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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

To call Richard Strauss “legendary” at this point in history seems banal, passé. Because of his larger-than-life persona during his lifetime and the ramifications (both positive and negative) surrounding his artistic and historic legacy, the invocation of Strauss as “legend” is at once hyperbolic and understated. Scholars of the late twentieth century were typically iconoclastic, suffering few if any idols to escape academic deconstruction and recontextualization. Thus, a flawed idol like Strauss, whose undeniable ties to Nazi Germany earned him the title “Jupiter Compromised” from author Michael H. Kater, proved fertile ground for research and debate.

Human beings are notorious for embracing these flawed idols, the ancient gods who were a mixture of iron and clay and the heroes of epic literature who acted so nobly and erred so tragically. Humankind has always loved a good story, and Strauss wove one with his robust energy, his sharp tongue, and the enigmatic body of music by which he created a kind of transcendant metanarrative of his life.

Every protagonist must have at least one antagonist, and Strauss, with his singularly polarizing nature, attracted many. His arguments with his critics are well-documented and find musical voice in Ein Heldenleben most notably. Likewise, disagreements and heated words with fellow composers and other musicians receive ample treatment in the literature. After all, Richard Strauss was a public figure, and good fights catch the attention of the public imagination. Even Strauss’s involvement with the Third Reich has been read by some as a mythological turn to the dark side, the valiant yet aging knight seduced by power, comfort, and compromise.

---

One area of contention that receives little attention in Strauss studies is the composer’s troubled relationship with his publishers. Most general biographies give a passing nod to the legal battles and the establishment of the *Genossenschaft deutscher Tonsetzer*, but these are bylines in the grand trajectory of Strauss’s career. Narratively, they provide troughs between the swelling waves generated by the man and his music. On the level of character development, they flesh out the picture of Strauss as a complex figure, embattled and embattling, contentious but beleaguered. As plot material, however, there are more interesting subjects to discuss. The activities of the publishing industry do not generally attract a broad audience.

Strauss’s enigmatic song cycle *Der Krämerspiegel* can be seen as a musical counterpart to this episode in Strauss life, a working out of the composer’s frustration. And it is the piece’s intimate and inextricable ties to the publishing world that condemn it from the start. Since its composition in 1918 and its publication in 1921 *Krämerspiegel* has been relegated to obscurity by performers and researchers alike. The reasons for this are numerous, and not all the questions surrounding the work have been discussed in the scant literature that exists.

Most general studies of Strauss make only brief and passing mention of *Krämerspiegel* though there are some which devote a bit of space to the brouhaha surrounding its composition, namely Strauss’s irritation at having to fulfill a contractual obligation for publishers Bote & Bock. The darkly satirical *Krämerspiegel* served as both an attempted escape from lawsuit and an act of revenge for the embittered composer whose formation of the *Genossenschaft deutscher Tonsetzer* (GDT) with his friend Friedrich Rösch serves as a complementary endeavor in this struggle with the publishing industry. The GDT was one of the first societies designed to protect the rights of the composer, and it was Friedrich Rösch to whom Strauss dedicated the now symbolic *Krämerspiegel*. However, despite the song cycle’s centrality in these historic events,
little attention has been given it apart from its quixotic nature and its anomalous place in Strauss’s oeuvre.

Existing Research on *Krämerspiegel*

The state of research would present a bleak and daunting picture except for a few isolated pockets of research. Although Norman Del Mar’s critical commentary on Strauss offers a nice overview of *Krämerspiegel*, most writers have preferred to deal with the composer’s more accessible Lieder. Of primary significance are two relatively recent doctoral dissertations that deal with some of the most immediate questions that arise in regard to the work. Sarah Baker’s 1990 dissertation for Memphis State University offers, as its title says, “An Annotated Translation and Analysis of Richard Strauss’s *Krämerspiegel*,” while Julianne Fiske Cross’ “A Merry Prank: Richard Strauss, *Krämerspiegel*, and Publishers” (1995) uses the historical debacle that prompted the work as its focal point. Both cover similar territory and offer a rather comprehensive analysis of the text and music, including the many allusions to publishers and even Strauss himself and the numerous quotations included from Strauss’ other works (most notably the recently completed opera *Der Rosenkavalier*). Form, meter, musical motives, and basic harmonic practices are covered, and each dissertation includes an extensive bibliography. Neither dissertation offers analysis as to the motives behind Strauss’s choices and the impact they would have for performers and audiences.

Authorial Intent in *Krämerspiegel*

Unanswered questions abound as to Strauss’s intent in writing *Krämerspiegel*; likewise unresolved is how the composer’s choices in regard to that intent have led to the piece’s
enigmatic status in the repertoire. The challenges it presents to performers and audiences make it an easy contention that Strauss did not particularly want the piece to succeed. While he took great care with the work as a craftsman, his anger at Bote & Bock and other publishers compelled him to use the piece as a kind of artistic statement rather than a viable work to be performed. Evidence for this can be found in the inscrutability of the text, at least to a general audience; the musical elements are also eclectic, and the difficulty of the piece combined with its lack of audience appeal make it uninviting to those who would consider mounting the piece in performance.

Perhaps because of their speculative nature, these questions have not been asked, and the manner in which compositional intent has affected the reception of this work has not been explored. Even those who take a serious look at Krämerspiegel seem to miss part of the point of the work, namely that Strauss did not want publishers to make money on it. The title of Cross’s dissertation calls the piece “A Merry Prank,” referring to the tone poem Till Eulenspiegels lustige Streiche, which also plays a part in the Krämerspiegel debacle. This seems a bit rosy as the tone of the piece is much more vitriolic in nature. Unless one comes to terms with the hateful tone of the poetry and the inaccessibility of both text and setting, Krämerspiegel’s true place in the conflict between Strauss and his publishers remains only partially explained. In contrast to the picture of Strauss as heroic thwarter of his critics in the tone poem Ein Heldenleben, this enigmatic song cycle presents Strauss as something of a “Bösenkavalier,” a cavalier who is not so much “rosy” as he is “nasty” (böse).

Between 1906 and 1917, Strauss was busy with operatic projects. While he may not necessarily have been reluctant to return to writing Lieder, he was nonetheless piqued at being legally obliged to do so. Clearly, he had to comply or face further litigation, but for a man of
Strauss’s temperament, simply kowtowing to an adversary would have been degrading. *Krämerspiegel* was the compromise the composer concocted to vent his frustration while sticking to the letter of the law.

*Krämerspiegel* was intended to put Bote & Bock in a dilemma. Strauss had (or so he thought) fulfilled his contractual obligation. He had provided the firm more than the required six songs specified in the contract, and the ball was now in the publisher’s court. From the composer’s point of view, the firm had two equally unpleasant choices. They could refuse publication and take the loss, giving Strauss the victory, or they could publish the piece and offer themselves and their fellow publishers up as laughingstocks. Furthermore, they wouldn’t have been able to sell many copies due to the obscure nature of the text and the unidiomatic musical language. As the story goes, the firm refused publication but got a little revenge of their own when Strauss was later forced to write for Bote & Bock his Opus 67, which includes the *Ophelia Lieder* and three settings of poems by Goethe, to fulfill the contract.

The impact of Strauss’s temper on the nature of *Krämerspiegel* has not been investigated. While attempts have been made to approach the piece, nobody has explored the problems that were composed into it. This is probably because researchers assume that Strauss, though clearly invoking parody, nevertheless intended the work for publication; why then did he make so many bizarre choices that go against contemporary aesthetics. If one opens oneself to the possibility that he wanted the piece to be a magnificently-crafted failure, the strange nature of the work begins to make a great deal more sense.
CHAPTER II

EIN HELDENLEBEN:

THE HEROIC STRAUSS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GDT

A detailed examination of Richard Strauss’s relationship with the music publishing world is far reaching given the length, volume, and variety of his professional activities. Even Baker and Cross devote only a handful of pages to the subject in their aforementioned studies. Nonetheless, their findings present good overviews of the industry in the decades leading up to Krämerspiegel, and a further examination of the work would be incomplete without a summary of important events and personages. Del Mar also provides some insight into this facet of Strauss’s professional life in his discussion of Krämerspiegel.

From 1870 to 1898, copyright laws protected creative works for thirty years after the death of the author. This protection was, of course, for the publishing firm and its rights to print and distribute the materials; composers essentially sold their works for a fee and had little control over (not to mention little income from) the work thereafter. Interestingly enough, it was the firm of Bote & Bock who managed to have the law extended to cover concert works as well as dramatic works. In 1898 at the Congress of Allgemeiner deutscher Musikverein, which met to revise the 1870 copyright law, the composer Hans Sommer moved to have the thirty-year statute of limitation abolished. His proposal was unsuccessful. Oskar von Hase of Breitkopf & Härtel, on the other hand, met with ready success when he proposed the extension of royalties to include concert works as well as dramatic works; composer and publisher would share the 1% of gross profits allowed by the provision. A new copyright law in 1901 allowed for performance rights

---

3 Baker, 9.
royalties although it didn’t specify the beneficiary: the composer or the publisher? The statute of limitations was extended to fifty years in 1935 and to seventy years in 1965.⁴

Strauss’s dealings with publishers up to this point were not always amicable,⁵ and on July 14, 1898, he circulated among his fellow composers a letter in which he protested the congress’s support of the Hase proposal. He contended that the publisher gained the most from this resolution and requested signatures for a petition to the Reichstag for greater protection for composers.⁶ This culminated in a meeting in September when the group of composers decided to boycott the Allgemeiner deutscher Musikverein, agreeing to send lawyer Friedrich Rösch as their representative before the Reichstag.⁷ Rösch was also a composer and a childhood friend of Strauss, who, with his conducting career and composing, had little time left for legal wrangling. The organization known as Genossenschaft deutscher Tonsetzer (The Fellowship of German Composers) was essentially born at this meeting although it would take until January 14, 1903, for it to come into official existence.⁸ Strauss’s cofounders of the GDT were, notably, Hans Sommer and Friedrich Rösch.

In the meantime, there was a great deal of political wrangling, including the formation of a counter-organization, the Verein der deutschen Musikalienhändler by none other than Hugo Bock of Bote & Bock. This entity was intended to uphold the interests of publishers and eventually became the Genossenschaft zur Verwertung der Aufführungsrechte (also known as

---

⁶ Baker, 9.
⁷ Baker, 9-10.
⁸ Peterson, “Händler,” 120.
GEMA) in 1910. Strauss Biographer George Marek also sites the intervention of politicians, funding concerns, and opposition from fellow composers as obstacles that faced the nascent GDT. In 1915, some composers left the GDT and formed an alliance with GEMA.

The existence of a union such as the GDT had numerous ramifications and implications, and the story involves many names that appear in association with Krämerspiegel. Along with the aforementioned Bock and Hase, Robert Lienau and Ludwig Strecker stood for publishers’ interests in the development of GEMA. The heroic Strauss could claim at least a qualified victory in this battle in that there was now a voice for composers in the debate over intellectual property rights. And although his conducting and composing careers demanded his creative attention, he still devoted time in the next couple of decades to find common ground between the GDT and GEMA. This continued into the thirties with what Kater calls Strauss’s “quest to control the politics of musicians in the Third Reich.”

---

9 Baker, 10. Kater gives the name of the organization as Gesellschaft für musikalische Aufführungs- und mechanische Vervielfältigungsrechte, 218. Most likely it took the fuller name in 1915 with the addition of composers defecting from the GDT.


11 Kater, 1915.

12 Cross, 6-7.

13 Kater, 220.
CHAPTER III
DON QUIXOTE: STRAUSS TILTS AGAINST BOTE & BOCK

Despite his advocacy of intellectual property rights, Strauss needed the publishing industry. He contracted with Bote & Bock for the publication of his *Sinfonia Domestica* in 1903 and, according to Del Mar, “in an unguarded moment allowed a seemingly innocent clause to be inserted in the contract giving them the rights to his next group of songs whenever this should appear.”\(^\text{14}\) The contract specifically called for Strauss to give the firm twelve songs, and while the composer did give them the six op. 56 songs for publication in 1906, he quickly became preoccupied with other projects, including the operas *Elektra, Der Rosenkavalier, Ariadne auf Naxos*, and *Die Frau ohne Schatten*.

Del Mar further suggests that Strauss’s interest in writing Lieder was “soured” by the GDT/GEMA struggle, but reasons for the delay became moot when Bote & Bock threatened to take him to court for breach of contract.\(^\text{15}\) Apparently they had grown impatient and did not sympathize with the composer’s overwhelming interest in opera; they wanted the remaining six songs, and they were tired of waiting for them. Strauss’ issues with the publishing industry thus took on a new dimension.

According to Del Mar, it was at this time that Strauss recalled a book of satirical poems, *Die Harfe*, sent to him in 1913 by Alfred Kerr, a Berlin critic who was working for the *Berliner Tageblatt* by 1918.\(^\text{16}\) It is not known when Strauss contacted Kerr, “quite possibly supplying him with a list of the members of the newly formed publishing association GEMA.”\(^\text{17}\) Still, it

\(^{15}\) Del Mar, 358.
\(^{16}\) Ibid.
\(^{17}\) Cross, 9.
seems to have taken little time for the eager critic to supply the twelve “scurrilous little verses of the composer’s victimization,” which arrived on March 8, 1918.

Strauss completed the cycle in May of the same year and considered his contractual obligation fulfilled. Bote & Bock were not amused. Indeed, in his chapter on Mahler and Strauss for *The Cambridge Companion to the Lied*, James L. Zychowicz puts the episode in colorful terms:

> Outraged, the music firm took Strauss to court, and, in losing the case, he was forced to write “proper songs.” What followed was a subtle form of retribution, the Sechs Lieder, Op. 67, which contain the three songs of the mad Ophelia along with three impertinent poems from Goethe’s *West-östlicher Divan*.  

Michael Kennedy further suggests that the Op. 67 songs are “six of his most recondite Lieder…which, although they are innovative and among the most challenging he wrote, could never be called popular or easily saleable.” Even in his presentation of six “proper songs” to the firm, Strauss was still determined to make it difficult for Bote & Bock to turn a profit from their extortion.

Strauss withheld the six Brentano Lieder, giving them to Fürstner instead. Barbara A. Petersen opines in *Ton und Wort: The Lieder of Richard Strauss* that he “recognized the greater artistic merit as well as possibilities for performance…and preferred to save them for his principal publisher…who was one of the publishers not criticized in op. 66.”

Not wanting to let Bote & Bock get the better of him, Strauss sought other publishers for *Krämerspiegel* but was, understandably, turned down. He most certainly understood their limited appeal, but a select audience is an audience nonetheless. In 1921, however, Paul

---

18 Del Mar, 358.
Cassirer, an art publisher based in Berlin, privately published 120 copies of a deluxe edition; Michael Fingstein provided several illustrations, and both the composer and the authors autographed the copies. Baker’s dissertation reproduces several of the illustrations, including the frontispiece, which shows Strauss riding a winged horse over a tightrope below which appears a hand holding a mirror in which a pig’s face stares back. The pig is, of course the merchant, or “Krämer,” of the title; more specifically, the swine represents the publishing industry. Sawing at one of the poles holding the tightrope is a man, identified by Baker as Hugo Bock, and as one monkey climbs the pole, another bearing a whip appears to be threatening the modern Jason on his Pegasus. The publication of Krämerspiegel did attract some press attention, seemingly mixed, and only anecdotally pertinent to the history of the cycle.

The first documented performance of Krämerspiegel was in 1921. The soprano Sigrid Johansson and pianist Michael Raucheisen performed for a private gathering at the Hotel Kaiserhof in Berlin. It was private due to the threat of lawsuit, and Strauss himself was not even in attendance. Alfred Kerr was the host of the party.

Kerr might have gained a more lasting fame had he been a bit more diligent. Apparently, Strauss liked his suggestion for a comic opera called Peregrin, but Kerr never completed the libretto. The minor notoriety he achieved with his texts for Krämerspiegel, however, will continue to grant him a considerable footnote in the history of Western music.

---

22 Cross, 11.
CHAPTER IV
GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS
Till Eulenspiegel: The Merry Prank of Naming Names

Perhaps the most problematic element of *Krämerspiegel* is Kerr’s almost untranslatable text, which is laden with puns, idioms, slang, and other word play. At once satirical and allegorical, the poems would have been confusing for an outsider of the times, and the publishing industry would have found them downright offensive. Thus, the audience for such a work would have been and continues to be extremely select. Likewise, singers of the day would have been attracted to more universal texts; singers today rarely give more than a glance to such bizarre and practically untranslatable material.

Indeed, the overuse of the word “untranslatable” is not as redundant as it seems, for it is the reason cited on record jackets and liner notes for what may seem a glaring omission to audiences who do not speak German. Boosey & Hawkes did not include a translation when it published the piece for a largely English-speaking audience in 1959, citing the same “untranslatable” reason along with the assertion that “the subject matter had ‘lost all meaning.’”\(^\text{26}\) This characteristic of the text, and thus the piece, remains a congenital defect despite recent scholarly efforts to explain the allusions and *double entendres*.

Thus Spake Strauss: Self-Quotation in *Krämerspiegel*

Many composers employ the art of self-quotation, and a man with as much self-confidence as Richard Strauss could even make an art of it. It should be noted here that it is not the intention of this dissertation to present a complete musical analysis of the piece; this has already been done quite well by Cross and Baker, whose works have detailed discussions of

tonal relationship, motivic development, and melodic and harmonic analysis. Rather, this of the
quotations is designed to lay the groundwork for the further exploration of how an audience
might perceive Strauss’s own intentions on how the piece should be perceived, or “read.” And
while it is tempting to go into more specific detail as to the meaning of certain quotations, only
brief suggestions are offered in this section to provide the needed context for future
development.

In his article on “Pitch Specificity in Strauss” for the Princeton collection Richard
Strauss and His World, Derrick Puffett point out that most of the quotations in Krämerspiegel
are at original pitch in relationship to the work each is from. A notable exception is the Tod und
Verklärung quotation in song eight, “which, however, uses the same D major as it does thirty
years later when it reappears in the Four Last Songs.”

Puffett does not go into great detail, but his assertion raises yet another layer to the issue of self-quotation. A further examination of this
phenomenon might elucidate the aforementioned conundrum of what constitutes a quotation, and
the simple observation is worth noting not only for the light it sheds on the cycle’s relationship to
earlier works but also its seeming connection to Strauss’s late Lieder.

The Shopkeeper’s Mirror: The Commerce of Krämerspiegel

The recently published The Cambridge Companion to the Lied contains, among its
treasures, two articles that bear heavily upon the study of Krämerspiegel. The final part of the
collection, labeled “Reception and Performance,” offers David Gramit’s discussion on “The
circulation of the Lied: the double life of an artwork and a commodity” and Graham Johnson’s
look at “The Lied in performance.” These articles deal with areas that have long gone

---

unexplored due to the long-held belief that art music existed, if not in an ivory tower, then at
least in an ivory vacuum. Although it has been almost half a century since Milton Babbitt’s
infamous “Who Cares if You Listen” article for the February 1958 edition of *High Fidelity*, there
are few well-defined constructs for examining the complex relationships between composers,
publishers, audiences, and performers.

Gramit has an illuminating explanation for this in the case of the Lied, “whose status as a
genuinely artistic genre long was contested precisely because its status as an all-too-viable
commodity appeared to threaten its standing as art.”28 For a long time, it seemed necessary to
protect art music in general and the Lied in particular from investigations that might upset its
careful balancing act and topple it into a kind of crass commercialism. This led to an isolation of
the genre that is so eloquently described by Graham Johnson that it is worth quoting him at
length:

A glance at Ernst Challier’s 1885 Großer Lieder-Katalog is enough to show that
the Lied was big business at the end of the nineteenth century. Names now long
forgotten rub shoulders with the immortals in astonishingly lengthy lists of settings that
have vanished without a trace. In consulting Challier we are, after all, scanning a
catalogue where great Lieder and pop songs of the time jostle with each other for
attention. At this stage the Lied was still all-encompassing, still nominally something for
everyone. Once popular music achieved its own momentum and was hived off to its own
discographies and discotheques, we are left with the songs that really matter, the songs
that survived. But to whom do these songs matter, and how much? In my case the
question is not merely rhetorical: my living as a concert accompanist depends on that
continuing interest.

I daresay that even the greatest Lied enthusiast, when divested of her or his rose-
colored Schubertian Brille, is aware that many people view the art form as a formidably
highbrow category (German) of an esoteric sub-section (song) of an embarrassingly
emotional corner (vocal music) of an already doomed species (classical music).29


He goes on to express not only his appreciation for the efforts of universities and their presses in maintaining a serious interest in the Lied but also his concern that many have “come to accept the Lied’s Cinderella status as inevitable”^{30} and “[m]ore dangerously, we even may have begun to enjoy the fact that its seeming inaccessibility to the common listener has given it the glamour of a minority cult.”^{31} He continues:

> Music however, by its very nature, encourages more vital, less marginal, attitudes. And those who write about music should surely aspire to connect with both performer and public in a way that makes a practical difference to how the music sounds.^{32}

While Johnson goes on to make many other salient points, these are the most germane to this study in that they point out the divide between academic research and the actual thought processes of performers and audiences. Thus no easily classified method of inquiry can be invoked to label such an investigation since much of the literature has avoided the points of view of performer and audience as generative factors in artistic output. That such considerations may be considered by a composer *a priori* is a valid hypothesis, particularly in the story of *Krämerspiegel*.

The realms of semiotics and aesthetics are perhaps most relevant to an analysis of this sort. This would involve the broader understanding of semiotics proposed by V. Kofi Agwu’s in his *Playing with Signs: A Semiotic Interpretation of Classic Music*. While the structural and rhetorical semiotic theory put forth by Eero Tarasti is more fashionable in scholarly discourse at this time, Agwu’s interpretation of the discipline is much more malleable and considerably more applicable to examining *Krämerspiegel*. Agwu develops the theory that audiences hear in signs; that is, certain musical gestures and elements carry extramusical significance for the

---

^{30} Ibid.  
^{31} Johnson, 315-316.  
^{32} Johnson, 316.
listener, a phenomenon that he calls extroversive semiosis.\textsuperscript{33} He also addresses formal, temporal, and harmonic elements in his chapter on introversive semiosis.\textsuperscript{34} This approaches the rhetorical understanding of Tarasti; inversely, Tarasti validates a broader understanding of musical semiotics in his book *Myth and Music*, specifically in his discussion of specific semes (sign groups) and styles.\textsuperscript{35} It is worth noting that the works of Strauss are mentioned in a couple of instances, *Rosenkavalier* as exemplary of “the fabulous” seme\textsuperscript{36} and *Till Eulenspiegel* as “a pure example of the fantastic quality.”\textsuperscript{37}

This examination of both the audience’s expectations and its potential “reading” of *Krämerspiegel* is not intended to be a rigorous semiotic deconstruction, but it is informed by the discipline. Although Agawu’s focus is primarily on Classic music (i.e. Western music from the mid-1700s into the beginning of the 1800s), in the final chapter of *Playing with Signs*, he turns his attention to Romantic music and the problems involved with treating it semiotically. In particular he brings up certain paradoxes, such as the “public-private opposition:” “private codes…seem to close off the outer world and forge an internal, self sustaining discourse” while simultaneously “the grandiose utterances of these composers, which seem to acknowledge a self-evident meaning…are decidedly outgoing or universal in intent.”\textsuperscript{38} His subsequent words on Mahler could easily be applied to Strauss:

His unabashedly public angle plays on the listener’s familiarity with various topics including marches, ländler, bugle-calls, chorales, and so on; yet that same compositional voice contrasts with, or sometimes merges into, an extremely personal and—some might claim—autobiographical one.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{34} Agawu, 51ff.
\textsuperscript{36} Tarasti, 101.
\textsuperscript{37} Tarasti, 113.
\textsuperscript{38} Agawu, 136.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
This understanding of genre-related expectations also touches upon the discipline of aesthetics. Edward Lippman’s *A History of Western Musical Aesthetics* provides a general framework for these considerations. The *History* does not posit any one paradigm for understanding the values related to art music in any particular century; rather it focuses more on the various strains of thought that have emerged in the discussion of aesthetics throughout the history of European music. Still, its coverage of major topics in the nineteenth century points to the importance of emotional realism, formalism, and idealism. After all, Strauss’s life bridged the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and his writing reflects the influence of ideas from both. Lippman’s segment on semiotics is illuminating in its delineation of the two major strains of semiotic hermeneutics: the philosophical study of signs proposed by Charles Pierce and that put forth by Ferdinand de Saussure which “conceived of such a field as closely related to linguistics.” Agawu’s sense of semiotics appears to be more grounded in the former paradigm. Although more structuralist approaches, based in part on a linguistic understanding of form and function, are not without merit, they are not as useful to this study as the more philosophical approach to aesthetic semiosis. Lippman is a bit too broad in his presentation to be of practical use here, but his work is seminal in advancing the academic merit of a discussion of beauty, value, and the sets of expectations a particular society or group brings to the experience and interpretation of a work of art.

**The Performer’s Perspective**

Del Mar, writing some thirteen years after Boosey & Hawkes’ 1959 publication of the

---

work, cites “the publisher’s reluctance to encourage the propagation of the words”\textsuperscript{41} as one of the reasons for the sporadic nature of performances. This seems rather optimistic given the highly stylized nature of the work. After all, even if the text were disseminated, it would mean very little to very few, and even if the context were explained it would lack the immediacy of the time in which it was written.

Even in the transitional Germany of the late 1910’s and early 1920’s, performers and audiences of Lieder were accustomed to literature that fell within a certain set of parameters; while composers naturally challenged and dialogued with these boundaries, the writing in \textit{Krämerspiegel} deliberately defies standard expectations of the day. Art song generally employed a high romantic style, essentially tonal with a high degree of chromaticism. Texts followed certain traditional tropes, such as the natural world, erotic love, and the like. Certainly there were departures, but these aesthetic considerations were normative and describe much of Strauss’s output in the genre.

\textit{Krämerspiegel} is rather subversive regarding such accepted practices. Textually, the poetry employs a great deal of word play and double entendre that demands a fairly intimate understanding of the publishing industry of the time. At once satirical and allegorical, Kerr’s text would have been confusing for an outsider of the times, and the publishing industry would have found the poems downright offensive. Thus, the audience for such a work would have been and continues to be extremely select and would not have appealed to publishers even if the lyrics were not laden with personal attacks. Likewise, singers of the day would have been attracted to more universal texts; singers today rarely give more than a glance at such bizarre and practically untranslatable material.

\textsuperscript{41} Del Mar, 365.
It is also important to keep in mind that performers are highly sensitive to audience expectation. One only has to note Graham Johnson’s comments above to realize that performing musicians have a vested interest in knowing their audiences’ expectations and limits (i.e. in the sense of how far they will trust the performer outside the boundaries of their expectations). Thus, anything that is true of the audience is also true, in a sense, of the performer. If a soprano decides, for instance, to mount Arnold Schoenberg’s *Pierrot Lunaire* or Luciano Berio’s *Sequenza III,* she is most certainly aware that the performance will attract some listeners and alienate others. While there are some who would come to hear this particular hypothetical soprano, most listeners would base their decision to attend, at least in part, to the nature of the work and their interest in it. With a work that is outside the established canon or beyond the awareness of the intended audience, the soprano must either trust in or earn the trust of her listeners. Performers are highly aware of their audiences and their experiences as are many composers, and a worldly man like Strauss was indubitably aware of much more.

From a vocalist’s perspective, one of the first questions to be answered is what voice type did Strauss have in mind when writing *Krämerspiegel.* A soprano gave the first known performance, but the majority of recordings of the piece feature tenors. Baritone Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau sings the cycle on his set of six compact discs devoted to Strauss’s Lieder although he transposes several sections of the cycle down due to the high tessitura. The range is two octaves and a major third (g-flat to b-flat” for women and an octave lower for men); even if one takes the higher optional notes on song ten, the range is two octaves and a minor second (a to b-flat” for women and an octave lower for men). Most singers would likewise be daunted by the fact that the lowest B-flat is as highly exposed as the highest, or vice-versa.

---

42 It should be noted, however, that Fischer-Dieskau performs the fourth song at pitch. It is not a lengthy stretch of singing for the vocalist so a baritone with a high B flat could potentially handle this song with few tessitura issues.
Many sopranos would be able to handle the range, which lends support to the view that the work was composed for the high female voice. Indeed, Strauss’s operas and his Lieder reveal the composer’s favorable disposition to this voice type; after *Guntram*, the composer’s operatic protagonists are all sopranos. It is most likely not a coincidence that Strauss proposed to his future wife (a soprano) following a rehearsal of *Guntram*. However, the *Guntram* connection could be perceived in quite a different light. The Heldentenor title role of Guntram was, essentially, both a first and a last for Strauss. After this, tenors are relegated to secondary roles, and often these roles are comic and even unflattering in nature. Even the Italian singer in *Rosenkavalier* is forced to perform his beautiful solo in the midst of a veritable menagerie of characters, and the lyric melody is drowned out by the ensuing cacophony of disinterest. Strauss’s vocal writing for *Krämerspiegel* resembles some of the awkward, buffoonish material of Herod or Aegisth.

Although it is highly subjective and admittedly speculative, the psychology of singers should not go unmentioned. The tropes concerning the vain soprano and the brainless tenor are very old but not particularly academic. They do point out tendencies that, while difficult to verify or corroborate, deserve to be stated so that they can be examined with greater scrutiny. First one must acknowledge the skeleton in the closet, then bring it out into the light, and finally proceed to forensic evaluation. Sopranos are often perceived and spoken of as self-centered, arrogant creatures. Perhaps a safer thing to say is that few are interested in singing anything that will not show off their voices at their most attractive. Why flatter a piece with one’s attention when the piece hardly flatters oneself—and indeed vocalists, for varying reasons, often equate their personhood with their instrument in a way that is foreign to musicians who play a more external piece of equipment.
This can be said of tenors as well, but there is also that trope about tenors being somewhat stupid. The joke runs, “Did you hear the one about the tenor who was so dumb the other tenors noticed?” There exist plenty of singers of every Fach who, because of some natural ability of the instrument or even some natural deficiency of intelligence, either do not have to or do not choose to think as much as those who practice, develop technique, diversify repertoire, and so forth. Yet there are many who are quite savvy, bringing much more to the table than a voice. However much truth one posits in such arguments, another option is possible. Despite the elaborate Fach system and the wide range of vocal sizes and timbres, sopranos are often perceived as falling into either of two categories: lyric and dramatic. Tenors are often grouped as such, but there is also a strong history of the comic tenor as well. While some composers find sopranos funny (and possibly even capable of humor), one never hears of a particular operatic role designated as a “comic soprano.” Comic tenors (or “character tenors”) and tenor roles are often discussed in such terms even if scores do not employ the nomenclature. *Krämerspiegel* fits into this categorization rather well.

What voice type the cycle was intended for may be an unanswerable question, but the above observations may help determine what voice type is most likely to mount the cycle. Baritones, would have trouble with the tessitura and would most likely need to transpose certain passages. Mezzo sopranos may face similar challenges, and true basses and contraltos would definitely need to make key adjustments. Sopranos and tenors are the most likely candidates to tackle *Krämerspiegel*. Of the two, tenors statistically predominate in documented performances and recordings. This may be due to a certain truth in the noted tropes of singer psychology, or it may result from the traditions associated with the Fach system. In either case, the character tenor seems the most likely choice for the cycle. This is not to say that sopranos (or other voice types,
for that matter) should not mount it, but the piece is ideal for a performer who is accustomed to comic roles that emphasize text and subtext over consistent beauty of tone.

But the cycle offers other obstacles for the singer. The vocal lines are often quite jagged, with uncomfortable leaps and frequent trips to the extremes of the traditional vocal range. For instance, in the eighth song there is a leap from a sustained high A to the A two octaves below it. [Example 1] Granted, there is room for a breath here, but the physical mechanics still exist. Songs three and ten contain examples of such jumps and contours where such conveniences as breaths and space for adjustment are not possible. [Example 2] While some singers might be drawn to such challenges, most would find it too difficult or too time-consuming to learn, not to mention that it is potentially unflattering to the artist. Singers may also find the long preludes, interludes, and postludes tedious and unnecessary, and if one gives credence to the issue of vocalist vanity, it is understandable that many performers would eschew a song cycle that has extensive sections that are not about the singer. Petersen notes that in parts of the cycle “the vocal line is almost incidental, being clearly subordinate to the development of instrumental motives.”

Example 1. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 8, m.75.

![Example 1](image1)

Example 2a. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 3, mm.1 5-17.

![Example 2a](image2)

43 Peterson, *Ton und Wort*, 43.
Example 2b. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 10, mm. 17-20.

But pianists likewise have legitimate complaints concerning *Krämerspiegel*. It is well known that Strauss was preoccupied with writing operas and orchestral music at the time of his legal troubles with Bote & Bock. The piano part reflects this in its multiple voices, wide voicings of chords, and rapid temporal displacement of the hands. The first song has three contrapuntal voices in the piano (counting the block chords as a single voice), and at times these overlap, making the clarification of voices more difficult to execute. [Example 3] In an even more complex manner, song four begins with an elaborate four-voice fugue with sometimes as many rhythmic patterns occurring simultaneously. [Example 4] Wide voicing of chords can be seen throughout the first song, [Example 5] and songs seven and ten abound in demands on the performer to quickly displace his or her hands at rapid speeds. [Example 6] The lovely piano interlude to that opens song eight might entice some pianists to mount the piece, and it could be seen as a gesture of goodwill that Strauss put both performers on such equal footing. Nonetheless, it seems clear that the majority of pianists would at least hesitate before spending so much time perfecting something that would not ultimately be perceived as an impressive feat of virtuosity.

A final consideration for the performer is *Krämerspiegel*’s relationship to opera. This will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter VI, which deals with thoughts on mounting a performance of the cycle. Still, some general remarks will give a reading of the songs a fuller context. First, it is important to remember that Strauss saw the cycle as an interruption of his
operatic endeavors. He was preoccupied with the expansive genre and its potential for parody and dialectic between various styles of music. In an opera, the different characters and the pace

Example 3. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 1, mm. 10-13.

Example 4. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 4, mm. 15-16.

Example 5. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 1, mm. 32-34.
Example 6a. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 7, mm. 8-11.

Example 6b. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 10, mm. 1-16.
of the drama allow for quick juxtapositions that heighten and comment on the onstage situations in a kind of musical subtext that is distinctly Wagnerian. Indeed, Strauss is often portrayed as Wagner’s successor in this respect, in part because of this aesthetic that embraced an intermingling of text, music, and dramatic action.

It should also be noted that Strauss was extremely fond of Mozart. In *Die Zauberflöte*, Mozart used both “high” and “low” styles of music to represent and comment on the various characters, with German folk music epitomizing the earthily comic Papageno and various types of arias from traditional operas to paint the more “serious” characters. At times, the dramatic and sonic worlds collide. Although the level of dialectic is not as complex and intertwined as that of Strauss, Mozart gladly allows Pamina and Papageno to share a duet and places the bird-catcher in the hallowed halls of Sarastro’s brotherhood alongside Tamino.

This is a clear precedent for later composers of opera, and the approach is explored at length in Strauss’s operatic works. His tone poems also reflect this, with the subtext being provided by an external source. While the technique is not as successful in Lieder, *Krämerspiegel* seems to display similar thought processes, particularly in its extended piano solos and its rapid juxtaposition of various musical styles. Self-quotation also adds to the dramatic meaning, particularly when various themes are pitted against each other just as Strauss saw himself fighting Bote & Bock and the publishing industry.

**Audience Expectation and Response**

Another factor that condemns *Krämerspiegel* to obscurity is its narrow appeal to a highly select audience. Even at the time, only those who worked with the music publishing industry

---

44 It is Strauss’s love of the *Jupiter* symphony that led Kater to equate the composer with the flawed god. See Kater, 211.
would have comprehended the allusions in Kerr’s texts, and while understanding the musical references and quotations was not necessarily a prerequisite for engaging the piece, that layer of meaning would have been lost to anyone unfamiliar with Strauss’s *Der Rosenkavalier, Ein Heldenleben, Sinfonia Domestica, Tod und Verklärung*, and *Till Eulenspiegel*. The most likely candidates for such an audience would have been Strauss’s closest friends and admirers. Fellow musicians and composers would likewise be familiar with the satirized firms. The publishers who ran the companies, though clearly understanding Strauss’s intention, would probably not have been in attendance.

Modern audiences are at even more of a disadvantage. After all, how many people who attend song recitals are equipped with even a rudimentary knowledge of the pre-Weimar publishing industry? Likewise, only a handful would catch the musical quotations. A good translation accompanied by extensive program notes may prove one way to overcome the gap, but such an endeavor would be time-consuming and require a decent budget for printing. And it is questionable whether audiences would take the time to read something so lengthy and involved.

Even if these obstacles could be overcome, the music is not the easiest to listen to. Reviewing a Bard College retrospective called “Richard Strauss and His World,” critic Bernard Holland writes about struggling with how to make sense of Strauss:

> Strauss’s “Krämerspiegel” on Friday night again clouded the issue, with Sarah Rothengerg’s ethereal piano accompaniments set next to crudely antagonistic vocal texts sung by Peter Kazaras.
>
> The queasiness that overtakes the ear after long stretches is not easily explained away.45

---

The piece does have some beautiful passages, but its blend of styles is decidedly jarring. The piece demands a great deal from listeners, and people who simply want to hear some pretty music are likely to find *Krämerspiegel* more effort than they would prefer to exert. After all, listening attentively to any piece of art music requires a certain commitment of time and energy with the expectation of some aesthetic or intellectual payoff. And while artists often want to challenge the audience to deeper levels of appreciation, *Krämerspiegel* is a conundrum with few clues, a complex set of parts without any set of instructions on how they fit together.

Turning to the various styles employed, one notes that high romanticism, folk music, and the Viennese waltz are often starkly juxtaposed, not only with one another but also with atonal passages and non-functional chordal interpolations from distant keys. Savvy audience members might catch the many quotes from other works by Strauss, but even they might find the meaning of some of the tonal and stylistic shifts confusing and even tiresome to listen too. In a semiotic sense, it would be extremely difficult to figure out what Strauss means by this eclectic hodgepodge of unrelated musical elements. Likewise, audiences may be nonplussed as to the meaning of the long introductions, interludes, and postludes. After all, a song cycle lacks the dramatic subtext of an opera, and it is quite unusual at a song recital to watch the singer stand silent for minutes at a time while the piano seems to digress on sometimes unrelated material.

Unfortunately, most modern audiences (and perhaps numerous Weimar auditors) would not understand the accomplishments made by Strauss and his friends for composers’ rights. This too would need to be explained in program notes. And here the question is at its most crucial: what does Strauss want his audience to take away from this musical experience? The contention offered here is that he did not intend *Krämerspiegel* for general circulation as a concert piece. Rather, out of pique at his publishers, he composed a cycle that would isolate and even estrange
audiences, thus making the cycle both a private artistic triumph for himself and a work that would never make his enemies any money due to its use of privately understood parody.
CHAPTER V

DER BÖSENKAVALIER: THE SONGS OF DER KRÄMERSPIEGEL

1.

Es war einmal ein Bock, ein Bock
der frass an einem Blumenstock, der Bock
Musik, du lichte Blumenzier,
wie schmatzt der Bock voll Schmausegier!
Er möchte gar vermessen die Blüten alle,
alle fressen.
Du liebe Blüte wehre dich,
   du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich!
Schere dich, du Bock!
   Du liebe Blüte wehre dich!
Du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich, du Bock!

Once upon a time there was a Goat
Who fed on a stalk of flowers.
Music, you bright flowery ornament,
How the Goat smacks his lips with greed for the feast.
He would like presumptuously to eat all the flowers,
   all of them.
You lovely bloom, defend yourself,
   you Goat and greedy glutton, off with you!
Off with you, you Goat!
   You lovely bloom, defend yourself,
You goat and greedy glutton, off with you!

The first publisher to be skewered by Kerr’s sharp pen is the one closest to the conception of Krämerspiegel, the aforementioned Hugo Bock, head of the firm of Bote & Bock. The cycle was ostensibly being written for them so it is natural they should rank top billing, and the first two poems are dedicated to making plays on the two halves of the company’s name. It was quite convenient for Strauss and Kerr that Hugo Bock’s last name means “he-goat.” Thus, in the first song, the goat gluts himself on the blossoming flower Music.

The cycle begins rather humbly, with a straightforward folksong that is clearly in G. Both melody and harmony are relatively simple and clearly discernable, the chromatic leading tones in the right hand of the piano imbuing the texture with a rustic, even comic quality, as if the piano were slightly out of tune. [Example 7] While an educated listener would realize that this is neither high romanticism nor emerging modernism, they might be willing to give the piece the benefit of the doubt, perhaps recalling the humble nature of early Lieder or even the earthy music of Mozart’s Papageno. It may be simply a coincidence, but the piece is in G, the key of much of Papageno’s music.
The introduction is rather long—eighteen measures at a leisurely tempo. Though some in the audience might begin to grow restless and wonder when the singer was going to begin (or if, indeed, he or she somehow missed the entrance), others might remember some of Schumann’s cycles, such as Dichterliebe or Frauenlieben und leben, which have extended postludes. Perhaps
this is an attempt to comment on the practice. Edward F. Kravitt suggests as much in his *The Lied: Mirror of Late Romanticism*.46

When the vocal line enters, the rustic and comic nature of the piece is confirmed, particularly with the “Es war einmal…” (“Once upon a time…”) formula and a bucolic allegory about a naughty goat that eats a lovely flower, identified here with music. Words like “schmatzt” (“smacked”), “Schmausegier” (“greedy feast”), and “Gierschlung” (“greedy gulper”) are chosen for their humor, and the large downward leaps at “wie schmazt” (“how he smacked his lips”) and “fressen” (“to feed”) add to the overall effect. [Example 8] Of course, to begin a song cycle in such a strange manner is a bit outside the lofty tradition, and the listener is likely to be a bit mystified by the strange subject matter unless he or she is let in on the joke and understands the identity of the “Bock” in question. Even so, the internal consistency of the individual song merits some trust; it is in the subsequent songs that the confusion multiplies.

Example 8a & b. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 1, mm. 28-29, 35.

---

The second song finds the goat eyeing a specific bouquet, or “Strauss.” This “Rosenstrauss” is the rosy wreath that guards the entrance to the Rosenkavalier’s house against this “Botenbock.” Of course, the double allusion to the hero of Strauss’s recent opera is intentional. No specific member of the Bote family is mentioned in the literature; thus, Kerr appears to be expanding the satire to identify not only the heads of the firms but the firms themselves. The thorns prick the goat’s thick hide, and he falls back with, essentially, his “ass dragging.” The publishing firm of Bote & Bock failed to appreciate the humor of the song.

The first quotation from another musical work appears in the second song, which opens with a juxtaposition of motives, one a dark, brooding figure, played in three different octaves, all in the lower ranges of the piano. This theme, called by Baker “the principal motive of the cycle,” is perhaps intended to signify the composer; this is Cross’s interpretation, but other possibilities are likely. For instance, it’s appearance as the head of the fugue motive in the fourth song may suggest that it is Music or Art itself. Whatever its significance is, the theme is diametrically opposed to the one that follows. [Example 9]

This would be a light, high figure taken from Baron Ochs’s “mit mir” waltz music in Der Rosenkavalier. [Example 10] There are many such quotations from the opera in this song as

---

47 Baker, 65
Example 9. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 2, mm. 1-12.

\textsuperscript{48} Cross, 51-52
well as in the cycle as a whole. This quotation is placed in stark opposition to the preceding theme, which is decidedly more serious in tone. The chromatic waltz in the upper range of the piano may indicate a certain frivolous character not unlike the buffoonish Baron Ochs, who, though he is a villain, is undoubtedly a comic one. Baker points out that this version of the waltz is much less diatonic than that which appears in Der Rosenkavalier.49 Cross further notes that the rhythmic gesture becomes a motive that is juxtaposed against the steadier “composer motive.”50

[See Example 9] This theme alternates with the darker one, and both become more fragmented and eventually give way to the song proper.

The next quotation from Rosenkavalier appears in mm. 21-24 and again in mm.37-53. [Example 11] This has come to be known in the literature as the “Presentation of the Rose” theme. [Example 12] Its appearance in mm. 37-47 corresponds to the textual passage referencing the Rosenkavalier and the Rosenstrauss, thus identifying the hero and his gate’s guardian as the innocent protagonists just as Sophie and Octavian had to suffer the unpleasant advances and insinuations of Ochs.

Example 11a. Krämerspiegel, Song 2, mm. 20-24.

49 Baker, 66. See also Cross, 52-54, for her discussion of the theory that the “mit mir” music is derived from Josef Strauss’s Geheime Anziehungskräfte, or Dynamiden, op. 173. While this theory has precedent and deserves noting, it is not crucial to an understanding of Krämerspiegel.

50 Cross, 70.
Example 11b. Krämerspiegel, Song 2, mm. 36-53.
Whereas Del Mar and Baker both identify the previous two allusions, Cross finds another in the triplet figure of the interlude in mm. 97-99. [Example 13] She identifies the source as the “Tavern” scene in which Ochs is revealed as a philanderer. [Example 14]\(^{51}\) That this is an actual quotation is indeed questionable; still it would explain what would otherwise be a compositional anomaly as the figure appears nowhere else in the piece. That Strauss would have been careless or ambivalent in overlooking this detail is doubtful.


\(^{51}\) Cross, 66-68.
With the first sonority of the second song, the listener is introduced to a new style that is almost the polar opposite of that of the first song. The loud, low ascending figure in three octaves is strikingly serious and portentous coming from the amusing tale of the goat. [See Example 9] It may even seem dark and foreboding to some, although those put in the mind of Mozart’s Die Zauberflöte by the first piece might be inclined to consider the wise gravity of Sarastro. Those familiar with Strauss’s tone poems might even recall the rising heroic figures of Heldenleben or the second part of Tod und Verklärung, and there may be some astute enough to hear the opening motive as a transformation of the stepwise melody of the first song. Unfortunately, without text or some other external frame of reference, readings at this point will vary, and the wise listener will wait before forming an opinion as to the meaning of this new element.

Quickly there comes yet a third type of music, a high, light waltz, somewhat chromatic in nature but perhaps a welcome bit of levity for those who have started to miss the hungry goat already. As discussed, these two themes alternate in an increasingly fragmented dialogue before giving way to the main song, at which point one is left to puzzle out the significance of the interlude. Only with the knowledge that this is a reference to the simple-minded boor Baron Ochs does the meaning become clear: the light music is actually intended to represent the enemy (the publishers), and the heavy music reflects the serious intent of the protagonist (the artist).

The waltz of the song proper is clearly intended to be light-hearted and reminiscent of Rosenkavalier. The text even includes the title of the opera as well as a blatant combination of that and the composer’s name (“Rosenstrauss”). Again, the fairy tale formula is used “Einst kam…” (“Once came…”), and the audience meets a familiar figure, namely the goat of the first song. With the “Bock” so closely juxtaposed with his identification as “Bote” (“messenger”),
some early listeners might have quickly caught on to the parody of the publishing house even without knowing Strauss’s recent difficulties. For a modern audience, program notes would certainly be needed.

Though the music has moved from the folksy world to that of bourgeois dance, similar devices are to be found, namely large leaps in the vocal line, grace notes, and onomatopoeic words. Examples of large leaps include the first two notes of the vocal line and the repeated treatment of “O Bock” and “hinterwärts” [Example 15] while the use of grace notes and colorful text can be seen at “klopft” (“knocked”) and “Pfote” (“paw”). [Example 16]

Example 15a & b. Krämerspiegel, Song 2, mm. 28-30, 85-89.
Example 15c & d. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 2, mm. 105-110, 129-142.

0 Bock, zieh mit gesenktem Sterz

hinterwärts, hinterwärts!

mit gesenktem Sterz hinterwärts,

hinterwärts!
A particularly comic phrase occurs at “Der Strauss sticht seine Dornen schnell” (“The bouquet pricked his thorn quickly”), where the broken words are matched by equally staccato gestures in the piano. [Example 17] The music, however, becomes increasingly chromatic, and the vocal lines take on a certain aggressive jaggedness. The two statements of “O bock, zieh mit gesenktem Sterz hinterwärts” (“O goat, back away with your hindquarters dragging”) may merit such treatment, but those who were hoping for a jaunty little waltz might feel a little uneasy at this intrusion of yet another type of music. Though the waltz does settle back into a more typical lyric diatonicism, the listener is left with a considerable amount of material to process, especially given that they are only two songs into the cycle.

Example 17. Krämerspiegel, Song 2, mm. 72-78.
3.

Es liebte einst ein Hase die salbungsvolle Phrase,  
obschon wie ist das sonderbar,  
sein Breitkopf hart und härter war.  
Hu, wisst ihr, was mein Hase tut?  
Oft saugt er Komponistenblut,  
unt platzt hernach und platzt hernach vor Edelmut.

Once there was a Rabbit who loved unctuous phrases,  
Although that isn’t really peculiar,  
his broad head grew harder and harder.  
Hey! Do you know what my Rabbit did?  
He often sucks the blood of composers,  
And afterwards he bursts with noble generosity.

The third song in the cycle tells the story of a blood-sucking hare “Hase” with a broad head “Breitkopf” that is notably hard “hart” and becomes harder and harder “härter.” This parasitic rabbit is Oskar von Hase, who headed the firm of Breitkopf & Härtel. It was he who proposed extending royalties to include concert works in 1898. Apparently the hare enjoys speaking unctuously and feeds on the blood of composers. Once he has gorged himself, he bursts with high-minded generosity. Another more retributive reading not explored by either Baker or Cross is that this is another act of poetic justice by Strauss & Kerr: the composer’s noble blood may bloat the rabbit’s carcass to an untimely end.

Breitkopf & Härtel is described by Del Mar as “the most eminent of all German publishers.”52 Hase’s role in the 1898 Copyright discussion has already been mentioned as has his participation in the formation of GEMA. It should also be noted that the firm had refused to publish Strauss’s early compositions once he was no longer backed by his uncle, which might explain the particularly harsh treatment reserved for Hase. As late as 1986, Del Mar was able to write, “To this day the great publishing house remains adamant in banning the text on, for example, programmes and record sleeves.”53

Del Mar further says of the third song that it is “full of rich twisting phrases suggestive of Wagner, of Hänsel und Gretel or of Strauss himself, especially in the closing bars which descend

52 Del Mar, 361.  
53 Ibid.
in shifting harmonies recalling *Don Quixote*.54 Whereas Baker presumably reads this more stylistically, not making any mention of specific allusions, Cross extrapolates a great deal more from Del Mar’s suggestion. She sees the turns of the melody as an evocation of Brünhilde’s motive from Wagner’s *Götterdammerung* and finds a more direct correlation between the final chords of the piece to those of *Don Quixote* [Example 18] as is proposed by Del Mar.55 Furthermore, she offers suggestions as to their meanings in the context of the piece.


This raises the thorny question of whether a passage “reminiscent of” a certain piece is actually a specific “allusion to” or even “quotation from” said piece. Clearly Cross’s discussion is on one side of the argument while Baker’s omission of any mention to these pieces represents the other.56 Del Mar remains comfortably in between the two opposing poles as his overview is not intended to be exhaustive; likewise, one could read his comments as more descriptive of the general style as opposed to a prescriptive list of what is being referenced. While this dissertation

54 Ibid.
55 Cross, 74-76, 79.
56 Interestingly enough, it is Baker who, in the fourth song, finds the postlude as texturally reminiscent of *Till Eulenspiegel*. She goes so far as to call it a “reference” whereas neither Del Mar nor Cross makes any mention of the tone poem in this section. See p.83. Again the question is raised concerning the blurry lines between similarity, allusion, and quotation.
Example 18b. *Don Quixote*, final measures.

does not seek to decide either way, it is worth noting that Cross’s comments on the style of the work are far more pertinent to the question at hand. She says, “In choosing to parody Wagner,
Strauss also evokes his own early opera *Guntram* and his very early songs. The interpretation she derives from this is not wholly convincing, but her reference to Strauss’s earlier style of writing for voice is an important point. It is this style of Lieder writing that Bote & Bock desired as it was easy to market and sell; the satiric writing of *Krämerspiegel* references this style but juxtaposes it with several others in a sort of mini-opera without dramatic context.

The third song is at once less and more problematic for the audience. With a few exceptions, it could stand as representative of Strauss’s approach to the whole set. The writing reflects the high romanticism of the composer’s early Lieder and exhibits many characteristics that are typical of the genre. However, the points of departure seem intrusive and even antagonistic given the sense of expectation, the “contract,” established between the audience and the generic norms. Clearly, Strauss is establishing a certain dialectic with the concept of Lieder in general and song cycles in particular.

While the third song does not demonstrate the long introductions, interludes, and postludes that characterize several of its companion songs, it exhibits many of the other qualities that make *Krämerspiegel* rather difficult to approach for both performer and audience member. The text has been summarized and the allusions to publishing entities explained. But even if the majority of audience members were familiar with the firm Breitkopf & Härtel, which is still extant, it is questionable how many would know that Oskar von Hase ran it in Strauss’s time. Thus, unless precautions are taken, the text becomes an inexplicable fable about a blood-sucking rabbit that feeds on composers and then explodes with generosity. While the modernist, absurd, and experimental were beginning to be explored in the arts, they are not the norm for Lieder of the time, particularly those from the pen of Richard Strauss.
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57 Cross, 74.
This stands in even starker relief when one considers that this is the most straightforward of the songs, with its strong use of romantic harmonies, ornamentation, and characteristic figures both vocal and pianistic. Note the leading tone harmonies of “Hase” and “Phrase” as well as the use of turns in both the piano and the vocal line. [Example 22] Also, the writing for both performers is, overall, idiomatic. However, the two-octave range and the disjunct leaps at “Breitkopf hart und härter war” are departures from normative writing for the voice; the extremities of range are most noticeable at the point where the line becomes most jagged, the interval from “hart” to “und” spanning a tenth. [See Example 20 below] In the postlude Strauss sabotages a relatively tonal harmony with a bizarre harmonic progression that is as arresting to the ear as it is to the rapidly shifting piano voicing. Audiences would thus be aware that parody is being invoked, but they may wonder whether perhaps their own senses of expectation were being made fun of.

Example 19. Krämerspiegel, Song 3, mm. 9-14.
After all, one has to first consider and accept the incongruity between the text and the music. The text is once again a fable, with its characteristic opening, “Es liebte einst…” (“There once was a rabbit who loved…”) and its use of an animal as the primary character. The music, however, is more serious than that of the first two, and the divide becomes almost horrific when one discovers that this strange, unctuous animal is also a kind of vampire or parasite. This is introduced with an almost histrionic setting of “Hu, wisst ihr…” (“Hey, do you know…”) with a stark shift in texture, dynamics leading back into the more romantic style for the revelation.

[Example 20] Is the cycle humorous or serious, silly or scary?

Example 20. Krämerspiegel, Song 3, mm. 15-18.

4.

Drei Masken sah ich am Himmel stehn
wie Larven sind sie anzusehn.
O Schreck! dahinter sieht man
Herrn Friedmann!

I saw three masks in the heavens
That looked like ghouls.
Oh horror! Behind them can be seen
Mr. Friedmann!

The forgotten firm of Drei Masken Verlag, run by a Mr. Friedmann, provides the butt of Kerr’s next joke. A horrific sight appears in the sky – three masks that look like ghouls. “Larven” can also translate as “larvae,” which links it to the animal theme; poetically the spectral rendering is preferred, but the double meaning is probably intended.) Of course, there is nothing
to fear as the speaker spies behind the masks Mr. Friedmann, the ponderous music giving way to a light, comic jaunt.

The fourth song opens with a style of music that is undeniably serious. Once again comes the ominous theme that opened the second song, only this time it used in a four voice fugal texture in the piano. Moreover, the motive, now a fugal subject, degenerates into an almost atonal series of jagged leaps. [Example 21] The tone is predominantly dark and heavy, and the thick contrapuntal writing is only intermittently broken by episodes of homophony. While the tonality is decidedly B-flat minor, the end of the subject’s atonal character is a constant reminder of the instability being invoked. Clearly, the listener is to take this song as a recondite work, especially given the length and nature of the introduction.

The voice confirms this with its echo of the head of the subject and its dramatic declamation. Likewise, the text paints a rather startling picture of three spectral masks and its interjection “O Schreck…” (“Oh Horror…”). [Example 22] The tension builds to a fortississimo chord and a cliffhanging “sieht man…” (“one sees…”) with a fermata delaying the resolution. [Example 23] And up to this point, there has been no indication that the answer to the mysterious vision will be anything less than horrific.

Example 22. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 4, mm. 17-25.
Example 23. Krämerspiegel, Song 4, mm. 26-32.

However, it is only Herrn Friedmann, whose innocuous identity is revealed with a lively polka, breaking the mood entirely and dispelling the serious nature of the piece as well. On the one hand, it is a masterful use of suspense, the building of tension, and a comic release that demonstrates a strong understanding of parody. On the other hand, it is yet another thwarting of audience expectation and yet another bizarre juxtaposition of two very different musical styles. Even audience members who are willing to go along with this exercise of musical dialectic may nonetheless find the reference to an obscure publishing firm a bit difficult to comprehend. It is not clear why this firm appears so ominous nor is it made known why Mr. Friedmann’s management of it is so comical. One might realize that, yes, Strauss is deriding publishers, but the threat here is painted as minimal and the offense is not even hinted at as in other poems (e.g. the greedy goat and the blood-sucking rabbit).

Del Mar, Cross, and Baker are all silent as to the reason Strauss chose Drei Masken Verlag for his parody, and the text offers no clues. The most obvious reason would be related to the copyright wars and the opposing factions of the GDT and GEMA; to this date nothing certain
has been confirmed in the literature, certainly due in part to the firm’s obscurity. One can only hypothesize that they were somehow aligned with the enemy camp.

Fairy tales and fables often speak of a cunning fox, called “Reynard.” “Reinecke” is the German equivalent, and in the fifth song, the publishing house of Brüder Reinecke can be translated as “Fox Brothers,” or even “Reynard Brothers,” since Kerr uses the less poetic taxonomy “Füchsen” to make the literary allusion more clear. The narrator warns that if you have written a tone poem, you should watch out for such characters, particularly the Reynard Brothers, who devour what belongs to you. The Brüder Reinecke apparently never published any work of Strauss although it is possible that he was rejected by them. This is nowhere verified in the literature although Del Mar confirms that they were in the “enemy camp,” most likely referring to the copyright dispute. Another possibility is that one of Strauss’s friends had suffered under the hand of Karl and Franz Reinecke, who owned the company. Since a “tone poem” is mentioned in the text, it is likely that the firm had unduly profited from a specific work although identity of that composition and its author remain undiscovered.

One thing is certain: the Reynard Brothers of song five are indeed destructive and ravenous. The lively music evokes the spirit of a foxhunt, with the voice perhaps acting as a horn call. It is clearly in E Major, but there are numerous quick chromatic shifts that happen
suddenly and with little or no preparation. [Example 24] The allegorical fairy tale animals return again as do the light, comic grace notes in the voice. [Example 25] All in all, for the listener this is comparatively a straightforward song, especially now that one expects to find different musical styles in every Lied of the cycle; in this one, the style remains consistent throughout, which makes it easier to interpret. It is also tonally closed though some may find the shifting harmonies a bit off-putting.


---

58 Del Mar, 362.
The shift from a narrative tone to one that is more cautionary should not go unnoticed as it begins to establish a smoother literary link to the final poems, which are more general in their satire and avoid lampooning specific companies and people. An alert listener would note the shift from simple narrative to imperative warning: essentially, “If you have composed a tone poem, watch out for the foxes that would devour what is yours.” This admonishing tone carries
into the sixth song as well, giving way to the seventh song, which goes back to a more narrative approach even though it does speak of peril from an enemy.

6.

O lieber Künstler sei ermahnt   O dear Artist, be warned,
und übe Vorsicht jedenfalls!   And in any case exercise caution!:
Wer in gewissen Kähnen kahnt,   Whoever boats in certain boats,
dem steigt das Wasser bis zum Hals. Will find himself in water up to his neck.
Und wenn ein dunkel trübes Licht   And when a dark, dreary light
derdächtig aus dem Nebel lugt,   Glimmers suspiciously through the fog,
lustwandle auf der Lienau nicht,   Don’t go strolling on the Lienau,
weil dort der lange Robert spukt,   For that’s where Tall Robert haunts,
Der lange Robert!   Tall Robert!
Dein Säckel wird erobert vom langen Robert! Your purse will be stolen by Tall Robert!

In song six the word play is somewhat stretched, and even Leo Connolly’s deft translation for Baker demonstrates that Kerr’s Procrustean bed can yield bizarre results for the sake of a joke:

This verse is more problematical to translate because Kerr stretches the wordplay by inventing words. Two firms are mentioned in this verse: C. F. Kahnt of Leipzig and Robert Lienau of Berlin. *Kahn* can mean “small boat” or “skiff.” Kerr has made a verb out of the noun, thus arriving at *kahnt*, which in the original edition was underlined to emphasize the point. Kerr uses *Lienau* as the name of a park or “pleasure ground.” This *Lienau* is haunted by Tall Robert, who is Robert Heinrich Lienau, the operator of the firm.59

The Artist is warned in this poem to exercise caution when boating and to avoid strolling through the Lienau. Tall Robert, the Lienau’s mysterious bandit, has a name that plays nicely off the verb *erobert*, “captured,” or “conquered.” Apparently Lienau had published Strauss’s *Feierlicher Einzug der Ritter des Johanniter-Ordens* in 190960 while Kahnt never published the composer’s work. Robert Lienau’s association with the formation of GEMA has been mentioned, and it would be logical that Kahnt also played a part. Perhaps this is the simple

59 Baker, 35.
60 See Del Mar, 483 for the particular reference. The work is discussed by Del Mar in Vol. II, pp. 270-271.
explanation for all of the publishers that appear in the cycle; it is likely that Strauss sent Kerr a list of names, and the GEMA role would have made an easy source.

The sixth song poses a problem similar to that of the third song, namely that the references to other pieces are difficult to pin down. Del Mar remains silent as to the possibility of any quotations while Baker sees a quotation of the “Naturmotiv” of Das Rheingold from Wagner’s operatic cycle Der Ring des Nibelungen. The text at that point does contain the words “Nebel” and “lugt,” which she sees as combining into “a pangram for Nibelungen.” Though Cross entertains this possibility, she finds the motives more derivative of Rosenkavalier and Strauss’s own “Naturmotiv,” which appears in Lieder such as “Ständchen” and is derived in turn from Wagner’s motive of the same name. These speculations deserve noting, but they do little to further an understanding of Krämerspiegel from the perspective of the performers as well as that of the audience.

Anyone lulled into a false sense of security by the fifth song would find the interpretive work a little harder in the sixth. Del Mar identifies the piece as a Mazurka. While this might not strike the average listener, there is an unmistakable lilt and sense of leisure to the music. Once again, there are both a rather lengthy introduction and an extended postlude, but if this comes as a surprise to anyone in the audience, they haven’t been paying attention. The melody is tonal, and while there is pervasive chromaticism, it is more straightforward here than elsewhere and doesn’t threaten anything harsh or unprepared.

The textual parody is more complex here, with the more forced references to C. F. Kahnt and Robert Lienau having been explained above as have been the more veiled references to

---

61 Baker, 94.
62 Cross, 96, 100-101.
63 Cross, 96ff.
64 Del Mar, 362.
Strauss’s other works and a possible nod to Wagner. Explaining this in program notes would be advisable but tedious due to the difficulties in the word play and the subtleties in the musical allusion. The neologism “kahnt” and the more idiomatic German would be similarly problematic though not prohibitively so.

Essentially one is faced with another fable of caution, this time warning the listener to be careful while boating (“kahnt”) or taking a leisurely stroll in the Lienau pleasure grounds. In the first case, there is the potential of finding oneself in water up to the neck, and in the second there is the danger of being robbed by a bandit called Tall Robert. The two passages of caution are marked by the greatest amount of digression from the song’s lyricism and tonality, but the departures are not as sudden and stark as in previous songs, and the text justifies the change in tone. In the first case, “dem steigt das Wasser bis zum Hals,” (“he will be in water up to his neck”) prepares the shift from major to minor; the texture upon the return of the vocal part after a brief interlude retains the same figuration and texture of the first half of the song. [Example 26] The second one is more imposing and paints the stark summoning of “Der lange Robert” (“Tall Robert”) in a dramatic fashion, but even this yields to music that unifies the piece as a pleasing whole. [Example 27] Thus, despite the textual oddities, Strauss manages to make this one of the more straightforward parts of the whole. Indeed, Baker reminds us that this was the last song of the cycle to be set, taking Strauss a whole day of work before he was satisfied with it.65

A remark from Del Mar is worth noting: “The elegant Mazurka Strauss conjures out of all this nonsense would make a pretty little piano piece on its own without the foolish voice line, which curiously makes no independent musical contribution.” 66 This is a rather harsh opinion and certainly open for debate. However, this observation points to the importance of the piano

65 Baker, 88.
66 Del Mar, 362.
part. This may foreshadow, in a way, the long piano interlude before the eighth song, which could also stand alone as a short work for keyboard.

Example 26. Krämerspiegel, Song 6, mm. 39-58.
Example 27. Krämerspiegel, Song 6, mm. 74-93.
As a final jab at a specific publisher Kerr offers up B. Schott’s Söhne in the seventh song. The Germans were fighting the British in the Great War of the time, thus the reference to “the Brit” as the enemy. So too were they finding an enemy in “the Scot” (“Schott”). The particular “Scot” here is a merciless rack-stretcher (“Strecker”), and the image evoked is that of merciless torture. Of course, the name of the head of the Schott firm happened to be Ludwig Strecker. The allusion to the British may also reference Schott’s holdings in England. Strecker was a member of the GEMA coalition, and his firm’s financial dealings with the English may have made him doubly culpable in Strauss’s eyes.

In the seventh song, the postlude is a polka that appears to be based on a theme from *Don Quixote*. Though Baker does not make any mention of the reference, Del Mar sees in the final bars of the song “a coda of high good humour in which the jagged principal theme reveals an unsuspected allegiance to Sancho Panza before dying away to nothing.”67 [Example 28] This is identified by Cross as Sancho’s “shepherd” or “country bumpkin” motive.68 [Example 29] Her presentation is more convincing here than than in the extrapolations of the third and sixth songs. Also more convincing is her further assertion that Sancho’s theme is derived from “The Fool” motive from *Guntram*.69 This makes a great deal of sense as it explains the reason why someone
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67 Baker, 362.  
68 Cross, 110, 111.  
69 Cross, 110, 112.
as menacing as the brutal torturer of the poem is suddenly revealed as a comic figure. As with Herr Friedmann in the fourth song, Ludwig Strecker is not a character to be taken seriously.

Example 28. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 7, mm. 32-56.
Example 29. *Don Quixote*, end of 71 into 72.
Song seven is similar to song four in that a dark and heavy opening yields quickly to a roguish parody in the end. The stormy prelude, marked by heavy chords and downward scales in octaves, is, again, a bit on the long side, but the fast tempo makes it seem less so. The vocal declamation is similar to song four, but the disjunct vocal line beginning at “Manchen hat…” is arresting and even unsettling. [Example 30] One might be reminded of Wagner’s antagonistic dwarf Mime.

Example 30. Krämerspiegel, Song 7, mm. 24-27.

Audiences of Strauss’s time would have easily caught the reference to the British as enemies, but modern listeners might need reminding. Also, the publishing firm would need to be identified as would its head, but the offense is more clearly stated here than in the fourth song. Still, it is strange that a quick dance hall style of music reveals that the daring torturer is actually nonthreatening, especially given the buildup to the climax. Is this a madman who stretches his victims out on the rack or is he a silly object of derision? The play on words is clear, but the intent could be slightly confusing for the listener trying to reconcile the animosity with the effervescent satire.
The second part of *Krämerspiegel* is a set of five songs lampooning the publishing industry as a collective. It opens with a brief verse referencing Strauss’ tone poem *Tod und Verklärung*. The message is that the merchants bring death (“Tod”) to music and transfiguration (“Verklärung”) to themselves.

One significant passage from the eighth song is not a quotation from Strauss’s prior works; rather, he uses the music again in his later opera *Capriccio*. [See Example 32 below] At the time of *Krämerspiegel*, however, it was entirely new although Cross finds in it quotations from *Heldenleben.* Far more compelling and indeed more pertinent to this study is her discussion of its relationship to Strauss’s early Lieder, most notably “Allerseelen” and “Zueignung.” Cross’s view that *Rosenkavalier* is also evoked in the writing are duly noted but less convincing. Most noticeable in the song is a blatant quotation from *Tod und Verklärung*, which coincides with Kerr’s play on the title. [Example 31]

Depending on the tempo, the forty-three-measure piano interlude that begins song eight can be anywhere from two and a half to over three minutes long. It is basically self-contained and arguably the most attractive music of the cycle. Modern listeners may recognize the music as belonging to Strauss’s opera *Capriccio* although a 1918 audience would have to wait many years to hear the music in this context. Cross asserts, “the last five songs differ in character from
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70 Cross, 113-119.
71 Ibid.
72 Cross, 119-120, 122.
the first seven, and this interlude returns in the final song, bracketing a sort of cycle-within-a-
cycle.”\textsuperscript{73}

Example 31a., \textit{Krämerspiegel}, Song 8, mm. 75-78.

\begin{musicexample}
\begin{music}
\begin{musicxml}
<score>...
\end{musicxml}
\end{music}
\end{musicexample}

But why this lovely piano solo in the middle of a song cycle? After all, it is practically a piece in its own right, and the vocalist never sings the material. Of course, the attentive listener must wait until the end of the cycle to realize that the music returns, but the enigma remains. One solution that has not been put forth is that this is exactly the kind of material Bote & Bock desired. It clearly evokes Strauss’s early Lieder with its soaring melody over an active yet unintrusive accompanying figure of arpeggiated chords. The harmony is quite straightforward though not without its high romantic chromaticism, its yearning suspensions, and its straightforward purpose to be, as Strauss writes in the tempo marking, “Ruhig singend,” or “calmly singing.” [Example 32] It is almost another “Allerseelen” or “Morgen.” This is what the composer was capable of, and he could write such music well, but he was not inclined to do so under legal duress. In giving the most marketable music of the cycle to the solo piano, he is

\textsuperscript{73} Cross, 113.
Example 32., *Krämerspiegel*, Song 8, mm. 1-44.
Example 32. (cont.)
essentially thumbing his nose at the publishing firm. If they wanted to make money from this work, they would first have to allow the libelous text to circulate, and then they would face the challenge of interesting performers in the piece. Also, an audience might puzzle over Strauss’s choice of relegating the most tuneful music of a song cycle to a portion of the work that might be “singing” but wasn’t “sung.”

There is a rhetorical reason too for putting an extensive piano interlude at this point of the cycle. The framing of the “cycle within the cycle” has already been mentioned, but even without knowing the closing material, the audience realizes that this is a distinct (albeit lengthy) division, and the broadening out of the text to the publishing world as a whole confirms such a discrete break.

Before the voice enters, however, Strauss introduces a new musical idea, one that is more agitated and in the relative minor. [Example 33] The first theme reasserts itself before being
abruptly interrupted by the second material accompanied by the entrance of the voice, which confirms what the listener already knows from the warring musical ideas: “Art is being threatened.” Of course, the text clarifies that the “Kunst” (“Art,” which should probably be capitalized in English as well, given the personification) is being menaced not by other music, but rather “vom Händlern” (“by the merchants”), who are in this case the publishing firms taken as a group. Just at the point where the most confused audience member might be ready to give up, the meaning of the cycle becomes more than allegorical; *Der Krämerspiegel* is a mirror for the shopkeeper, as the listener is more literally reminded in this song.

Example 33. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 8, mm. 45-54.
The two musical ideas do further battle, until there is a sharply punctuated climax ending with a loud sustained chord supporting the vocalist’s high A. This is made even starker by the immediate drop of two octaves in the vocal line to a quiet quotation of the “Transfiguration” motive of *Tod und Verklärung*, mentioned above. The text, of course, sets this up with a play on the title. The merchants bring death to Music, reserving transfiguration for themselves and giving the secondary material a certain victory celebration in the postlude. [Example 34] The calm first theme, however, has the last word although the harmonies are less stable and the final sonorities are minor. Art Music has escaped annihilation, but perhaps it did not survive unscathed.

Example 34. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 8, mm. 75-108.
Example 34. (cont.)
Es war mal eine Wanze,    Once there was a Bedbug
die ging, die ging auf's Ganze.    Who went all the way.
Gab einen Duft, der nie verflog,    He let off a stink that never went away,
und sog und sog.    And sucked and sucked.
Doch Musici, die packten sie und knackten sie.    But the Musicians grabbed it and cracked it.
Und als die Wanze starb und stank,    And as the Bedbug died and stank,
ein Lobgesang zum Himmel drang.    A song of praise rose up to heaven.

The next song, the ninth of the cycle, returns to the storytelling mode and the animal imagery. This time the publishing industry is a foul-smelling bedbug (“Wanze”) that gets swollen from the blood it sucks; musicians then grab it, crush it, and kill it. It also stinks, and just as the smell rises from the carcass so, too, a “Lobgesang,” a song of praise, rises to heaven. The highly chromatic setting is also a play on the musical slang meaning of “Wanze,” which refers to the accidental English speakers call a “sharp.” Also worth noting is the previous appearance in the cycle of the blood-sucking rabbit of the third song. Note that the rabbit of song three experienced a similar demise. And since the allegory has extended from individuals and corporate entities to the publishing industry as a whole, it is understood that all of those who profit from the work of composers will share the same grisly fate.

The ninth song begins with another long introduction. This one is not only lengthy but also highly chromatic; indeed, the reiterated half step relationship in the harmonic voice leading, the pervasive melodic use of the interval, and the prominent use of melodic sixths give the piece an almost serial or even atonal feel. [Example 35] This unsettling use of chromaticism and the recurrent use of a sforzando on the second half of the first beat [Example 36; see also Example 35] are explained by the entrance of the vocal line. The overwhelming dissonance of the song,
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74 Geoffrey Walker’s translation for the Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau recording (see Appendix A) inexplicably has the bedbug gripping and breaking the musicians.
the meandering nature of the left hand melody, and the jarring offbeat accents are obviously musical representations of the song’s subject: a bedbug. The use of “Wanze” (literally, “bedbug”) as musical slang for “sharp,” whether understood or conveyed through program notes also helps the listener comprehend Strauss’s choices. And, naturally, such a chromatic setting of the text involves many sharps, lending another layer to Strauss’s musical play on words.

Example 35. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 9, mm. 1-23
Example 36. Krämerspiegel, Song 9, mm. 30-44.

The opening “Es war mal…” (“There once was…”) again invokes the world of the fairy tale as does the beastly inhabitant of the song. This bedbug appears to be a pernicious sort as it “goes all the way” (“ging aug’s Ganze”) and gives off a fragrance that never goes away as it sucks. The bite of the bug is felt not only in the piano’s use of sforzando but also in the accents on the unaccented syllables of “Wanze” and “Ganze.” [See Example 36] The fable, however, is
not clear at this point, at least from a strictly aural reading. Once again, a dialectical shift in musical material is used to make the meaning apparent.

The change to a “somewhat livelier” (“etwas lebhafter”) tempo and more tonal and aggressive musical material underline the textual revelation that this is a bedbug that plagues musicians. The bedbug is none other than the merchants of the previous song as represented by the personalities and companies lampooned in the first seven Lieder of the cycle. The musicians grab and crack the bedbug, thus leading to a return of the earlier tempo and musical material. This reprise may indicate the fading life of the now incapacitated vermin. [Example 37] As the bug starves and stinks, a song of praise (“Lobgesang”) rises to heaven in yet another jarring juxtaposition of three distinct musical materials. [Example 38] The text is rather explanatory along these lines, however, and the return to the first musical material of the song in a noticeably G Major context helps bring a bit of coherence to the piece. But the bedbug lives on as the dissonant F# against the G Major chord of the final sonorities; apparently, the listener must surmise, publishers are an unfortunate necessity and will never die out entirely. [See Example 38] Indeed, a few of the publishing firms mentioned in the cycle outlived Strauss himself.

Example 37. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 9, mm. 50-59.
Example 37. (cont.)

Example 38. Krämerspiegel, Song 9, mm. 60-70.
Publishers are fleecers ("Schröpfer") in song ten, and they trample through the hall of the arts like the Ox of Lerchenau ("Ochs von Lerchenau," referencing the buffoonish antagonist of Strauss’ opera Der Rosenkavalier). Whereas artists are a creative force, publishers are painted as destructive, sly, avaricious, belligerent, and infested with vermin. Though these bugs are clearly more microscopic in nature ("Bazillenträger," or “germ-carrier” is related to the English borrowing of the Latin bacilli for a certain bacteria) the juxtaposition with the bedbug of the previous song can’t escape notice.

Themes from Der Rosenkavalier pervade the tenth song. Cross and Baker seem conflicted as to the exact source of the material, the former seeing Faninal’s motive from Act II as the basis for the introduction and the latter siding with Ochs’s Act I entrance. Both agree that mm. 8-11 of the song are a mutation of Ochs’s “mit mir” theme. [Example 39] Cross furthermore sees mm. 24-30 as a paraphrase of one of Faninal’s lines, where he “mockingly describes Ochs’s lust for Sophie, ‘Da sitzt ein Lerchenau und karessiert in Ehrbarkeit mein Sopherl’ (‘there sits a Lerchenau and caresses my little Sophie respectfully’).” [Example 40] The precedent for this invocation of Faninal in this song is found in Del Mar’s commentary who sees the use of Faninal’s motive as “referring to the poor old man’s noble aspirations towards the
house of Lerchenau, [but which] ends by being applied more to Ochs’s boorishness.” Cross provides an alternate reason for Strauss’s use of Faninal: “In Strauss’s metaphor the publishers aspire to become artists, just as Ochs and Faninal hope to become aristocrats, and they attempt to own art, just as Ochs seeks to own Sophie.” This seems a bit more in line with Strauss’s attack on his enemies, and indeed they are represented in the eleventh song by the twofold description “die Händler und die Macher,” which has been translated in various ways—“the handlers and the masterminds,” “the wheelers and the dealers,” “the shopkeepers and the bosses.” However the phrase is translated, it is clear that Strauss is broadening his offense to include the publishers (represented by Ochs) and anyone who would assist them (such as Faninal).

Example 39. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 10, mm. 8-11.

An understanding of the cycle’s relationship to *Rosenkavalier* will certainly help the audience relate to the tenth song, especially since the “Ochs” of “Lerchenau” is one of the similes used to describe those who would fleece the artistic creators of the text. But before one hears the text, there is yet another extended introduction. The lively tempo certainly makes it shorter, but the widely-spaced voicing in the piano and the quick harmonic shifts make for an uneasy journey to understanding Strauss’s intention.

75 Cross, 137-139.
76 Del Mar, 364.
77 Cross, 135-136
Example 40a. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 10, mm. 22-33.


78 See Appendix A.
Example 40b. (cont.)

The introduction is matched by an equally disjunct vocal line, and both combine with the list of negative associations (or accusations) heaped upon the enemies of the artist to give a rather unsettled feeling to the audience. These associations are presented first in the form of questions: “Who tramples through the house of artists?” “Who lays nets like the hunter?” “Who is the guardian of the money sack?” “Who is the one who stirs up quarrels?” “Who is the one who carries germs?”

Another dialectic shift to a more leisurely tempo and a more ingratiating musical idiom accompanies the obviously facetious answer. It is the publisher, who is characterized as honest, friendly, and even excellent. Of course, the listener is aware of the sarcasm. The musical setting is simply designed to drive the point home, and Strauss does drive the point home well with his extended melisma on “edle” (“noble”)—this is apparently the least of the publisher’s qualities. [Example 41]
Example 41. Krämerspiegel, Song 10, mm. 42-57.

etwas gemächlicher

bie - de-re, der freund - li-che, der treff - li-che, der

die Ver - le - ger!
11.

Die Händler und die Macher
sind mit Profit und Schacher
des “HELDEN” Widersacher.
Der lässt ein Wort erklingen
wie Götz von Berlichingen.

The Merchants and the Bigwigs
Are, with their profit and haggling
The Hero’s enemies.
He lets a word sound forth
Like Götz von Berlichingen.

Song eleven pits the greedy wheelers and dealers (“die Händler und die Macher”) against the Hero; “HELDEN” is in quotes and capitalized in the text itself. Clearly Ein Heldenleben is being invoked here as is that heroic character Beethoven whose famous Fifth Symphony incipit is used. Of course, as the text goes on to explain, it is not Beethoven the hero that is being referenced but rather the hero of Goethe’s play Götz von Berlichingen. The title character is infamous in Germany for his line in which he defiantly states, “Du kannst mich am Arsch lecken” (literally, “You can lick my ass”). In Germany the four-note motive became a nonverbal substitution for the phrase “Leck mich am Arsch,” which would be translated as “kiss my ass” in more idiomatic English. This is obviously a variant of the famous line from Götz von Berlichingen. The words employed by Goethe’s Götz are used by the Hero to answer the vulgar wheeler-dealers, and the quote from Beethoven is intended to hit the point home, not to mention that it puts Strauss in the favorable light of his heroic musical predecessor.

Strauss gets even more personal in the eleventh song by using his own “Hero” theme from Ein Heldenleben in the left hand piano of the opening measures. This is juxtaposed with the Heldenleben theme that signifies the Hero’s adversaries. [Example 42] Cross and Del Mar also find references to Symphonia Domestica, namely the use of a theme identified by Del Mar as representing Strauss in the tone poem. Cross identifies it as “the husband, wife and child

---

79 Del Mar says of Strauss that “contrary to general belief, he never saw himself in the role of hero where Ein Heldenleben was concerned, but simply used elements of his life by way of illustration.” p. 364.
80 Del Mar, 364.
motive,\textsuperscript{81} but whatever its specific meaning in \textit{Symphonia Domestica}, its transformation here would signify Strauss. [Example 43] It is interesting to note that both authors focus on different passages, Cross on the opening vocal line and Del Mar on the setting of “HELDEN;” Baker, however, makes no mention of the \textit{Symphonia Domestica} quotation, devoting her attention entirely to the \textit{Heldenleben} references, which are more immediately recognizable.

Example 42a. \textit{Krämerspiegel}, Song 11, mm. 1-9.

\textsuperscript{81} Cross, 143.
Example 42a. (cont.)

Example 42c. *Ein Heldenleben*, opening measures of *Etwas langsamer*.

Example 43. *Symphonia Domestica*, 119.
This song also includes the aforementioned quotation of the opening motive from Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. [Example 44] This has been discussed as both an association with the heroic composer and a defiant gesture towards the publishers. Cross offers another gloss that, while not altogether convincing, is interesting and worth mentioning:

It is interesting to note that the same rhythmic pattern is also used as the Kommissarius’s (Commissary of Police) motive in Der Rosenkavalier…The Baron is in the Inn with Mariandel (Octavian, disguised), where he is made to look a fool through the plottings of Octavian, Valzacchi and Annina. Pandemonium breaks loose; Annina, disguised, claims the Baron is her husband, four children run in screaming “Papa! Papa!,” and the Innkeeper and Valzacchi accuse him of bigamy, threatening scandal and the police. The Baron, in defense, calls for the police himself. The Kommissarius appears, accompanied by the Beethoven motive. The motive seems to be abusively directed at the Baron, whom the Kommissarius also derides verbally, calling him “that fat, bald guy.” By means of the Beethoven motive, Strauss allows the Kommissarius in essence to tell the Baron to “kiss my ass.”

Song eleven is the only one of the cycle with no piano introduction at all. This draws a certain attention to itself. Perhaps Strauss was running out of devices to hold the listener’s attention, or perhaps it is simply a concession that faithful listeners have already grasped Strauss’s point. In any case, the “wheelers and dealers” are pitted here against the “HERO,” with whom they haggle over profits in an adversarial manner. This should be by now quite a clear statement to the audience so little interpretation from that perspective is needed. And even if the listener does not catch the musical reference to Heldenleben it would be extremely difficult for him or her to miss the quotation of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. Yet the invocation of the ultimate musical hero is well understood; modern listeners, however, would require program notes for the allusion to Goethe’s play and the more crude usage of the incipit.

82 Cross, 150-151.
Example 44. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 11, mm. 10-22

*Der lässt ein Wort erklingen*

*wie Götz von Berlichingen.*
12.

O Schröpferschwarm, o Händlerkreis, wer schiebt dir einen Riegel?  
O swarm of fleecers, O circle of merchants,!  
Who will put an end to you?  
That’s already been done with new roguishness.  
By Till Eulenspiegel.

Concluding the cycle is an epigram on the commercial world. Essentially, the poet ponders who will shoot down this swarm of fleecers. The answer: it has already been done by the clever rogue Till Eulenspiegel, the protagonist of Strauss’s tone poem of the same name. In the final song, the horn theme from *Till Eulenspiegel* answers the question in the text, “O Schröpferschwarm, o Händlerkreis, wer schiebt dir einen Riegel?” (“O swarm of leeches, O circle of tradesmen, who will stop you?”) The theme appears in the music before the text and vocal line tell the listener that it has already been done by Till Eulenspiegel, thus identifying Strauss with the merry prankster. [Example 45] The piano prelude from song eight returns here as a postlude and is interwoven with other music from *Till Eulenspiegel*. Cross also finds permutations of material from *Heldenleben*, but once again, its subtlety raises the question as to how much of it is intentional and how much of it is simply Strauss’s idiom.

The final song is a slow, leisurely, and even hesitant Ländler. American audiences will be familiar with the dance from Rodgers and Hammerstein’s musical *The Sound of Music*, but even without knowing that this is a Ländler, listeners will definitely hear the folkdance nature of this song. The introduction is longer than many in the Lieder tradition but rather conservative given what has come before in the cycle. The final poem and its vocal delivery are likewise quite concise. Who is going to put an end to the malpractice being performed by the villainous swarms of fleecers and circles of merchants? Why, it has already been done with roguish wit by
Till Eulenspiegel, and only the most inattentive listener will not realize by this point that Strauss is referring, at least in part, to himself.

Example 45a. *Krämerspiegel*, Song 12, mm. 29-41.
CHAPTER VI
PERFORMING DER KRÄMERSPIEGEL

From the above, it could easily be argued that *Krämerspiegel* is a losing battle for the performer. Its difficulty to execute might be a gauntlet for the adventurous to take up, but its limited audience appeal and its esoteric references to forgotten names and situations make it a hard sell even for the most stout-hearted. But there has been a relatively recent shift in the way people view the world, life, and art. Granted postmodernity as a concept can be traced back quite a ways, but the postmodern worldview and, more pertinently, the postmodern aesthetic only gained a widespread saturation of western culture in the 1990s with the rapid acceleration of technology. Particularly worth note is the change in the collective sense of humor. *The Simpsons, South Park*, and similar shows use a highly referential style of comedy that relies on parody and a certain dialectic that relies on tapping into its audience’s associations with common cultural icons. Isn’t this what Strauss was doing in *Krämerspiegel*?

This is not to say that Strauss was a “proto-postmodern” composer. There are certainly better candidates for that title (Satie comes to mind), and modernism was not devoid of an interest in multimedia dialogue between art forms and genres. Nonetheless, a work like *Krämerspiegel* found very little acceptance in its day because it did not conform to generic norms. Peterson writes, “Although Strauss’s *Krämerspiegel*, op. 66. had not gone unnoticed or unperformed since its creation in 1918, about the time of Strauss’s death at least one writer considered the cycle ‘now as good as extinct.’”

A half-century later, crossing boundaries and blending “high,” “low,” and “pop” genres is widely accepted and even encouraged. Despite its

---

many drawbacks, a work like Krämerspiegel can have a certain currency in the twenty-first-century musical world.

For the performer intending to mount Krämerspiegel, there are many things to keep in mind to help engage the audience. While a postmodern audience may be more receptive to the cycle, a certain amount of preparation is necessary. A translation and program notes (such as those included in Appendix B) are imperative. Otherwise, the audience will most likely be completely confused and quickly disengaged. This has been stated again and again in the reading of the songs, for it is important for the performer at all times to keep in mind how the audience is relating to the piece. Without this common understanding of some of the “rules” of the piece (i.e. the word play, references, allusions, etc.), much of the piece will not be communicated and the one-dimensional experience will neither do justice to Strauss’s intent nor will it be wholly satisfying for even the most generous listeners.

Other tools are available to elucidate Krämerspiegel for an audience. The following comments are primarily directed towards the singer, but a clever pianist might also find ways to incorporate them into performance. One first has to consider the dual nature of the cycle: is it a song cycle or is it an opera?

The first set of tools involves both genres. Both opera and the Lied tradition invest a great deal of importance in the text. In successfully delivering words, every aspect of a singer’s instrument comes into play: tonal quality, inflection, diction, color, and the like.

Since Krämerspiegel is generally a comic text that utilizes many styles, there may be places where the vocalist should sacrifice a beautiful tone for one that more adequately suits the text. For instance, in the third song, a standard legato should be employed for the highly romantic line that climaxes on a high B-flat; however, at the jagged line surrounding the play on
Breitkopf & Härtel, though proper vocal technique is needed to avoid discomfort and vocal distress, the singer should not resist the bray brought on by the large leaps. The following “Hu” should have a similarly comic quality before the return to the more standard Lied setting. This approach heightens the contrast between styles and provides the audience members with a multi-dimensional interpretation that will likewise help them in their own interpreting.

Infection, color, timbral shading, and diction are all familiar to performers of Lieder. The singer must decide which words to stress and in what way. Is this particular word comic? Can some of the consonants be used to convey this? Does the serious nature of this part of the cycle demand an overall darker color, or will shading certain words work just as well? While this is not intended to be an exhaustive set of suggestions for interpreting Krämerspiegel, it should be noted that a standard approach to asking these questions and making these decisions is not enough. Many singers who are not used to performing comedic literature may need to think well outside the box. In preparing to perform the cycle, it might be advisable to listen to music from different genres to discern how certain singers use their voices to evoke humor. The type of singing closest to that called for in Krämerspiegel lies in the realm of opera, in particular the many comic roles that call for “less than beautiful” singing and a moment-by-moment engagement with the text and its execution.

Though Krämerspiegel is not an opera, it employs many of the musical devices that Strauss used in his writing for the genre, including a rapid juxtaposition of musical styles that establish a certain dialectic that is not always related to the text. Thus, the piano part should not be viewed as mere accompaniment. While this is always a mistake vocalists are advised to avoid, it is extremely important to realize that in Krämerspiegel the piano provides the subtext. For instance, in the introduction to the second song, two types of music do battle; one of them
represents Strauss, and the other stands for Bote & Bock. While it may not be possible to physically convey this in a formal recital, understanding the purpose of the prelude’s existence will better prepare the singer to stay “in the moment,” telegraphing through his or her alert eyes and body that he or she is still engaged. Just as in an opera the music tells part of the story, so too in *Krämerspiegel*.

Even in a formal situation, facial expression, gestures, and body language are generally accepted tools for the singer. Again, opera provides a good model, especially since *Krämerspiegel* requires more involvement in these areas. Obviously, there are many ways to incorporate these physical elements into the performance, but a successful performance demands that the vocalist make conscious choices. One option is to use a different stance when one is singing and when the weight of the performance is solely on the pianist. This does not mean disengaging oneself from the performance and allow one’s mind to wander until the next vocal line; rather, the change of stance can alert the audience that a rhetorical change has taken place and they must now direct their attention completely to the piano.

If there is a greater deal of freedom attached to the performance, the singer may wish to employ a greater amount of movement, a wider range of facial expression, and larger, more operatic gestures, and even multimedia aids such as those employed in the first publication. But even in a conservative setting, these devices can be invaluable, not only in relieving the monotony of the “stand and sing” recital staple, but also in heightening the contrast between “serious” idioms and more emphatic or comic ones.

Performers should further note that there is a great deal of anger of varying degrees in these songs, and even the comedy ranges from the absurd to the biting. Singers accustomed to thinking only along the lines of “happy,” “sad,” “mad,” and “funny,” may want to invest in a
thesaurus or take an acting class to discover the many shades of emotion that can be conveyed by the voice and the body.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In a letter to librettist Hugo von Hofmannsthal dated June 5, 1916, Richard Strauss boasts,

I’m the only composer nowadays with some real humor and a sense of fun and a marked gift for parody. Indeed, I feel downright called upon to become the Offenbach of the 20th century...sentimentality and parody are the sensations to which my talent responds most forcefully and productively.84

This letter follows closely on the success of the pair’s Rosenkavalier, and it was in this general spirit that Krämerspiegel was conceived and executed. Had Strauss not been so bitter at the Bote & Bock debacle, the cycle might have been a bit more accessible. Of course, had his hand not been forced, the cycle would probably never have come into existence.

As it stands, the cycle is clearly an exception to the many subtle and complex rules that govern the production and dissemination of Lieder. Kravitt notes that Krämerspiegel does not fit the mold of Strauss’s late Lieder in its use of “detailed musical imagery.”85 The cycle’s “treatment of both text and music” is cited by Petersen as what sets the work apart from the composer’s other songs.86

Any performer daring enough to attempt a mounting of Krämerspiegel most likely already possesses many of the qualities that are needed to bring a satisfying performance of the cycle to fruition. For both vocalist and pianist, it is first necessary to have the technique and ability to execute the numerous difficult passages in the work. Confidence, determination, discipline, and persistence are required as well. It is also imperative for the initiating performer

---

85 Kravitt, 29.
86 Peterson, Ton und Wort, 45.
to secure a willing partner in the endeavor, one who also exhibits these same traits, for 
*Krämerspiegel* demands that both performers be equally astute, engaged, and committed.

Likewise, both performers need to give careful consideration to issues raised in the previous chapter. Singers are not always trained to be actors and pianists even less so, but *Krämerspiegel* demands this for adequate interpretation. And it bears noting that this interpretation must happen on many levels. It is not enough to simply comprehend the historical context of the cycle. Even acknowledging the many difficulties Strauss composed into the piece will only take one so far. The public dynamics of the copyright debacle and Strauss’s legal wrangling with Bote & Bock, the personal dimensions of Strauss’s vindictive anger, and the private layers of meaning woven into *Krämerspiegel* are only the beginning. Performers must look at the piece not only from their own interpretive stance but also that of the audience, for a listener’s process of interpretation will ultimately inform and shape the choices made by singer and pianist.

The way to a larger acceptance of *Krämerspiegel* has been paved by a cultural change. The new millennium is, after all, quite different from Strauss’s world. And looking back, one might even conclude that the composer was, as the cliché goes, “ahead of his time” although the opposite opinion was commonly held throughout the last century.

Many scholars past and present see Strauss’s turn away from the atonality of *Elektra* to the more melodious music of *Rosenkavalier* as a retreat into anachronism. There is of course the other camp, represented by those who hold a certain grudge against the influence of the Second Viennese School, who herald the reverse as a major victory for twentieth-century music. Both arguments have their merits as well as their blind spots, but there are other ways of assessing the about-face. If one considers Strauss’s interest in parody and multiple layers of reference
encompassing the dramatic, the musical, the textual, and the subtextual, it becomes clear that the composer was not necessarily writing for the typical modernist audience. His preoccupation with this kind of generic interaction and dialectic are rather more suited for a postmodern aesthetic.

Bernard Holland says, in a more general sense, that “Strauss holds up a mirror to our own confusions.” The word choice is obviously interesting in that it parallels the mirror (“Spiegel”) that Strauss held up for his publishers, demeaningly called shopkeepers (“Krämer”) by the angry musician. During his remarkable lifetime, spanning two centuries and as many world wars, Strauss demanded a great deal from life. He also expected as much from his publishers, performers, and audiences. That Krämerspiegel is not typical of Strauss’s song output does not mean that it is of less importance. Though it will most likely never be widely embraced by performers and audiences, it nonetheless sheds a great deal of light on one of the most enigmatic figures of music history. In Krämerspiegel, Strauss is both at his most personal and his most detached. While the composer’s vitriol and the motivations behind his artistic choices are clearly evident, he writes with humor, wit, and élan, revealing a personality who could view his situation with a certain distanced objectivity. And thus Krämerspiegel is not only a mirror for bygone publishers, modern audiences, and publishers and researchers of all generations, it is also mirror for Richard Strauss himself, legend though he may be.

---

87 Holland.
APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF AVAILABLE TRANSLATIONS
The original text is presented in a form corresponding most closely to that of the Leo Connolly/Sarah E. Baker manuscript. The other translations have been adjusted slightly to make comparison easier. Every effort has been made to reproduce the spelling, punctuation, and grammar of the individual translations. Some more literal and others more idiomatic.

1.

**Original text by Alfred Kerr**

Es war einmal ein Bock, ein Bock
der frass an einem Blumenstock, der Bock
Musik, du lichte Blumenzier,
wie schmatzt der Bock voll Schmusegier!
Er möchte gar vermessen die Blüten alle,
alle fressen.
Du liebe Blüte wehre dich,
du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich!
Schere dich, du Bock!
Du liebe Blüte wehre dich!
Du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich, du Bock!

**Leo Connolly, trans.**

There once was a goat, a goat,
who gnawed at a flowering bush, the goat.*
Music, thou bright flowering ornament,
how the goat smacks his lips, full of gluttony!
Presumptuously he would like to devour all,
all the blossoms.
Dear blossom, defend thyself!
Thou goat and glutton, begone!
Begone, thou goat,
Thou lovely blossom defend thyself!
Thou goat and glutton, begone, thou goat!

**Julianne Fiske Cross (with Ruth Lorbe)**

Once there was a goat
who gorged himself on a stalk of flowers.
Music, you clear flower ornament,
how smacks the goat with greed for the feast.
He is so presumptuous to devour all the flowers.
You lovely bloom defend yourself,
you goat and greedy one, be off with you!

**Geoffrey Watkins**

Once upon a time there was a Goat, a Goat;
feeding upon a flowering shrub was this Goat.
Music, thou Flower of shining beauty,
see how greedily he smacks his lips!
He would like to have the nerve to eat all the Flowers.
Defend yourself, sweet Flower! Go to hell, you
greedy, gulping Goat!

**Michael Shane Hurst**

Once upon a time there was a Goat
Who fed on a stalk of flowers.
Music, you bright flowery ornament,
How the Goat smacks his lips with greed for the feast.
He would like presumptuously to eat all the flowers,
All of them.
You lovely bloom, defend yourself,
you Goat and greedy glutton, off with you!

* (who gorged himself on a pot of flowers)
Einst kam der Bock als Bote
zum Rosenkavalier an’s Haus;
er klopft mit seiner Pfote,
den Eingang wehrt ein Rosenstrauss.

Der Strauss sticht seinge Dornen schell
Dem Botenbock burch’s dicke Fell.

O Bock, zieh mit gesenktem Sterz hinterwärts,
O Bock, O Botenbock, zieh mit gesenktem
Sterz hinterwärts!

Once came a goat as a messenger
to the house of the Rosenkavalier;
he knocked with his hoof,
the entrance was barred by a bouquet of roses.
The bouquet sticks its thorns quickly
the messenger-goat through his thick hide.
Oh goat, back off with your rump dragging backwards,
backwards!

Once the goat came as a messenger
to the Rosenkavalier’s home.
He knocks with his paw:
the entrance is barred by a rose bouquet.
The bouquet quickly sticks its thorns
through the messenger’s thick hide.
Thou goat, withdraw, with downcast backside,∗
backwards!
Thou messenger goat, withdraw, with downcast
backside, backwards.

Once the Goat came as a Messenger
to the house of the Knight of the Rose.
He knocked with his hoof,
the entrance was guarded by a Bunch of roses.
The Bunch quickly stuck its thorns
into the thick hide of the Goat-Messenger.
Goat, back out with your tail between your legs, back
out, back out!

* (Lowered rear end)
3.

Es liebte einst ein Hase die salbungswalde Phrase,  
obskon wie ist das sonderbar,  
sein Breitkopf hart und härter war.  
Hu, wist ihr, was mein Hase tut?  
Oft saugt er Komponistenblut,  
unt platzt hernach und platzt hernach vor Edelmut.

Once a rabbit loved to use the unctuous phrase,  
although that is quite remarkable,  
his bright head became harder and harder.  
Ha! Do you know what my rabbit did?  
He often sucks the blood of the composer  
and bursts afterwards from his nobleness.

There once was a hare who loved the unctuous phrase,  
Although this is not peculiar,  
his broad head was hard, very hard.  
Hey, do you know what my hare does?  
Often he sucks composers’ blood,  
and afterwards bursts, yes, bursts with generosity.

A Hare once loved unctuous phrases,  
although strangely enough  
his Fat Head became more and more wooden.  
Ugh! Do you know what my hare does?  
He often sucks the blood of composers  
and then bursts with magnanimity.

Once there was a Rabbit who loved unctuous phrases,  
Although that isn’t really peculiar,  
his broad head grew harder and harder.  
Hey! Do you know what my Rabbit did?  
He often sucks the blood of composers,  
And afterwards he bursts with noble generosity.
Drei Masken sah ich am Himmel stehn
wie Larven sind sie anzusehn.
O Schreck! dahinter sieht man
Herrn Friedmann!

I saw three masks in the heavens,
to be regarded as specters.
Horrors! Behind them I see
Mr. Friedman!

Three masks I saw up in the heavens
like ghouls they appear.
Oh horror, behind them one sees
Herr Friedmann!

I saw three Masks in the sky
That looked like hideous faces.
Oh horror, behind them
Mr. Peaceful can be seen!

I saw three masks in the heavens
That looked like ghouls.
Oh horror! Behind them can be seen
Mr. Friedmann!
5.

Hast du ein Tongedicht vollbracht,  
nimm vor den Füchsen dich in Acht  
denn solche Brüder Reinecke,  
die fressen dir das Deinige, das Deinige,  
das Deinige!  
Die Brüder Reinecke, die Brüder Reinecke.

If you have produced a tone poem,  
beware of foxes,  
because such Reynards,  
they’ll devour what’s yours, what’s yours,  
what’s yours,  
the Fox Brothers, the Fox Brothers!

Should you create a tone poem,  
beware of the foxes  
because such brothers Reinecke  
will gobble what is yours!  
The brothers Reinecke.

If you have composed a tone poem,  
beware of the Foxes,  
for these Reynard Brothers  
eat what belongs to you, to you, to you!

If you have written a tone poem,  
Watch out for foxes  
Because these Reynard Brothers,  
They will eat what is yours!  
Those Reynard Brothers.
O lieber Künstler sei ermahnt
und übe Vorsicht jedenfalls!
Wer in gewissen Kähnen kahnt,
dem steigt das Wasser bis zum Hals.
Und wenn ein dunkel trübes Licht
verdächtig aus dem Nebel lugt,
lustwandle auf der Lienau nicht,
weil dort der lange Robert spukt,
Der lange Robert!
Dein Säckel wird erobert vom langen Robert!

Dear artist, be warned,
and be cautious in any case:
He who goes boating in certain boats
will be in water up to his neck. *
And when a dark, dismal light
suspiciously deceives through the mist,**
do not be strolling in the Lienau,
for Tall Robert haunts there,
Tall Robert!
Your purse will be conquered by Tall Robert!

Oh dear artist be admonished
and practice caution in any case!
Whoever goes boating in certain boats
ends up in water up to his neck.
And when a dark, dim light
beckons dangerously out of the fog,
don’t go for a pleasure walk on the Lienau,
because there the tall Robert haunts,
tall Robert!
Your purse will be captured by tall Robert.

Oh dear artist be warned
and in any case be cautious!
He who rows in certain boats
falls into the water up to the neck.
And if a dim, cheerless light
peeps suspiciously through the fog,
don’t dawdle in the Flax Field,
for it is haunted by tall Robert,
tall Robert!
Tall Robert will steal your purse!

O dear Artist, be warned,
And in any case exercise caution!
Whoever boats in certain boats,
Will find himself in water up to his neck.
And when a dark, dreary light
Glimmers suspiciously through the fog,
Don’t go strolling on the Lienau,
For that’s where Tall Robert haunts,
Tall Robert!
Your purse will be stolen by Tall Robert!

* (the water will rise up to his neck.)
** (suspiciously peers out of the mist,)
7.

Unser Feind ist, grosser Gott,
wie der Brite so der Schott.
Manchen hat er unentwegt
auf das Streckbett hingelegt.
Täglich wird er kecker.
O du Strecker!

Our enemy is, great God,
As the British, so the Scot.
He has unflinchingly
laid many a man on the rack.
Daily he gets bolder.
O thou rack-stretcher!

Our enemy is, God knows,
like the Englishman so the Scot.
Many has he laid constantly
upon the torture rack.
Everyday he becomes bolder.
Oh you stretcher!

Good God, the Scot
is as much our enemy as the Briton.
Many a man, without thinking twice,
has he stretched upon the rack.
He becomes bolder every day.
Oh you torturer!

Our enemy, good God,
Is the Scot as much as the Brit.
Many has he ruthlessly laid
Upon the torture rack.
Daily he grows bolder.
O you Stretcher!
8.

Von Händlern wird die Kunst bedroht,
da habt ihr die Bescherung.
Die bringen der Musik den Tod,
sich selber die Verklärung.

Art is threatened by merchants
and this is what comes of it:’
they bring death to music,
And to themselves – transfiguration!

Through tradesmen our art is endangered,
There you have a mess.
They give to music death and
to themselves transfiguration.

Art is threatened by shopkeepers,
and there you have it.
They bring Death to music
and Transfiguration to themselves.

It is by the merchants that Art is threatened,
And there you have the problem.
They bring death to music,
And for themselves transfiguration.

* (And there you have your nice mess:)
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There once was a bedbug that went all out:
it gave a scent that never faded
and sucked and sucked.
But, musicians, they grabbed it and crushed it.
And as the bedbug died and stank,
A song of praise rose to Heaven.

∗ Perhaps Watkins means “that stopped at absolutely nothing.”
Die Künstler sind die Schöpfer,   
ihr Unglück sind die Schröpfer.   
Wer trampelt durch den Künstlerbau   
Als wie der Ochs von Lerchenau?   
Wer stellt das Netz als Jäger?   
Wer ist der Geldsackpfleger?   
Wer ist der Zankerreger?   
Und der Bazillenträger?   
Der biedere, der freundliche, der treffliche,   
der edle Verleger!

The artists are creators,   
the leeches are their misfortune.   
Who tramps through the hall of Art   
like the Ox of Lerchenau?   
Who places the net as a hunter?   
Who is the money tender?   
Who causes quarrels?   
Who carries germs?   
The upright, friendly, marvelous,   
noble Publisher!

The Artists are the Creators,   
The fleecers are their bane.   
Who tramples through the artist’s building   
just like Ochs of Lerchenau?   
Who sets the net other than the hunter?   
Who controls the moneybags?   
Who is the quarrel provoker?   
And the carrier of bacteria?   
The honest one, the friendly one, the excellent one,   
the noble publisher!

Artists are creators,   
and bloodsuckers are their bane.   
Who tramples through an artist’s creation   
like the Ox from Lerchenau?   
Who is the hunter that spreads the net?   
Who stinks of money?   
Who picks quarrels?   
And who is the carrier of germs?   
The upright, friendly, excellent,   
noble publisher!
Die Händler und die Macher
sind mit Profit und Schacher
des “HELDEN” Widersacher.
Der lässt ein Wort erklingen
wie Götz von Berlichingen.

The dealers and the masterminds
when it comes to profit and haggling,
are the adversaries of the hero.
He lets a word resound
like Götz von Berlichingen.

The wheelers and the dealers
with their profit and haggling
are enemies of the “Hero.”
He lets the words resound
once used by Götz von Berlichingen.

The shopkeepers and the bosses,
with their profits and haggling,
are the enemies of the HERO.
The hero speaks the words
of Götz von Berlichingen.

The Merchants and the Bigwigs
Are, with their profit and haggling,
The Hero’s enemies.
He lets a word sound forth
Like Götz von Berlichingen.
O Schröpferschwarm, o Händlerkreis, 
wer schiebt dir einen Riegel?
Das tat mit neuer Schelmenweis
Till Eulenspiegel.

You mob of leeches, you—you tradesmen!
Who will shoot the bolt on you?
That was accomplished with new roguish music
by Till Eulenspiegel.

(Sarah E. Baker offers an alternate translation for this entire verse.)

You swarm of leeches, you commercial world!
Who will put an end to you?
That’s been done with new roguish philosophy
by Till Eulenspiegel.

Oh you swarm of fleecers, oh you circle of merchants, 
who will stop you?
That has been done with new roguishness
by Till Eulenspiegel.

Oh swarm of bloodsuckers, oh gang of shopkeepers, 
who will throw a spanner in your works?
It has been done in a new and waggish way
by Till Howleglass.

O swarm of fleecers, O circle of merchants, 
Who will put an end to you?
That’s already been done with new roguishness
By Till Eulenspiegel.
APPENDIX B

TRANSLATION AND NOTES FOR THE AUDIENCE
This is a suggested format for translation and notes for performances of *Krämerspiegel*.

### Original text by Alfred Kerr

1.

Es war einmal ein Bock, ein Bock
der frass an einem Blumenstock, der Bock
Musik, du lichte Blumenzier,
wie schmatzt der Bock voll Schmausegier!
Er möchte gar vermessen die Blüten alle, alle fressen.
Du liebe Blüte wehre dich,
    du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich!
Schere dich, du Bock!
    Du liebe Blüte wehre dich!
Du Bock und Gierschlung schere dich, du Bock!

### Translation by Michael Shane Hurst

1.

Once upon a time there was a Goat
Who fed on a stalk of flowers.
Music, you bright flowery ornament,
How the Goat smacks his lips with greed for the feast.
He would like presumptuously to eat all the flowers, all of them.
You lovely bloom, defend yourself,
you Goat and greedy glutton, off with you!
Off with you, you Goat!
    You lovely bloom, defend yourself,
you goat and greedy glutton, off with you!

*Bock*: literally, a he-goat; refers to Hugo Bock, head of the Bote & Bock publishing firm

2.

Einst kam der Bock als Bote
    zum Rosenkavalier an’s Haus;
er klopft mit seinger Pfote,
    den Eingang wehrt ein Rosenstrauss.
Der Strauss sticht seinge Dornen schell
    Dem Botenbock burch’s dicke Fell.
O Bock, zieh mit gesenktem Sterz hinterwärts,
    hinterwärts!
O Bock, O Botenbock, zieh mit gesenktem
Sterz hinterwärts!

### Translation

2.

Once the Goat came as a messenger
to the Rosenkavalier’s house;
He knocks with his hoof,
the entrance is guarded by a rosy Wreath.
The Wreath quickly sticks its thorns right through the Messenger-Goat’s thick hide.
O Goat, go away with your ass dragging behind you, behind you!
O Goat, O Messenger-Goat, go away with your ass dragging behind you!

*Bock*: see song one
*Bote*: literally, a messenger; references second half of the name of the Bote & bock publishing firm (no individual person seems to be intended here)
*Rosenkavalier*: literally, rosy cavalier; a reference to Strauss’s opera *Der Rosenkavalier*
*Rosenstrauss*: literally, rosy wreath; the composer is being referenced and linked to *Der Rosenkavalier*

This song includes several quotations from *Der Rosenkavalier*

3.

Es liebte einst ein Hase die salbungsvalle Phrase,
obschon wie ist das sonderbar,
    sein Breitkopf hart und härter war.
Hu, wisst ihr, was mein Hase tut?
    Oft saugt er Komponistenblut,
unt platzt hernach und platzt hernach vor Edelmut.

### Translation

3.

Once there was a Rabbit who loved unctuous phrases,
Although that isn’t really peculiar,
    his broad head grew harder and harder.
Hey! Do you know what my Rabbit did?
    He often sucks the blood of composers,
And afterwards he bursts with noble generosity.

*Hase*: literally, a rabbit; head of the Breitkopf & Härtel publishing firm
*Breitkopf*: literally, broad head; referencing the firm
*hart und härter*: literally, hard and harder; again, referencing the firm
4.

Drei Masken sah ich am Himmel stehn  I saw three masks in the heavens
wie Larven sind sie anzusehn.  That looked like ghouls.
O Schreck! dahinter sieht man  Oh horror! Behind them can be seen
Herrn Friedmann!  Mr. Friedmann!

*Drei Masken*: literally, three masks; refers to the Drei Masken Verlag, a publishing company  
*Herrn Friedmann*: Mr. Friedman was the head of Drei Masken Verlag

5.

Hast du ein Tongedicht vollbracht,  If you have written a tone poem,
nimm vor den Füchsen dich in Acht  Watch out for foxes
denn solche Brüder Reinecke,  Because these Reynard Brothers,
die Fressen dir das Deinige, das Deinige,  They will eat what is yours, what’s yours
das Deinige!  what’s yours!
Die Brüder Reinecke, die Brüder Reinecke.  Those Reynard Brothers.

*Reinecke*: literally, Reynard, a stock fox character from fairy tales; references the publishing house of the  
Reinecke brothers (Brüder Reinecke)

6.

O lieber Künstler sei ermahnt  O dear Artist, be warned,
und übe Vorsicht jedenfalls!  And in any case exercise caution!:
Wer in gewissen Kähnen kahnt,  Whoever boats in certain boats,
dem steigt das Wasser bis zum Hals.  Will find himself in water up to his neck.
Und wenn ein dunkel trübes Licht  And when a dark, dreary light
verdächtig aus dem Nebel lugt,  Glimmers suspiciously through the fog,,
lustwandle auf der Lienau nicht,  Don’t go strolling on the Lienau,
der lange Robert spukt,  For that’s where Tall Robert haunts,
Der lange Robert!  Tall Robert!
Dein Säckel wird erobert vom langen Robert!  Your purse will be stolen by Tall Robert!

*Kahn*: literally, a small boat or skiff, with Kähnen being the plural  
*Kahnt*: Kerr’s neologism derived from Kahn, designed to reference C. F. Kahnt, a publisher based in Leipzig  
*Lienau*: a sort of “pleasure ground” created for the song; designed to reference Robert Lienau, a publisher based in Berlin  
*lange Robert*: literally, Tall Robert; designed to cast Robert Lienau as a bandit who haunts the Lienau  
erobert*: literally, robbed; a word play on the first name of Robert Lienau
7.

Unser Feind ist, grosser Gott,
wie der Brite so der Schott.
Manchen hat er unentwegt
auf das Streckbett hingelegt.
Täglich wird er kecker.
O du Strecker!

Our enemy, good God,
Is the Scot as much as the Brit.
Many has he ruthlessly laid
Upon the torture rack.
Daily he grows bolder.
O you Stretcher!

_Brite:_ literally, “Brits,” for the British, who were at the time fighting against the Germans in World War I
_Schott:_ literally, “Scot,” for Scotsman; refers to the Schott publishing firm
_Strecker:_ literally, stretcher; refers to Ludwig Strecker, head of the Schott firm as a rack-stretcher, or torturer

8.

Von Händlern wird die Kunst bedroht,
da habt ihr die Bescherung.
Die bringen der Musik den Tod,
sich selber die Verklärung.

It is by the merchants that Art is threatened,
And there you have the problem.
They bring death to music,
And for themselves transfiguration.

_Tod...Verklärung:_ literally, death...transfiguration; a reference to Strauss’s tone-poem _Tod und Verklärung_

The lengthy piano interlude that begins this song was later used by Strauss in his opera _Capriccio_
The most notable quote from this song is the opening theme of the second half of _Tod und Verklärung_

9.

Es war mal eine Wanze,
die ging, die ging auf’s Ganze.
Gab einen Duft, der nie verflog,
und sog und sog.
Doch Musici, die packten sie und knackten sie.
Und als die Wanze starb und stank,
ein Lobgesang zum Himmel drang.

Once there was a Bedbug
Who went all the way.
He let off a stink that never went away,
And sucked and sucked.
But the Musicians grabbed it and cracked it.
And as the Bedbug died and stank,
A song of praise rose up to heaven..

_Wanze:_ literally, a bedbug; also used as German musical slang for the accidental known in English as a _Sharp_
10.

Die Künstler sind die Schöpfer,  The Artists are the Creators,
ihr Unglück sind die Schröpfer.  The fleecers are their bad luck.
Wer trampelt durch den Künstlerbau  Who tramples through the house of Art
Als wie der Ochs von Lerchenau?  Like the Ox of Lerchenau?
Wer stellt das Netz als Jäger?  Who lays nets like a hunter?
Wer ist der Geldsackpfleger?  Who guards the money?
Wer ist der Zankerreger?  Who picks fights?
Und der Bazillenträger?  Who carries bacteria?
Der biedere, der freundliche, der treffliche,  The upright, friendly, excellent,
der edle Verleger!  Noble Publisher!

Ochs von Lerchenau: literally, Ox of Lerchenau; Baron Ochs was the boorish villain of Strauss’s opera Der Rosenkavalier

There are several quotations from Der Rosenkavalier in this song

11.

Die Händler und die Macher  The Merchants and the Bigwigs
sind mit Profit und Schacher  Are, with their profit and haggling
des “HELDEN” Widersacher.  The Hero’s enemies.
Der lässt ein Wort erklingen  He lets a word sound forth
wie Götz von Berlichingen.  Like Götz von Berlichingen.

HELDEN: literally, hero; refers to Strauss and his tone-poem Ein Heldenleben (“A hero’s life”), which is considered to be loosely autobiographical
Götz von Berlichingen: title character of a Goethe play; the “word” referred to is an infamous line the character utters, which translates into English as “You can kiss my ass;” the incipit of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony became a substitute for the actual German phrase

Along with the quotation of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, themes from Strauss’s tone-poems Ein Heldenleben and Symphonia Domestica are used

12.

O Schröpferschwarm, o Händlerkreis,  O swarm of fleecers, O circle of merchants!
wer schiebt dir einen Riegel?  Who will put an end to you?
Das tat mit neuer Schelmenweis  That’s already been done with new roguishness.
Till Eulenspiegel.  By Till Eulenspiegel.

Till Eulenspiegel: roguish title character of a Strauss tone-poem, here referring to the composer himself

A quotation from Till Eulenspiegel occurs at the vocal finish, and the piano interlude from song ten becomes a postlude here
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