘ingeniously’ served up with political scenery, everything is fake, except for the outstandingly commendable participation of the actors.”<sup>85</sup>

The *Vossische Zeitung* carried two separate reviews, one by its theater critic, Arthur Eloesser, and the other by its music critic, Max Marschalk. The latter’s piece, quoted here in full, engages with Weill’s contribution to *Happy End* not only at greater length, but also with greater sensitivity, especially to Weill’s instrumentation, than any of the other reviews:

Since *Mahagonny* Kurt Weill has specialized in collaborating with Bert Brecht. He has sought and found connection to the music of our time in a different way from before *Mahagonny*, a connection specifically to “utility- and ephemeral-music.” All those who create music today, even the most serious, flirt with modern dance rhythms, which undergo subtle alterations yet belong to the same family. Weill has developed into a master of the “Song.” He was already that in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, and is almost more so in *Happy End*. His rhythms, his always piquantly harmonized melodies, are easy on the ear; and a light melancholy that clings to his airs, even to the more impudent ones, makes sure that the heart is not left empty. This melancholy reveals to us the authentic musician who does not want to get lost in dedicating himself to mere bagatelles, and who really does not do so. The listener consistently derives pleasure from the music of *Happy End* in and of itself; he also derives pleasure from the fine, imaginative fabric of the music, from the creative use of a small, distinctively constituted orchestra. It is right and proper to mention here the superb Lewis Ruth Band, charged with the task of performing the music, and its superb director, Theo Mackeben.<sup>86</sup>

## ii. Afterlife

The length of *Happy End*’s opening run has been the stuff of myth, according to which the total number of performances is alleged to have been somewhere in the low single digits. Some accounts have it surviving for just five performances, some for as few as two. Sigismund von Radecki, while praising the music and identifying reasons for the production’s critical failure, recalls things correctly: “The piece contained a number of splendid songs. The press, however, irritated by Brecht’s huge success and the preceding plagiarism affair, pounced on the piece and completely trashed it, such that it had to be closed after thirty performances.”<sup>87</sup> We know from Aufricht that he had substantial ongoing costs during the summer months and beyond: “the salary of ensemble members Neher, Geron, Hörrmann, Lorre, later Theo Lingen and a number of beginners, the office and technical personnel, my associates, the theater lease of 9000 marks a month.”<sup>88</sup> Even if the production was failing badly, it made no economic sense to close it after only a handful of performances. A detailed and humorous explanation of the dilemma facing failing productions, including *Happy End*, appeared in an article published in November 1929 in *Die Weltbühne* under the byline “Premierentiger” (“Tiger” was one of the pseudonyms of satirist Kurt Tucholsky):

Expensive stars, like lodgers, are usually rented from month to month. Once you have employed them, you must keep them busy until the last day of the month, whatever the cost; it is always cheaper than what they cost if they are simply left idle. Thus the production is given at least thirty times. (Have you noticed there are always series comprising thirty, sixty, or

ninety nowadays?) A play that has flopped is no longer interred after three or five performances: first-class burials rarely occur anymore. Guaranteed subscriptions allow it to be galvanized: whatever is no longer savored by walk-in customers is still good enough for the cadre of subscribers who bring in the expenses of thirty times *Happy End* or *Hannibal ante portas*, if only with the greatest difficulty. The ability of such an audience to remonstrate or demonstrate against a pig in a poke and force closure after the third or fourth repeat by whistling and hissing—as recently occurred with [Marcel] Achard’s grotesquerie in the *Tribüne*—this is the exception whose rarity proves the rule.<sup>89</sup>

After *Happy End*’s thirty-day run, which concluded on 1 October, it would have to wait nearly three decades for another production. Meanwhile the music made its presence felt outside the theater in a variety of ways, as the composer had already intended during the play’s genesis. Sheet music and recordings of his songs continued to circulate, of course. On 8 February 1930, moreover, Lotte Lenya performed four numbers from *Happy End* as part of a “Bunter Abend” for the Südwestdeutsche Rundfunk (Frankfurt).

In a discerning review of the broadcast, which appeared in the March issue of *Anbruch*, Theodor W. Adorno expressed his appreciation of Weill’s modular approach to theater music, while also observing that the “adventurous traits” of the songs of *Happy End* represented a departure from *Die Dreigroschenoper* (an echo of Weill’s letter to him, quoted above):

Lotte Lenya sang new songs by Weill from the ambit of *Happy End* (it is a feature of the Weillian song style that it is not bound by the single work; works remain open to one another; songs can switch over from one to the other, from the [Berliner] *Requiem* to *Mahagonny*, for example; it is as though the works, insurgent improvisations, had not formed their own crust, as they are wont to do in bourgeois art practice, but maintained the nimbleness of social engagement). “Surabaya-Johnny” and “Bilbao,” which have appeared on a record, were sung by Lenya with a combination of delicate sweetness and disdainful impassiveness that, because of what is omitted and suppressed, goes well beyond the interpretation of these pieces through cabaret-like pointedness and expressive communicativeness; also the “Sailors’ Song” with its crosswise-inserted refrain, and the very strange song “Jetzt nur nicht weich werden,” which mobilizes at once the pace and incomprehensibility of the intention of eccentrics. Nothing could be more mistaken than to see those songs in the shadow of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. Only when they are separated from it do they reveal the most adventurous traits, which no longer emanate from the beggars’ poetry.<sup>90</sup>

The creative principle whereby works “remain open to one another” applied as much to Brecht as to Weill. While *Happy End* was not staged again until 1958, material from the show soon found its way into all manner of projects undertaken by both artists. Indeed, the immediate afterlife of the work is characterized more by its contents being recycled than by any attempts to stage it again. In the case of Brecht and Hauptmann, they quickly moved on to *Der Brotladen* and *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe*, both of which, as described above, included thematic elements and lyrics from the earlier work. In the case of Weill, he followed up on his complaint that his music had been “badly integrated” within a “bad play” by eventually proposing a quite different arrangement.

In 1932, the composer had still not abandoned the idea of rescuing the piece after its critical failure. In a letter to UE dated 3 June, he reported: “Brecht and Frau Hauptmann have produced a definitive, depoliticized version of *Happy End* of which copies are currently being made at Bloch Erben.<sup>91</sup> Bloch Erben would like at the same time to have the music to *Happy End* available as perusal material for the theaters.” Weill had evidently not yet seen the new version. After reminding UE that the various scores had been returned to Vienna, he wrote that “we must arrange from them an easily performable piano-vocal score, making use of the numbers that have already appeared (to which the extra verses must be added)”; he then provided a complete list of musical numbers, including “Hosiannah Rockefeller.” “My plan,” he continued, “is to tighten the piece in such a way that the musical numbers, which include some of my best and most popular songs, form the framework of the whole thing.” He also suggested

that “this new version of *Happy End* should be launched in Vienna,” with the express wish, deriving from the Raimund-Theater’s spring 1932 production of *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*, that “we exploit the big Viennese success of Lenya, for whom *Happy End* contains an ideal role.”<sup>92</sup> In his reply on behalf of UE, Hans Heinsheimer confirmed that “both book and music will be available as soon as possible as material to present to theaters, and we very much hope that new possibilities open up here.” His caveat was that “In connection with the revision and depoliticization of the work there is the question of whether the titles of the songs should not in part be changed, since some of them in their current state are highly offensive.” Heinsheimer did not specify which titles were troublesome (presumably at least “Mutter Goddams Puff in Mandelay,” as Weill had listed the “Mandelay-Song”), but he requested that Weill should “clarify this point before we prepare the perusal material.”<sup>93</sup>

Meanwhile UE received the Bloch Erben script and Heinsheimer quickly conveyed his wholly negative reaction to the composer: “May I tell you quite openly that I am far from pleased and cannot imagine that there is much that can be done with it?” The exception, he writes, is the character of “Lilly,” which “would certainly be a splendid role for Lenya.” “Write to me soon and contradict me,” he urges: “I would be pleased if I were mistaken.”<sup>94</sup> After reading the Bloch Erben script, Weill was inclined not to contradict but to agree with him:

I was amazed that Brecht and Frau Hauptmann have left the piece *completely untouched*. If I was inclined to take up the whole complex of *Happy End* again, it was on the assumption that the piece would undergo a thorough revision, in the sense that the whole piece would have to be reduced to a playing time of two hours and the plot condensed so that it provided merely a framework for the songs. . . . In its current form it is literally the version that was performed in Aufricht’s theater and flopped because of a weak text.<sup>95</sup>

Weill was exaggerating in describing the Bloch Erben script as “completely untouched.” Brecht and Hauptmann had in fact changed the ending and removed “Hosiannah Rockefeller” (now repurposed in *Die heilige Johanna*). Weill had already pointed out this cut in the letter he sent to UE just a few days earlier, the main purpose of which was to establish the whereabouts of the various performing materials. But his conclusion after reading the new script was clear: “I’m against performing the piece in the current version.”

A further attempt at resuscitation followed six months later. In a letter dated 26 December 1932, Weill mentioned to UE the need for a companion piece to the “small version” of *Mahagonny*. This time *Happy End* would be altered to match the form of the earlier work:

The obvious thing to do (an old plan of mine) would be to turn *Happy End* itself into a kind of Songspiel with short spoken scenes etc. (something along the lines of scenes from the life of a Salvation Army girl). Brecht could do that, of course, but the thought of subjecting oneself to all the difficulties of working with Brecht just for such a small and simple matter is dreadful. I’ll nonetheless give it some thought. . . . At any rate I’ll pursue this plan, which could give us a very nice evening for six performers and an eleven-piece orchestra.<sup>96</sup>

Hitler’s seizure of power was little more than a month away. For Weill, a German Jew whose art the National Socialists denounced as “degenerate,” the rapidly deteriorating political situation posed an existential threat: he left Germany in March 1933, never to return. Nor did he pick up again the idea for a Songspiel version of *Happy End*. Instead, just as it already was for Brecht and Hauptmann, *Happy End* became for him a work to which he would return on a number of occasions as a source for self-borrowings. In *Marie Galante* (1934), the melody of the instrumental Introduction and “Les filles de Bordeaux” borrows from “In der Jugend goldnem Schimmer”; the instrumental interlude “Scène au dancing” reworks “Das Lied von der harten Nuss”; and “Das Lied vom Branntweinhändler” does double duty as the orchestral “Complainte” and the duet “L’arreglo religioso.” In *Johnny Johnson* (1936), the instrumental Introduction draws on “Das Lied vom Branntweinhändler” and “The West-Pointer’s Song” seems to

echo “Der Song von Mandelay”; in *One Touch of Venus* (1943) “The Trouble with Women” derives, as did the earlier “Les filles de Bordeaux,” from “In der Jugend goldnem Schimmer.”<sup>97</sup> In this way Weill’s works for the musical stage continued to remain “open to one another.”

After World War II, following the blanket ban of Weill’s work during the years of Nazi rule, *Die Dreigroschenoper* immediately found its way back to Berlin in August 1945 with a production directed by Karlheinz Martin at the Hebbel Theater. Although it would eventually take an additional thirteen years for *Happy End* to receive its first postwar production, both the Münchener Kammerspiele and the Schloßpark-Theater in Berlin had expressed interest in the piece before then. Already in January 1950 the stage division of Brecht’s West German publisher, Suhrkamp, contacted Elisabeth Hauptmann about a possible production in Munich.<sup>98</sup> And in a letter to Helene Weigel in July 1957, Hauptmann indicated that the Schloßpark-Theater, which had produced Weill’s *Der Silbersee* in 1955, was considering staging *Happy End*.<sup>99</sup> Although neither plan materialized, when the piece did eventually open in a production at Munich’s Kleine Komödie on 31 January 1958, the predominantly positive press reviews proved that the wait had been worth it.

One might well ask why the fortunes of *Happy End* changed so much from the mixed responses gained three decades before. Arguably, it was not just Gerhard Metzner’s production that warranted what drama and music critic K. H. Ruppel, writing for the *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, described as “animated applause” (*animierter Applaus*), but also a much more favorable predisposition on the part of the critics than at the time of the work’s premiere. Ruppel looked back to a time before the National Socialists seized power and sent much of *Happy End*’s creative team into exile: he recalled the “great, glorious, unforgettable theatrical landscape of the Berlin of the 1920s,” which “is beginning to glow anew in our memory.”<sup>100</sup> He referred to two other recent productions of stage works by Weill—*Die Bürgschaft* at the Städtische Oper in Berlin and *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* in Darmstadt—and then wondered “Are we witnessing the beginning of a Kurt Weill renaissance?” In his opinion, the songs had the greatest impact: “With the applause raining down, one celebrated the memory of Kurt Weill, the German classic song composer [*des deutschen Klassikers des Songs*].”<sup>101</sup>

The revival of Weill’s works had already begun in the United States several years earlier, with the smash-hit off-Broadway production of *The Threepenny Opera* in 1954. But the idea of a possible “Weill renaissance” in Germany seems wholly justified in hindsight. Ruppel himself named two key preconditions for the renewed German interest in Weill’s music: the postwar reevaluation of Weimar culture, and the rediscovery and canonization of German artists from a golden era that was beginning “to glow anew.” The *Happy End* revival belongs in the context of the broad cultural process of “coming to terms with the past” (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*) that was occurring at the time, and responses to the Munich production can be interpreted as symptomatic of that trend. After twelve years of National Socialism, Germans on both sides of the divided nation were developing an appetite for pre-Nazi culture, now deemed “great, glorious, unforgettable.” True, like the critics in 1929, Ruppel still drew unfavorable comparisons with *Die Dreigroschenoper*, categorizing *Happy End* as a mere “parergon” of the earlier work. But that hardly led him to cast a negative verdict overall: “The audience is entertained, without being dealt a moral or socially critical uppercut.”

Ruppel singled out qualities that “steered the production toward the musical”: “humor, theatrical joy, fun.”<sup>102</sup> Nor was he alone. According to Heinz Rode in the *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, “Finally, in Munich,” the review began, “we have found something that people for so long have been calling for: the German ‘Musical,’” and several critics made the same point in terms of genre. Rode also welcomed *Happy End* as an overdue discovery, even if it involved “completely removing the shark’s teeth from these Chicago gangsters so that their conversion by the Salvation Army can take place without enormous difficulty.”<sup>103</sup> That appears to have been a deliberate decision within the production, for according to the Brecht scholar

Ernst Schumacher, who reviewed it for the Munich weekly *Deutsche Woche*, the director made changes to the text to mitigate its political content:

With his adaptation and new production of this play Gerhard Metzner believed he should eliminate the socially critical aspects because they are now out of date. He defused the Salvation Army songs, in particular the programmatic song “Obacht, gebt Obacht,” castrated the summation given by the boss of the gang, Die Fliege, at the end of the piece, and he did not consider it appropriate, as in the premiere in Berlin, to light up the stained-glass paintings of the saints of the Salvation Army, “St. Ford,” “St. Morgan,” and “St. Rockefeller.” Thus he took away the play’s more profound wit and downgraded it to a satire of the crime-play genre.<sup>104</sup>

Schumacher’s account is corroborated by Metzner’s substantially revised script for the 1958 production: described on the title page as a “new version [Neufassung] for the Kleine Komödie,” the Munich script replaced the original ending, including Die Fliege’s stump speech, with a reprise of the Prologue and a “concluding dance [Schlusstanz] by the entire ensemble.”<sup>105</sup> Adhering to the theoretical tenets of Brechtian epic theater, Schumacher went on to criticize the lack of intertitles, which in the original production were used for the purposes of *Verfremdung*, as well as the style of acting employed. Rather than “demonstrate,” according to Schumacher, the actors “identified [einfühlen] with the characters, whom the authors had consciously caricatured.” Yet he concluded that “Weill’s music under the direction of Heinz Brüning withstood the tabloid treatment [Boulevardisierung]. It was really the only pleasure of this production, which unfortunately failed to contribute to the creation of a modern singspiel style.”<sup>106</sup>

The publication of musical and textual sources for *Happy End* is closely tied to its postwar performance history. Later in 1958, between the production in Munich and another in Hamburg (at the Kammerspiele) which opened at the end of December, Bloch Erben generated a new rental script (Tt5), and UE produced a piano-conductor score (Se). The latter—that is, the piano part extracted from Weill’s full score, with the vocal lines added above and some instrumental cues in the piano part itself and occasionally on a separate staff—remained the only commercially available source of Weill’s music for the piece until the publication of Alan Boustead’s edition of the full score (Fe) in 1980, again by UE. One of the key differences between the two publications in terms of musical numbers is that Se omits “Hosiannah Rockefeller,” as did both the 1932 script and the 1958 revival in Munich, whereas Fe includes it, albeit only as a facsimile of Weill’s holograph score and not newly engraved.

Both the 1958 rental script and the piano-conductor score describe *Happy End* as a “comedy in 3 acts by Dorothy Lane.” A later printing of Se from ca. 1965 inserts an English singing translation of the song texts by Michael Geliot beneath the German lyrics and prints on its cover a striking painting of a Salvation Army band that Caspar Neher had created as part of his set designs for the 1959 premiere of *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe*. Also included in English are dialogue cues; these, to quote text added to the copyright page, “are not literally translated, but their equivalent given from the English production of the translator [in] 1964,” referring to the British premiere and first English-language staging of *Happy End*. Performed by members of the Traverse Theatre and directed by Geliot, it opened as part of the Edinburgh Festival on 14 August 1964 and ran through 5 September, after which it eventually transferred to the Royal Court Theatre in London, where it opened on 11 March 1965.

Great Britain was riding something of a Brechtian wave, following the tour of the Berliner Ensemble to London in September 1956, which not only was successful at the time but also had a demonstrable long-term impact on British theater. To say that the Edinburgh production of *Happy End* “transferred” to the Royal Court Theatre, where the Ensemble’s influence was particularly acknowledged, is not entirely accurate, however, at least if one compares the programs. Unlike those who attended the premiere in Scotland, the London audiences heard the “Hosannah” song, albeit not at the end of the show, as in Berlin in 1929, but at the beginning. Otherwise the sequence of numbers printed in both programs more or less

matches that of the 1958 score (though “Surabaya-Johnny” and “Tough Nut” are flipped), just as Monica Shelley and Arnold Hinchcliffe’s creatively free translation of the pared-down dialogue follows closely the contours of the 1932 Bloch Erben script.<sup>107</sup> David Drew is listed in the London program as “musical advisor” and Alan Boustead as “associate conductor and répétiteur.” Both of them would then play decisive roles in the subsequent dissemination of the music of *Happy End*. In 1975 Drew, the composer’s foremost postwar champion, realized Weill’s idea, which circumstances had forced the composer to abandon: to create a Singspiel version of *Happy End*.<sup>108</sup> And Boustead, who collaborated with Drew on the 1975 arrangement, prepared the 1980 edition of the full score.

After seeing the premiere of *Happy End* in 1929 and finding it “a very pleasing way of spending an evening,” C. Hooper Trask of the *New York Times* felt that it “would make an interesting production on Broadway.”<sup>109</sup> And so it did, almost half a century later. *Happy End: A Melodrama with Songs*, as the English translation was billed, received its first performance at the Yale Repertory Theatre in New Haven, Connecticut, on 6 April 1972. With a run of 32 performances, the production (staged by Michael Posnick) triggered a handful of productions elsewhere, and it was revived in New Haven for a further 29 performances in 1975. Two years later, on 7 May 1977, a production directed by Robert Kalfin opened on Broadway at the Martin Beck Theatre (75 performances) with Yale Rep alumni Meryl Streep as Lil(l)ian Holiday and Christopher Lloyd as Bill Cracker (although he could not perform on opening night). Michael Feingold’s English version of the text amounted to “a free adaptation,” as Feingold himself put it, “which treats the ‘Dorothy Lane’ script as loosely as the collaborators of 1929 treated their mysterious source.”<sup>110</sup> Free adaptation notwithstanding, it was Hauptmann herself who was nominated for a Tony Award in the category “best book of a musical.” The show also received nominations for “best original score” and “best musical,” but it lost out in all three categories to *Annie*, which took home several other awards as well.

Feingold’s “free” treatment is apparent on both the small scale and the large. Perhaps the most substantial change—one already introduced in Lenya’s 1960 recording (see below) and in the Royal Court production in 1965—involved moving “Hosiannah Rockefeller” from the end of the show to the Prologue, together with the “giant stained-glass caricatures of St. Henry Ford, St. John D. Rockefeller, and St. J. P. Morgan.” In Broadway fashion, the final scene, titled “The Happy End,” comprised a reprise of four musical numbers: “Song of the Big Shot,” “In Our Childhood,” “Lieutenants of the Lord,” and “The Bilbao Song.” Nevertheless, this was a significant milestone in the reception of *Happy End*, and the Feingold adaptation has been staged internationally, in Canada, Australia, England, and Wales. Indeed, its success invites comparison with Marc Blitzstein’s adaptation of *The Threepenny Opera*. Noteworthy in this connection is that productions of *Happy End* in Finland and Greece used translations of Feingold’s rather than Hauptmann’s version. Feingold’s lyrics were also included in Boustead’s full score (Fe) and would replace the Geliot translation in subsequent printings of the piano-conductor score (which incorporates “Hosiannah Rockefeller” as an “Epilog”).

Performance records preserved by UE document a gradual increase in the number of performances of *Happy End*—both of the play with music and of concert presentation of the songs—that went hand in hand with the appearance of the various performance materials mentioned above, from the piano-conductor score in 1958, via Hauptmann’s script in *Julia ohne Romeo* in 1977 and the full score in 1980, to Feingold’s English-language adaptation published in 1982. One of the UE logs, for example, captures seventeen productions in the 1960s (adding up to about 440 performances), about seventy in the 1970s (exceeding 1,200 performances), and more than one hundred in the 1980s. In this last decade, productions predominantly took place in Germany, followed by the United Kingdom and the United States, but with many other international venues represented as well, from Copenhagen to Tel Aviv and Tokyo. No reliable data are available for the United States, however, because UE no longer had rights in the U.S. market after 1975, so the figures in the logs for that region are too low.<sup>111</sup>

Recorded media also played their part in the work's dissemination. Although Brecht and Hauptmann had conceived of turning *Happy End* into a film shortly after the premiere and continued to consider doing so until the late 1930s, the idea had to wait until the 1970s before it became reality. In fact, two screen versions materialized within five years of each other. In 1972 director Heinz Schirk created *Happy End oder Wie ein kleines Heilsarmeemädchen Chicagos größte Verbrecher in die Arme der Gesellschaft zurückführte* for the West German Südwestfunk. And in 1977, the same year as the first Broadway production, Manfred Wekwerth, a former associate of Brecht's, wrote and directed an adaptation for East German television called *Happy End: Ein Kriminalfilm nach der gleichnamigen Komödie von Dorothy Lane*. (GDR television had already broadcast in 1967 a video recording of a theater production staged by the Volkstheater in Rostock.) In the United States, the Public Broadcasting Service filmed a production of *Happy End* at the Arena Stage in Washington, D.C., in 1984. It was subsequently aired as part of PBS's "American Musical Theater" series.

A key figure in the Weill renaissance that began in the mid-1950s and has continued in a variety of ways up to the present was the composer's widow, Lotte Lenya (1898–1981). Her personal engagement, which included establishing the Kurt Weill Foundation in 1962, and perhaps more important, her example as a performer, which is legendary, shaped tremendously Weill's legacy and reception. In the case of *Happy End*, she played a decisive role in putting the work on the map, beginning with her recordings of "Surabaya-Johnny" and the "Bilbao-Song" with conductor Theo Mackeben that appeared toward the end of 1929. Her first long-playing record, *Lotte Lenya singt Kurt Weill*, which she recorded in early July 1955, featured those two numbers as well as "Was die Herren Matrosen sagen." Of even greater impact was the recording of the entire score done in 1960 that appeared as the last in the series of recordings of Weill's German-language stage works conducted by Wilhelm Brückner-Rüggeberg; the other three were *Die sieben Todsünden* (released in 1957) and *Die Dreigroschenoper* and *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny* (both in 1958). Lenya's disc of *Happy End* was based on Weill's original score but incorporated some newly arranged instrumentation and, presaging Geliot's production at the Royal Court in London and Feingold's adaptation, moved "Hosiannah Rockefeller" from the end to the beginning, where it serves as the "Introduction (Hosianna)." In its place as the conclusion was a reprise of "Der kleine Leutnant des lieben Gottes," as is also prescribed in Tt5 and Tp.

Around the time of the 1960 recording there began to emerge a flurry of arrangements of one *Happy End* number in particular: the "Bilbao-Song," which has continued to attract attention from an eclectic mix of musicians into the present. A random sample, taken here from 1961, brings together such incongruous bedfellows as Percy Faith and His Orchestra in a lush arrangement for a big, brass-heavy band softened by a large string section; Gil Evans's contemporary-jazz version; and two quite different pop renditions, Andy Williams's "The Bilbao Song" and Yves Montand's "La chanson de Bilbao." Tracing the dissemination of *Happy End*'s musical "modules"—in particular the two songs originally recorded by Lenya in 1930—in such a vast array of arrangements vindicates the composer's aspirations in ways he could never have foreseen but which he would doubtless have welcomed. Although very much in the spirit of the composer's original conception, that facet of reception has been so far-reaching that its detailed documentation here would be disproportionate, not to mention entirely impractical, in the context of an edition of the work (but see the volume *Popular Adaptations*, KWE IV/2).

The changing fortunes of *Happy End* in the theater and other media have had their counterpart in academic scholarship. Until the play with music received its theatrical revival in 1958, almost nothing had been written about the piece since the premiere: the sole exception was Ernst Schumacher's comprehensive study *Die dramatischen Versuche Bertolt Brechts 1918–1933*, published in East Berlin in 1955, with seven pages on *Happy End* comprising a detailed, three-page plot outline and a critical assessment of the piece based on access to archival materials and with active support and encouragement from Brecht and Hauptmann. Schumacher's

assessment, published some three years before he had an opportunity to review the Munich production in 1958, had little good to say about the work: "The significance of the play for the German stage," he claimed, should be limited to the fact that "certain themes and passages were later used by Brecht in *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe*."<sup>112</sup> Erroneously thinking that *Happy End* "adopted from *Die Dreigroschenoper* the proposition that the time of the petty criminal is over" (it was in fact *Die Dreigroschenoper*, in Brecht's 1931 revision, that would adopt that line from *Happy End*), Schumacher dismissed it as "a paltry, banal show, whose socially critical tendency was appended because this heightened the appeal."<sup>113</sup> He also found the songs "ideologically weak and vacuous" (*ideologisch aber schwach und nichtssagend*). In this Marxist vein, he mentioned only two reviews of the premiere: the one published in *Die Rote Fahne*, which he quoted approvingly at length, and the one from *Das Theater*. He selected the latter to represent "the bourgeois press," as he dubbed it, which "also thought the piece was wretched."<sup>114</sup> The single redeeming feature, for Schumacher, was the fact that "Brecht used the piece to practice certain alienation effects of his epic theater"; these, he concluded, were "capable of bringing even a weak play somewhat to life."<sup>115</sup>

If Schumacher exemplifies the perspective of Brecht scholarship that became prevalent in East Germany, the play hardly did much better in the eyes of West German music critic Hellmut Kotschenreuther, who in his 1962 monograph on Weill relegated *Happy End* "essentially to the theater of amusement." Yet in light of recent productions and echoing Schumacher's review of the Munich production, Kotschenreuther still managed to find virtue in the music, in part no doubt because the songs were enjoying their own vigorous afterlife quite separate from the play.

The "Kurfürstendamm version of *Die Dreigroschenoper*," as *Happy End* was called, met with little audience approval at the end of the 1920s. Audiences at the end of the 1950s accepted the piece with open arms: it was performed in Munich in 1958 and in Hamburg in 1959 [*sic*]. Both productions proved that Weill's music is still able to compensate for the meager text and secure a respectable success with the public. The vitality of the songs appears to be undying.<sup>116</sup>

Schumacher's and Kotschenreuther's comments serve to highlight the decisive role played by staging and performance in critical engagement with *Happy End*. Scholars that followed in their wake variously incorporated these factors into their assessments or, in some cases, omitted them altogether. For example, in his monograph on Weill and Brecht that was derived from his doctoral dissertation and published in 1977, Gottfried Wagner contended "musical defamiliarization arises primarily from the text-content connection and less from how musical forms are constituted." "The most characteristic feature in *Happy End*," he observed, "is how the dimensions of the religious and the economic are defamiliarized and connected with each other. The epic manner of performance is never realized (resolution occurs only with the ending)—a deficit that has a negative impact on the comprehensibility of the musical structure."<sup>117</sup>

Although Wagner's point about resolution was well taken with respect to the piece's overall dramaturgy, he neglected to consider Caspar Neher's stage design. The latter included, among other things, the "epic" captions redolent of the narrative title cards in silent movies, the switch to a distinctive *Songlicht* for the duration of the musical numbers (as indicated in the script), a revolving stage that brought into view the different sets for each scene (see Plates 15–17), along with the signature white half-curtain at the front of the proscenium. All of these elements, separately and together, contributed to the production's impact, not to mention other aspects of performance practice (discussed below).

A common theme in much of the subsequent literature on *Happy End*—a theme sounded already in the early reviews and echoed by Kotschenreuther—has been the power of Weill's music to keep the work alive. The "only justification for its survival," writes Weill biographer Ronald Taylor, "lies in the songs. Superb songs."<sup>118</sup> Two more recent studies offer explanations for the mixed reception of *Happy End* at the time of

the premiere by identifying particular tensions in the work itself, although here, too, performance practice surely has a critical role to play. In an article published in 2013, Benjamin Kohlmann considers the melodramatic pathos that lends both the lyrics and the music “their appeal to the spectators’ emotions”—something seemingly at odds with the tenets of epic theater. “The scene between Bill and Lillian (and *Happy End* more generally),” Kohlmann argues, “creates a tension between epic theater’s carefully measured sympathy and melodrama’s emotional submersion, thus leaving room for the audience’s empathetic identification with the two main characters. . . . *Happy End* is constantly working against the confines of its own literary form, but the authors’ artistic wager with melodrama also entailed the possibility that the strategy of estrangement would be unable to outdo and defamiliarize the commodified affects of melodrama.”<sup>119</sup> The “attempt to impose a communist meaning on the play,” he concludes, “testifies to Brecht’s and Weigel’s fears that the text’s ideological message might be smothered by the artificiality of an ostentatiously ‘happy’ ending,” and “It is important to recognize that Brecht and Hauptmann sought to devise a dramatic mode that could convey modernist irony as well as affective sincerity, even if their attempts at an artistic integration of the two turned out to be unstable and inconclusive.”<sup>120</sup> This very instability, one could infer, was at least partly responsible for generating the various audience responses so pithily captured by Wilhelm Westecker in his review for the *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung* cited above.

Aligning himself with the efforts of scholars such as Astrid Horst and Sabine Kebir, whose work he cites copiously, Tobias Lachmann aims to give Hauptmann her due as principal author after decades of her having taken a backseat to Brecht. “In the final analysis,” Lachmann maintains in an article from 2005, “the American backdrop is better able to explain not only the connection between religion and business but also that between gender and social power. This insight owes to the singular input of Elisabeth Hauptmann, with which she significantly expands the expressive range of the Brecht collective and demonstrates her considerable influence on Brecht’s oeuvre.”<sup>121</sup>

How much Hauptmann was responsible for Lieutenant Lillian Holiday coming in the wake of Captain Macheath, and how much that remarkable contrast of principal characters derives from her “singular input,” remain open questions. *Happy End* certainly was a play that came into being through collective work done during a protracted process of creation and rehearsal. But Hauptmann nonetheless deserves a significant amount of credit, as recent scholarship has been eager to demonstrate. That same scholarship also demonstrates how *Happy End* is better able to escape the long shadow cast by *Die Dreigroschenoper* the more it manages to assert its significant differences from its fabled predecessor, whether through its Americanism, at once overt and melodramatically ironic, or through its Hauptmann-inspired female lead.

## V. Performance Practice

Many of the critics who attended the original production, even if they panned the play, lavished particular praise on the performance of the leading lady. “Neher is wonderful,” veteran critic Felix Hollaender gushed in his review of *Happy End*. “I’ve never seen her so nuanced, so consummate, so commanding. She is well on the way to becoming a first-rate actress. She sings her chansons with a charm and a quiet assurance that enraptured the audience.”<sup>122</sup> Many of Hollaender’s colleagues shared his opinion.

*Happy End* requires singing actors for its principals: not only Lillian, but also Bill, Sam, and Die Fliege. In this regard it resembles *Die Dreigroschenoper*, albeit with notable differences of degree rather than kind. Because *Die Dreigroschenoper* leans more toward the condition of opera and operetta, with its overture, finales, and choruses, the score is more substantial than that of *Happy End*; its performers also came from a wide variety of musical niches, including operetta (Harald Paulsen, who was really an acting singer rather than the other way around), film (Roma Bahn), and cabaret (Rosa Valetti and Kate Kühl). In contrast, the principals of

*Happy End* were all stage and film actors, albeit with extensive singing experience.

Another difference of degree is how the musical numbers function within the two works. In *Happy End* the music is all “diegetic” in that it involves actual performance of one kind or another, whether Lillian’s, Bill’s, and Sam’s songs and ballads, on the one hand, or the Salvation Army hymns and marches, on the other. With the partial exception of the “Bilbao-Song,” which mixes a diegetic refrain with non-diegetic stanzas, the actors are never required, as they frequently are in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, to deliver their monologues and dialogues as dramatic musicalized speech. Instead, whenever they sing they are staging a musical performance, as if in a cabaret. An analogous example from *Die Dreigroschenoper*, but somewhat atypical for the work, is “Seeräuberjenny,” which Macheath complains to Polly is just so much “playacting” (*Verstellerei*). The Hollywood connection is relevant here, too, given that music in early film was generally of this performative kind (non-diegetic underscoring was added separately, of course).

Like Kurt Gerron, who played the roles of Tiger Brown in *Die Dreigroschenoper* and Sam Worlitzer in *Happy End*, Carola Neher provides a manifest link between the two works, having originally been cast as Polly. Although she was indisposed for the premiere of *Die Dreigroschenoper* and had to be replaced by Roma Bahn, she would eventually rejoin the production in that role at Schiffbauerdamm in a run that began in May 1929. In his comments on the cast change, which appeared in the *Berliner Börsen-Courier* on 13 May, Herbert Jhering lauded Neher’s performance as Polly in terms that find echoes in Hollaender’s review of *Happy End*. Singling out the reinstated scene between Polly and her rival, Lucy, Jhering remarked on Neher’s “magical mixture of irony and apprehension” (*zauberhafte Mischung von Ironie und Besorgnis*): “How she lifts her handkerchief to her eyes, how she dabs her face, is almost musically choreographed and reminds one of the great performances of Gutheil-Schoder in *Der Rosenkavalier*. Then she sings the ballad of Lucy [presumably “Barbarasong”], which is now given to Polly, with a charm, with a capacity to switch between wit and emotion, that enraptures. A perfect unity of style and expression, class and distance.”<sup>123</sup>

From initial conception through opening night, Neher’s contribution to the creation of *Happy End* was substantial. In 1925, four years before taking on the part of Lillian, she had performed the title role in a production in Breslau of *Major Barbara*, the Salvation Army play by George Bernard Shaw with demonstrable relevance to Brecht and Hauptmann’s conception of *Happy End*.<sup>124</sup> But not only did Neher play the part of Lillian; given that the role evolved as a vehicle for the particular mixture of her talents, in effect she embodied it. For this reason, the various sources documenting her performance practice repay careful study, especially the sound recordings but also the corroborating written accounts. Their intrinsic value is twofold: first, they provide access to a model to be studied, if not emulated, by performers; and secondly, they offer a key to critical interpretations of the work. Of particular note are Neher’s various performances of songs from *Die Dreigroschenoper*, especially the “Barbarasong” in the Pabst film, *3-Groschen-Oper*, and her recording of “Surabaya-Johnny” in the setting by Bruinier, all demonstrating her idiosyncratic abilities. As also noted by a number of critics at the time, her interpretive approach entailed switching between modes—that is, between the spoken and the sung—and all that is expressed by means of that stylistic contrast. She speaks some of the lyrics in a kind of *Sprechgesang*, not because she is unable to sing the music “properly” but because she chooses at that point to eschew the notated pitches for expressive purposes. When, at other points, she delivers the melody as written, she does so with her piercing soubrette, by turns mischievous, coquettish, and street-wise. Recall, too, Diebold’s observation about “her quiet, matter-of-fact eloquence” and how she “plays a second person until she finally reverts to her first one.” The recipe requires what Jhering called a “magical mixture,” with irony as one of the essential ingredients. In this way she managed to negotiate the tension that Kohlmann described as one “between epic theater’s carefully measured sympathy and melodrama’s emotional submersion.”

There is another key aspect of the performance practice not transmitted in the published materials but reflecting the spirit of the original production. Scribbled on the bottom of the alto saxophone/flute part to “Surabaya-Johnny” is the annotation “Zwischenmusik I. Strophe,” and on the bottom of the percussion part (albeit crossed out) “als Entrakt (1. Strophe).” Both annotations indicate that the song appeared in the show as an instrumental interlude, just as various numbers had in *Die Dreigroschenoper*. The published libretto of that work included them as *Zwischenaktmusiken*, a conventional feature in operettas and plays with music at the time. Because there was no such documentation in the case of *Happy End*, it cannot be known for certain how many numbers were used in this way. Even so, based on the scant annotations in the manuscript parts, it seems reasonable to assume that the practice was in effect here, too, and that it augmented the musical content of the show beyond what is conveyed either by the full score or by the typescript book. Other such evidence can be found for “Das Lied von der harten Nuss” (annotations in **Im**: ASax, BSax, Trp, and Szg), which was probably played between Acts IIIa and IIIb, and for “Geht hinein in die Schlacht” (annotation for “Zwischenmusik 8 Takte” in **Vh**). There is no evidence in the sources, however, for how the partial reprises of no. 3 (in Act I) and no. 4 (in Act II) were done, whether with the band or just with voices.

Additional staging issues concerning music need to be resolved. Just before Bill’s “Bilbao-Song,” **Tt3** states that Jimmy “inserts a coin into the electric piano.” Apart from this stage direction, there exists no other verbal or, indeed, visual evidence that documents the instrument’s actual use as a stage property in the original production. But Rudolf Arnheim’s review noted a realm “where bowlegged men sock one another in the gob, where one puts a nickel in the music box [*Musikautomat*] to satisfy the urge for artistic enjoyment, where one not only eats but also conducts discussions with a knife, and where the kind of barroom philosophy familiar to us from Brecht’s chansons is quite at home: that our dear God is no longer around, that everything happens as it must, and that the world is a sad place nowadays.”<sup>125</sup> Arnheim’s allusions to the libretto (the reference to “socking in the gob” in the lyrics of “Das Lied von der harten Nuss” and the preceding dialogue), to the gang’s knives, and to God’s absence (in “Was die Herren Matrosen sagen”) raise the question as to whether with “music box” he is not referring to the “electric piano” mentioned in **Tt3**.<sup>126</sup>

In any event, music’s role in *Happy End* and the extent to which the addition of interludes reinforces that role are both important factors to address in staging productions based on this Edition. Another, related question hangs over the lyric “Sei willkommen später Gast” (in Act IIIb) that Weill never set. The libretto has a stage direction that Lilian sits down at an organ and both plays and sings, which is corroborated by several production photographs (**M1**) showing a small harmonium (in one of them, Carola Neher is sitting at the instrument and appears to be playing it).<sup>127</sup> None of the sources, however, offers any information regarding the melody to be sung. Whereas **Tt1/2** provide a complete stanza (“Sei willkommen später Gast / Reich uns deine Hände / Was du je gelitten hast / Jetzt ist es zu Ende”), **Tt3** abridges it. The cued title echoes German Christmas hymns such as “Sei uns willkommen, Herre Christ” or “Vom Himmel

hoch, da komm ich her” (whose eighth stanza begins with the words “Sei mir willkommen, edler Gast”), but neither melody would fit the lyric with ease.

As documented in the Critical Report, there are numerous ways in which the Edition departs from the previously available performance materials. Among the more notable departures are the different key for no. 1 (D $\flat$  major instead of E $\flat$  major); the presence of an instrumental interlude between the two stanzas in no. 2; four instead of three stanzas in no. 8 (the extra stanza with flute doubling); a new refrain (an instrumental “dance chaser”) of thirty-four measures at the end of no. 9; an extra stanza in no. 10; and the alternate orchestration of “Surabaya-Johnny” presented in the Appendix (no. A11) that calls for clarinets and a violin, thereby obviating the need for a Hawaiian Guitar in *Happy End*.

Some editorial decisions have also been influenced by Lotte Lenya’s performances of songs from the work. Although she never played the role of Lilian on stage (Weill’s partisan intervention notwithstanding), she made several recordings of the music, beginning with those of Lilian’s “Surabaya-Johnny” and Bill’s “Bilbao-Song” that appeared shortly after the premiere and prior to her performing them live on the Frankfurt radio station on 8 February 1930 with, to quote Adorno (see above), “a combination of delicate sweetness and disdainful impassiveness.” Generally speaking, her approach at the time was not so different in tone and temperament from Neher’s. She made the recordings, moreover, with the musicians from the original production, the Lewis Ruth Band under the direction of Theo Mackeben, who thus captured for posterity a “sonic image” that Weill had developed in close collaboration with them.

As noted earlier, Lenya’s recordings from the time of the premiere have proven especially useful in the editing process insofar as they fill—or at least help to fill—some gaps in the transmitted performance materials. Conversely, those same recordings also serve to illustrate the significant gaps that exist between notation and performance. Aspects of the musical work not precisely conveyed by Weill’s notation include the dimensions of tempo, dynamics, rhythm, phrasing, rubato, and, not least, the vocal delivery of “delicate sweetness and disdainful impassiveness,” comparable in spirit to the “coquettish and street-wise” quality of Neher’s diction discussed above. These surviving sonic documents from the time of *Happy End*’s premiere and beyond bear witness, above all, to the considerable license taken by performers at the time with regard to note values, especially at the ends of phrases.

With her next recording of “Surabaya-Johnny” in 1943, part of the disc collection of “Six Songs by Kurt Weill” issued by Bost Records, Lenya delivered an altogether more tender and wistful impression, thanks chiefly to the lilting piano accompaniment in Weill’s new arrangement (possibly played by the composer himself), which substantially altered the music’s underlying *Gestus*, and even though her tessitura had shifted little in the interim. After that, however, with the Berlin theater songs from the 1950s and the recording of the entire score from 1960, one can follow the evolution of Lenya’s voice into its deeper and more familiar regions. With all traces of the world of the ingénue soubrette erased, *Happy End*’s most famous song ends up a far cry from the original Lilian’s melodramatic play-acting from 1929.

## Notes

1. Dr. Arno Huth, “Happy End’ – Dreigroschenoper Nr. 2,” *Hallesche Zeitung*, 5 September 1929 (also published in *Allgemeine Zeitung Chemnitz*, 6 September; *Dortmunder Zeitung*, 7 September). Lutz Weltmann, “Rezept Dreigroschenoper,” *Berliner Volkszeitung*, 3 September 1929: “Der hervorstechendste Unterschied zur ‚Dreigroschenoper‘, nach deren Rezept man das neue Stück zum Erfolge führen wollte, ist die Vorlage.” Oscar Bie, “Berliner Theater,” *Breslauer Neueste Nachrichten*, 4 September 1929: “Es ist ein Aufguß nach der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘, die in diesem Hause ihren großen Erfolg gehabt hat.” Herbert Jhering, “Dreigroschenoper-Ersatz,” *Thüringer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 September 1929: “Ein Rollentext sollte geschaffen werden, der den Bühnenstil der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘ weiterbildet.”
2. Arthur Eloesser, *Vossische Zeitung*, 3 September 1929 (evening edition): “Happy End’ bekennt sich als eine Amerikanisierung der Dreigroschenoper.” See also Wilhelm Westecker, *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung*, 3 September 1929 (evening edition): “eine ins Amerikanische transponierte Dreigroschenoper.”
3. A few months earlier, Berliners would have seen another *deus ex machina* in the guise of a Hollywood ending: Emmerich Kálmán’s *Die Herzogin von Chicago*. I am grateful to Joel Galand for drawing attention to this precedent in the world of operetta.
4. Werner Hecht provides figures taken from a contemporaneous report in the magazine *Charivari*: “more than 280 performances at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, more

- than 80 performances at the Raimund Theater in Vienna, nearly 75 at the Altes Theater in Leipzig, and nearly 50 in the Schauspielhaus Stuttgart.” See Werner Hecht, *Brecht-Chronik: 1898–1956* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), 269.
5. The review appeared with the heading “Berlin Audience in Near Riot in Drama of Chicago Gang Life” in the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 3 September 1929. According to the review in *Berlin am Morgen* (4 September 1929), there was another inscription in addition to this one displayed during the scene: “Diese Prachtorgel wird mit Standard-Oil geschmiert” (This splendid organ is greased with Standard Oil).
  6. *Time* 14, no. 12 (16 September 1929): 29.
  7. C. Hooper Trask, “Down, But Not Out, on the Berlin Stage,” *New York Times*, 27 October 1929 [report dated “Oct. 3” (but probably 3 September)].
  8. *Berliner Tageblatt*, 3 May 1929 (morning edition).
  9. “grundsätzliche[n] Laxheit in Fragen geistigen Eigentums.” “Eine Erklärung Brechts,” *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, 6 May 1929. The text is reprinted in Bertolt Brecht, *Werke: Große kommentierte Berliner und Frankfurter Ausgabe*, ed. Werner Hecht et al., 31 vols. (Berlin: Aufbau; Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988–2000), vol. 21, 315–16, along with another commentary from the author titled “Bert Brecht sagt,” published in the *Filmkurier* two days earlier, on 4 May 1929, in which he stated that “I think in a quite lax manner in matters of intellectual property” (*daß ich in Sachen des geistigen Eigentums ganz lax denke*). This was not the first time Kerr had charged Brecht with plagiarism. He had done so already five years earlier, in 1924, in a review of Brecht’s *Leben Eduards des Zweiten von England*. Brecht belatedly drafted, but never published, a response in 1926 with the title “Über Plagiate”; see Brecht, *Werke* 21, 174–75.
  10. “Das Stück ‚Happy End‘ folgt inhaltlich der short story ‚Under the Mistletoe‘ von Dorothy Lane. (Erschienen in J. L.’s Weekly, St. Louis, Mo.) Die Bearbeitung für die deutsche Bühne stammt von Elisabeth Hauptmann. Die Songs sind von Brecht und Weill. Die Bilder von Caspar Neher.” *Das Stichwort: Zeitung des Theaters am Schiffbauerdamm*, September 1929.
  11. “der geborne & Co!” Kästner’s “Surabaya-Johnny II” first appeared in print as “Surabaja-Johnny der Zweite” in *Simplicissimus* 34, no. 52 (24 March 1930): 638. According to the collected edition of Kästner’s works, the song had its first performance at the political-literary cabaret *Katakombe* in Berlin on 5 March 1930. See Erich Kästner, *Wir sind so frei: Chanson, Kabarett, kleine Prosa*, ed. Hermann Kurzke (Munich: Carl Hanser, 1998), 464. Kästner’s parody appears in that edition on pp. 334–35. It is also included in *Brecht-Liederbuch*, ed. Fritz Henneberg (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984), 406. Kästner’s pointed “& Co.” is echoed in the title of John Fuegi’s study *Brecht and Company: Sex, Politics, and the Making of the Modern Drama* (New York: Grove Press, 1994), in which the author discusses Elisabeth Hauptmann’s “quiet but essential role” (p. xiv) in Brecht’s success. The title on the cover, as opposed to inside the book, is even abbreviated to *Brecht & Co.*
  12. “Die Musik war von Weill, die Songtexte waren von Brecht (er hat aber auch kräftig am Stücktext geholfen).” Elisabeth Hauptmann, letter to Ingeburg Gentz, 8 June 1958; EHA, Fld. 1218.
  13. “Sind es wirklich schon – oder erst – einige dreissig Jahre her, dass ich mit Ihnen in den Stücken ‚Happy End‘ und ‚Mann ist Mann‘ (im Schiffbauerdamm-Theater und im Schiller-Theater) spielte? Im ersten Stück spielten Sie eine Rolle, die, wie ich glaube mich erinnern zu können, die ‚Fliege‘ hiess – und ich – mit Kurt Geron und Peter Lorre zusammen – eine Gangster-Bande. Ganz genau allerdings erinnere ich mich wie dieses Stück quasi ‚auf den Proben‘ entstand. Für uns ‚Gangster‘ wie auch für die ‚Fliege‘, die ja Nebenrollen waren, fielen gelegentlich ein paar Sätze ab – und ich sehe Sie noch vor mir, wie Sie eifrig Ihre Sätze notierten, auf die grossmütig die beiden Protagonisten – Frau C. Neher und O. Homolka – verzichteten. Auch Geron, Lorre und ich waren eifrig darauf bedacht bei der ‚Verteilung‘ der Sätze nicht zu kurz zu kommen. War ein solcher Satz in Sicht, zogen wir einen Ballon hoch, den wir an einer Kulisse befestigt hatten, um darauf aufmerksam [zu machen], dass wir auch noch da waren. – Wenn man das heute erzählt, will es kein Mensch glauben – und doch wurde aus solchen ‚Anfängen‘ die grosse Schauspielerin Helene Weigel, der ich zu ihrem 70. Geburtstag herzlichst gratuliere.” Theo Lingen, letter to Helene Weigel, n.d. [May 1970]; Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Helene-Weigel-Archiv, Fld. Ko 7996.
  14. “Alle beschäftigten Schauspieler, mit Ausnahme Homolkas, sind dem Theater dauernd verpflichtet, so daß hier der Versuch unternommen ist, den Ensemblegedanken möglichst zu verwirklichen.” *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 August 1929.
  15. “Das Stück ist entstanden aus dem Stück ‚Happy End‘ von Elisabeth Hauptmann.” *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe*; reprinted in Brecht, *Werke* 3, 128.
  16. Jhering’s initial review, titled “Happy End,” appeared in the *Berliner Börsen-Courier* on 3 September 1929 (evening edition). A slightly altered version, expanded by an opening and a closing paragraph, appeared under the heading “Dreigroschenoper-Ersatz” in several other newspapers, among them the *Magdeburger Zeitung* (6 September) and the *Thüringer Allgemeine Zeitung* (7 September).
  17. John Willett, “Bacon ohne Shakespeare? The Problem of Mitarbeit,” *Brecht Yearbook/Brecht-Jahrbuch* 12 (1983): 126.
  18. “Die Generalprobe [...] zog sich in die Länge. Die Dekorationen wurden zum erstenmal aufgebaut, die Kostüme zum erstenmal angezogen. Die Pausen zwischen den Bildern und Akten dauerten unendlich lange.” Bernhard Reich, *Im Wettlauf mit der Zeit: Erinnerungen aus fünf Jahrzehnten deutscher Theatergeschichte* (Berlin: Henschel, 1970), 306.
  19. “Nach dem Erfolg der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘ waren Brecht und Weill mit mir einig, die nächste Spielzeit mit einem Stück in der gleichen Kombination zu eröffnen. Brecht hatte mit seiner Assistentin Elisabeth Hauptmann eine Story zwischen einem Heilsarmee Mädchen und einem Gangsterchef konstruiert. Die Figuren waren der amerikanischen Unterhaltungsliteratur entnommen. Zwei Akte waren im groben fertig, der Titel war ‚Happy End.‘” Ernst Josef Aufricht, *Erzähle, damit Du Dein Recht erweist* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1966), 96.
  20. “Kurzgeschichte von E.H. Von Brecht korrigiert.” Astrid Horst, *Prima inter pares: Elisabeth Hauptmann—Die Mitarbeiterin Bertolt Brechts* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1992), 38. The document in question is in BBA, Fld. 448/35–43. In her survey of thematically related projects, Horst draws attention to two that remained incomplete—one titled “Gut und Böse,” the other “Marie Andersen”—both of whose materials are housed in BBA and are mixed together with those for *Happy End*; see *Prima inter pares*, 47.
  21. “Liebe Bess, heute fiel mir ein, ob Sie nicht Lust haben, sich an dem Massarygeschäft zu beteiligen? Ich würde Ihnen eine Fabel geben usw. und Sie würden ein kleines Stück daraus zimmern, ganz locker und schlampig, meinerwegen auch fetzchenweise! Eine teils rührende, teils lustige Sache für etwa 10 000 Mark! Sie müßten es zeichnen, aber das würde Ihnen natürlich kolossal nützen. Denn die Sache könnte ganz anständig werden durch einfache Offenheit und eine Art rührende Bescheidenheit!!  
Fabel ungefähr so:  
Milieu: Heilsarmee und Verbrecherkeller  
Inhalt: Kampf des Bösen mit dem Guten  
Pointe: Das Gute siegt”  
Brecht, *Werke* 28, 320 (which suggests a too-late date of June 1929).
  22. Contract of 23 March in EHA, Fld. 1920; agreement of 16 April in EHA, Fld. 1921; statement of 2 May in BBA, Fld. 783/12; contract of 11 May in BBA, Fld. 586/22–26.
  23. “In den heutigen Wiener Blättern findet sich eine Notiz über Ihr und Brechts neues Stück *Happy End*. Es wäre uns wichtig, darüber Informationen zu erhalten.” *W-UE*, 159.
  24. “Die beiden Autoren der ‚Dreigroschen-Oper‘, Bert Brecht und Kurt Weill, haben ein neues Werk beendet, das den Titel ‚Happy end‘ führt. Es handelt sich wieder um ein opernhafes Volksstück, das die im Film und Theater übliche Art des glücklichen Endes um jeden Preis persifliert. Das neue Werk wird wieder am Theater am Schiffbauerdamm in Berlin unter der Regie Erich Engels mit Carola Neher in der weiblichen Hauptrolle herausgebracht werden.” *Salzburger Volksblatt*, 8 February 1929.
  25. Hauptmann, letter to Emil Burri, 29 March 1965; EHA, Fld. 219. Here, Hauptmann recalls her and Brecht’s visits to the Salvation Army quarters at Dresdener Straße in Berlin, both before and after his car accident near Fulda in May 1929.
  26. The print of the photograph in EHA, Fld. 705, catalogued as “Elisabeth Hauptmann in der Uniform der Heilsarmee,” contains the following handwritten comments by Hauptmann: “Von Koch aufgenommen im Staatl. Schauspielhaus 1928; Für Uhu aufgenommen Boden vom Staatstheater. Für Abdruck der Kurzgeschichte ‚Bessie Soundso‘; EH in einem Kostüm von Lucie Mannheim aus Stück ‚Von morgens bis mitternachts‘ von Georg Kaiser.” Kaiser’s play (1912), first performed in Munich in 1917 (Brecht saw it in 1921), included a Salvation Army setting.
  27. “Bei den Methodisten war ursprünglich sein Amt. Dann verliebte Miß Catherine Memford, eine Antialkoholistin, sich in ihn, weil er in einer frommen Teegesellschaft das Gedicht ‚Der Traum des Schnapshändlers‘ so begeistert vortrug. Sie heirateten, sie bekamen eine achtbare Zahl von Kindern, und sie gründeten die Heilsarmee, die ‚Hal-leluja-Rotte‘, die mit wütender Inbrunst und Trommelwirbel um die Seelen verstockter Sünder rang. An der Spitze ihrer Getreuen zogen sie in die Massenquartiere und ‚retteten‘. Kein Milieu wurde für den Bekehrungsakt verschmäht; die Straße, die Stube, das Eisenbahncoupe waren die Stätte des religiösen Wunders. Fauchend wichen vor ihren Psalmen, ihren Teemarken, ihrer Gymnastik, ihren Traktätchen die Kreaturen der Hölle zurück.” Paul Wiegler, *Figuren* (Leipzig: Verlag der weißen Bücher, 1916), 162.
  28. “Ein ausgezeichnetes Buch mit Schattierungen und viel Stoff. Ich fische Wörter und Farben heraus, sie schwimmen in Schwärmen darin herum. Ich muß noch einmal Psalmen schreiben. Das Reimen hält so sehr auf. Man muß nicht alles zur Gitarre singen können! [...] Nachts ‚Der besoffene Wald singt einen Choral‘ fertig gemacht, eine letzte Strophe. Das ist gute Arbeit. Der Teufel hole das Vernünftige! Die Worte haben ihren eigenen Geist. Es gibt gefräßige, eitle, schlaue, stiernäckige und ordinäre. Man muß eine Heilsarmee gründen zu ihrer ‚Errettung‘, sie sind so verkommen. Man muß sie einzeln bekehren, vor allem Volk, und sie im Gefolge mitnehmen und allem Volk zeigen.” Brecht, *Werke* 26, 146–47.
  29. James K. Lyon, “The Source of Brecht’s Poem ‘Vorbildliche Bekehrung eines Branntweinhändlers,’” *Modern Language Notes* 84, no. 5 (October 1969): 802–06.
  30. Tamara Berger-Prösdorf, *Die Funktion der Heilsarmeegeistlichen in den Dramen Brechts* (New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 1993).
  31. Brecht’s list is reprinted in Brecht, *Werke* 21, 176.
  32. See Gustavus Myers, *History of the Great American Fortunes*, vol. 1 (Chicago: Kerr, 1910), 213–14. Tweed and Connolly were both eventually indicted for corruption.

33. Already in *Der Brotladen* the political critique that emerged almost as an afterthought in *Happy End* comes squarely into focus. Brecht makes the political purpose of his piece quite plain by means of the chart included among the fragmentary materials. With its two columns, it recalls the chart in the “Anmerkungen zur Oper *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*,” with which Brecht and Peter Suhrkamp defined salient differences between “dramatic” and “epic” opera (see Bertolt Brecht and Peter Suhrkamp, “Anmerkungen zur Oper *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*,” *Versuche 2* [Berlin: Kiepenheuer, 1930], 107–15; reprinted in Brecht, *Werke 24*, 74–86. An earlier version of the “Notes” appeared as “Zur Soziologie der Oper – Anmerkungen zu *Mahagonny*,” in the journal *Musik und Gesellschaft 1*, no. 4 [August 1930]: 105–12). In the materials for *Der Brotladen*, the playwright makes analogous ideological points by comparing the Salvation Army and the Communist Party as institutions that address poverty in the distinctly different ways specified in the chart (original German reprinted in Brecht, *Werke 10/1*, 593):
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| The Communist Party                      | The Salvation Army   |
| Initially helps no-one                   | Helps the individual   |
| Leads the individual to the group        | Separates him from the group                                 |
| Has force as a resource                  | Opposes force  |
| Thinking in material terms               | Thinks in ideal terms  |
| Has success because of the bad situation | In spite of the bad situation                                |
| Is interested                            | For ideal reasons is uninterested in changing the situation. |
34. The unfinished prose narrative for the film adaptation of *Happy End* is published as “In ein berüchtigtes Lokal” in Brecht, *Werke 19*, 322–29.
35. The materials are held in EHA and BBA.
36. Letter of 25 May 1929; *W-UE*, 164.
37. “Den *Bilbao-Song* habe ich absichtlich noch nicht geschickt, weil noch immer nicht ganz feststeht, ob er in *Happy end* hereingenommen wird. Sie bekommen ihn aber in wenigen Tagen. Ausserdem haben Sie doch bereits 2 Songs für *Happy end*, die Sie vorbereiten können. Es werden im ganzen etwa 7 Songs sein, darunter 3–4 als Schlager zu verwertende.” Weill, letter to UE, 22 July 1929; *W-UE*, 174. A photocopy of Loewy-Hartmann’s letter to Weill of 25 July is in WLRC, Series 41, Box 1.
38. “Der dritte Akt krankt, meiner Meinung nach, vorwiegend daran, dass die Massnahmen der Lilian zu lahm sind, als dass sie einen Umschwung bewerkstelligen könnten. [...] Völlig unverstänlich wird infolgedessen im 4. Akt das Zurückkehren der Verbrecher. [...] Meine Vorschläge bezwecken eine wesentliche Vereinfachung der Handlung. [...] Es könnte dann abschliessen mit der Intonierung des Chorals vom ‚anständigen Menschen‘ der mit der Wucht des ‚Kanonensong‘ durch Megaphone verstärkt das unbeirrbar gute Gewissen Amerikas persiflieren könnte.” Carbon copy in Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Erich-Engel-Archiv, Fld. 132.
39. “Das Schlussbild zeigt (nicht wie ursprünglich geplant die elegant gewordene Bar): einen TEMPEL, so wie von Sinclair in ‚Öl‘ beschrieben, der Lilian-Tempel. Er ist aus weissem Marmor und hat goldene Leisten und Inschriften. Die bunten Glasfenster zeigen die großen Heiligen der Staaten: Rockefeller, Vanderbilt, Morgan usw. Der Tempel enthält den modernsten Komfort: Lautsprecher in den Bauch eines Engels eingebaut, herausnehmbare Orgelpfeifen, in denen man Cocktails mixen kann usw. Lilian ist Evangelistin und predigt, Dick predigt ebenfalls, gibt daneben Börsentips. ‚Nichts ohne Gott‘. Die alte Bande gehört zu Lilians Anhängerschaft, einige davon, z.B. Saidie und Geron fangen ebenfalls mit an zu predigen. (amerikanische Predigtplatte) // [Hauptmann added a handwritten note:] “Lieber Herr Engel, Brecht dankt sehr für Ihren Brief, für den Song vom anständigen Menschen ist er sehr, auch für das Auskleiden hinter dem Paravent; mit der Bühne ist er sich noch nicht ganz im klaren, das Schlussbild soll ein moderner Tempel bilden anstelle der alten Bar, damit der Bilbao-Song bleiben kann. – Wichtig ist, dass Brecht anstelle der Saidie ‚die Dame mit dem schwarzen Parfüm‘ einführt, die das ganze geheimnisvoller + outrierter macht und etwas spannender. Der ‚D.m.d.sch.P.‘ gehört die Bande. Sie rauft mit Lilian um die Männer. Sobald es ganz klargestellt ist, werde ich es aufschreiben und Ihnen schicken.” Hauptmann closes the letter by passing on greetings from the Brechts and the Weills; Erich-Engel-Archiv, Fld. 152. Sinclair’s novel *Oil!* was published in 1927.
40. “Blattern” is German for smallpox. Astrid Horst has persuasively suggested a link between the name chosen for the bar and George Bernard Shaw’s 1905 play about the Salvation Army, *Major Barbara*. Horst observes that Shaw, in his preface to the play, drew an analogy between how society deals with the disease of smallpox and how it deals with criminals in society. The latter, he claimed, were deemed “morally sick,” a figurative smallpox on society. See Horst, *Prima inter pares*, 45. That Brecht and Hauptmann were familiar with Shaw’s play is indisputable.
41. KWE I/5, 226.
42. *Kalkutta, 4. Mai* (1926) is an adaptation by Feuchtwanger and Brecht of Feuchtwanger’s play *Warren Hastings: Gouverneur von Indien* (1916). The edition of the adaptation, first published in Feuchtwanger’s *3 Angelsächsische Stücke* (Berlin: Propyläen, 1927), does not include the text of “Surabaya-Johnny,” however, which is sung in the play by the character Lady Marjorie. See *Perspectives on Lion Feuchtwanger and Bertolt Brecht: “Calcutta, 4th May,”* (Calcutta: Avantgarde Press [for the Consulate General of Germany in Calcutta], 1994), 88.
43. A detailed history of the text and its settings can be found in *Brecht-Liederbuch*, ed. Hennenberg (see note 11), 404–07, in which Hennenberg discusses, among other things, the text’s revision and use in the 1941 premiere of Brecht’s *Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder*. Whether Bruinier’s setting was sung in the *Kalkutta* production remains unclear, according to Hennenberg. See also Albrecht Dümling’s entry “Surabaya-Johnny” in *Brecht-Handbuch 2: Gedichte*, ed. Jan Knopf (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001), 136–38.
44. “Augenblicklich mache ich die restlichen Songs für *Happy end*. Ich hoffe, rechtzeitig fertig zu werden, um noch einiges für die Premiere herauszubringen. Es werden im ganzen etwa 7–8 Nummern werden.” “Marek Weber sagte mir heute, er möchte so bald wie möglich den *Surabaya-Johnny* für Jazzbearbeitung haben (offenbar für Electrola).” *W-UE*, 177 and 176.
45. “Ich habe unterdessen etwa 7 Nummern für *Happy End* fertiggestellt u. lasse von allen Nummern (die ich vorläufig für Klavier und Gesang notiert habe) Abschriften herstellen, die Ihnen dann in einigen Tagen zur Verfügung stehen. Darunter ist ein grosser Tango *Was die Herren Matrosen sagen*, der, wie mir scheint, von allem, was ich bisher in dieser Art gemacht habe, die grössten Ausnützungsmöglichkeiten hat. [...] Oder soll ich ihn auch, wie ich in diesem Brief mit dem *Bilbao-Song* vorschlage, gleich hier Herrn Platen geben, um ihn gleich für Grammophon ausnützen zu können?” “Bei dieser Gesellschaft [Orchestra] wird Mackeben (der übrigens dort neuerdings die besten Platten der *Dreigroschenoper* herausgebracht hat) zur Premiere von *Happy end* einige Gesangs- und Orchesteraufnahmen machen.” *W-UE*, 178 and 177.
46. “Es wäre vielleicht gut, wenn Sie Marek Weber (z. Hd. Electrola) baldmöglichst mitteilen würden, dass Sie ihm noch 2 Stücke aus *Happy end* anbieten können (*Bilbao-Song* und den Tango *Was die Herren Matrosen sagen*). [...] Es wäre zu überlegen, ob Sie nicht die 6 Songs und die 3 Heilsarmeelieder zu einem kleinen Klavierauszug zusammenstellen sollten. [...] Es ist möglich, dass noch ein neuer Song hinzukommt, aber das würde sich ja in den allernächsten Tagen entscheiden.” *W-UE*, 179–80.
47. Felix Jackson, who knew Weill personally and collaborated with him on the unperformed and lost opera *Na und?* (1927), is a case in point. In his unpublished typescript “Portrait of a Quiet Man: Kurt Weill, His Life and His Times” (photocopy in WLRC, Reference Collection), written in the mid-1970s, Jackson relies heavily on Aufricht, sometimes with and sometimes without acknowledgment. The same goes for Ronald Sanders and Ronald Taylor, both of whom, in their respective biographies, rely on Aufricht’s account and quote it extensively. See Ronald Sanders, *The Days Grow Short: The Life and Music of Kurt Weill* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980), 137–44; Ronald Taylor, *Kurt Weill: Composer in a Divided World* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 156–59.
48. “Brecht hatte in den Ferien dem Gangsterchef einen Teil seiner Kompetenzen amputiert und aus diesem Teil eine Rolle für die Weigel geschrieben, die geheime Chefin der Gang, die Fliege genannt. Sie heiratete am Schluß den Heilsarmeeoffizier, gespielt von dem heute als Schriftsteller bekannten Sigismund von Radecki, eine skurrile Erscheinung durch seine enorme Länge und seinen kahlen Kopf und mit einer tiefen Baßstimme, mit der er den Heilsarmeesong vom ‚Brantweinhandler‘ anführte. George weigerte sich, das Fragment einer ausgeweideten Rolle, wie er es nannte, zu spielen.” Aufricht, *Erzähle*, 98.
49. “Engel arrangierte zwei Akte und verlangte den dritten. Brecht konnte ihn nicht liefern. In einer heftigen Diskussion entzweiten sie sich. In getrennten Zimmern mußte ich mit beiden reden. Engel bat mich, seinen Vertrag zu lösen oder ein anderes Stück zu spielen. Brecht würde den dritten Akt nie schreiben, der Inhalt der Story sei in zwei Akten erzählt. Brecht nannte Engel einen müden, verbrauchten Mann und erinnerte immer wieder an die ‚Dreigroschenoper‘, die ich unfertig angenommen hatte. Angeregt durch die Schauspieler hatte er den Schluß während der Proben geschrieben.” *Ibid.*, 98–99.
50. “Lieber Engel, ich dachte mir gleich dass Sie das Stück sofort für komplett halten würden wenn es Sie geld kosten könnte es nicht für komplett zu halten Ihre weigerung diesen text zu arrangieren wich als etwaige fingerzeige Sie geld zu kosten drohten auf der stelle der frischen behauptung Sie könnten diesen text arrangieren Sie halten also den text für den richtigen text und sich für den richtigen mann sobald eine andere meinung (etwa Ihre frühere) geldverlust bedeuten würde Ich halte Sie keineswegs für geldgierig aber eine passive abhängigkeit vom geld (und vielleicht auch geltung) hat eben auch schon genügt Sie für jede künstlerisch oder intellektuell verantwortungsvolle arbeit untauglich zu machen selbstverständlich können Sie heute selbst dieses leichte und nur sehr bescheiden in neuland vordringende stückchen nicht mehr auf die bühne stellen Sie werden lediglich um geld und renomee zu gewinnen aus dem stück altes theater machen und Sie wissen dies auf solche art endet unsere mehrjährige zusammenarbeit mit der ich ungeachtet meiner mühe und absehend von den resultaten durchaus zufrieden war so lange ich glauben konnte dass sie geistige zwecke verfolge. Ihr brecht.” Erich-Engel-Archiv, Fld. 132. Brecht typed the letter in his usual lowercase style and omitted punctuation; the original emphasis (pencil underline) may be Brecht’s or Engel’s; Engel added in ink “erhalten 19. Aug. abends 23<sup>h</sup>.”
51. “Kann ich [...] die Durchführung meiner Regiearbeit mit meinem künstlerischen Gewissen vereinbaren und unterliege ich nicht einem weiteren unerträglichen aggressiven Verhalten [d]es Herrn Brecht, so will ich davon absehen, die für mich aus der bisherigen Lage entstandenen Rechte geltend zu machen.” Erich-Engel-Archiv, Fld. 128.
52. “Premierenverlegung. Die Uraufführung der Magazingeschichte ‚Happy End‘ von Dorothy Lane im Theater am Schiffbauerdamm muß infolge Erkrankung der Hauptdarstellerin Carola Neher auf Sonnabend, den 31. August, verlegt werden. Die gelö-

- sten Karten werden bis Freitag an der Kasse umgetauscht." *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 27 August 1929 (evening edition). "Die Premiere von ‚Happy End‘ mußte wegen im letzten Moment aufgetretener technischer Schwierigkeiten neuerlich verlegt werden und findet am Montag, den 2. September, 8 Uhr, statt." *Ibid.*, 31 August (evening edition).
53. "Ich wollte und mußte ihm glauben. Ich hatte ein teures Ensemble engagiert. Brecht übernahm die Regie, Engel zog sich zurück, die Proben verliefen glatt. Nur in dem fragmentarischen letzten Akt kam es zu Konflikten mit den Schauspielern. Sie verlangten Text, ihre Rollen wären nicht zu Ende geführt. Ich hatte eine Aussprache mit Brecht in meinem Büro. Ich warf ihm vor, er hätte mich hereingelegt. Wir brüllten solange, bis wir stimmlos waren. Dann resignierte ich. Ich gab es auf, ihn weiter zu mahnen. Ich wußte, wie zwecklos es war. Engel hatte recht behalten, es gab nur ein Fragment eines dritten Aktes. Ich hoffte das Stück mit den großartigen Schauspielern, der Weillschen Musik in der Mackebenschen Interpretation über die Runden zu bringen." Aufricht, *Erzähle*, 99.
54. "In den letzten Tagen vor der Generalprobe war Brecht von seltsamen Gestalten umgeben. Einer von ihnen hieß Slatan Dudow, später prominent in Ostberlin. Einige kamen aus Moskau. Einen Dr. Reich stellte mir Brecht als Meister für Striche vor. Gegen ein Honorar von 2000 Mark wollte er mir welche für ‚Happy End‘ vorschlagen." *Ibid.*
55. "Es war etwa eine Woche vor der Premiere, als mich Brecht heranzog. Viel konnte nicht mehr geändert werden, die Proben dienten der Festigung des Gefundenen. Die Generalprobe wurde am Abend vor der Premiere angesetzt. Sie zog sich in die Länge. Die Dekorationen wurden zum erstenmal aufgebaut, die Kostüme zum erstenmal angezogen. Die Pausen zwischen den Bildern und Akten dauerten unendlich lange. Obwohl viel Publikum gekommen war, so scherte sich Brecht nicht darum. Er unterbrach und ließ unfertige Passagen wiederholen, bis sie saßen. // Die Probe begann um sieben Uhr abends, und es ging auf Mitternacht, als Brecht den ersten Akt akzeptierte. Trotz der Unterbrechungen und der Regie-Anweisungen vor einem Publikum beherrschten sich die Schauspieler. Als aber nach Mitternacht die Pausen länger und die Unterbrechungen des Regisseurs häufiger wurden, wurden die Darsteller sichtlich nervös. Jeder wollte von seiner Rolle diese oder jene Stelle wiederholen; die Kollegialität hörte auf und der schauspielerische Egoismus ließ sich gehen." Reich, *Im Wettlauf*, 306–07.
56. "In der Premiere war bis zur Pause nach dem zweiten Akt der Publikumserfolg ebenso stark wie bei der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘. Und dann kam der dritte Akt. Das Publikum, hörbar enttäuscht, raschelte und hustete. Ich stand hinter der Bühne und zählte die Minuten. Der Akt war zu Ende, ein Finale mußte noch von dem auf der Bühne versammelten Ensemble gesungen werden. Völlig unerwartet sah ich, meinen Augen nicht traugend, Helene Weigel auf die Vorderbühne kommen. Mit gellender Stimme, von einem Zettel ablesend, rief sie in den Zuschauerraum: ‚Was ist ein Dietrich gegen eine Aktie! Was ist ein Bankeinbruch gegen eine Bankgründung!‘ und andere vulgär-marxistische Provokationen. [...] Den Ausfall der Weigel hatten die Ratschläge der seltsamen Gestalten verschuldet. Sie fanden ‚Happy End‘ nicht genügend ideologisch untermauert." Aufricht, *Erzähle*, 100–01.
57. "Die Weigel war verzweifelt. Sie bat nun mit leiser Stimme, ihren Monolog noch einmal wiederholen zu dürfen, wo sie doch keine eigentliche Probe gehabt habe... Da brach eine Schauspielerrevolte los: Nichts da – der Monolog ist ein Dreck, den hört sich das Publikum sowieso nicht an; aber wir, die den ganzen Abend auf der Bühne stehen und das Stück tragen, wann haben wir jemals unsere Schlußszene ordentlich probiert! Die Arbeiter waren schon im Begriff, die Dekoration abzubauen und schoben die Weigel beiseite. Da griff ich ein und ordnete an, der Monolog der Gräfin werde wiederholt. Das war das Stichwort. Homolka rebellierte und schrie: ‚Aha, der rote Agitator aus Moskau! – Es war sehr komisch. Als sich der Sturm gelegt hatte, durfte die Weigel ihren Monolog wiederholen. Um sechs Uhr morgens war die Probe beendet. Der Zuschauerraum hatte sich geleert. Nur Brecht und ich harreten aus." Reich, *Im Wettlauf*, 307.
58. "‚Happy End‘ war ein Stück, von dem Brecht gehofft hatte, daß es auf den Proben gewissermaßen von selbst Form gewinnen werde." "In dieser schwierigen Probenzeit, wo oft ganze Nächte hindurch experimentiert wurde." Sigismund von Radecki, *Gesichtspunkte* (Cologne and Olten: Jakob Hegner, 1964), 80–88; reprinted as "Erinnerungen an Brecht," *Dreigroschenheft* 18, no. 4 (2011): 33–38, at 36.
59. "Bei der Generalprobe gab es einen Riesenkrach vor versammeltem Publikum, so daß alles erleichtert aufatmete, weil solch ein Krach von guter Vorbedeutung für die Premiere sein soll. Aber dann wurde es eben doch ein Durchfall. Für die nächsten Aufführungen improvisierte Brecht noch schnell ein Schlußwort, das ich allein vor dem Publikum sprechen mußte. Ich trug die Uniform der Heilsarmee und hatte mir den Text meiner kleinen Rede in die Mütze genäht, für den Fall, daß ich nicht weiter wußte. Ich weiß noch, daß dort der Satz vorkam: ‚Was ist der Einbruch in eine Bank gegen die Gründung einer Bank!...‘ Ältere Schauspieler sagten mir nachher: ‚Der Brecht weiß genau, warum er sich an dich wandte; ein erfahrener Schauspieler würde so eine improvisierte Schlußrede gar nicht übernehmen, weil er sich über das Risiko klar ist.‘" *Ibid.*
60. Both of these lines occur in *Tt1*, an early, four-act version of the script. In questioning the effectiveness of law and order as compared with the methods and resources of the Salvation Army, Bob further remarks to the Kommissar, here, too, sounding the theme of retraining: "Sie werden umlernen müssen, Kommissar, wenn Sie bei der Polizei bleiben."
61. Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, trans. S.W. Ryazanskaya, ed. Maurice Dobb (New York: International Publishers, 1970), 216–17. Marx's introduction derives from his manuscripts on economics (the *Grundrisse*) of 1857–58. Because it was published only posthumously in 1939, the text would have been unknown to Hauptmann and Brecht.
62. "Ich bin seit 10 Tagen von 10 Uhr morgens bis 2 Uhr nachts im Theater. Es gibt ja leider keine andere Möglichkeit, ein solches Stück auf die Beine zu bringen. Ich habe für Happy end einige Stücke geschrieben, die noch über die Dreigroschenoper hinausgehen und mehr zum Stil von Mahagonny hinüberführen. Orchester habe ich wieder ganz neue Dinge ausprobiert, an denen ich jetzt mit dem Orchester zusammen stundenlang herumastle. Das ist sehr zeitraubend, aber ungeheuer lehrreich. Ich bin überzeugt, dass ein Kompositionsschüler auf einer solchen Probe mehr lernen könnte (formal und instrumental) als in einem dreijährigen Studium." Photocopy in WLRC, Series 40; original in Theodor W. Adorno Archiv, Frankfurt am Main.
63. Established by classically trained flutist and conductor Ludwig Rütth, the Lewis Ruth Band achieved its breakthrough thanks to its involvement in the original production of *Die Dreigroschenoper* and in subsequent recordings. See contemporaneous portraits of the band in *Skizzen: Illustrierte Monatszeitschrift für Kunst, Musik, Tanz, Sport, Mode und Haus* (issued by Electrola): "Die Lewis-Ruth-Band," *Skizzen* 3, no. 12 (December 1930): 14; and "Lewis Ruth: Der jazzende Symphoniker," *Skizzen* 4, no. 10 (October 1931): 17.
64. "Ausserdem musste ich manches, was ich bei den hiesigen Musikern nur anzusagen brauchte, für die gedruckte Ausgabe erst fixieren." Weill, letter to UE, 12 September 1928; photocopy in WLRC, Series 41, Box 1.
65. "Wir dürfen uns auch nicht dazu verleiten lassen, das, was durch die *Dreigroschenoper* nicht nur für meine sondern für die allgemeine musikalische Situation erreicht worden ist, jetzt zu bagatellisieren, weil meine neuen Arbeiten zufällig einmal in einem schlechten Stück schlecht eingebaut waren." "Auch *Happy end* ist in dieser Beziehung völlig verkannt worden. Stücke wie der grosse *Heilsarmeemarsch* und das *Matrosenlied* gehen über den Songcharakter weit hinaus." *W-UE*, 195, 194.
66. "Bei den Proben des ‚Surabaya-Johnny‘, eines Songs aus dem neuen Stück ‚Happy End‘, fiel mir während der Probe ein, daß die Violine von einer Klarinette eine Oktave tiefer begleitet werden könnte. Ich lasse die Jazzband aufhören, schreibe die Partitur um, und es ergibt sich, daß der Klang dadurch viel gewonnen hat. Dies wäre unmöglich mit einem großen Orchester. Der Dirigent würde augenblicklich sagen: Können Sie denn überhaupt nicht instrumentieren, da Sie während der Probe Änderungen an der Partitur vornehmen?" *Berlin am Morgen*, 6 September 1929; reprinted in *GS2*, 446.
67. Photocopy of Lenya's letter to UE (12 August 1958) in WLRC, Series 30, Box 12, Fld. 32; Aufricht's and Hauptmann's letters to UE (29 and 27 August respectively) in Series 18, Fld. 64.
68. "Die Saison hat eingesetzt. ‚Happy end‘ von Brecht und Weill, den Autoren der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘, war (im Theater am Schiffbauerdamm) kein unbestrittener Erfolg. Das Stück ähnelt, der Kritik zufolge, zu sehr der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘." *Prager Tagblatt*, 5 September 1929.
69. "Brecht und Weill dekorieren ihr neues Werk ‚Happy end‘ als eine Magazingsgeschichte von Dorothy Lane. [...] die Wahl ist charakteristisch: man bedient sich einer Literaturgattung, die eindeutig nicht Literatur ist, man nennt, um der Firma weiterhin einen unseriösen Anstrich zu geben, als Verfasserin eine Frau und als Ursprungsland vollends jenes beneidete Amerika, wo die Leute Kunstwerte mit der Stoppuhr messen und sich unter Sophokles einen europäischen Zeitgenossen von unbestimmter Nationalangehörigkeit vorstellen." Rudolf Arnheim, "Krankenkost," *Die Weltbühne* 25, no. 37 (10 September 1929): 406.
70. "Warum kommt ein solches Stück zustande und warum wird es aufgeführt? Schuld ist gewiß jener verbreitete Snobismus, der Geist darin sieht, keinen zu haben, aber auch Dummheiten fallen nicht vom Himmel. Diese hat ihren Grund in der Müdigkeit der Menschen [...] weil die Menschen diesseits und jenseits der Rampe müde sind, weil Krieg und Inflation ihnen die Nerven verdorben haben und sie nicht den Elan und vor allem nicht die Lust aufbringen, Werte zu schaffen oder zu genießen. Wir alle stecken in dieser Krise, aber es kommt viel darauf an, wie man sich ihren Auswirkungen gegenüber verhält: ob man sich die Ärmel aufkrempelt und geräuschvoll mitmacht und Beifall klatscht oder ob man unruhig und traurig beiseite geht." *Ibid.*, 407.
71. "Der Begriff des Zweideutigen beherrscht alles. [...] romantischer Humor. Etwas ganz Subjektives, verschwärmt Ironisches. [...] Übrigens ist und bleibt er ein wirklicher Dichter, der Dichter der armen, mit Mord und Hunger verfluchten, mordenden und gemordeten Kreatur vor Gottes Thron." Willy Haas, "Berliner Saisonbeginn," *Die literarische Welt* 5, no. 37 (13 September 1929); quoted in *Brecht in der Kritik: Rezensionen aller Brecht-Uraufführungen*, ed. Monika Wyss (Munich: Kindler, 1977), 104–05.
72. "Das Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, das im vorigen Winter das Glück mit der Dreigroschenoper gehabt hat, kam mit einem neuen Stück, unter dessen vielen Verfassern ebenfalls wieder der Name Bert Brecht prangte. Es hieß ‚Happy End‘, nannte sich eine Magazingsgeschichte von Dorothy Lane; die deutsche Bearbeitung, so behauptete der Zettel, stamme von Elisabeth Hauptmann, die Songs von Brecht und Weill. An die beiden weiblichen Mitarbeiter glaubte kein Mensch; desto mehr an die Erzählungen von großem Krach und Meinungsverschiedenheiten, die es schon bei den Pro-

ben zu diesem Kollektivstück gegeben haben soll. Erich Engel legte noch vor der Auf-führung die Regie nieder und überließ sie Brecht allein. E[r] tat recht daran; denn dieses Happy End machte wirklich nicht glücklich. Ein verdünnter Aufguß der Drei-groschenoper ohne die nach zwei Jahrhunderten noch tragende Grundlage des alten Dichters, wieder Verbrechermilieu, wieder Parodie, wieder glückliches Ende, aber alles ohne Laune, ohne Witz, grob und geistlos trotz aller aufgewandten Arbeit. Wieder mußte man das Götz-Zitat wörtlich über sich ergehen lassen; wieder mußte man er-leben, daß man einer Dame das öffentliche Aussprechen von Worten zumutete, die bisher lediglich Eigentum der Männer waren, wenn sie unter sich sind. Wieder gab's Zoten und Bordell-Songs, diesmal aber alles ohne Schwung und Verve und dafür am Schluß plötzlich mit Moral und Sozialethik behängt. Es war erschütternd komisch, nach aller Parodie plötzlich eine Vorlesung über Edelkommunismus und die großen Verbrecher Ford und Morgan und Rockefeller zu bekommen. Das Publikum nahm's übel und begann mitzuspielen, und es hatte recht damit. Für sich allein ist diese Ge-schichte von dem Verbrecherhüptling, zu dem das Heilsarmeeädchen kommt: erst bekehrt er sie, dann sie ihn und seine Genossen, zu blöde. // Da kann auch keine noch so gute Aufführung etwas retten. Herr Homolka als Bill Cracker gab sich alle Mühe und Frau Neher als Hallelujah-Lillian ebenso. Das Publikum überzeugen konn-ten sie so wenig wie Herr Gerron, Frau Weigel oder Herr Lorre, der hier in den Pau-sen seines St. Just allabendlich eine zweite Rolle spielt. Ein Teil klatschte überzeugt, ein anderer pfiß ebenso überzeugt, und der wird auf die Dauer recht behalten." *Han-noverscher Kurier*, 8 September 1929.

By "Götz quotation," Fechter is referring to Bill's line in Act I, right before the Salvation Army makes its first appearance. He may also have had in mind the line in "Die Ballade von der Höllenlili" where the singer has the words "Und mit morgen könnt ihr mich!" thus allusively echoing, in ears attuned to German idioms, the cele-brated and notoriously vulgar moment in Goethe's play *Götz von Berlichingen* in which the titular character says of the Imperial Army's Captain "Er aber, sag's ihm, er kann mich im Arsch lecken!" (Tell him, however, he can kiss my ass).

73. "Nun hat Brecht sich selbst kopiert. Kopieren ist immer gefährlich. Da liegt die Lan-geweile auf der Lauer. Denn man will schließlich nicht eine ins Amerikanische trans-ponierte Dreigroschenoper, sondern neues Leben, neues Theater, einen neuen Schritt sehen. Brecht und mit ihm das ganze Theater am Schiffbauerdamm treten aber auf der Stelle. Der Erfolg der Dreigroschenoper läßt sich nicht einfach mit denselben Mitteln wiederholen. Darüber darf auch der mit einigen Pfiffen, Unruhe und kleinem Tu-mult untermischte Premierenbeifall nicht hinwegtäuschen. Dieser Beifall galt be-stimmt noch zu einem großen Teil der Dreigroschenoper." *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung*, 3 September 1929.
74. "rührende Magazingsgeschichte [...] lebt zwischen ‚Broadway‘ und der Dreigroschen-oper mit einer starken Neigung zur Sentimentalität" "Die einen faßten das Hosian-nah als eine Verherrlichung des Kapitals und die Bilder Fords, Morgans und Rockefellers als moderne Heiligenbilder auf und klatschten, die anderen faßten alles als eine Parodie auf und klatschten auch. Einige pfißen. Die protestierten gegen die Parodie. Andere pfißen und protestierten gegen die Verherrlichung. Vier Lager in einer Aufführung! So sehr wußte Brecht das Publikum über seine Absichten im Un-gewissen zu lassen. Seltsam, die Klatschenden standen sich gegenüber und die Pfei-fenden und die Pfeifenden meinten wieder die Klatschenden. In dieser Karrussellfahrt der Meinungen ging das Stück schließlich unter." Ibid.
75. "Carola Neher hat sich eine Walze mit ganz dünnen Stiften eingelegt, um ihr Halle-lujahmädchen von der Räuber-Jennie zu unterscheiden. [...] Gegen den Beifall wuchs der Widerspruch der unbestochenen Gemüter. Mein Herz war bei diesen Wider-standsfähigen, es war vor allem bei den Schauspielern, die trotz Applaus und Daka-pos hier mißbraucht werden, zugunsten einer servilen Geschäftigkeit, zugunsten einer von Caspar Neher besorgten großen Aufmachung, die an sich nicht ohne Geschick ins Filmische hinüberschlug." *Vossische Zeitung*, 3 September 1929 (evening edition).
76. "Wiederholungen sind immer falsch. [...] ‚Happy end‘, das die Leichtigkeit als Pro-gramm hat, geriet in die Länge und Breite. Witz verträgt nur Kürze. [...] Die groß konzipierte Schlussszene mit den Heiligenbildern von Ford, Morgan und Rockefeller wirkt wie das Tableau eines ganz anderen Werkes; nicht mehr eines Schulstücks, nicht mehr eines Szenariums, sondern eines Hauptwerkes. [...] es war der erste echt Berli-ner Premierenabend mit Spannung und Elektrizität, immer auf der Grenze zwischen tobendem Beifall und lauerndem Skandal." *Thüringer Allgemeine Zeitung*, 7 Septem-ber 1929.
77. "Die glänzend artikulierende Frau Weigel sprach, nein: las am Schluss des versan-denden Abends von einem Zettel rasch noch ein bisschen Sozialkritik. Angepappt. [...] Verlesene Worte – dazu schwerlich auf Brechts Acker gewachsen. (Sie könnten, wären sie geistreicher, von Tucholsky sein.)" *Berliner Tageblatt*, 3 September 1929 (evening edition).
78. "So hat Weill durch ältere, vorhandene, zuverlässige Melodien, wenn auch in der Jazz-maske, das Publikum von der neuen Musik weggelockt. Aber Weill... Schmeichler! Er setzt wenigstens entzückend, was das Volk (gegen Entree) singt. Er ist ein sehr Aparter im Unaparten." Ibid.
79. "Statt dessen erfolgt eine Stimmungs-Kopie des Schlagers der vorjährigen Saison mit ein paar netten diesjährigen Einfällen. Die Politik aber ist diesmal nur phrasenhaft und sinnlos angehängt: ein Blinddarm neben dem üblichen Verdauungsweg." *Frank-furter Zeitung*, 5 September 1929.
80. "Es ist ein Wunder, wie hier aus einem dramatischen Nichts ein szenisches Etwas ge-zaubert wurde. Mit Kitsch machte man Ironie des Kitsches. Mit Kunst machte man künstliche – künstlerische Schmiere. Zauberkünstler mit politischen Sprüchen. Un-sere Bewunderung für die Mache aus dem Nichts." Ibid.
81. "Die Songs von Brecht schlagen gelegentlich einen rhythmischen Funken; aber nur gelegentlich, wenn Weill ihm die geschickten Noten liefert. Der Ton hat weniger Ly-rismus als früher; ist auch gröber im Wortbegriff: ‚nur keine Noblesse, sondern ein's in die Fresse!‘ reimt es ungefähr in einem der Songs. Und ‚in einem Sixpence-Bett werd' ich donnern hören die See‘. Das ist balladesk und kaum von heute. Am stärk-sten und von wirklicher Vollendung in Musik und Text: der Auftrittsmarsch der Heils-armee: ein großer kriegerischer Rhythmus um einen Teller Suppe für die Armen. Hier tönt was Echtes aus dem Klimbim und ahnt noch nicht den rückwirkenden Spott von später." Ibid.
82. "Ja, wie die Jeanne d'Arc läuft die Carola Neher als Hallelujah-Lillian mit der Fahne voran; predigt mit verbohrtener Energie die eingelernten Heilslehren; erringt komische Siege mit der schweigerisch-nüchternen Färbung ihrer Suada. Aber dann verwandelt sie sich unter dem Zwang der Rolle in die Kompletistin mit den drei Glas Whisky – und wir kennen Lillian nicht mehr; und Carola Neher spielt ein zweites Wesen bis zur schließlichen Rückkehr in ihr erstes." Ibid.
83. "Niemand würde diesem Theaterbegräbnis einen so großen Kranz widmen, wenn es sich nicht um Bert Brecht handelte. Denn dieser Schöpfer des ‚Baal‘ und der ‚Haus-postille‘ ist ein von Talenten überströmtes Wunderkind der neuen Generation gewe-sen. Sein erster Theatererfolg, die ‚Dreigroschenoper‘ ist ihm offenbar schlecht bekommen. So ist zu hoffen, daß der verdiente Mißerfolg seiner neuen Arbeit auf ihn die gleiche Wirkung ausübe wie die Bußbank auf seine Verbrecher." *Neue Freie Presse*, 17 September 1929 (morning edition).
84. "Der musikalische Partner, Kurt Weill, mag auf der Höhe der Dreigroschenoper ge-blieben sein. Aber Bert Brecht verrät diesmal keinen anderen Ehrgeiz als den Drang, den Erfolg, den wohlverdienten Erfolg der Dreigroschenoper auf möglichst bequeme Weise zu wiederholen. [...] Karola [sic] Neher als Hallelujah-Dame mit einer seltsam erfrischenden Herzhaftigkeit jungen Menschentums." Ibid.
85. "Den mehr konjunktur- als gesinnungsmäßigen Endeffekten [...] verleiht erst das zu-verlässige Auftreten der Schauspieler politischen Ernst. [...] Ein Reklamemacher! [...] Man kann nicht wissen, was in dieser dramatisierten Magazingsgeschichte Original und was Plagiat ist, denn die Texte der eingestreuten Songs stammen vom berühmten Pla-giator Bert Brecht. In diesem ‚geistreich‘ und mit Gesinnungskulisse aufgemachten Rührbrei ist alles unecht, bis auf das hervorragend anständige Mitwirken der Schau-spieler." *Die Rote Fahne*, 4 September 1929.
86. "Seit ‚Mahagonny‘ hat sich Kurt Weill im Zusammenarbeiten mit Bert Brecht spe-zialisiert. Er hat in anderer Weise wie bis zu ‚Mahagonny‘ Anschluß gesucht und ge-funden an die Musik unserer Zeit; und zwar an die ‚Gebrauchs- und Verschleißmusik‘. Mit den modernen Tanzrhythmen, die einem leichten Wechsel unterworfen sind und die dennoch einer Familie zugehören, liebäugeln sie alle, selbst die ernstesten, die heute Musik produzieren. Weill hat sich zu einem Meister des ‚Song‘ entwickelt. Er war es schon in der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘. Er ist es beinahe mehr noch in ‚Happy End‘. Seine Rhythmen, seine immer pikant harmonisierten Melodien fallen ohne weiteres in die Ohren; und eine leichte Melancholie, die seinen Weisen, selbst seinen frechen, anhaftet, sorgt dafür, daß auch die Herzen nicht leer ausgehen. Diese Melancholie zeigt uns den echten Musiker auf, der sich in der Hingabe an Bagatellen nicht verlie-ren will, und der sich wirklich nicht verliert. Der Hörer hat an der ‚Happy End‘-Musik an sich durchweg sein Vergnügen; und er hat sein Vergnügen auch an der feinen, geistvollen Faktur, an der phantasievollen Art der Verwendung eines kleinen, apart zusammengesetzten Orchesters. Es geziemt sich, der vortrefflichen ‚Lewis Ruth Band‘, der die Ausführung der Musik obliegt, zu gedenken und ihres vortrefflichen Leiters Theo Mackeben." *Vossische Zeitung*, 4 September 1929 (evening edition).
87. "Das Stück enthielt eine Reihe prachtvoller Songs von Brecht und Weill. Aber die Kritik, die schon durch Brechts Riesenerfolg und die vorausgegangene Plagiats-An-gelegenheit gereizt war, fiel über das Stück her und verriß es gänzlich, so daß es nach dreißig Aufführungen abgesetzt werden mußte." Radecki, "Erinnerungen," 36.
88. "Die Gagen der festengagierten Schauspieler Neher, Gerron, Hörrmann, Lorre, spä-ter Theo Lingen und mehrere Anfänger, das Büro und technische Personal, meine Mitarbeiter, die Theaterpacht von 9000 Mark monatlich [...]. Aufricht, *Erzähle*, 96.
89. "Die teuren Prominenten werden ja, wie möblierte Herren, meist von Monat zu Monat gemietet. Hat man sie einmal, muß man sie bis Ultimo beschäftigen, koste es, was es wolle; das ist immer noch billiger, als was sie kosten, wenn sie spazieren-gehen. Also wird die Vorstellung mindestens dreißig Mal gehalten. (Haben Sie be-merkt, daß es heute durchwegs Dreißiger-, Sechziger-, Neunziger-Serien gibt?) Ein durchgefallenes Stück wird nicht mehr nach drei oder fünf Aufführungen eingesargt: Begräbnisse erster Klasse kommen kaum mehr vor. Die Rückversicherung des Abon-nements erlaubt seine Galvanisierung: das, worauf keine Laufkundschaft mehr an-beißt, ist immer noch gut genug für den Abonnentenstamm, der die Spesen von dreißig Mal ‚Happy End‘ oder ‚Hannibal ante portas‘, seis auch mit Ach und Krach, hereinbringt. Daß solch Publikum gegen die im Sack gekaufte Katze re- und de-monstriert, durch Pfeifen und Zischen bei der dritten, vierten Wiederholung die Ab-setzung erzwingt – wie kürzlich bei Achards Grotteske in der ‚Tribüne‘ –, das ist ein Ausnahmefall, dessen Seltenheit die Regel bestätigt." *Die Weltbühne* 25, no. 46 (12 November 1929): 754.
90. "Lotte Lenja sang neue Songs von Weill, dem Umkreis von Happy end zugehörig (es ist Zeichen des Weillschen Songstiles, daß er nicht eigentlich durchs Einzelwerk be-

- grenzt wird, sondern daß die Werke offen gegeneinander bleiben, daß Songs aus einem ins andere hinüberwechseln können, wie etwa aus dem Requiem nach Mahagonny; als hätten die Werke, revoltierende Improvisationen, sich nicht wie die der bürgerlichen Kunstübung verkrustet, sondern blieben in der prompten Beweglichkeit der Aktion). Surabaya-Jonny und Bilbao, von denen es auch eine Platte gibt, von Lenja mit einer schmächtigen Süße und schnöden impassibilité zugleich gesungen, die allen kabarettistisch pointierten und expressiv mittelsamen Vortrag dieser Dinge weit hinter sich läßt durch das, was fallen gelassen, verschwiegen wird; dazu das Matrosenlied mit dem quer montierten Refrain und dem sehr merkwürdigen Song ‚Jetzt nur nicht weich werden‘, der Tempo zugleich und Unverständlichkeit der Absicht von Exzentriks mobilisiert. Nichts falscher als jene Songs im Schatten der Dreigroschenoper zu sehen. Erst von ihr getrennt, zeigen sie die abenteuerlichsten Züge, die aus der Bettlerlyrik nicht mehr folgen.“ Theodor W. Adorno [“Wgd.”], “Neue Musik im Frankfurter Rundfunk,” *Anbruch* 12, no. 3 (March 1930): 124.
91. The Bloch Erben script (Tt3) includes a note at the end that it was prepared by C. Sommer. Charlotte Sommer (1884–1943) was the daughter of Salomon Jadasohn, noted composer, conductor, and teacher in Leipzig. Her sister Bertha married the operetta composer Leo Fall (1873–1925). Sommer’s husband died around 1923, and subsequently she received a small share of royalties from Fall’s catalogue but also set up a typing and mimeographing service in Berlin. On 14 December 1942 she and her son Felix were deported to Auschwitz, where they were killed by February 1943.
92. “Brecht und Frau Hauptmann haben eine endgültige, entpolitisierte Fassung von *Happy end* hergestellt, die bei Bloch Erben jetzt vervielfältigt wird. Bloch Erben wollen gleichzeitig auch die Musik zu *Happy end* in einem Ansichtsmaterial für die Bühnen verfügbar haben. [...] Wir müssten danach rasch einen leicht spielbaren Auszug einrichten, unter Verwendung der bereits erschienenen Nummern (denen nur die weiteren Strophen beigefügt werden müssten). [...] Mein Plan geht dahin, das Stück selbst so zusammenzuziehen, dass die Musiknummern, unter denen sich ja meine besten und populärsten Songs befinden, das Gerüst des Ganzen bilden. [...] Ich schlage aber besonders vor [...], dass wir für diesen neuen Start von *Happy end* auch den grossen Wiener Erfolg von Lenja ausnützen, für die *Happy end* eine ideale Rolle enthält.” *W-UE*, 388–89.
93. “Buch und Musik von *Happy End* werden möglichst bald als Verlagsmaterial für die Bühnen verfügbar sein und wir hoffen sehr, dass sich hier neue Möglichkeiten ergeben.” “Im Zusammenhang mit der Neufassung und Entpolitisierung des Werkes ist auch zu fragen, ob die Titel der Songs nicht zum Teil geändert werden sollen, da einige davon im augenblicklichen Zustand höchst anstössig wirken. Bevor wir also ein Ansichtsmaterial fertigstellen [...] bitten wir Sie, auch diesen Punkt aufzuklären.” Letter of 7 June 1932; *W-UE*, 390 and 389–90.
- In 2002, theater scholar Foster Hirsch wondered about “Der Song von Mandelbay”: “Could the lyrics of this unabashedly salty number have contributed, as much as Weigel’s Communist manifesto, to the displeasure of the opening-night audience?” Foster Hirsch, *Kurt Weill on Stage: From Berlin to Broadway* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 66. Based on the press reviews, the answer to Hirsch’s question would appear to be no, but they could well have been a factor—hence Heinsheimer’s squeamishness.
94. “Darf ich Ihnen ganz offen sagen, dass ich davon sehr wenig entzückt bin und eigentlich mir gar nicht vorstellen kann, dass man viel damit machen wird. [...] Ich kann auch in den Figuren mit einziger Ausnahme der ‚Lilly‘ (die allerdings eine grandiose Rolle für Lenja wäre) mehr als einen schwachen Abglanz Brecht’scher Typen finden. [...] Schreiben Sie mir bitte recht bald und widerlegen Sie mich. Ich würde mich freuen, wenn ich mich geirrt hätte.” Letter of 10 June 1932; *W-UE*, 391.
95. “Ich war sehr erstaunt darüber, dass Brecht und Frau Hauptmann das Stück vollkommen unangetastet gelassen haben. Wenn ich überhaupt den Komplex *Happy end* noch einmal aufgegriffen habe, so geschah das lediglich unter der selbstverständlichen Voraussetzung, dass das Stück einer gründlichen Bearbeitung unterzogen werden muss, und zwar in dem Sinne, dass das ganze Stück auf etwa 2 Stunden Spieldauer gebracht werden muss und die Handlung derartig konzentriert werden muss, dass sie nur das Gerüst für die Songs bildet. [...] So wie es jetzt vervielfältigt ist, ist es wörtlich die Fassung, die bei Aufricht gespielt wurde und die wegen der textlichen Schwächen durchgefallen ist. [...] Ich werde also Herrn Wreede sagen, dass ich dagegen bin, das Stück in der vorliegenden Fassung aufzuführen.” Letter of 15 June 1932; *W-UE*, 395.
96. “Das Naheliegendste wäre natürlich (ein alter Plan von mir), die Songs aus *Happy end* ebenfalls zu einer Art von Songspiel mit kleinen gesprochenen Spielszenen usw. einzurichten (etwa in der Art: Szenen aus dem Leben eines Heilsarmeemädchens). Das könnte natürlich Brecht machen, aber es ist ein schrecklicher Gedanke, wegen einer so kleinen und leichten Sache alle Schwierigkeiten einer Arbeit mit Brecht wieder auf sich zu nehmen. Trotzdem werde ich mich mit dem Gedanken beschäftigen. [...] Jedenfalls werde ich diesen Plan weiterverfolgen, da man auf diese Weise vielleicht einen sehr schönen Theaterabend für 6 Darsteller und 11 Mann Orchester bekommen könnte.” *W-UE*, 431.
97. Stephen Hinton, “Weill’s Self-Borrowings,” in *Kurt Weill und Frankreich*, ed. Andreas Eichhorn (Münster: Waxmann, 2014), 89–101.
98. Walter Schürenberg (Suhrkamp), letter to Hauptmann, 26 January 1950; BBA, Fld. 1118/064.
99. Letter of 3 July 1957; EHA, Fld. 672.
100. “Die große, herrliche, unvergeßliche Berliner Theaterlandschaft der zwanziger Jahre beginnt in unserer Erinnerung neu zu leuchten.” *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 3 February 1958.
101. “Stehen wir vor einer *Kurt-Weill-Renaissance*?; “[D]a prasselte der Beifall, und man feierte das Gedächtnis Kurt Weills, des deutschen Klassikers des Songs.” *Ibid*.
102. “Das Publikum wird unterhalten, ohne daß ihm moralische oder sozialkritische Kinnhaken versetzt werden. [...] zum Musical hinsteuernd [...] die Laune, die Theaterlust, der Spaß.” *Ibid*.
103. “Endlich scheint in München das Gefundene zu sein, wonach man schon so lange gerufen hat: das deutsche ‚Musical‘. [...] Von ferne her geistert noch die Unterwelt der ‚Dreigroschenoper‘ hinein, aber diesen Gangstern aus Chicago wurden die Haifischzähne so gründlich ausgebrochen, daß ihre Bekehrung durch die Heilsarmee ohne große Schwierigkeiten vonstatten gehen kann.” *Nürnberger Nachrichten*, 6 February 1958.
104. “Gerhard Metzner glaubte nun bei seiner Bearbeitung und Neueinstudierung dieses Stückes die sozialkritischen Aspekte, weil längst überholt, eliminieren zu sollen. Er entschärfte die Heilsarmeesongs, besonders das programmatische Lied ‚Obacht, gebt Obacht‘, kastrierte das Resumé der Bandenchefin, der ‚Fliege‘, am Schluß des Stückes [...] Und er hielt es auch nicht für angebracht, dazu so wie in der Uraufführung in Berlin die auf Glas gemalten Heiligen der Heilsarmee ‚St. Ford‘, ‚St. Morgan‘ und ‚St. Rockefeller‘ aufleuchten zu lassen. Dadurch nahm er dem Stück seinen tieferen Witz und degradierte es zu einer Persiflage des Kriminalstückgenres.” Ernst Schumacher, “‘Happy-End’ – doch leider kein Beginn,” *Deutsche Woche*, 12 March 1958.
105. A copy of the Munich script is held in WLRC, Series 18, Fld. 65.
106. “Zu diesem Zweck ließ er die Titel weg, die sich im Original finden und dazu dienen, das ‚Milieu‘ zu verfremden. Er hielt die Schauspieler nicht an, zu demonstrieren, sondern gestattete ihnen, sich in die von den Autoren bewußt karikierten Gestalten einzufühlen. [...] Die Musik von Weill widerstand unter der Führung von Heinz Brüning der Boulevardisierung. Sie war denn auch der eigentliche Genuß dieser Inszenierung, die leider kein Beitrag zur Schaffung eines modernen Singspielstils war.” Schumacher, “‘Happy-End’ – doch leider kein Beginn.”
107. “HAPPY END / A Comedy in 3 Acts / by / BERTOLT BRECHT / and / ELISABETH HAUPTMANN / with Music by KURT WEILL / Translated by: Monica Shelley / Arnold Hinchcliffe” (“Lyrics BY: MICHAEL GELIOT” has been added at the bottom of the title page by hand). Copy of typescript in WLRC, Series 20.
108. *Happy End Songspiel* is a suite of the songs drawn from the composer’s original score and rearranged to fit into a structure organized according to quasi-religious topics: *Prologue—Memories and Renovations; 1. Hellfire and Repentance; 2. Youth and Experience; 3. Poverty and Riches; Epilogue—Benedictions*. See *Kurt Weill: A Guide to His Works*, compiled by Mario R. Mercado, 3rd edition, rev. and edited by Carolyn Weber (New York: Kurt Weill Foundation for Music, 2002), 54. “Concert performance in the ‘classical’ manner.” Drew wrote in his commentary, “is unthinkable; performing organisations should allow rehearsal-time for simple stage-direction and lighting, and sensitive solution of the balance problems whenever band and singers are on the same platform” ([www.singscript.plus.com/daviddrewmusic/weillworks-3.htm](http://www.singscript.plus.com/daviddrewmusic/weillworks-3.htm) – accessed 29 June 2017). *Happy End Songspiel* was recorded by the London Sinfonietta under David Atherton and released by Deutsche Grammophon in 1976. In 1999 Drew prepared a revised ordering of the suite to supersede the original one.
109. *New York Times*, 27 October 1929.
110. *Happy End: A Melodrama with Songs; lyrics by Bertolt Brecht, music by Kurt Weill, original German play by Dorothy Lane, book and lyrics adapted by Michael Feingold* (New York: Samuel French, 1982), 7.
111. The logs indicate particularly long runs at Krakow’s Stary Teatr (88 performances in the 1966/67 season) and at West Berlin’s Tribüne (103 performances in 1970/71). In the 1980s, the overwhelming majority of German productions took place in the West: thirty-seven, compared to two in the East. Photocopies of UE’s performance records in WLRC, Series 30, Box 12, Fld. 5 (“Aufführungen,” 1962–1992) and Fld. 21 (“Vorschau,” 1973–1993).
112. “Bestimmte Motive und Partien des Stückes wurden später von Brecht in *Die heilige Johanna der Schlachthöfe* verwertet. Damit dürfte auch wohl die Bedeutung des Stückes für die deutsche Bühne erschöpft sein.” Ernst Schumacher, *Die dramatischen Versuche Bertolt Brechts 1918–1933* (Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1955), 256.
- Schumacher’s assessment echoed Brecht’s own postwar thoughts. In her 1958 letter to Ingeburg Gentz (see note 12), Elisabeth Hauptmann recalled that Brecht agreed in 1955 to make *Happy End* available again on the condition that his name be suppressed and the work billed as “by Dorothy Lane, Music by Kurt Weill.” This would explain why the first printing of both Tt5 and Se in 1958 omitted Brecht’s name (although it was added to the latter on a sticker that read “Songtexte von Bertolt Brecht”); eight years earlier, Brecht’s new publisher, Suhrkamp, hoping to capitalize on name recognition, wondered in an inquiry about rights whether *Happy End* could be billed under Brecht’s name only (letter to Hauptmann; see note 98). The fact that Brecht distanced himself from the work after World War II fueled the “long process of mystification” referred to by John Willett (see note 17), which included the notion that Brecht had deliberately “sabotaged” the original production with Weigel’s “improvised speech” and that he was proud of both the scandal and the failure. Hanns Eisler remembered things differently. In a conversation with Nathan Notowicz on 21 April 1958, he recalled that Brecht had been genuinely disappointed by the failure of

*Happy End* in 1929: “Alas, it was a flop, even though I found it delightful.” (“Gott, es war leider ein Durchfall, obwohl ich es reizend fand.”) Notowicz’s casual interjection that Eisler and Brecht were proud of such failures back then prompted strong dissent from Eisler: “No, we were not proud of it. That’s not correct. He wanted to repeat the big success of his ‘Penny Opera,’ but the means were inadequate. Parts of it were already too harsh. ‘Happy End’ was actually far more progressive and pointed.” (“Nein, wir waren nicht stolz darauf. Das ist nicht richtig. Er wollte den großen Erfolg seiner ‚Groschenoper‘ noch einmal erzielen, aber die Mittel waren nicht genügend. Es war teilweise auch zu scharf schon. ‚Happy End‘ war ja wirklich viel fortschrittlicher und präziser.”) See Nathan Notowicz, *Wir reden hier nicht von Napoleon. Wir reden von Ihnen! Gespräche mit Hanns Eisler und Gerhart Eisler*, ed. Jürgen Elsner (Berlin: Verlag Neue Musik, 1971), 192–93.

113. “Das *Happy end* war mit dem aus der *Dreigroschenoper* übernommenen Theorem, die Zeit der kleinen Verbrecher sei vorbei, fertig. *Happy end* war ein dürftiges, banales Spiel, dessen gesellschaftskritischer Zug angehängt war, weil er den Reiz erhöhte.” Schumacher, *Die dramatischen Versuche*, 261.
114. “Auch die bürgerliche Kritik fand das Stück miserabel.” *Ibid.*, 262.
115. “Brecht benutzte das Stück regielich zur Einübung bestimmter Verfremdungseffekte seines epischen Theaters. [...] Daß diese formalen Elemente imstande sind (wenn ihnen ein präzises Spiel der Darsteller entspricht), selbst einem schwachen Stück zu einem gewissen Leben zu verhelfen, wurde durch *Happy end* bewiesen.” *Ibid.*
116. “Die ‚Kurfürstendammfassung der Dreigroschenoper‘, wie man ‚Happy end‘ genannt hat, fand beim Publikum der ausgehenden zwanziger Jahre wenig Zustimmung. Das Publikum der ausgehenden fünfziger Jahre akzeptierte das Stück willig: 1958 wurde es in München, 1959 in Hamburg aufgeführt. Beide Aufführungen erbrachten den Beweis, daß Weills Musik noch heute über die Dürftigkeit des Textes hinwegtäuschen und dem Stück einen respektablen Publikumserfolg sichern kann. Die Lebenskraft der Songs scheint unverwüchlich zu sein.” Hellmut Kotschenreuther, *Kurt Weill* (Berlin: Max Hesses Verlag, 1962), 55.
117. “In *Happy End* entsteht musikalische Verfremdung primär aus dem textlich-inhaltlichen Zusammenhang und weniger aus der Zusammensetzung musikalischer Formen. [...] Das bezeichnendste Merkmal in *Happy End* ist, dem generellen Thema des Stückes entsprechend, die Verbindung von religiöser und ökonomischer Verfremdungsdimension. Die epische Spielweise wird hier nie verwirklicht (die Auflösung erfolgt erst mit dem Ende) – ein Defizit, das sich auch nachteilig auf die Deutlichkeit der musikalischen Struktur auswirkt.” Gottfried Wagner, *Weill und Brecht: Das musikalische Zeittheater* (Munich: Kindler, 1977), 267.
118. Taylor, *Kurt Weill* (see note 47), 157–58. Jens Malte Fischer, for his part, extols Weill’s contribution by taking sides with the composer’s own defense of his music in his correspondence with UE. “One may call it eclectic,” Fischer opines, “but it is *Gebrauchsmusik* of the highest quality, masterful in its compression.” The play, he contends, is “irredeemable.” Weill’s music, however, “sparkles as it did from the beginning.” (“Man mag es eklektisch schelten, aber es ist Gebrauchsmusik von höchster Qualität, meisterhaft in der Abbeviatur. [...] *Happy End* von Elisabeth Hauptmann mit einigen Song-Texten von Brecht ist nicht zu retten. Die Musik Kurt Weills funkelt hingegen wie am ersten Tag.”) See Jens Malte Fischer, “‘Happy End’ – aber nur für Kurt Weill,” in *Brecht und seine Komponisten*, ed. Albrecht Riethmüller (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 2000), 90–91.
- By contrast, Albrecht Dümling, in his wide-ranging discussion, rejects criticisms of the work that dismiss the happy ending as trivial, focusing instead on “style quotation” and “caricature” as critical ingredients of an “unmasking of the Salvation Army as a capitalist aid organization.” He thus turns common comparisons of *Happy End* with its predecessor on their head: “While the salvation is only appended in *Die Dreigroschenoper*, the whole development in *Happy End*, as the title already announces, points toward the ‘happy’ end, the ‘conversion’ of the hardened criminals.” (“Die oft kritisierte Trivialität der Schlußwendung – die freilich nur äußerlich trivial ist! – ist bewußtes Stilzitat und dient der Karikatur einer Gattung, die ebenso kulinarisch sein möchte wie die Oper. [...] In Wahrheit bedeutet das Happy-End die Enttarnung der Heilsarmee als kapitalistische Hilfsorganisation. [...] Während bei der *Dreigroschenoper* die Rettung nur angehängt ist, zielt bei *Happy End* die ganze Entwicklung, wie schon der Titel deutlich verkündet, auf dieses ‚glückliche‘ Ende, die ‚Bekehrung‘ der hartgesottenen Gangster.”) See Albrecht Dümling, *Laßt euch nicht verführen: Brecht und die Musik* (Munich: Kindler, 1985), 200. In a defense of the play utterly different from Dümling’s, Foster Hirsch takes critical apology a step further—in effect contradicting Weill’s above-quoted view that his music had been “badly integrated” within “a bad play”—by making the case for the music’s being purposefully integrated in a variety of compelling ways. In grappling with how the modular elements of the piece cohere, Hirsch sees the “Bilbao Song” as being “written in the grain of the show’s mise-en-scène.” And although he admits that this song, like some of the others, is “introduced by pretexts so feeble the show seems to be mocking its own casualness,” he is nonetheless at pains to demonstrate how “Weill used all his skill and subtlety as a composer to create a small masterpiece of music theatre.” See Hirsch, *Kurt Weill on Stage* (see note 93), 65. In his published dissertation, *Ein Aparter im Unaparten: Untersuchungen zum Songstil von Kurt Weill* (Saarbrücken: Pfau, 2007), Tobias Faßhauer raises Weill’s song style of the late 1920s to the level of an essential personal style, analyzing in extensive technical detail songs from *Happy End* as key examples. Faßhauer’s title borrows a phrase coined by Alfred Kerr to characterize Weill in his review of *Happy End* in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, 3 September 1929 (see note 78 above).
119. Benjamin Kohlmann, “Awkward Moments: Melodrama, Modernism, and the Politics of Affect,” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 128, no. 2 (March 2013): 341–43.
120. *Ibid.*, 344, 345.
121. “Wie sich zeigt, vermag der amerikanische Hintergrund letztlich nicht nur ‚besser als die deutsche Szenerie die Verbindung von Religion und Geschäft zu verdeutlichen‘, sondern auch diejenige von Geschlechtlichkeit und gesellschaftlicher Macht. Bei dieser Erkenntnis handelt es sich um eine originäre Zutat Elisabeth Hauptmanns, mit der sie die Ausdrucksvielfalt des Brecht-Kollektivs um eine bedeutende Facette bereichert und ihren großen Einfluss auf das Werk Brechts unter Beweis stellt.” Tobias Lachmann, “‘Und das Ganze endet happyendlich / Selbstverständlich’: Gangster, Girls und Geldgeschäfte in Elisabeth Hauptmanns Komödie ‘Happy End,’” in *Anmut spart nicht noch Mühe: Zur Wiederentdeckung Bertolt Brechts*, ed. Rüdiger Sareika (Iserlohn: Institut für Kirche und Gesellschaft, 2005), 170. Lachmann draws on Horst, *Prima inter pares* (see note 20); and Sabine Kebir, *Ich fragte nicht nach meinem Anteil: Elisabeth Hauptmanns Arbeit mit Bertolt Brecht* (Berlin: Aufbau, 1997). A complementary study to the ones by Horst and Kebir is Paula Hanssen, *Elisabeth Hauptmann: Brecht’s Silent Collaborator* (Bern: P. Lang, 1995).
122. “Die Neher ist wundervoll. Ich habe sie noch nie so abgetönt, so vollendet, so souverän gesehen. Sie ist auf dem Wege, eine allererste Schauspielerin zu werden. Sie singt ihre Chansons mit einem Charme und einer Diskretion, die die Zuhörer hinrissen.” *8 Uhr-Abendblatt*, 3 September 1929.
123. “Wie sie das Taschentuch an die Augen führt, wie sie das Gesicht betupft, das ist geradezu musikalisch fixiert und erinnert an die große Spielleistung der Gutheil-Schoder im ‚Rosenkavalier‘. Dann singt sie die Ballade der Lucy, die jetzt der Polly in den Mund gelegt wird, mit einem Charme, mit einer Fähigkeit zwischen Witz und Gefühl zu jonglieren, die hinreißt. Eine vollkommene Einheit von Stil und Ausdruck, von Niveau und Distanz.” *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, 13 May 1929.
124. See *Carola Neher: Gefeierte auf der Bühne, gestorben im Gulag*, ed. Bettina Nir-Vered et al. (Berlin: Lukas, 2016), 35. See also note 40 about the origin of “Blattern-Bar,” the earlier incarnation of Bill’s Ballhaus.
125. “wo breitbeinig Männer einander in die Fresse hauen, wo man einen Groschen in den Musikautomaten steckt, wenn man ein Bedürfnis nach Kunstgenuß verspürt, wo man mit dem Messer ißt und diskutiert, und wo jene Stammtischphilosophie zu Hause ist, die wir aus den Chansons von Brecht kennen: daß nichts mehr los ist mit dem lieben Gott, daß alles kommt, wie es kommen muß, und daß es traurig auf der Welt ist heutzutage.” Arnheim, “Krankenkost,” 406; emphasis added.
126. Another reviewer, Franz Servaes, took offense at a “music box” that was employed to “ridicule German Christmas carols” (“nachdem schon vorher deutsche Weihnachtslieder per Spieldose lächerlich gemacht waren”). *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, 3 September 1929. “Spieldose” here implies a smaller instrument than Arnheim’s “Musikautomat.” The two German words connote different kinds of “music box.” The “elektrisches Klavier” mentioned in *Tt3* is probably a coin-operated player piano.
127. The photo of Neher sitting at the harmonium (which has one manual and six stops) is reprinted in *WPD(e)*, 99.

