Die Dreigroschenoper: the 1928 Full Score

by Stephen Hinton

"Where's the score of *Groschenoper*?" Eager to capitalize on their composer's unexpected triumph, Weill's publishers cabled him this terse question from Vienna on 6 September 1928, a week after *Die Dreigroschenoper* had received its legendary premiere at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm in Berlin. Weill had no simple answer. He eventually sent them the full score that is reproduced here as a facsimile. First, however, he had to finish it. Hence his initial response to the inquiry about the score's whereabouts: "I'm still busy at the moment completing the score in light of experiences with the current production and also matching the vocal score exactly with the stage script."[1]

First came the production, then the complete score—performance, then publishable record. This creative sequence, hardly novel in the world of opera, nonetheless belies the notion that a work's entire compositional process, culminating in the full score, precedes any performance. As later, when Weill was composing for the American musical theater, his involvement in the work's realization was such that the distinction between creation and production became blurred. Each flowed into the other.

Though staged in the wake of a British theatrical triumph, the production also reflected native fashions. No doubt the original idea was to repeat the huge success of Sir Nigel Playfair's revival of *The Beggar's Opera*, which had opened at London's Lyric Theatre in 1920 and run for a record-breaking 1,463 performances. Yet Berlin was already enjoying its own trend of modernized theatrical classics, such as productions of Shakespeare done in contemporary dress ("Hamlet im Smoking" as one of them was dubbed).[2] *Die Dreigroschenoper*, conceived and presented as a modernized adaptation, followed this trend. Weill's score borrowed only a single air from the original *Beggar's Opera*: No. 3, "Morgenchoral des Peachum," uses the same melody as the first air of John Gay's and J.C. Pepusch's ballad opera, and in the same key. Initially this number was to follow the "Ouvertüre," as it does in Gay's work (both works feature classicizing overtures with fugues), but the last-minute insertion of "Moritat vom Mackie Messer" disturbed the neat parallel. In the program booklet and the performance materials, Brecht was billed as the "adapter" of the German translation, which his self-effacing assistant, Elisabeth Hauptmann, had prepared for him in the winter of 1927–28.[3] The title *Die Dreigroschenoper*, it should be noted, was invented only shortly before the premiere; prior to that the piece was principally referred to by Gay's English title or its German equivalent, *Des Bettlers Oper*. Weill's music—a high-low stylistic mix drawing on baroque counterpoint, traditional and popular song, opera and operetta, and even Lutheran chorale, colored throughout by the sonorities and idioms of the modern dance band—contributed as much as anything to the work's multilayered ambiguity. A classic it was, but one defamiliarized in a provocative way.

The story of the production's five-month genesis and legendary first night has been told many times, often inaccurately. So unexpected was the triumph that even the head of Universal Edition's opera department at the time, Hans Heinsheimer, appears not to have been present on opening night, 31 August, despite his later claims. On 1 September, the *Musikedition* sent Weill a telegram: "Warmest congratulations on the great success. Urgently request piano-vocal score indicating most successful individual numbers." And on 3 September, Heinsheimer followed up with a polite letter saying, "We are sincerely happy about the great success of the 'Drei-Groschen-Oper,'" adding that he had received a piano-vocal score from a "Herr Löwy."[4] Heinsheimer's own colorful accounts of the premiere, published in two sets of memoirs, would thus appear to belong to the pervasive and enduring *Dreigroschen* mythology.[5] Weill's wife, Lotte Lenya—who played the role of Jenny and most certainly *was* there, although her name was omitted from the program—left her own account, itself not entirely accurate. In it, however, she offered a valid word of caution for all historians of the piece: "Perhaps the strangest note of all is that people who scornfully had passed up that opening night began to lie about it, to claim to have been there, primed for a sure-fire sensation. . . . Sometimes, remembering all that madness, even to the blank space in the program, I'm not even sure that I was there myself."[6]

Based as far as possible on primary sources rather than unreliable hearsay, the story runs as follows.[7] The twenty-nine-year-old impresario Ernst Josef Aufricht was looking, in the early months of 1928, for a play with which to launch his new company at the Theater am Schiffbauerdamm, a medium-sized mock-rococo theater in a then unfashionable area near the center of Berlin. Brecht offered Aufricht *The Beggar's Opera*, even though work on the adaptation had scarcely begun. The sporadically creative months between then and the premiere included a collaborators' retreat in late May and early June to Le Lavandou in the south of France. Back in Berlin, Weill continued work

on the musical numbers until late July, by which time he had produced an incomplete (and now largely lost) vocal score. Meanwhile he, Brecht, and Hauptmann had signed a contract with the theater agents Felix Bloch Erben. Rehearsals began on 10 August. During the frantic final weeks, as the surviving rehearsal scripts show, the book underwent substantial and frequent revision—a creative process that lasted virtually until opening night (which was planned to coincide with Aufricht's thirtieth birthday). The cast changed along with the work and vice versa. Carola Neher, who was to play Polly, dropped out after the death of her husband, the poet Klabund. She was replaced by Roma Bahn. (Neher returned for the second run and played Polly in the 1931 Pabst film.) Brecht's future second wife, Helene Weigel, was to play Mrs. Coaxer, but was incapacitated with appendicitis. Rather than recast her role, the authors simply removed it. Musical numbers, such as the "Moritat," were added, while others were swapped around and even assigned to different roles (Lucy, for example, temporarily inherited the "Barbarasong" from Polly). Still others were cut, especially when the piece became too long. The "Salomonsong" disappeared, as did "Arie der Lucy" and the "Ballade von der sexuellen Hörigkeit," the latter reportedly because of the squeamishness of the actress playing Mrs. Peachum, Rosa Valetti. The seven instrumental parts were hastily copied, just hours before the first band rehearsal, in the Held-Werkstätte in Charlottenburg. And Weill continued to work on the full score for a number of days after opening night.

The holograph presented here offers last rather than first thoughts: *Die Dreigroschenoper* as it emerged from the theater, not its state prior to performance. It resulted from the composer's attempt to fix once and for all what had, up to that point, depended on the actors' and musicians' collaborative cooperation. They, too, had been part of his conception. As he completed his written record of the work, the production had just begun a run that was to last more than three years, with more than 350 performances. Other theaters were already signaling their interest. Dispatching his final installment of the score on 12 September 1928, a week after the publisher's query, Weill enclosed an accompanying letter explaining his tardiness and describing the nature of the musicians' participation: "The delay has to do with my having to write out whole sections afresh, as they are still required in the theater. Moreover, there are certain things I had to write down for the published edition that I could simply communicate to the musicians here by word of mouth."[8]

These musicians were the Lewis Ruth Band, named after the band's leader Ludwig Rüth, and directed by the pianist Theo Mackeben. In the absence of comprehensive documentary evidence, we shall never know for sure how much Weill's music was transformed by the production process. Not all the sources have survived, and the transmission of the few that have has sometimes been unusual. For example, we still have three measures of an earlier full-score version of "Ballade vom angenehmen Leben," which were reproduced shortly after the premiere as part of the preface to the popular vocal selection in the series Musik für alle.[9] (See the facsimile on page 143.) This version of the ballad, whose introduction consists merely of the side-drum cuing the number's opening rhythm, was the one initially copied into the band parts. At some stage, presumably during rehearsal, possibly during the first few days of production, the familiar instrumental introduction quoting the final four measures of each verse was added: the halting first two measures, with their anacruses marked *molto rit*, followed in the next two measures by the melody of the line "Nur wer im Wohlstand lebt, lebt angenehm." The band parts contain the adjustments, which entail (among other things) changes of instrumentation: the doubling of the vocal line becomes the responsibility of the piano rather than the tenor saxophone, and the piccolo is cut altogether.[10]

Of Weill's draft piano-vocal score only a few numbers have survived.[11] Perhaps the most bizarre, and certainly most ominous, transmission of primary materials concerns an item from that source. On display at the Nazis' 1938 exhibition of "degenerate music" in Düsseldorf was a poster showing a photograph of Weill together with a facsimile of the closing three measures of the song "Ballade vom angenehmen Leben" in the composer's own hand. (See the facsimile on page 144.)[12] The caption of the poster reads, "The 'Creator' of the *Dreigroschenoper*, Kurt Weill, in person." It is followed by the last line of the verse—in this context devoid of all irony—"Nur wer im Wohlstand lebt, lebt angenehm" (Only he who is well-to-do lives well) announced as "his handwriting, giving the personal philosophy of the *Dreigroschenoper*."[13] The question of who willfully contributed to Weill's defamation by providing the exhibitors with this item will no doubt remain a mystery. On a purely musicological level, the exhibit offers a rare, tantalizing glimpse of *Die Dreigroschenoper* before it went into rehearsal.

The correspondence between Weill and his publisher provides other important clues to the genesis of the music, as do the various paper types of the holograph itself. The letter dated 10 September identifies those numbers not submitted before in their final versions:

> You now have the complete vocal score. No. 6 (Seeräuberjenny), No. 2 (Moritat), and No. 13 (Ballade v. angen. Leben) will follow soon in full score. I enclose an exact list of numbers [now missing]. The "Ballade von der sexuellen Hörigkeit" has been cut completely. I am sending you No. 12 (Barbarasong) [originally No. 13 but soon to become No. 9], which is mainly set for piano in the full-score version, so that you can literally transfer the piano part to the vocal score. No. 17 (Salomonsong) [later 18] is set for harmonium in the full-score version I'm sending you. Please transfer this version (not the one in the vocal score) to the printed vocal score.[14]

As can be seen in the holograph, all the songs Weill mentions are written on the same paper type (K.U.V. Beethoven Papier Nr. 39). It would be mistaken, however, to assume that the work's genesis can be completely reconstructed from the type of paper used and the way it is collated in the full score, as Fritz Hennenberg has done.[15] Weill's pre-premiere correspondence with his publishers makes mention of an incomplete piano-vocal score, of which, as stated above, little seems to have survived.[16] The order in which Weill submitted the numbers of the full score does not necessarily reflect the order in which they were composed, whether in draft or in full score. The numbers submitted later may or may not have been revised. He may simply have written them out again because the first copies were "still required in the theater." He may have revised them "in light of experiences with the current production," as with "Ballade vom angenehmen Leben." Or he may have "had to write [them] down for the published edition" for the first time because he "could simply communicate [them] to the musicians here by word of mouth." The "Moritat" is an obvious instance of the confusion that may arise from these multiple possibilities. The title appears in the holograph score immediately following the "Ouvertüre," with the indication "für Leierkasten" ("for barrel organ"). The full score of the number is inserted after No. 3, with the instrumental variations written out, more or less reflecting the parts used by the musicians. Unfortunately, the score used by Theo Mackeben at the premiere is no longer extant; it was presumably among the materials still required in the theater. Of Mackeben's own materials, only his copy of the piano-conductor score, published after the premiere, has survived. Although this contains interesting performance markings, it is essentially a post-premiere version of the piece.

In the absence of Mackeben's original materials or any other musical source that transmits a complete version of the score *before* the premiere, the surviving parts used by the other six members of the band are especially valuable, although these do not accurately transmit any one version either.[17] Their multiple layers of markings indicate that they were altered not only in the course of rehearsal but also during the long performance run. Some of the extra layers are hard to date, with the "Moritat" again being a particularly graphic case in point. The instrumental variations have been added, in several hands, to each part. No doubt Weill's final version grew out of the production, with successively elaborate variations emerging as this last-minute number established itself as the work's signature tune. The scribbled parts in this case document the piece's genesis, albeit in a rather garbled way, even reflecting some of its performance his-

tory after the composer's holograph was submitted. For the instrumentalists, that performance history included various gramophone recordings, with and without voice, and Pabst's 1931 film.

The Lewis Ruth Band was made up of skilled studio musicians adept at improvising as the occasion demanded, and the band parts bear traces of such occasions. In several instances the musicians are instructed to play earlier numbers as instrumental music. The instructions are included in the first published libretto, and Weill wished to have them inserted into his full score, as can be seen from the note written to accompany the installment of 10 September 1928: "With No. 2 ['Moritat'] please add to the vocal score and full score the following: 'At Macheath's various entrances the orchestra can start playing this piece softly. At the beginning of the eighth scene it is played in a slow tempo as a funeral march.'" Such was the performance practice during the initial run of the piece, as the band parts testify. Also added to the band parts are instructions to play certain numbers as purely instrumental entr'actes. The entr'actes are not written out, however, and the repetitions of the "Moritat" are notated only in the barest outlines. The instrumentalists knew from rehearsals what the composer wanted.[18]

The band parts thus reveal the process that constituted the work's musical and theatrical presence during the first few years of its reception history in Berlin. They also vividly reflect the confused state of the performance materials that Weill was keen to rectify by assembling the full score.[19] Only some of the changes contained in the parts found their way back into the score after the composer had initially communicated them orally to the musicians. Some were added to the parts after the premiere, no doubt. Moreover, the composer evidently departed in his revisions from what the band was playing. His full score does not faithfully document the Schiffbauerdamm production, as comparison of the sources shows, but was conceived to transcend it. The work is not synonymous with the event.

Weill was equally concerned about two other components of the materials: the stage script and the vocal score. These, as he remarked, had to match exactly. But as anyone who has ever staged the piece knows, that match remains an elusive goal to this day. In fact, the situation has only worsened. The first published stage script, like Weill's holograph score, emerged directly out of the Berlin production.[20] It was published in October 1928 and sent to theaters along with other performance materials: the vocal score (prepared by Norbert Gingold and published in November), the piano-conductor score (also published in November), and the instrumental parts. At this stage, the match between the various sources, though far from exact, was reasonably good, even if the Schiffbauerdamm production had not been adhering to any of them religiously.

The most significant discrepancies, however, surfaced with a new version of the script that was published in Brecht's *Versuche* in 1931, three years after the premiere. The relationship of this version to the original production is complicated indeed.[21] A "literary" version of the work, it excludes much of the stage business in the original script and many of the musical cues, including the entr'actes. It also excluded any collaboration by the composer. For the most part the new material, which effectively alters the complexion and purpose of the piece, can be seen as Brecht's belated response to a review of the premiere that appeared on 4 September 1928 in the Communist daily newspaper *Die rote Fahne*. "Not a trace of modern social or political satire," the reviewer concluded, having characterized Brecht himself as a "bohemian." Whether or not Brecht sought to rectify this alleged shortcoming, he certainly influenced how the piece was subsequently interpreted, as the work's reception history reveals.[22] This later version is the one usually performed nowadays, both in the original German and in many translations. Weill's score, however, belongs to the version of the work that created the initial impact.

Despite the apparent urgency of Universal Edition's inquiry, Weill's score had to wait forty-four years before it was finally printed. The day after cabling his request for the full score, Hans Heinsheimer followed up with a letter describing the publishing plans for the work. The piano-vocal score was already being engraved, even though Weill still had to submit four more numbers in that format (the "Ouvertüre," "Seeräuberjenny," "Polly's Lied," and the "Barbarasong"). The "Kanonensong" was also being engraved, as a separate number. The band parts eventually had to be made, of course. Heinsheimer said he required the score because "we want to have arrangements of the 'Kanonensong' and the 'Zuhälterballade' made immediately for dance band [*Salonorchester*] and naturally need your instrumentation as a guide for the arranger."[23] Such popular arrangements were indeed made, as were further piano arrangements of individual numbers. But plans to publish the full score soon evaporated. On 8 September Heinsheimer was still counting the printed full score for theaters among the various publishing projects connected with the work; a week later, on 13 September, he was in the process of changing his mind. The day before, Weill had sent him a list of the distribution of instruments, indicating that the player of the piano and harmonium part also acts as conductor, as was the case with Mackeben at Schiffbauerdamm. This list prompted Heinsheimer to make a practical suggestion: "If one can conduct from the piano and harmonium in this way, then the production of a proper score becomes superfluous. Conductors can direct a small orchestra from the piano or harmonium if the parts are arranged accordingly." He also cited a generic precedent to justify this cost-cutting measure: "You know, of course, that scores are never printed for operettas; the conductor directs from the piano-vocal score." Then he suggested two possible courses of action. The first would be to print the piano-vocal score "with the necessary additions." The alternative would be to arrange "the orchestral piano parts, without taking the piano-vocal score into account, as a conductor's part."[24] Weill rejected the first suggestion but acceded to the idea of a "condensed score" [*zusammengezogene Partitur*], as he put it in his reply of 17 September. A further letter from Vienna, on 19 September, sought to confirm that Weill was "in agreement that a piano-conductor score [*Klavier-Direktionsstimme*] be produced rather than a full score."[25]

Although Weill accepted the lack of a published full score in principle, he came to regret it in practice. On 28 November, shortly after the *Klavier-Direktionsstimme* was published, he wrote to Vienna with a complaint: "Unfortunately there are endless mistakes . . . which can possibly cause my music to sound heavily altered."[26] By 14 March 1933, with the first American production (directed by Francesco von Mendelssohn) in sight, he expressed this view even more forcefully.

> I have written again to Mendelssohn and implored him to provide for a respectable performance of the music. Perhaps it would be helpful if you could send him (Hotel Ambassador) my original score of *Die Dreigroschenoper*. The printed score is really full of errors and gives rise to many false impressions on account of its being a reduced piano-conductor version. We must do everything we can to assure a first-class performance of the music. . . . It is not jazz music in the American sense but rather a quite special, new sound, which can be achieved only by a meticulous realization of the original full score.[27]

It would appear that Weill's request was not carried out; the holograph score probably crossed the Atlantic for the first time in 1952, when New York City Opera was planning a production (see Kim Kowalke's essay in this volume). And it was another twenty years before it finally found its way into print. Karl Heinz Füssl's edition of the full score, prepared for Universal Edition's Philharmonia series, appeared in 1972,[28] by which time the libretto that Weill's holograph was originally supposed to match had been out of circulation for several decades. In the process of editing, Füssl "cleaned up" Weill's holograph, comparing it with a few of the other sources, wisely ignoring later versions of the book but unwisely and, in places, uncritically ignoring the fact that the manuscript bore traces far removed in time and space from the composer's own notations.[29] Moreover, in making his printed version conform to standard practices of notation, Füssl had to remove some of the features that reflect the work's original conception—features that can be savored in this facsimile.

The work, throughout, is scored for many more instruments than players. In standardizing the notation, Füssl's edition gives each instrument required in any number its own separate staff, suggesting many more players than there actually were or, indeed, need to be. Weill's extremely economical holograph more accurately reflects the scale of the original production. The "Ouvertüre" is an example. It begins with two saxophones, two trumpets, trombone, timpani, and harmonium — seven instruments indicated in the holograph (eight in the printed edition). When the banjo enters on the second page, the second trumpet drops out, remaining "tacet" for the rest of the number. The holograph thus poses a riddle: how did the seven players negotiate such changes of instruments? It could be assumed, in this case, that the banjo and second trumpet parts were played by the same person. But the band parts indicate that the second trumpet part was given to the percussionist. Moreover, that player's part has some passages, not in the holograph, that complement the first trumpet throughout the "Ouvertüre." In this case, then, consultation of the band parts does not solve the riddle so much as compound it. There are two likely solutions: either the banjo player briefly took over the percussionist's role, or the second trumpet player's versatility was such that he could play two instruments at once (a group photograph of the band includes a trumpet player with a drum on his knees—see page 144). The banjo player was quite versatile himself. Besides banjo, his part instructs him to play bandoneon, guitar, and Hawaiian guitar. It even includes several passages for cello (for example, in "I. Dreigroschenfinale"). By marking these passages for cello "ad lib.," however, Weill was presumably making allowances for less versatile players. The total number of instruments required by the score is twenty-three.

The holograph records several renumberings occasioned by cuts, additions, and reorderings. The "Barbarasong"—changed from 13 to 12 to 9—is perhaps the most glaring example. Originally performed by Lucy, it was eventually appropriated by Polly.[30] Lucy lost another number, too: her parodistic aria. (Weill later commented that the actress who eventually played Lucy in the premiere [Kate Kühl] did not have the "good vocal abilities" of the actress for whom the part was conceived.) Her aria was cut, and along with it the whole scene "Kampf um das Eigentum." The scene had been restored by the time the production was in its second *en suite* season at Schiffbauerdamm in October 1929, but the musical number (left unorchestrated by the composer) was not revived.[31] It is therefore missing from the full score. Yet another remarkable feature of the holograph is the indication of Polly as the singer of the "Salomonsong," whereas it is Jenny who sings it in all the published materials. Lotte Lenya must have taken over the number during the rehearsal period, that is, before Weill dispatched the full score. That the change escaped his attention as he completed his revisions may be due to the fact that by that point the number itself had been cut altogether.

In view of the holograph's genesis, the date at the end of the score—23.8.1928—is nothing if not misleading. The composer may have finished a version of the work a week before the premiere, in time for the parts to be copied in Charlottenburg and for the band to be rehearsed. But a week in the theater is a long time, as Weill well knew. Only when the process of realization had run its hectic course, and the work had undergone all manner of revisions, could he truly say that his collaborative efforts were complete.

Here, then, is the score of "*Groschenoper*"—the score Weill eventually submitted, two weeks after the premiere, in response to his publishers' eager inquiry. It is hardly in the state now that it was when Universal Edition received it. Over the last sixty years, the holograph has passed through other hands, some leaving indelible marks—traces, in various colors, of the work's involved performance history. For the most part, those traces were left in the United States, the country where Weill was to become a naturalized citizen. But that is another story.

Notes

1. Weill to Universal Edition (UE), 7 September 1928. "Ich bin augenblicklich noch damit beschäftigt, die Partitur nach den Erfahrungen der hiesigen Aufführung fertig einzurichten, und den Klavierauszug mit dem Textbuch genau in Einklang zu bringen." Original items from the correspondence between Weill and Universal Edition are held in the Wiener Stadtbibliothek. Photocopies of the complete correspondence are in the Weill-Lenya Research Center (WLRC), New York [series 41]. The correspondence is quoted by permission of the Kurt Weill Foundation for Music and Universal Edition. All translations are by the author.
2. The fashion for classics in modern dress started in 1921 with Erich Ziegel's Hamburg production of Schiller's *Die Räuber*, followed in 1922 by Ivan Schmith's modernization of Molière's *Tartuffe* at Berlin's Deutsches Theater. Hermann Röbbeling staged *Hamlet*, with the protagonist wearing a tailcoat ("im Frack"), at Hamburg's Thalia-Theater in 1926. In 1928, apart from the jazzed-up *Beggar's Opera* by Weill and Brecht, Berlin also saw a contemporary-costume staging of *Macbeth*. See Manfred Boetzkes et al., "Modische Anpassung: Klassik im Zeitkostüm," in *Weimarer Republik*, ed. Kunstamt Kreuzberg et al., 3rd ed. (Berlin: Elefanten Press, 1977), 750–51.
3. The extent of Hauptmann's creative contribution to Brecht's plays is a topic of continued scholarly dispute. In the case of *Die Dreigroschenoper*, John Fuegi, citing the Brecht authority Klaus Völker, puts the figure as high as "80 or even 90 percent." See Fuegi, *Brecht and Company: Sex, Politics, and the Making of the Modern Drama* (New York: Grove Press, 1994), 196.
4. (1 September 1928) "Herzlichsten Glückwunsch zum großen Erfolg. Erbitten dringendst Klavierauszug mit Bezeichnung erfolgreichster Einzelnummern." (3 September 1928) "Wir freuen uns aufrichtig über den großen Erfolg der 'Drei-Groschen-Oper.' . . . Wir haben den Klavierauszug durch Herrn Löwy bekommen."
5. Hans Heinsheimer's two sets of memoirs are *Menagerie in F Sharp* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1947) and *Best Regards to Aida* (New York: Knopf, 1968).
6. "August 28 [*sic*], 1928," foreword to Bertolt Brecht, *The Threepenny Opera*, trans. Eric Bentley and Desmond Vesey (New York: Grove Press, 1964), xiv; first published as "That Was a Time," in *Theatre Arts* 40, no. 5 [May 1956], under Lotte Lenya's byline but written by George Davis, based on interviews with Lenya and Elisabeth Hauptmann.
7. The present account relies heavily on the second and third chapters of Stephen Hinton, ed., *Kurt Weill: "The Threepenny Opera"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 9–77.
8. "Die Verzögerung kam daher, daß ich ganze Teile erst neu schreiben mußte, weil sie im Theater noch gebraucht werden. Außerdem mußte ich manches, was ich bei den hiesigen Musikern nur anzusagen brauchte, für die gedruckte Ausgabe erst fixieren."
9. Kurt Weill, *Die Dreigroschenoper*, Musik für alle no. 274 (Berlin: Ullstein-Verlag, 1929). (This is a selection of eleven numbers.)
10. The "production master" for the piano-vocal score (see note 16) has the instrumental introduction inserted on an additional page.
11. A copy of the "Melodram," for example, appears to have belonged to the earlier score. It surfaced at a Viennese antiquarian bookseller in 1992 and is now in the possession of the WLRC [series 12, folder 19], along with a cover page for the entire piano-vocal score. The information on that page, in Weill's hand, indicates that it—and presumably the contents it originally covered—predates the premiere. It reads: "*Kurt Weill / Musik / zu / 'The Beggar's Opera' / (Des Bettlers Oper) / op. 25 / Klavierauszug.*" Weill's post-premiere correspondence with his publisher includes much discussion of "10a" (the "Melodram"). Since that correspondence notes the submission of 10a on a separate sheet, the cover may not relate directly to the item it currently accompanies.
12. Notice that the measures reproduced on the poster are rhythmically more complex than those corresponding in the published piano-vocal score and feature no vocal doubling.
13. See *Entartete Musik: Eine kommentierte Rekonstruktion*, ed. Albrecht Dümling and Peter Girth (Düsseldorf: Landeshauptstadt Düsseldorf, 1988).
14. "Sie haben jetzt den Klavierauszug vollständig. Nr. 6 (Seeräuberjenny), Nr. 2 (Moritat) und Nr. 13 (Ballade v. angen. Leben) folgen in Partitur in kürzester Zeit. Ein genaues Nummerverzeichnis liegt noch einmal bei. Die 'Ballade von der sexuellen Hörigkeit' ist ganz gestrichen. Nr. 12 (Barbarasong) ist in der Partiturfassung, die ich Ihnen schicke, hauptsächlich für Klavier gesetzt, sodaß Sie den Klavierpart wörtlich in den Klavierauszug übernehmen können. Nr. 17 (Salomonsong) ist in der Partiturfassung, die ich Ihnen schicke, für Harmonium gesetzt. Ich bitte Sie, diese Fassung (nicht die in dem Klavierauszug enthaltene) in den gedruckten Klavierauszug zu übernehmen."
15. Fritz Hennenberg, "Weill, Brecht und die 'Dreigroschenoper': Neue Materialien zur Entstehung und Uraufführung," *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 40 (1985): 281–91.
16. The piano-vocal score Weill submitted after the premiere (photocopy in the WLRC [series 10/D7, folder 16]), also in several installments and in response to a cabled request from his publishers, was the basis for the published version, which was arranged by Norbert Gingold. David Drew accurately describes it as a "production master" (*Kurt Weill: A Handbook* [London: Faber; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987], 96). As Drew says, "By far the greater contribution is Weill's." Like the full score, some of it must have been written out "in light of experiences with the current production." It seems unlikely that much, if any of it, was used before the premiere for rehearsal purposes, since it shows few signs of the substantial changes the work went through during the production process.
17. Mackeben's original materials are held by his widow, Toni Mackeben. Photocopies and 35 mm color slides are in the WLRC [series 10/D7, folder 8].
18. The entr'actes suggest the influence of operetta. The "Moritat" inserted as a recurring leitmotiv, on the other hand, may have a double meaning: it both parodies the leitmotivic practices of Wagnerian music-drama and points to the emerging medium of film, where such "underscoring" was to become commonplace. When the full score was eventually published, none of these instructions was included.
19. Of course, even the production of accurate materials could not have guaranteed fidelity in performance. Already on 11 October 1928 Weill wrote to his publishers concerning a production in Frankfurt which intended to make reductions in the orchestra: "I consider this dangerous and beseech you, Herr Direktor Hellmer, strictly to forbid that any changes are made in the music or instrumentation without my consent." ("Ich halte das für sehr gefährlich und bitte Sie, Herrn Direktor Hellmer, streng zu verbieten, irgendwelche Änderungen in der Musik oder in der Instrumentation vorzunehmen, ohne meine Zustimmung einzuholen.")
20. This script (UE 8850) was a joint publication of Felix Bloch Erben, Berlin, and Universal Edition, Vienna. An original copy is in the WLRC [series 20/D7 1928a].
21. See Hinton, *Kurt Weill: "The Threepenny Opera,"* 27–33; and Steve Giles, "Rewriting Brecht: *Die Dreigroschenoper*, 1928–31," *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 30 (1989): 249–79.
22. A recurring topos in the work's reception history has been the notion that any work's popularity threatens to compromise its aesthetic and ideological integrity. Several prominent critics, proceeding from this snobbish assumption, have sought to account for the popularity of *Die Dreigroschenoper* in terms of a misunderstanding of the authors' intentions (see my "Misunderstanding The *Threepenny Opera*," in Hinton, *Kurt Weill: "The Threepenny Opera,"* 181–92). The work's box-office success posed a critical dilemma for those whom Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno described as "the most progressive intellectuals"—a dilemma he first articulated in his piece "Zur Dreigroschenoper," published just months after the premiere. He wrote: "One finds oneself having to bear out doubts concerning the purportedly exalted operetta form, and with reference to the work itself, to reveal its success to be a misunderstanding; ultimately—provided the work stands up—to defend it against that success" (Adorno, "The Threepenny Opera," translated by Hinton in *Kurt Weill: "The Threepenny Opera,"* 129–34).

    Whatever the authors' respective intentions were, Brecht's revisions reflect an apparent change in his, as do his theoretical "Notes," first published three years after the premiere (see Bertolt Brecht, "Notes to *The Threepenny Opera*," in *Collected Plays*, 2, pt.2 [London: Methuen, 1979]). The revisions and "Notes" have been enormously influential, even if using them as the basis of any interpretation invites anachronism. Apart from appeasing his Marxist critics, Brecht's revisions and theories can be seen as providing further, if belated, ammunition for the kind of defense proposed by Adorno and attempted in various ways by later commentators.
23. "Wir wollen den 'Kanonen-Song' und die 'Zuhälter-Ballade' sofort für Salonorchester arrangieren lassen, brauchen aber dazu naturgemäß Ihre Instrumentation als Anhaltspunkt für ein Arrangement."
24. "Wenn man auf diese Weise vom Klavier oder Harmonium aus dirigieren kann, so würde die Herstellung einer richtigen Partitur entfallen können[,] und die Dirigenten könnten vom Klavier oder Harmonium aus das kleine Orchester leiten, wenn diese Stimme entsprechend eingerichtet sind. Sie wissen wohl, daß z.B. bei Operetten niemals eine Partitur gedruckt wird, sondern der Dirigent dirigiert aus dem Klavierauszug. Wir könnten auch den Klavierauszug noch einrichten, wenn die notwendigen Eintragungen noch rasch vorgenommen werden. . . . Wir schreiben diese Zeilen in grosser Eile und müssen noch genau überlegen, ob letzterer Vorschlag wirklich gangbar ist oder ob die Orchesterklavierstimmen ohne Rücksicht auf den Klavierauszug als Direktionsstimme eingerichtet werden soll."
25. "Wir haben gerne davon Kenntnis genommen, daß Sie damit einverstanden sind, daß an Stelle einer Partitur eine Klavier-Directionsstimme [*sic*] angefertigt wird."
26. "In der Klavier-Direktionsstimme finden sich leider eine Unmenge von Fehlern, durch die meine Musik eventuell stark verändert klingen kann."
27. "Ich habe an Mendelssohn noch einmal ausführlich geschrieben und ihn beschworen, für eine anständige Ausführung der Musik zu sorgen. Es wäre vielleicht sehr angebracht, wenn Sie ihm (Hotel Ambassador) meine Originalpartitur der 3 Gr.-O. hinüberschicken würden. Denn die gedruckte Partitur ist recht fehlerhaft und gibt durch die Zusammenziehungen des Dirigierauszugs zu zahlreichen Mißverständnissen Anlaß. Wir müssen ja alles tun um eine erstklassige Ausführung der Musik zu erreichen. . . . es [ist] keine Jazz-Musik im amerikanischen Sinne sondern ein ganz eigener, neuer Klang, der nur durch sorgfältigste Herausarbeitung der Originalpartitur zu erreichen ist."
28. Kurt Weill, *Die Dreigroschenoper*, ed. Karl Heinz Füssl, Philharmonia 400 (Vienna: Universal Edition, [1972]).
29. In the "Ballade von der sexuellen Hörigkeit," for example, Füssl retains the option for the second wind player to use bass clarinet rather than tenor saxophone, even though the marking in the holograph is not in Weill's hand and is in English rather than German. This performance instruction clearly belongs to the later (American) layer of markings discussed in this volume by Kim Kowalke.
30. See Kim H. Kowalke, "In Trivial [?] Pursuit: Who Sings the 'Barbarasong'?" *Kurt Weill Newsletter* 6, no. 2 (fall 1988): 8–11.
31. Kurt Weill, "Zur 'unterdrückten Arie' der Lucy aus der *Dreigroschenoper*," *Die Musik* 25, no. 2 (1932–33): 128; reprinted in Kurt Weill, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Stephen Hinton and Jürgen Schebera, eds. (Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1990), 108.