

Richard Strauss – Der Komponist und sein Werk

**Allitera Verlag**

# MÜNCHNER VERÖFFENTLICHUNGEN ZUR MUSIKGESCHICHTE

Begründet von Thrasybulos G. Georgiades  
Fortgeführt von Theodor Göllner  
Herausgegeben seit 2006  
von Hartmut Schick

Band 77

Richard Strauss  
Der Komponist und sein Werk  
Überlieferung, Interpretation, Rezeption  
Bericht über das internationale Symposium zum 150. Geburtstag  
München, 26.–28. Juni 2014

# Richard Strauss

# Der Komponist und sein Werk

Überlieferung, Interpretation, Rezeption

Bericht über das internationale Symposium  
zum 150. Geburtstag  
München, 26.–28. Juni 2014

Herausgegeben von  
Sebastian Bolz, Adrian Kech  
und Hartmut Schick

Allitera Verlag

Weitere Informationen über den Verlag und sein Programm unter:  
[www.allitera.de](http://www.allitera.de)

Juni 2017  
Allitera Verlag  
Ein Verlag der Buch&media GmbH, München  
© 2017 Buch&media GmbH, München  
© 2017 der Einzelbeiträge bei den AutorInnen  
Satz und Layout: Johanna Conrad, Augsburg  
Printed in Germany · ISBN 978-3-86906-990-6

# Inhalt

Vorwort .....	9
Abkürzungsverzeichnis .....	13

## **Richard Strauss in seiner Zeit**

Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen

Des Meisters Lehrjahre.

Der junge Richard Strauss und seine Meininger Ausbildungszeit bei Hans von Bülow .....	17
---	----

Dietmar Schenk

Berlins »Richard-Strauss-Epoche«.

Richard Strauss und das Musikleben im kaiserlichen Berlin .....	37
---	----

Dörte Schmidt

Meister – Freunde – Zeitgenossen.

Richard Strauss und Gerhart Hauptmann .....	51
---	----

Albrecht Dümling

»... dass die Statuten der Stagma dringend zeitgemässer Revision bedürfen«.

Richard Strauss und das musikalische Urheberrecht 1933 / 1934 .....	73
---	----

## **Richard Strauss und das Orchester**

Stefan Schenk und Bernhold Schmid

»... es ist mir mitunter schon der Gedanke aufgetaucht,  
einige Partien umzuinstrumentieren.«

Einblicke in die Werkstatt des jungen Strauss anhand seiner Instrumentations-Überarbeitung des <i>Macbeth</i> .....	111
--	-----

Hartmut Schick	
»Neue Gedanken müssen sich neue Formen suchen«:	
Die Tondichtungen von Richard Strauss und das Reprisesproblem. . . . .	135
Stefan Keym	
Ausklang oder offenes Ende?	
Dramaturgien der Schlussgestaltung in den Tondichtungen von	
Richard Strauss und ihr historischer Kontext . . . . .	167
Bernd Edelman	
Vom Bayerischen Defiliermarsch zu Gustav Mahler.	
»Poetischer Kontrapunkt« im <i>Don Quixote</i> von Richard Strauss . . . . .	191
Achim Hofer	
»Seiner Majestät dem Kaiser und König Wilhelm II.	
in tiefster Ehrfurcht gewidmet.«	
Richard Strauss' Märsche 1905–1907 . . . . .	259
Carsten Schmidt	
Die Uraufführung der <i>Alpensinfonie</i> im Licht bislang unbeachteter Quellen . .	295

## **Richard Strauss und das Musiktheater**

Adrian Kech	
Kritik als kreatives Potenzial.	
Revidierte Komposition in den Hofmannsthal-Opern von Richard Strauss . .	313
Walter Werbeck	
Richard Strauss und die Operette . . . . .	335
Robert Maschka	
Fortschreibungen:	
Der Tantaliden-Clan in Richard Strauss' <i>Elektra</i> und <i>Ägyptischer Helena</i>	
sowie in Manfred Trojahn's <i>Orest</i> . . . . .	353

Arne Stollberg  
»Übergang zum Geiste der Musik«.  
Ästhetische Diskurse und intertextuelle Spuren in Strauss' *Daphne* . . . . . 381

Ulrich Konrad  
Glucks Drama aus Wagners Geist in Strauss' Händen.  
Die Bearbeitung der Tragédie opéra *Iphigénie en Tauride* . . . . . 399

### **Richard Strauss als Liedkomponist**

Andreas Pernpeintner  
Der späte Strauss und seine frühen Lieder . . . . . 425

Birgit Lodes  
»Rot« versus »tot«:  
*Blindenklage* von Karl Friedrich Henckell (1898) und Richard Strauss (1906) . . 439

Matthew Werley  
»Ach, wie hatten jene Zeiten Kraft«.  
Erinnerungskultur, Landschaft und Richard Strauss'  
*Blick vom oberen Belvedere* . . . . . 469

Reinhold Schlötterer  
Musikalisch-Elementares bei *Im Abendrot* von Richard Strauss . . . . . 497

### **Richard Strauss und die USA**

Wolfgang Rathert  
Richard Strauss und die Musikkritik in den USA . . . . . 517

Claudia Heine  
Objekte von ideellem und materiellem Wert.  
Wege der Überlieferung von Strauss-Autografen in die USA . . . . . 533

Morten Kristiansen  
The Works of Richard Strauss in the American Repertoire:  
A Preliminary Study . . . . . 559

Bryan Gilliam

Richard Strauss Reception in America after World War II:

My Straussian Journey ..... 583

Autorinnen und Autoren ..... 595



## Vorwort

Der 150. Geburtstag von Richard Strauss am 11. Juni 2014 war für das Institut für Musikwissenschaft der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München und das dort angesiedelte, 2011 gegründete Forschungsprojekt *Kritische Ausgabe der Werke von Richard Strauss* der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften ein willkommener Anlass, die internationale Strauss-Forschung zu einem großen Symposium in die Geburtsstadt des Komponisten einzuladen. Der vorliegende Band präsentiert in schriftlicher Form die Ergebnisse dieser Tagung, die vom 26. bis 28. Juni 2014 in den Räumen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften München stattfand und durch zwei Konzerte ergänzt wurde: einen von Andreas Pernpointner moderierten Liederabend mit Anja-Nina Bahrmann und Dieter Paier sowie ein großes Konzert zum Thema »Richard Strauss und Gustav Mahler«, das vom Chor des Bayerischen Rundfunks unter Leitung von Peter Dijkstra, dem Rezitator Georg Blüml und dem Pianisten Anthony Spiri gestaltet wurde.

Da die Werke von Richard Strauss – zumindest die Tondichtungen und die bekannteren unter den Opern und den Liedern – im Repertoire der Opern- und Konzerthäuser auf der ganzen Welt prominent vertreten sind, bedurfte es des Richard-Strauss-Jahres 2014 im Prinzip nicht, um an den Komponisten zu erinnern. Eigentümlich war aber doch die ambivalente Art und Weise, in der die Medien, zumal am 150. Geburtstag, das Phänomen Richard Strauss thematisierten – nämlich zumeist mit einem Unterton, aus dem man deutliche Vorbehalte heraushören konnte, wohl auch ein Unbehagen am Publikumserfolg dieses vermutlich meistaufgeführten Komponisten des 20. Jahrhunderts. »Klangzauberer im Zwielficht« titelte eine der großen deutschsprachigen Zeitungen, »Voller Widersprüche« eine andere, »Strauss – ein schwieriges Erbe«, »Gebt dem Mann einen Schatten!« und (durchaus doppelsinnig) »Die überlebte Moderne« lauteten die Überschriften weiterer Artikel über einen »Komponisten, der noch immer zum Widerspruch reizt«. Leben und Werk von Strauss wurden gegeneinander ausgespielt, bis hin zu Eleonore Büning's Aufruf, seine »himmlische Musik« endlich nicht mehr »von seinem spießigen irdischen Lebenslauf zu trennen.«

Mindestens ebenso interessant wie die trotz aller Popularität schwierige und komplizierte Musik von Strauss scheint für die mediale Öffentlichkeit immer noch das ambivalente Verhalten des Komponisten gegenüber den Machthabern in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus, sein ausgeprägter Geschäftssinn oder sein betont bürgerlicher, dem romantischen Geniebild sich entziehender Habitus zu sein – ungeachtet dessen, dass solche Themen mittlerweile recht gut aufgearbeitet sind, wie nicht zuletzt das 2014 von Walter Werbeck herausgegebene *Richard Strauss Handbuch* zeigt. Musik und Biografie halten aber immer noch mehr als genug Forschungsdefizite und anspruchsvolle Heraus-

forderungen bereit, denen zu widmen sich lohnt. Bereits der Umstand, dass Strauss nach wie vor polarisiert und zum Widerspruch reizt, zeigt jedenfalls, dass es bei diesem Komponisten noch viel zu diskutieren und auszufechten gibt.

Nachdem die Musikwissenschaft das Thema Richard Strauss in den Nachkriegs-Jahrzehnten weitgehend gemieden hatte (wie Bryan Gilliams Beitrag in diesem Band illustriert), entwickelte sich im Wesentlichen erst in den letzten 30 Jahren national und international eine ernsthafte, kritische Strauss-Forschung, die seitdem stetig wächst und inzwischen mit dem *Richard-Strauss-Quellenverzeichnis* ([www.rsi-rsqv.de](http://www.rsi-rsqv.de)) und dem Langzeitprojekt *Kritische Ausgabe der Werke von Richard Strauss* auch eine solide philologische Basis bekommt. Bahnbrechend gewirkt haben hier besonders die Forschungen von Franz Trenner, Bryan Gilliam und Walter Werbeck sowie die Aktivitäten des Richard-Strauss-Instituts in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, aber auch die 1999 in München veranstaltete Konferenz *Richard Strauss und die Moderne* und die gleichzeitige große Strauss-Ausstellung der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek zum 50. Todestag des Komponisten mit ihrem wunderbaren Ausstellungskatalog.

Für jüngere WissenschaftlerInnen und aktuell Studierende scheinen die alten, namentlich von Theodor W. Adorno geschürten Vorbehalte gegenüber dem »begabten Kegelbruder« (so Thomas Mann) und seinem angeblichen Verrat an der Moderne schon weitgehend obsolet geworden zu sein. Und in einer Zeit, die bereits durch die Postmoderne hindurchgegangen ist, spricht nicht zuletzt auch das Interesse von Komponisten wie Helmut Lachenmann, Wolfgang Rihm, Manfred Trojahn oder Jörg Widmann an den komplexen Partituren von Richard Strauss für dessen wiederkehrende Aktualität. Dass dabei irritierende und problematische Aspekte im Leben und Wirken des Komponisten nicht ausgeblendet werden, versteht sich von selbst und zeigen auch die Beiträge des vorliegenden Bandes, die einen weiten Bogen spannen – von biografisch-kulturgeschichtlichen und rezeptionsästhetischen Themen (mit dem Fokus auf Strauss' Berliner Zeit und seiner Wirkung in den USA) über die Interpretation von Orchesterwerken, Opern und Liedern bis hin zu philologischen Fragen.

Nicht weniger als vier Generationen von Strauss-Forschern haben zum Symposium von 2014 beigetragen und ihre Beiträge in vielfach erweiterter Form hier publiziert: vom mittlerweile 91-jährigen Nestor der Strauss-Forschung, Reinhold Schlötterer – der 1977 an der Universität München die bis heute existierende Richard-Strauss-Arbeitsgruppe begründet hatte –, bis hin zu sechs Jahrzehnte jüngeren Mitarbeitern der Münchner Forschungsstelle Richard-Strauss-Ausgabe. Zwei Namen allerdings fehlen tragischerweise. Roswitha Schlötterer-Traimer verstarb im Oktober 2013 und konnte so die Tagung, auf die sie sich gefreut hatte, nicht mehr erleben und berechnen. Salome Reiser, die als Editionsleiterin der Richard-Strauss-Ausgabe die kritische Ausgabe der Oper *Salome* vorbereitet und beim Symposium noch referiert hatte, erlag im Dezember 2014 ihrer schweren Krankheit. Dem ehrenden Gedenken an beide Kolleginnen sei dieser Band gewidmet.

Viele haben dabei mitgewirkt, das Symposium von 2014 und den Druck des vorliegenden Bandes zu ermöglichen. Allen voran gebührt der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und ihren MitarbeiterInnen Dank für die Überlassung der Räume und Technik sowie die organisatorische Hilfe bei der Durchführung des Symposiums. Den Kollegen Jürgen May und Wolfgang Rathert danken wir für die Mitwirkung bei der Planung des Programms. Als Förderer haben die Tagung und die begleitenden Konzerte finanziell großzügig unterstützt: die Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, die Regierung von Oberbayern und der Kulturfonds Bayern mit dem vom Bayerischen Staatsministerium für Bildung und Kultus, Wissenschaft und Kunst aufgelegten Förderprogramm zum Richard-Strauss-Jahr 2014, ferner das Kulturreferat der Landeshauptstadt München, der Verein der Freunde der Musikwissenschaft München und das Institut für Musikwissenschaft der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. Ihnen allen gilt unser herzlicher Dank. Der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft danken wir zudem für die Förderung der Drucklegung dieses Bandes aus Mitteln der Union der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften und dem Münchner Allitera Verlag für die umsichtige verlegerische Betreuung. Für die Reproduktionsgenehmigung für Quellen- und Notenabbildungen sind wir der Familie Strauss und den betreffenden Verlagen zu Dank verpflichtet. Und nicht zuletzt sei allen Autorinnen und Autoren herzlich gedankt für ihre Beteiligung am Symposium und an der vorliegenden Publikation. Zusammen mit ihnen hoffen wir auf eine breite und produktive Resonanz.

München, im Februar 2017

Die Herausgeber

# Richard Strauss Reception in America after World War II: My Straussian Journey

Bryan Gilliam

This essay, because of its partly autobiographical nature, cannot be considered objective, since I was very much a part of much of this American reception history. This essay serves as a kind of footnote to Wolfgang Rathert's entry in the *Richard Strauss Handbuch* (»Strauss und die Musikwissenschaft«),<sup>1</sup> which does not tell the entire story; indeed, among other things, the bibliography excludes my *Richard Strauss's Elektra* (1991), the first full-length book on Strauss sketches, and my edited volume *Richard Strauss. New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work* (1992), which was an outgrowth of the first international fully musicological conference on the composer in May 1990, held in America and not in Germany.<sup>2</sup> I hope that my »footnote« will serve as a reminder to a younger generation of German musicologists who may not have been aware of some of the American roots of Strauss scholarship. My aim is to outline three areas of importance for a study of American Strauss reception: first, the academic (the role Strauss played in the construction of music history courses and textbooks), second, the critical (from the everyday level of newspaper journalism to Adornean critical theory), and, third, the musicological (how did Strauss musicology get started after the second world war?).

The first thing to understand in American musical academy of the 1960s through the 1980s is that there were certain general covert notions of good and bad in music, especially with regard to music of the »long 19<sup>th</sup> century« (1800 through World War I).<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Wolfgang Rathert, »Strauss und die Musikwissenschaft,« in: *StraussHb*, p. 531–45.

2 Bryan Gilliam, *Richard Strauss's Elektra. Studies in Musical Genesis and Structure*, Oxford 1991 and ed., *Richard Strauss. New Perspectives on the Composer and His Work*, Durham, NC 1992. Paperback edition 1997, with a new introduction by Michael Kennedy. The first such musicological conference in Germany (now reunited) was not held until nine years later, in Munich (»Richard Strauss und die Moderne,« July 1999). For six years there had been symposia on various composers in connection with the then East German Leipzig Gewandhaus Music Festival, organized and run by the late conductor, Kurt Masur. In October 1989, just before the fall of the wall, the theme was Richard Strauss and a festival program was printed (Peters) in 1991.

3 Many of these notions were discussed more than three decades ago in Janet Levy's »Covert and Casual Values in Recent Writings about Music,« in: *Journal of Musicology* 5 (1987), No. 1, p. 3–27, but her study did not specifically concern Strauss.

These are notions I grew up with and accepted at face value as a young student and gradually came to question as I got older. These were the virtues and sins of my youth, sometimes overtly described, but more often written between the lines. To remind myself properly of this era of American music history, I consulted old out-of-date textbooks (first-edition textbooks by Richard Crocker, Donald N. Ferguson, Donald Jay Grout, David Hughes, Paul Henry Lang, George Machlis, and others) from the library vault making notes along the way, and the virtues stood out with remarkable consistency: motivic economy (American notion of not being a spendthrift), organicism (proper growth from seed to flower), chamber music or chamber-like effects when talking about orchestral music, polyphony (as opposed to homophony), and well-conceived developmental spaces.<sup>4</sup>

The great sins were largely the opposite, especially the grandiose (theatrical), the wasteful, and the eclectic. In the case of music after World War I the same holds true, but we can now add the tonal, the affirmative, and the popular. I should add here that American narratives about the demands of history and musical style were made without much knowledge about Adorno's agenda (he comes into play more in 1980s America), but rather that of Schoenberg (who was teaching at UCLA) and, more importantly, his students and their students who were then teaching 20<sup>th</sup>-century music courses at major colleges and universities. In the 1960s and '70s, most music departments still did not see 20<sup>th</sup>-century music as a fit topic to be taught by musicologists, rather it was taught by composers or theorists.

To discuss Strauss reception in American musicology in the 1950s through the 1970s is easy: there was little, if any; my article on Strauss for *The Journal of the American Musicological Society* was the first.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, judging by the early decades of JAMS, there were relatively few topics after Beethoven that seemed of scholarly importance, hence the establishment of the journal *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* in 1977, whose founding editors recognized a large gap between a prodigious repertoire in the concert hall countered by a significant dearth in scholarly journals. It soon became one of the most popular of all American musicological journals.

A comment on Strauss made in 1956 by Joseph Kerman, one of the leading musicologists of his generation, illuminates the sense of values held by many high-modernist musicologists of the time. In it he decried Strauss's *Rosenkavalier* as being »false through and through [...] insincere in every gesture.«<sup>6</sup> He went on to find a kind of degeneracy in its music, with its tendency to spread unwanted bacteria, a chilling

4 Janet Levy was among the first to cite these assumed virtues, *ibid.*

5 Bryan Gilliam, »Friede im Innern: Strauss's Public and Private Worlds in the Mid 1930s«, in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57 (2005), No. 3, p. 565–598.

6 Joseph Kerman, *Opera as Drama*, New York 1956, p. 262. The book has remained popular over the decades and celebrated a 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition (Berkeley, CA 2005).

concept that echoes the rhetoric of a Third Reich vanquished only eleven years earlier. Kerman's critical excess includes the notion of Strauss spreading filth: »anything [Strauss] touched he soiled as pervasively as the waltz soils the texture of music.«<sup>7</sup> Here we see a good example of the »seed to flower« organicism trope, where the seed's DNA has somehow gone awry.

There are two remarkable aspects to Kerman's vitriol: first, the disturbing references to musical degeneracy (neither the first nor the last among English-speaking critics), but the second is the polemical emotion invested in such an over-heated argument. No musicologist, to my knowledge, criticized Kerman in published form after his attack; indeed, a survey of textbooks from that time and shortly thereafter show similar indulgences: Strauss's »distressing decline of power,« »a great talent groping,« »a tired man, largely bereft of original inventiveness, who had fallen back on lavender-scented Romanticism.«<sup>8</sup> This latter description is a disturbing topos with roots reaching down to Charles Ives and his homophobic ranting against »sissy« and »lily« composers.<sup>9</sup> Thus, on one side we have health, power, masculinity, and toughness vs. decadence, degeneracy, and aromatic fatigue. Charles Rosen in his essay »Who's afraid of the Avant-Garde« (1998) declared that »it is the art that is tough and that resists immediate appreciation that has the best chance of enduring and returning [...] [Composers should] pay no heed to the pressures of the music business.«<sup>10</sup> It is as if such tough music were tannic wine, needing years of bottle aging in the cellar before it could properly be appreciated. Or perhaps a better analogy would be Adorno's bottled messages (Flaschenpost) containing »New Music« enduring and hoping to find, one day, somewhere, a more sympathetic understanding?<sup>11</sup>

I cannot resist the Adornean allusion because it illustrates a problem for Strauss's reception here in the United States where there was, as stated above, no real musicological work done on Adorno in the 1950s and 1960s, despite the 1964 English translation of Adorno's essay marking the one hundredth anniversary of Strauss's birth in *Perspectives of New Music* (1965). It was published by people who admitted they did not fully understand it, but merely wanted to commemorate the Strauss centennial with something negative. I know this first-hand from an e-mail I received in 2004 after I had written an article on *Daphne* for the *New York Times*, though the mes-

7 Ibid.

8 Donald N. Ferguson, *A History of Musical Thought*, New York 1948, p. 559. Peter Yates, *Twentieth-Century Music*, New York 1967, p. 70. Paul Henry Lang, *The Experience of Opera*, New York 1973, p. 260.

9 David Michael Hertz, »Ives's Concord Sonata and the Texture of Music,« in: *Ives and his World*, ed. by J. Peter Burkholder, Princeton, NJ 1996, p. 99.

10 Charles Rosen, »Who's Afraid of the Avant-Garde?«, in: *New York Review of Books*, 14 May 1998.

11 See Adorno, »Schoenberg and Progress,« in: *The Philosophy of New Music*, transl. by Robert Hullot-Kentor, Minneapolis, MN 2006, p. 102. My emphasis.

sage denied any negative intent.<sup>12</sup> There was no American Strauss–Adorno discourse even as late as the 1970s,<sup>13</sup> when some of the badly translated Continuum Books started appearing. Thus, for years, young non-German speaking Americans reading Adorno did not appreciate the difference between »modern music« and »the New Music.«<sup>14</sup> They understood neither the immensity of his social-musical project nor young Adorno’s huge emotional investment in Strauss’s music before he had joined the Institut für Sozialforschung, which is why I published Adorno’s 1924 Strauss essay in English over two decades ago.<sup>15</sup>

In 1924, Strauss’s musical atheism disappointed the young, idealistic proto-Marxian Adorno, just 21 years old, who saw a great but self-satisfied, soulless composer. He recognized in Strauss a neo-Romanticism with a fully modern attitude. What he did not (or could not) articulate at that time was Schoenberg’s Modernism with his thoroughly neo-Romantic attitude. Adorno’s favorite 19<sup>th</sup>-century composers were unable to solve this crisis of the modern age: to bridge the schism between subject (what he called the »psychologisches Ich«) and object; to bring power back to the older authentic forms, whether it was Mendelssohn’s »shivering classicism«, Schumann’s »block sonata repetitions« or Bruckner’s »congregationless chorales«.<sup>16</sup> Wagner tried and failed with the impotent wave of a magician’s hand, but what unnerved Adorno was that Strauss seemed not to care. Read in this context (a context missing from earlier American writing on Strauss), Ernst Bloch’s remark – that he possessed a »profound superficiality« – is hardly a shocking indictment.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, the observation is not inaccurate, given his rejection of music as idealistic, redemptive, or even transcendent (unlike Schoenberg and the followers of the New Music). It was a useful indictment for many American high modernists who attacked Strauss by quoting Bloch and Adorno in words and phrases without knowing their proper contexts.

These larger contexts or constructions were not the stuff of American textbooks on 19<sup>th</sup>- and 20<sup>th</sup>-century music, nor were they a part of a larger American musicological discourse shortly after World War II. In 1960s American modernism, style and ideology were hopelessly intertwined in a dialogue that prized technical progress above all

12 »Why the Dying Richard Strauss Couldn’t Get Enough of *Daphne*«, in: *New York Times*, 5 September 2004.

13 Rose Subotnik’s »Adorno’s Diagnosis of Beethoven’s Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition,« in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29 (1976), No. 2, p. 242–275 was the first of its kind in American musicology.

14 See, example, Theodor W. Adorno, *Philosophy of Modern Music*, transl. by Anne G. Mitchell and Wesley V. Blomster, New York 1973. This unfortunate situation was rectified in 2006 (see fn. 10). My emphasis.

15 Theodor W. Adorno, »Richard Strauss at 60,« transl. by Susan Gillespie, in: *Richard Strauss and his World*, ed. by Bryan Gilliam, Princeton, NJ 1992, p. 406–15.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 408.

17 Ernst Bloch, *Essays on the Philosophy of Music*, transl. by Peter Palmer, Cambridge 1985, p. 38.

else. It was basically a note-driven discourse about the »Tendenz des Materials«, insulated from contemporary discussions in arts and literature that drew from criticism, aesthetics, and other disciplines. A major thrust of the 1980s and '90s-vintage, »New Musicology,« now as historical a term as the »New Music,« was to break through such insulation. Conferences on music and modernism(s) have become routine to the American Musicological Society, as if to compensate for the myopic discourse in the 1960s and '70s.

Back then, the Idea was far more important than the audience; any American composer who gained a following outside the academy was viewed with suspicion. Worse yet – given that composers were, after World War II, mostly financed by music departments – were those composers of financial independence, even worse, financial success. In his textbook entry on Strauss, the wealthy musicologist Joseph Machlis, who created a financial empire of music appreciation textbooks, accused Strauss of charging high fees, remarking that »it was his ambition to become a millionaire.«<sup>18</sup> And why did Strauss seek financial success? So that he could stop conducting and dedicate himself solely to composing, and unfortunately that dream collapsed during World War I, when his savings in British banks were impounded. The American Aaron Copland certainly fulfilled such a dream as did Elliott Carter, who of course was a millionaire at birth. Indeed, the British newspaper *The Guardian* compiled a list of the ten richest composers of all time and poor Strauss did not even make the top ten. Among those who did were Verdi, Rossini, Puccini, Tchaikovsky and Rachmaninov. George Gershwin topped the list.<sup>19</sup> What are we to make of the fact that none were even German?

To sum up Strauss's sins: the composer drew no sustenance from the inspiration of everyday 20<sup>th</sup>-century life; he showed great promise in dissonant, chromatic activity but gave it up; and he lived too long and then dried up as a composer (»a distressing decline of power«). Yet, there was one provocative voice that believed all this hand-wringing to be utter nonsense, and this was the pianist, conductor, and writer Glenn Gould. He remarked that by following an artificial path dictated by others, these »music chronologists,« those who followed the »time-style equation,« ignored the fundamental musical integrity of Strauss's compositions of any era. Gould would add that art is not material technology that gets better with time, and, thus, we cannot make a comparison between Strauss and Stockhausen the way we can between a typewriter and a computer.<sup>20</sup>

But the North American Gould was swimming against a powerful stream of post-war absolutism, where historical materialism was all that seemed to matter. The Nazis

---

18 Joseph Machlis, *An Introduction to Contemporary Music*, New York 1961, p. 71.

19 Kirsty Scott, »Gershwin Leads Composers Rich List,« in: *The Guardian*, 29 August 2005.

20 Glenn Gould, »An Argument for Strauss,« in: *The Glenn Gould Reader*, ed. by Tim Page, New York 1984, p. 86.



had banned the work of Schoenberg, whose compositions were simultaneously forbidden fruit in Germany and a symbol of fascist resistance in the United States. Twelve-tone music, according to Krenek, was a musical protest for émigré Austro-German composers in North America.<sup>21</sup> After the war, serialism, still detested by one segment of the allied forces, namely the Soviet Union, promised purity – an escape from the extra-musical baggage of the long 19<sup>th</sup> century. In short, it escaped the political dimension of musical reception that had been so damaging during the Third Reich.

But – of course – nothing could have been further from the truth. As Amy Beal has shown, the CIA had been secretly funding the music seminars in Darmstadt for years, encouraging serialism as a way both insuring a proper cultural rebirth in Germany after the »Stunde Null« and as a way of poking the Soviets in the eye with the dreaded »formalism« now on a wider international scale.<sup>22</sup> In short, Darmstadt was, in part, the spearhead of a musical cold war of tremendous importance for the allies and a new generation of Germans and like-minded Europeans. Arnold Schoenberg was dead, according to Boulez, and it was time to look to the musical purities of Anton Webern as an important new musical paradigm. This pure composer not only enthusiastically supported the Nazis but applauded the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, saying that it brought »a completely healthy race« into the war.<sup>23</sup> After the Austrian Anschluss he received a stipendium from the Reichsmusikkammer, which compromises notions that he was hated by the Nazi government. We come back to Joseph Kerman who, in his lucrative music appreciation text entitled *Listen*, not only found no degeneracy in Webern's music but implied that he was a committed socialist.<sup>24</sup> I digressed on Webern only because it points to the serious problems with the mix of social and musical politics. In the case of Darmstadt, the musical politics were too important at the time to be compromised by Webern's overt fascist beliefs.

So far I have dealt with criticism and historiography. I am coming back to it, but I want to enjoin my discussion with musicology. So let us begin with what in America we call the \$64,000 question: the persistent gap between Strauss's popularity in American concert halls and opera houses and an academic or critical discourse, especially in the 1960s, '70s, and '80s, that seemed to ignore the composer. I will begin

21 Ernst Krenek, »A composer's influences,« in: *Perspectives of New Music* 3 (1964), No. 1, p. 38.

22 Amy C. Beal, »Negotiating Cultural Allies: American Music in Darmstadt, 1946–1956,« in: *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 53 (2000), No. 1, p. 113.

23 Hans and Rosaleen Moldenhauer, *Anton von Webern. A Chronicle of His Life and Work*, New York 1979, p. 529. In a letter to Joseph Hueber, he described Japan's entry into the war as a »*decisive turn for the better!* [...] a mighty event! I really cannot tell you how much it preoccupies me.« (Webern's emphases.) Despite various references to Hitler in the Moldenhauer's text, there is no mention of him in the index. See Kathryn Bailey, *The Life of Webern*, Cambridge 1998, p. 168 f.

24 Joseph Kerman, *Listen*, New York 1980, p. 541.

with what I knew, as a naïve researcher, at the age of 22, who began graduate school at Harvard University with an overwhelming interest in Strauss opera but who never thought I could get a PhD in that field.

I knew that before becoming a legitimate musicologist, I first had to master seminars on medieval notation, on Josquin and the pre-Parisian chanson, and then on Bach and Handel. That was the reality of my field as it existed at my department in 1975. Musicology of the 1960s and 1970s was decidedly positivistic: we had scholarly editing, performance practice, and sketch studies. The musicologist – by avoiding the »dangerously accessible« – could thus avoid being called a mere journalist.

So I led a double life: the life of my coursework and the life of my real interests in Strauss, which involved a lot of unguided reading and especially a lot of outside listening. Then in my 3<sup>rd</sup> year came young Christoph Wolff, who was then working on Mozart piano concerti, but also on another project in the pipeline, namely a new edition of Hindemith's *Cardillac* for the Schott scholarly edition of his complete works.<sup>25</sup> In this context, he offered a seminar on 20<sup>th</sup>-century German opera, the first of its kind at Harvard: there we covered such composers as Alexander von Zemlinsky, Max von Schillings, Franz Schreker, Felix Weingartner, Paul Hindemith, and Kurt Weill. It was a genuine epiphany, and I was able to see Strauss in a far larger and richer context.

It soon came the time for me to choose a dissertation topic. I had a colleague, James Hepokoski, a few years ahead of me, whose topic was rejected. His adviser, John Ward, director of graduate studies, rejected his proposal for a dissertation on Sibelius symphonies. Such a subject was a matter for journalists, not high-minded musicologists. Was Sibelius not, according to René Leibowitz, »le plus mauvais compositeur du monde«?<sup>26</sup> Was he not, according to Adorno, a composer who invalidates the standards of musical quality »from Bach to Schoenberg«?<sup>27</sup>

Hepokoski came up with a compelling strategy. What »journalism« lacked was methodology! If our musical subjects seemed untimely, we could engage them with the latest musicological methodologies, and what was more »cutting edge« than creating editions and undertaking sketch studies, a rich and re-popularized tradition (in the 1970s and '80s), going back to the great Beethoven studies. Though Hepokoski gave up on Sibelius, he compromised by embracing Verdi's *Falstaff* and all its editorial problems. I stuck with Strauss and began working on *Daphne*, for entirely by chance our library had recently purchased one of 13 sketchbooks. Our dissertations

25 Paul Hindemith, *Cardillac. Oper in drei Akten op. 39*, 3 vol., ed. by Christoph Wolff (= Sämtliche Werke I.4), Mainz 1979/80.

26 Andrew Barnett, *Sibelius*, New Haven, CT 2007, p. 353.

27 Theodor W. Adorno, »Glosse über Sibelius,« in: *Impromptus*, Frankfurt am Main 1970, p. 88–92: »Wenn Sibelius gut ist, dann sind die Maßstäbe der musikalischen Qualität als des Beziehungsreichtums, der Artikulation, der Einheit in der Mannigfaltigkeit, der Vielfalt im Einen hinfällig, die von Bach bis Schönberg perennieren.«

were advised by some of the world's most famous non-specialists: for Hepokoski, it was David Hughes, a specialist in gothic polyphony, and, for me it was Christoph Wolff, a world authority on Bach. I knew I was going to have to be self-taught and that I would make a lot of mistakes, but – as a young, naïve, scholar – I was sure that I had for me in Germany a bedrock of Strauss scholars at universities and institutes who could help direct the course of my Strauss education. Of course, I soon learned from two slightly older American scholars that such was not the case.

These were two American musicology students who worked on Strauss, but neither of whom went into musicology: Barbara Petersen (who served as a vice president at Broadcast Music Incorporated) and Charlotte Erwin, who turned to the field of law. I spoke with Erwin, a graduate student at Yale, for several hours' time in 1978 at an American Musicological Society meeting and learned some very large fundamental things: there was no Strauss library or institute, no academic curriculum for Strauss, the manuscript archive was a bank vault in downtown Garmisch, and the sketchbooks were kept in shoeboxes in Alice Strauss's bedroom. However, and this was very important, there were certain individuals working outside academe or, at least outside their trained fields, who could be very helpful. I should add that there was a Strauss-Gesellschaft that I soon found out was more like the Wagner Societies in America (music lovers who favored a particular composer), but the Strauss-Gesellschaft sponsored the editing of correspondences and catalogues, which became very important for all of us.

In fact there was a certain methodology that we Americans developed for ourselves, one that I explained to younger musicologists, including my students: Charles Youmans, Michael Cooper, Morten Kristiansen, and others. The first stop was Palestrinastraße 21a where one first met with Franz Trenner for Brotzeit. He was the gatekeeper for Frau Alice and the Garmisch villa and the Brotzeit was really an informal interview. If you passed, he would phone her and set up a visit; he would also put you in touch with Reinhold and Roswitha Schlötterer and his Munich Strauss Arbeitsgruppe, which met in the evening in his office at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität. Trenner's then brand new sketchbook catalogue was my bible (despite its frustrating problems, inconsistencies, mistakes, and omissions), and it was my only guide as I went through those shoeboxes full of sketchbooks. The situation was pretty much the same in Vienna: no institute, library, or Stiftung. But there was, of course, Günther Brosche, who headed the International Richard Strauss Gesellschaft, again not a group of scholars but committed lovers of the music of Richard Strauss. He knew the location of every Viennese sketchbook, manuscript, and libretto folio from memory and helped me immensely during my *Daphne* work. And there was, of course, the friendly and helpful Otto Strasser, head of the archive of the Vienna Philharmonic, to whom Joseph Gregor had given his various versions of the *Daphne* libretto.

As I come to the end of my little autobiography, I just wish to emphasize that at the relatively young age of 35 (in 1988), I soon came to realize that if a real international

musicological discourse were to be established, it would not be in then West Germany, for there was no money and no institutional interest that I could see. I discussed this issue at length with my colleague, Larry Todd, and he suggested that I organize a conference in the United States, and thanks to the United States government in the form of a very generous gift from the National Endowment for the Humanities I was able to do so. I viewed it as a kind of Marshall Plan for Strauss research. I was now able to contact high-profile American musicologists whom I knew had an interest in Strauss and also bring over my colleagues from Germany and Austria.

Lewis Lockwood, a former professor and great Beethoven scholar, often spoke of his interest in *Rosenkavalier* and the element of time, and he agreed to participate as did George Buelow, the Heinen scholar, who had co-written (along with Donald Davian) a book on *Ariadne auf Naxos*.<sup>28</sup> Another friend from graduate school, Stephen Hefling – though a Mahler scholar – was happy to come up with a Mahler–Strauss topic. I had known of James Hepokoski’s interest in form and narrative in *Don Juan* since we were classmates, and he was delighted to present it to an audience. A former student, Pamela Potter, agreed to cover Strauss and the National Socialists. Larry Todd, my Duke colleague, and Kofi Agawu, a former Duke professor, agreed to speak as well. Barbara Petersen, who worked at BMI at the time agreed to read a paper about composers’ societies founded by Strauss that served as models to BMI.

And, finally, the scholars who had been so kind to me – Reinhold and Roswitha Schlötterer as well as Günter Brosche – participated as well. I even got an American subsidy for a special graduate session, which featured two Germans and one American: Sabine Kurth (now in the music department of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek), Annette Unger, and Scott Warfield (a professor of musicology in Florida). It was a great conference and produced a wonderful volume of essays, and, again, I am sorry it was omitted in the bibliography of the *Strauss Handbuch*, for it was a landmark in the history of late post-war Strauss musicology.<sup>29</sup>

Shortly after this conference, Leon Botstein contacted me asking whether I would be his advisor for a Strauss festival that he was planning for Bard College in 1992. I agreed and was able to get more American scholars (such as Botstein, Michael Steinberg, Timothy Jackson, and Derrick Puffett) to participate as well as to publish some important German essays for the first time in English: not only the early Adorno essay but ones by Rudolf Louis, Willi Schuh, and Paul Bekker, among others.<sup>30</sup> These two back-to-back conferences and their published volumes marked the major turnaround for American Strauss reception, and I am proud to have been a part of the

---

28 Donald Daviau and George Buelow, *The Ariadne auf Naxos of Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Richard Strauss*, Chapel Hill, NC 1975.

29 See fn. 2.

30 Gilliam, *Richard Strauss and His World*.

academic lives of younger English-speaking Strauss scholars, such as David Anderson, Philip Graydon, Wayne Heisler, Timothy Jackson, Joseph Jones, Morten Kristiansen, David Larkin, Mark-Daniel Schmid, Scott Warfield, Richard Wattenbarger, Matthew Werley, and Charles Youmans, among others.

But lastly the most important sea change in Germany came with the founding of the Richard Strauss Institute in 1999, a true international center, directed by Christian Wolff with Jürgen May. That same year was the first international Munich conference: »Richard Strauss und die Moderne«, organized by Bernd Edelmann, Birgit Lodes, and Reinhold Schlötterer in 1999 and published in 2001,<sup>31</sup> the same year as Julia Liebscher's conference, »Richard Strauss and das Musiktheater«, published in 2005.<sup>32</sup> There was a conference (Adorno and Strauss) organized by Andreas Dorschel,<sup>33</sup> and, of course, the RSI has sponsored several symposia over the years. In 2007, Matthew Werley and David Larkin put together a large international conference (»Strauss and the Scholars«) at Oxford University, where Strauss had received two honorary degrees. Conferences in Stuttgart (2012), Salzburg (2012), Munich (2014), Leipzig (2014), and Greifswald (2014) have followed. Another breakthrough in Strauss research was the decision on the part of the revised *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (2001) to have the Strauss biography written not by a journalist – as it had been in the previous edition – but by a musicologist.<sup>34</sup>

Since 1999, there has been a cornucopia of Strauss dissertations in Germany (8), England (8), and the United States (8). We have come a long way since the shoeboxes in Alice Strauss's bedroom. Digitally available sketchbooks, sophisticated data bases, a new scholarly Strauss edition, and much more. But it would be a shame to downplay the pioneering work of Alice Strauss who created the foundation for the Strauss edition, organizing and cataloguing letters, memoirs, manuscripts, and the like. She was helped by Franz Trenner, who was not a professor of musicology, and much of his

31 *Richard Strauss und die Moderne. Bericht über das Internationale Symposium München, 21. bis 23. Juli 1999*, ed. by Bernd Edelmann, Birgit Lodes, and Reinhold Schlötterer (= Veröffentlichungen der Richard-Strauss-Gesellschaft 17), Berlin 2001.

32 *Richard Strauss und das Musiktheater. Bericht über die Internationale Fachkonferenz Bochum, 14. bis 17. November 2001*, ed. by Julia Liebscher (= Veröffentlichungen der Richard-Strauss-Gesellschaft 19), Berlin 2005.

33 The conference papers were published in a volume, *Gemurmel unterhalb der Rauschens. Theodor W. Adorno und Richard Strauss*, ed. by Andreas Dorschel, Vienna 2004.

34 Bryan Gilliam, »Strauss, Richard (Georg)«, in: *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. Second Edition*, ed. by Stanley Sadie, Vol. 24, London 2001, p. 497–527. I insisted that this first entry employ, and thus make official, the catalogue numbers created by Franz Trenner for his *TrennerV*. The bibliography portion was constructed by my then student, Charles Youmans. Duke Press believed that a new edition needed a new introduction, which gave me the opportunity to invite my friend Michael Kennedy, the leading Strauss journalist of his day, to provide a general introduction.

work was self-funded. I should add the contributions of the Richard Strauss Arbeitsgruppe and the selfless work of Reinhold and the late Roswitha Schlötterer-Traimer in those early years. I am sure that they would have been proud of the current stage of Strauss research, and I know that Reinhold Schlötterer still is.

## Appendix

### American dissertations since 1999 (50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Strauss's death)

- Lodato, Suzanne Marie, *Richard Strauss and the Modernists: A Contextual Study of Strauss's fin-de-siecle Song Style*, Ph.D. diss. Columbia University 1999.
- Kristiansen, Morten, *Richard Strauss's Feuersnot in Its Aesthetic and Cultural Context: A Modernist Critique of Musical Idealism*, Ph.D. diss. Yale University 2000.
- Wattenbarger, Richard Ernest, *Richard Strauss, Modernism, and the University: A Study of German-Language and American Academic Reception of Richard Strauss from 1900 to 1990*, Ph.D. diss. University of Minnesota 2000.
- Welling, Miriam Joelle, *Words, Music and Operatic Aesthetics in Richard Strauss's Capriccio*, Ph.D. diss. University of Texas at Austin 2001.
- Cha, Jee-Weon, *Music, Language, and Tone Poem: Interpreting Richard Strauss's Tod und Verklärung, Op. 24*, Ph.D. diss. University of Pennsylvania 2004.
- Heisler Jr., Wayne, *Freedom from the earth's gravity: the ballet collaborations of Richard Strauss*, Ph.D. diss. Princeton University 2005.
- Jones, Joseph E., *Der Rosenkavalier: Genesis, Modelling, and New Aesthetic Paths*, Ph.D. diss. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign 2009.
- Sarver, Sarah K., *Embedded and Parenthetical Chromaticism: A Study of their Structural and Dramatic Implications in Selected Works by Richard Strauss*, Ph.D. diss. Florida State University 2010.

### British Dissertations since 1999

- Callahan, Mary B., *Richard Strauss's ›Geheimnisvolle Musik‹: Unveiling the Meaning of Salome*, Ph.D. diss. Queen's University Belfast 2003.
- Gibson, Robert Raphael, *Parody Lost and Regained: Richard Strauss's Double Voices*, D.Phil. diss. University of Oxford 2004.
- Graydon, Philip Robert, *Die ägyptische Helena (1927): Context and Contemporary Critical Reception*, Ph.D. diss. Queen's University Belfast 2005.

- Larkin, David John Paul, *Reshaping the Liszt-Wagner Legacy: Intertextual Dynamics in Strauss's Tone Poems*, Ph.D. diss. University of Cambridge 2006.
- Werley, Matthew Michael, *Historicism and Cultural Politics in Three Interwar-Period Operas by Richard Strauss: Arabella (1933), Die schweigsame Frau (1935) and Friedenstag (1938)*, D.Phil. diss. University of Oxford 2010.
- Shirley, Hugo, *A Kingdom of Dreams and Shadows: Richard Strauss, Die Frau ohne Schatten and the collapse of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's operatic project*, Ph.D. diss. King's College London 2011.
- Price, Jonathan Meredith, *Richard Strauss's choreographic works in the context of the new Baroque*, Ph.D. diss. Queen's University Belfast 2011.
- Reynolds, Michael, *The Theatrical Vision of Count Harry Kessler and its Impact on the Strauss-Hofmannsthal Partnership*, Ph.D. diss. Goldsmiths, University of London 2014.

### German dissertations since 1999

- Köhler, Michael, »Jetzt endlich habe ich instrumentieren gelernt!«: Studien zur Instrumentation der frühen Opern von Richard Strauss, Ph.D. diss. Humboldt Universität Berlin 1999.
- Obermaier, Gerlinde, *Die Bühnenwirksamkeit der Symbole in Hugo von Hofmannsthals und Richard Strauss' Zauberoper Die Frau ohne Schatten: Ein Einblick in die Inszenierungsgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Ph.D. diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München 2000.
- Hottmann, Katharina, »Die ändern komponieren. Ich mach' Musikgeschichte!« Historismus und Gattungsbewusstsein bei Richard Strauss. Untersuchungen zum späteren Opernschaffen, Ph.D. diss. Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hannover 2003.
- Schmidt, Manuela Maria, *Die Anfänge der musikalischen Tantiemenbewegung in Deutschland: eine Studie über den langen Weg bis zur Errichtung der Genossenschaft Deutscher Tonsetzer (GDT) im Jahre 1903 und zum Wirken des Komponisten Richard Strauss (1864–1949) für Verbesserungen des Urheberrechts*, Ph.D. diss. Universität des Saarlandes 2003.
- Bayerlin, Sonja, *Verkörpernte Musik: Zur Dramaturgie der Gebärde in den frühen Opern von Strauss und Hofmannsthal*, Ph.D. diss. Universität Würzburg 2004.
- Wolf, Christian, *Studien zur Entstehung der Oper Salome von Richard Strauss*, Ph.D. diss. Hochschule für Musik und Theater München 2009.
- Kech, Adrian, *Musikalische Verwandlung in den Hofmannsthal-Opern von Richard Strauss*, Ph.D. diss. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München 2013.
- Schaper, Christian, *Richard Strauss, Die Frau ohne Schatten: Studien zu den Skizzen und zur musikalischen Faktur*, Ph.D. diss. Universität Karlsruhe 2016.