CHAPTER 3
“GREY C’, ACCEPTABLE”:
Carl Orff’s Evaluation from the Denazification Era and the Ensuing Controversy

Following the unconditional surrender of Germany on 8 May 1945, the Allies were faced with the enormously difficult task of rebuilding the society they had just vanquished and restoring democracy to a country that had spent the last 12 years under totalitarian rule. The turbid and convoluted process by which the allies attempted to extirpate National Socialist influences from Germany is known as “denazification” (Entnazifizierung). ¹ Imposing cultural change, especially as an outsider, is inherently problematic, and denazification, as Abby Anderton has written, was “fraught with ambiguities and contradictions.”² Part of denazification involved determining who would be allowed to participate in the new Germany as public figures. Orff was among those whom the Americans evaluated. He was rated “‘Grey C’, acceptable,” the category for individuals who had been beneficiaries of the Third Reich but did not personally have National Socialist attitudes.³ Orff ultimately was granted a license to compose and guest conduct.

The focus of this chapter is the psychological and political screening Orff underwent in March of 1946 at the center in Bad Orb run by the Information Control Division (ICD) of the

---

² Anderton, Music among the Ruins, 42.
³ See Bertram Schaffner, report on Carl Orff, David M. Levy papers, Box 35, Folder 2, at the Oskar Diethelm Library, DeWitt Wallace Institute for the History of Psychiatry, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York City, New York. I thank the staff at this institution for their kind assistance.
United States Army. This chapter will provide closer scrutiny than has previously been undertaken of the extant documents of the ICD screening center, which outline the methodology, rationale, and goals of the American officers who ran the center.\(^4\) Orff’s psychological report demonstrates that the American officers were able to identify his anti-authoritarian worldview, as one also finds in his creative output. Orff’s dislike of militarism and his rejection of family tradition fit into the American officers’ profile of an anti-Nazi. The connection between Orff’s early anti-authoritarian attitudes and his denazification evaluation has not been noted in the previous literature, which has focused primarily on the veracity of Orff’s claims to the American officers (a subject that also will be addressed in this chapter).\(^5\)

The American evaluators identified that Orff was a “grey” figure and correctly surmised, despite the composer’s attempts to convince them to the contrary, that he had been a *Nutzeriesser* (that is, a beneficiary) of the Third Reich. I argue that Orff’s evaluation was fundamentally correct, although the ICD personnel were evidently unaware of certain details about the composer’s history during the period of National Socialism. The chapter also includes a new perspective on the controversy surrounding Orff’s denazification process that erupted over a decade after his death. This controversy centers a remark he is alleged to have made off the record regarding his close friend and associate Professor Kurt Huber. Orff has been faulted for allegedly exploiting his friendship with Huber, who was executed on 13 July 1943 for his involvement in the student resistance movement known as the White Rose (*die Weiße Rose*). The bitter nature of this controversy is symptomatic of the polarized debate concerning Orff and the Third Reich.

The process of denazification posed an enormous challenge to the Allied occupiers and

---

\(^4\) The files from the ICD screening center where Carl Orff underwent his denazification include many documents pertaining to the American officers’ methodology, including proceedings of a conference on “Germany after the war” that was held in 1944 in New York City. These documents are located in the David M. Levy papers, Boxes 34–37; the specific materials on “Germany after the war” are found in Box 37, Folder 29. See also Bertram Schaffner, *Fatherland: A Study of Authoritarianism in the German Family*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1948 for a detailed explanation of the processes used at the screening center in Bad Orb. See also the “Classification List,” dated 11 October 1945, in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 1. For additional information on the ICD screening center, see Caspar von Schrenck-Notzing, *Charakterwäsche: Die Politik der Amerikanischen Umerziehung in Deutschland*, Ullstein-Buch Nr. 33174, Zeitgeschichte, Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1981/1994, 137–143.

Germans alike: not only did a society have to be rebuilt, but so too did a people have to come to terms with a devastating past. About the latter point, the historian David Monod has written that the denazification process had a strong impact on German culture, such that many of “those who had enjoyed prominent careers in the Third Reich felt threatened enough to want to black out all memory of their Nazi-era selves. In multiple ways this development was unhealthy, but it helped create the image, fiction though it was, that the postwar arts were clearly and cleanly separate from the prewar…and allowed marvelous music to sound again.”

The suppression of the past and the silence about the shameful pain of the Third Reich have a direct bearing on at least two works of Carl Orff that will be the subject of the following chapters, Die Bernauerin and De temporum fine comoedia, in which the composer was able to break the silence through his art.

Carl Orff and the Denazification Process

Following Germany’s unconditional surrender, the Allied Forces divided the country into zones, each of which was controlled by a different country. Bavaria, where Carl Orff lived, was located in the American zone. John Evarts, the American branch chief in Orff’s home city of Munich from 1945 to 1947, wrote in a memorandum from this time that political clearance and scarce resources posed enormous challenges to revitalizing German culture and that, when his office was established in May 1945, “rubble and the dust of fallen bricks all but covered the city of Munich.” He estimated that 90 percent of performance venues were destroyed or seriously damaged.

During this difficult period, Orff was aided by his former student, the American officer Newell O. Jenkins (1915–1996). Jenkins had studied in Germany from 1932 to 1938 and was Orff’s pupil in the last year of his studies. In some regards, as previous scholars have noted, Orff was fortunate to have such an important connection to Jenkins, as he was able to avoid more stringent modes of denazification.

Werner Egk, for example, had to stand trial. As Orff’s

---

6 Monod, Settling Scores, 11.
7 Quoted in Amy C. Beal, New Music, New Allies: American Experimental Music in West Germany from the Zero Hour to Reunification (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 30, internal quotation marks omitted. For more on Evarts (1908–1989), see ibid., 30–32; Monod, Settling Scores, 38; Anderton, “Music among the Ruins,” 34 and 56.
8 For more information on Jenkins, see Appendix 3.
9 See, for example, Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 302.
Schulwerk associate Hans Bergese wrote to Erich Katz in the spring of 1947, a few months before the premiere of Die Bernauerin in Stuttgart: “Generally the American-Stuttgart air seems to be especially ozoniferous for him [i.e., Orff], since his former student has an effect there.”

Ironically, Jenkins’s impact on Orff was not as positive as previously has been thought. Had it not been for Jenkins, Orff may have avoided the denazification process altogether. Blacklisted composers were not allowed to collect royalties on performances of their works, but as Orff never was blacklisted this was not a concern in his case. Orff was not, in fact, on any of the lists drawn up by the Officer of Military Government, United States in October 1945; his name appears on a “grey” list from 1 June 1946. Composers were not required to be licensed by the Information Control Division (ICD), as Jenkins himself wrote to Orff in January 1946: “Since you presently have no interest in appearing in public, neither as conductor nor speaking [publicly] in any way, and you have not yet decided whether or not you want to accept a teaching [position], i.e. you want to dedicate yourself only to your compositions, you really do not need a license.”

It was, however, necessary to obtain a license in order to take on a position in the public sphere, and after the war Jenkins hoped that Orff would at least take a teaching position in the new Germany. Together with the anti-Nazi Theodor Heuss (1884–1963), then the head of the Stuttgart Kultministerium, Jenkins specifically wanted Orff to become the opera intendant in that

---

10 See Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 22–30.
11 Letter from Hans Bergese to Erich Katz, 15 April/15 May 1947, page III, front side, in Series 1, Carton 1, Erich Katz Collection (correspondence: persons), Special Collections, Regis University. Original language: Überhaupt scheint die amerikanisch-suttgartische Luft für ihn besonders ozonhaltig zu sein, seit sein ehemaliger Schüler dort wirkt. See also Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 137; letter from Werner Egk to Heinrich Strobel, 16 January 1946 (reverse side of first page), Ana 410, BSB HSL (this letter is cited further in the next chapter).
12 Monod, Settling Scores, 44.
13 See Oliver Rathkolb “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin: Zeithistorischer Rahmen zur Entstehungsgeschichte 1942–1947,” in the program for Wiener Volksoper Season 1997/98 (15–25), 18. This document was accessed at the OZM. Orff’s name appears on the “grey” list from 1 June 1946 (supplement to list of 1 April 1946). Source: National Archives, College Park, Maryland, OMGUS RG 260 Z 45F/11/47–3/25. I thank Oliver Rathkolb for his kind assistance in my research (especially raising my awareness to the fact that Orff did not need to go through the denazification process as Jenkins pushed him to do) and for sharing this document with me. He also confirmed to me that List 3/1945 (October 1945) from the same archival source does not include Carl Orff’s name in any category. Note that this information seems to be in contradiction to what Newell Jenkins described to Michael Kater in 1993 (Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 134).
In keeping with the composer’s dislike of authority, bureaucracy, and anything that could detract from his work, Orff had no interest in this administrative position. Michael Kater has attributed Orff’s reluctance to the composer’s desire to avoid further scrutiny, a plausible theory that is not mutually exclusive with a genuine lack of interest in such positions.\footnote{Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 110 and 113. In Württemberg-Baden, the term \textit{Kultministerium} was used instead of \textit{Kultusministerium} (ibid., 280 n. 23). Heuss went on to serve as the first President of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1949 to 1959.} 

In January 1946, Jenkins sent a letter to Orff, addressing him as “my dear Carl” (\textit{mein lieber Carl}) and using the familiar \textit{Du} forms, thanking him for their time together the preceding Christmas Eve. In this letter, Jenkins explicitly told Orff what he needed to say to clear his name and protect his livelihood:

I have presented your case completely objectively to our people from Intelligence and asked for advice regarding it. They are of the view that, if you really were actively antifascist and can clearly prove it, you would be of enormous use not only for us, the American occupation, but also for the future reconstruction of Germany… provided that you can acquit yourself in your still heart of any instances of being a beneficiary…. I simply would like to emphasize repeatedly the two most important points: to examine your own conscience and to produce proof that you were \textit{actively} employed against the previous government. For one seldom finds such people, and as [I have] said, they are of the greatest use for everyone.\footnote{See Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 136–137. While no doubt Orff hoped to avoid scrutiny as far as he possibly could, this fact is not mutually exclusive with a genuine lack of interest at taking an administrative position. Monod has written that Orff initially “had clearly not made up his mind” about the Stuttgart position (Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 300), although the basis for this statement is not entirely clear. Monod has suggested that Orff’s “‘Grey C’, acceptable” classification prevented him from taking the position in Stuttgart, even though Schaffner’s report states that the composer already had turned down this position (Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 67–68). In 1999, the journalist Reinhard J. Brembeck also implied that Orff initially was receptive to the position and only later realized that it would take away too much time from his composition (Reinhard J. Brembeck, “Mitläufer oder Widerstandskämpfer? Ein neues Dokument hat einen Historikerstreit über die Rolle des Komponisten Carl Orff im Nationalsozialismus ausgelöst,” \textit{Süddeutsche Zeitung}, Nr. 31, 8 February 1999, Münchner Kultur, S. 16). The basis for this statement is not clear.}

That Jenkins wrote that Orff could be “of the greatest use for everyone” demonstrates that he was approaching the situation in part from the perspective of how best to serve the American agenda,
a fact that has not been noted in the previous English-language literature. This letter, which Jenkins tellingly asked his teacher to treat confidentially, seems an imprudent breach of protocol, as it gave Orff an unfair advantage. At that time, ICD personnel were taking care at that time to ensure that “specific information that might have been useful to Nazis trying to confuse the examiners” was not released to the German population. Evidently Jenkins did not perceive his action as unprofessional, as the letter references discussing Orff’s case with colleagues and as he sent a copy of the letter, along with a summary of its contents, to his colleague John Evarts.

A subsequent letter from Jenkins, dated 26 March 1946, reveals still more vividly that he was highly intent on obtaining clearance for his old teacher to take a public position, even though Orff was resistant. Jenkins informed Orff “that we now urgently ask you to drive here tomorrow by jeep and to register at the Screening Center in Bad Homburg [sic]…. Please do not delay to come here, since it is in your own interests and you would only get a very bad mark in your account if, now of all times, you would refuse to aid us in this matter.” That Jenkins had to ask Orff in such strong terms suggests that the composer, aware that he did not need a license for anything other than jobs he did not want, likely preferred not to subject himself to the scrutiny of the new ruling powers, potentially opening an investigation into his recent past. It is hardly surprising that Orff had to be persuaded in such strong terms given his underlying distrust of authority, no doubt exacerbated by his recent experiences in a totalitarian state. Ultimately, he could be persuaded only to apply for a license as composer and guest conductor, the most noncommittal position he could take to qualify as a public figure. There are, in fact, very few references in the present literature to Orff conducting in public following his departure from the

---

18 This characterization, which pertains specifically to the screening center where Orff was evaluated, is found in Schaffner’s Fatherland, 117, from the author’s brief preface to a description of the screening center that originally was published in the Information Control Intelligence Summary of the Office of Military Government for Germany (ICIS No. 43, week ending 25 May 1946, reprinted in Fatherland, 117–126). The authors of the report judiciously omitted the “specific information” described in this quotation as a precaution, but the report describes several case studies (anonymously) that provide detailed information about the Americans’ criteria. The article was published after Carl Orff already had gone through the Screening Center.

19 Letter from Newell O. Jenkins to John Evarts, 7 January 1947, located in the National Archives with the letter to Orff on the same date as cited two notes previously.

20 Quotation collated from Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 261; Rathkolb, “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin,” 21. Original language: ...dass wir dich jetzt dringend bitten, hierher zu fahren und Dich morgen in einem Jeep bei dem Screening Center in Bad Homburg zu melden. […] Bitte saeume nicht hierher zu kommen, denn es ist in Deinem eigenen Interesse und Du würdest nur einen sehr schlechten Strich [literally “line”] auf Dein Konto bekommen, wenn Du ausgerechnet jetzt verweigern würdest uns in dieser Angelegenheit beizustehen. The literature curiously makes references both to Bad Orb and Bad Homburg; the two towns are about 50 kilometers apart as the crow flies.
Bach-Verein in 1934, and he likely did not use his license to guest conduct during the American occupation. Yet for whatever reason, Orff acquiesced to Jenkins’s insistence, and so he set out for his psychological evaluation by the Office of Military Government, United States.

The Philosophy and Methodology of the ICD Screening Center

Carl Orff’s evaluation took place at a screening center run by the ICD in Bad Orb. The center had in its employment a psychiatrist, a psychologist, and an expert on Nazi organizations. This team evaluated a selection of German citizens who were applying for licenses to participate in the new German society as public figures in nonpolitical capacities. The subjects came from an array of professions, some of the most common of which were publishers, journalists, and filmmakers. Other professions represented included an eclectic variety of theater managers, circus managers, and even a husband and wife ice skating duo (the last of whom were blacklisted). Of the 191 identifiable subjects for whom materials are extant in the archive, only nine were musicians: in addition to Orff, there were five conductors, two music publishers, and the chief of the music department for Frankfurt Radio. According to David Monod, musicians eventually were no longer evaluated at the center because “they were not sufficiently vital to the occupation” to merit use of its resources.

The extant documents of the ICD screening center include the reports on Orff and his fellow candidates as well as materials describing the methodology, rationale, and goals of the American officers who ran the center. These documents reveal that the participating officers took

---

21 For an exception, see Dokumentaiton, Vol. 2, 207 (Orff conducted two of his Monteverdi arrangements in their revised versions in Gera on 30 November 1940). The OZM informed me (20 November 2014) that they also have not been able to find other instances of Orff making a public appearance as conductor.
22 Regarding the skating duo, see David M. Levy (presumably), reports on Ernst Baier (26 November 1945) and Maxi Baier (born Herber, 31 January 1946), David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folders 10 and 23 (respectively).
23 The conductors were Bertil Wetzelsberger, Hans Rosbaud, the Hungarian Barnabás von Géczy (1897–1971, Class 17), Johannes (Hans) Swarowsky (1899–1975), and Max Hahn. Regarding Wetzelsberger and Rosbaud, see notes 142 and 143 infra, respectively. See also Monod, Settling Scores, 62–68 (Rosbaud); Prieberg, Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945, 8244–8245 (Wetzelsberger) and 6232–6238 (Rosbaud). See David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 32 (Class 17 folder, Géczy); Box 35, Folder 16 (Class 7 folder, Swarowsky); Box 35, Folder 35 (Class 20 folder, Hahn). For more on von Géczy, see Prieberg, Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945, 2070. For more on Swarowsky, see ibid., 7613–7614. I have not found any further information on Hahn as of this writing.
24 Monod, Settling Scores, 67. According to Monod, musicians were excluded shortly after Hans Rosbaud’s denazification, the report from which is dated 15 April 1946—two weeks after that of Carl Orff (David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2).
great pains to draw the most accurate conclusions possible. The goal of the center was to
determine if the subjects’ attitudes and worldviews were consistent with Nazi ideology and
therefore unsuitable for positions of leadership in the new Germany. Generally, four individuals
at a time would visit the ICD screening center; each group was referred to as a “class,” in
keeping with which the center sometimes was referred to as a school in which Germans were
educated in democratic thinking. The classification system was as follows:

“White A”: active anti-Nazis, or people who suffered as a result of their opposition
“White B”: passive anti-Nazis
“Grey C”: “Party members, or member of…subordinate organizations, without record of
Nazi or Nationalistic convictions or small non-Party opportunists.”
“Black” (D or E): “Candidates who were members of the Nazi party, or nonmembers
who believed in the principles underlying the Nazi platform.”

The “Grey C” category was further divided into “acceptable” and “unacceptable,” although
some candidates were simply rated “Grey C.” The military psychiatrist who conducted Orff’s
psychological interview, Major Bertram Schaffner, described “‘Grey C’, acceptable” as the
category for those individuals who were “compromised by their actions during the Nazi period
but not subscribers to Nazi doctrine,” a description that certainly applies to Carl Orff. The “‘Grey
C’, unacceptable” category was for individuals “who were not members [of the Nazi Party], but
were compromised by their activities in support of the Nazi regime and shared Nazi beliefs to a
large extent.”

The emphasis on finding people who had been active opponents of the Third Reich
proved difficult indeed. Elsewhere in Germany, American Intelligence Officer John Backer
complained to a junior officer that he had been told that he could only hire someone who was
“actively engaged in the resistance” to be his secretary. His retort: “Then, I said, I will have to do
my recruiting in the cemetery.” The personnel at the ICD screening center had better success

---

26 See classification list, dated 11 October 1945, page 1, David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 1 (punctuation
modernized). Throughout the documentation, the spelling varies between “grey” and “gray.”
27 The quotation is from Schaffner, Fatherland, 69.
28 Idem.
29 Quoted in Anderton, Music among the Ruins, 42. Source: Interview with John Backer, Intelligence Officer, 82nd
Airborne Division,” MG Officer Import/Export Branch, Economic Division, OMGUS, B Rep. 037, Nr. 79–82,
Landesarchiv, Berlin. Backer called the denazification process a “catastrophe of the first order” (idem).
than Backer, as the candidates were a select and pre-screened group.\(^{30}\) Alfred Toombs, the chief of the Intelligence Branch Office of the Director of Information Control, attached a note to the classification of one candidate who had been rated black in which he complained that an obviously unqualified candidate had been sent to the center in the first place.\(^{31}\) Such errors were, however, relatively uncommon. Of the 174 candidates who completed the testing and whose evaluations are extant in the archive, only 40 were denied licenses.\(^{32}\)

The documents from the ICD screening center are housed in the Oskar Diethelm Library at the DeWitt Wallace Institute for the History of Psychiatry of the Weill Cornell Medical College in New York City, in the papers of Dr. David M. Levy (1892–1977). Levy was an American psychiatrist who was instrumental in founding the screening center and later became a clinical professor at Columbia University.\(^{33}\) The papers, many of which were formerly classified documents, are not entirely sorted. While they remained in Levy’s possession throughout his lifetime and were bequeathed to the library upon his death, they arguably belong in the National Archives as they are military documents. Carl Orff was one of 46 subjects to be rated in a “grey” category; 109 were “White A” or “White B.” Despite his mediocre “grey” rating, Orff was among the 80 candidates who were granted licenses without any provision (an additional 54 were granted temporary or provisional licenses; for detailed statistics, see table 3.1).\(^{34}\)

It is a great misfortune, for which no explanation has yet been found, that most of the

\(^{30}\) Schaffner, *Fatherland*, 70 n. 8. Schaffner here specifically wrote that the size of each classification category (that is, the relative numbers of active anti-Nazis, passive anti-Nazis, etc.) of the screening center “is not to be taken as representative of the size of similar groups in the German population as a whole.” See also Monod, *Settling Scores*, 66.

\(^{31}\) Note attached to the report of Rohutraut Schulz-Baesken (Class 35), dated 21 May 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2. Toombs called for greater caution in the future “in order not to overcrowd the schedule with obviously black cases.” As of this writing, I have been unable to find biographical information on Toombs. See also Monod, *Settling Scores*, 66.

\(^{32}\) See David M. Levy Papers, Box 35. See also table 3.1. Note that there are 16 candidates for whom information about their classification is not available in the archive and one candidate who refused to complete (see materials for Joseph Muller, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 32), totaling 191 candidates.


\(^{34}\) Not all of the reports for subjects classified as White A or White B are clear as to whether or not a license was granted. Given that it was the norm for people to be granted a license with that rating, it is here assumed that subjects classified as White A or White B were granted licenses unless otherwise noted on the report.
papers from Carl Orff’s class, Class 23, do not survive in these materials.\textsuperscript{35} Even the original document of Orff’s final report is missing; “copy” is written on the surviving document, which is located in a folder that contains the copies of many final reports from various classes. There is no folder for Class 23 or several other classes.\textsuperscript{36} Orff’s report is one of five that are dated 1 April 1946. For four of these five subjects, again including Orff, there are carbon copies of the reports of their Rorschach tests (that is, the images they perceived in the inkblots). There is no analysis accompanying the Rorschach reports, however, as there is for many of the other subjects.\textsuperscript{37} The copy of Orff’s Rorschach test, which was previously unknown, is in a mislabeled folder of unsorted documents. The images Orff saw included several representations of the theater and dancers, unsurprisingly given his professional interests; a “fantasy animal with only head and legs”; and four images described as “grotesque,” one of which he likened to a painting by Hieronymus Bosch (ca. 1450–1516).\textsuperscript{38} Although Schaffner’s interpretation of Orff’s test is not found in the archival materials, the composer’s love of fantasy regardless is apparent in what he perceived in the inkblots.

For some of the other classes of the ICD screening center, there are substantially more materials in the archive than exist for Orff. These materials include notes taken by the personnel, a summary of an anecdote from each candidate’s life that he or she was asked to tell to the rest of the class, a questionnaire of forty sentence completions (designed “to examine the students’ attitudes toward all kinds of political and social problems”),\textsuperscript{39} and the two essays each interviewee was asked to write. These essays were “Meine Gefühle während der Nazizeit” (“My

\textsuperscript{35} Marisa Shaari, the archivist of the Oskar Diethelm Library, informed me in email correspondence on 1 April 2013 that there is nothing in the archive to indicate why some of the papers are missing from the collection. “Class 23” is written on Orff’s Rorschach test, but it is not specified on his final report.
\textsuperscript{36} Carl Orff’s report, written by Bertram Schaffner and 1 April 1946, may be found in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2 (third to last document). All future quotations and other references to Orff’s denazification report refer to this three-page document. The first page contains the preliminary information and first two paragraphs of the “political” section; the second page contains the third through eighth paragraphs of the “political” section; and the third page contains the “psychological” section. In the archive, the second and third pages of the report are reversed.
\textsuperscript{37} The folders in Levy’s papers (Box 35) skip without explanation from Class 22 to Class 25, and Orff was in Class 23.
\textsuperscript{38} Carl Orff’s Rorschach test is located in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 40. I discovered this document on 28 February 2014. The specific Bosch painting that Orff referenced was the “Triptych on the Temptation of St. Anthony” (ca. 1501), which perhaps came to mind because Werner Egk was at work on his \textit{La Tentation de Saint Antoine d’après les airs et des vers du dix-huitième siècle} (The Temptation of St. Anthony on airs and verses of the eighteenth century; score, Mainz, B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 4559), 1947/1959).
\textsuperscript{39} This test was devised by Dr. David Levy and Ernest Rott (Schaffner, \textit{Fatherland}, 7 n. 2). Although some sentence completion tests are printed in Schaffner’s book (Schaffner, \textit{Fatherland}, 147–149, 157–160, 167–170, 180–183, and 189–192), very few are extant in the David M. Levy Papers.
feelings during the Nazi period”) and “Die Kollektivschuld Deutschlands” (“The collective guilt of Germany”).

Orff’s report demonstrates that he impressed the officials at the screening center with his anti-Nazi attitudes. He was, however, downgraded from the second-best possible classification, “White B,” to “Grey C,” acceptable because he had benefitted from the Third Reich, both financially and with his exemption from service during the war. Nevertheless, he was granted his license to guest conduct. By examining extant materials on other candidates and studying the well-documented rationale behind the ICD’s screening process, one may gain insight into the conclusions that his evaluators drew as to Orff’s personality, psychological profile, and political attitudes.

The political portion of Orff’s interviews at the screening center was conducted by Ernest Rott, a French citizen who had been part of the Office of Strategic Services and was an expert on National Socialist organizations and the history of the Third Reich. The military psychiatrist Major Bertram Schaffner, who replaced David Levy after the latter left the ICD screening center, conducted Orff’s psychological evaluation. Schaffner was a Jewish man with four German grandparents whose mother had been born in Germany, and he had spent substantial time in Germany during his youth.

At the end of the war, Schaffner and his colleagues hypothesized that the root cause of Nazism was an underlying rigidity and authoritarianism in German culture, especially in the

---

40 Ibid., 120 (quotation reprinted from an article that first appeared in the Information Control Intelligence Summary of the Office of Military Government for Germany, ICIS No. 43, week ending 25 May 1946). For earlier classes, the second essay was about the Entnazifizierung program rather than collective guilt. Dozens of essays on all three subjects are collected in the David Levy Papers in Box 37, Folders 22–28, while others are found in Box 35 in the folders for several individual classes.

41 See the “recommendation” at the end of Orff’s report, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2.

42 Schaffner, Fatherland, 118 (includes reprint of ICIS No. 43) and 7 n. 2; Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 261. I have not been able to find further biographical information on Ernest Rott as of this writing. The loss of Rott, due to an order from General Lucius D. Clay (1898–1978) “that no allied nationals may be employed in an executive, supervisory capacity within the American MG [military government] after August 31, 1946” is part of what led to the closing of the screening center. Clay did not approve the American political analyst, a professor at Princeton University, whom the officials found to replace Rott (“Present Status of I.C.D. Screening Center,” dated September 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 4, pages 2–3).

43 Presumably Rott conducted the political interview and discussed his findings with Schaffner, who then wrote the report (only Schaffner’s name appears at the end).

context of family life and education. Family background was thus a crucial component of the center’s psychiatric evaluations. The themes of “the revolt of the son” and “the revenge of the father” had been prominent in Weimar Germany and were the subject of several plays from the beginning of World War I through the 1920s. In 1948, Schaffner published his pioneering book *Fatherland: A Study of Authoritarianism in the German Family*, in which he stressed the authoritarian role of the German father. Carl Orff’s childhood rebellion against his family’s military and religious traditions is therefore highly relevant in understanding his evaluation at the ICD screening center.

David Monod has raised an objection about the emphasis on family background in the evaluation process: “under this approach, artists [seeking licenses] might be blacklisted not just for who they were but for what type of parents they had.” This concern is mitigated by the fact that Schaffner, Levy, and their colleagues were more concerned with how each person had responded to his or her upbringing than on family background per se. For example, having revolted against an authoritarian upbringing generally would be taken in a candidate’s favor. One critic of the center was Hans Speier (1905–1990), a distinguished German sociologist who had immigrated to America where he was a professor at various institutions, including the University of Michigan. Speier considered the center’s interviews to be a serious invasion of privacy because they investigated “the most intimate aspects” of candidates’ lives, including “childhood, sex life, relations to parents, etc.” Speier also was concerned that the candidates’ information would not be reliable because it was obtained through intimidation.

In responding to these criticisms, Levy wrote to General Robert A. McClure on 23 January 1946 that the psychological evaluations were conducted in a non-stressful manner and that the interviews “consist largely of spontaneous expression.” He noted the contrast between the psychological and political evaluation interviews: “I have witnessed frequently the emotional

---

47 Schaffner, *Fatherland*.
51 See the letter from Hans Speier to Dr. David M. Levy from 10 January 1946 (the quotations come from the second page) in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 15.
tension in a candidate who had just completed a political interview, and his gradual relaxation as
the psychiatric interview progressed. In a recent discussion, two members of the British
Screening Section shared the same impression.” Levy concluded by stating that the center “in
essence, regards the study of a man’s personality as necessary as the study of his politics.”
While one must decide whether or not to take Levy at his word, it is at least clear that the staff of
the screening center put forth a conscientious effort to design a valid screening program.

Levy wrote about the importance of a thorough psychological analysis in an undated
document titled “Contribution of Psychiatric & Psychological Study to the I.C.D. Screening
Center.” This paragraph describes an important aspect of the screeners’ methodology:

The attempt on the part of the candidates to simulate anti-Nazi attitudes is common. In
the absence of concrete evidence, much can be learned in this regard through a study of
the childhood history and the personality, and the use of special attitude tests. Such
studies may decide the issue in certain cases; in others, they may aid in confirming or
challenging implications made in the political analysis.

Levy, who had left the ICD screening center by the time of Orff’s evaluation, wrote that these
words applied to all of the 25 case studies that he was examining. In the case of Carl Orff, his
anti-authoritarian attitudes since childhood and his insistence on pursuing his own individual
path, which deviated from his familial tradition, no doubt played an important role in Schaffner’s
assessment that Orff’s “environment and development are consistent with an antinazi [attitude],”
that “on psychological grounds, nazism was distasteful to him,” and that “he remained a passive
antinazi.”

Psychological evaluation was an important component of the ICD screening center’s
work, not only as a tool in determining a candidate’s proper political classification, but also in
determining a candidate’s suitability for licensing. Not all politically acceptable candidates

52 See the four-page letter from Dr. David M. Levy to General Robert A. McClure (1897–1957), 10 January 1946
(the first two quotations come from the third page, and the final quotation from the fourth page) in the David M.
Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 15. See also the description of the positive impressions of several candidates in two-
page report of 12 February 1946, subject heading “Reaction of Bad Orb Candidates,” David M. Levy Papers, Box
34, Folder 5; Schaffner, Fatherland, 119 (reprint of ICIS No. 43): “Some of the candidates arrive annoyed and
distrustful of the procedure, and every attempt is made to win their confidence and cooperation. Practically all
candidates have expressed their satisfaction with their experience….As a result of the atmosphere of the place they
talk freely and are usually completely cooperative.”
53 “Contribution of Psychiatric & Psychological Study to the I.C.D. Screening Center” (undated), page 1, David M.
Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 15. It is clear from this document that none of the cases in question was Carl Orff.
possessed the intelligence and mental stability to be granted a license. A salient example is a publisher, initially given the political classification of “White A,” whom Schaffner described as “an irritating, neurotic, conceited ‘crackpot’” and “a ‘pathological liar’…incapable of telling the truth” due to his “fantastic theories” that lack “any reference to reality…. He belongs to the ‘lunatic fringe.’” Schaffner specified in all capital letters that “UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD THIS MAN BE GRANTED A LICENSE!” A less extreme case is Orff’s conductor colleague Bertil Wetzelsberger, who made a poor overall impression on Schaffner and was rated only “Grey C.” While his report does not specify if he was rated “acceptable” or “unacceptable,” he was granted a provisional license, whereas the grey-rated Orff’s license had no such qualifications. Schaffner’s report on the “crackpot” is in striking contrast to his report on Orff, whom he described as a fundamentally stable individual. Schaffner’s evaluation contradicts the historian Michael H. Kater’s assessment that Orff suffered from bipolar II disorder, an assessment that Kater based primarily on negative character traits that he ascribed to the composer in *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits.*

---

55 As David Levy wrote to General McClure in January 1946: “However anti-Nazi in attitude a candidate may be, lack of intelligence on his part may make him too great a risk for our purpose in so important a post” (letter from Dr. David Levy to General Joseph McClure, 23 January 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 15). An applicant for a license as theater intendant was classified as “White A” and described as “anti-fascist, anti-militarist, anti-nationalist,” but nevertheless his political attitudes test had “answering revealing him to be somewhat authoritarian in his conception of family life” (Report of Gerd Briese, 7 June 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2). An applicant for a license as a journalist received a stellar rating but “nevertheless [had] certain mild authoritarian traits, based on his own militant political [specifically Socialist] convictions” (Report of Max Maurice Hofmann, 28 May 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2).

56 Report on Hans Firnges, 3 July 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2. Robert Schmid, Acting Chief of Intelligence, appended a note to this report that concludes: “Subject will be not be classified but license application is denied.” Evidently the “White A” classification ultimately was deemed to be too charitable.

57 It is unclear from the report if Wetzelsberger was given a license. His report, however, matches the description of the anonymous conductor characterized in Schaffner’s *Fatherland* as “opportunistic, unprincipled, conformist and weak. He was classified Grey and allowed to conduct as guest conductor but was not permitted to hold a position as regular conductor. In addition, selection of his orchestral programs will have to be under the supervision of a completely trustworthy licensee” (see Schaffner, *Fatherland*, 123–124; this section of the book is a reprint of ICIS No. 43). See Schaffner, report on Bertil Wetzelsberger (15 April 1946), David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2. For more on Wetzelsberger’s psychological evaluation, see his Rorschach test and its analysis in ibid., Box 35, Folder 40.

58 See Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 142: “Consider egocentricity, disregard for other people’s interests, unwillingness to become personally committed or emotional, tremendous charm and charisma, and bursts of creativity alternating with bouts of disease or lethargy during which work was sluggish….Moreover, consider extreme moodiness and a talent for making up fantasy, legends or lies….What emerges here is the profile of a man who was mentally ill.” According to the present *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* of the American Psychiatric Association, these symptoms are not characteristic of bipolar II disorder, possibly excepting “bursts of creativity alternating with bouts of disease or lethargy during which work was sluggish.” Kater speculated that Orff’s trauma in World War I may have been the cause of his bipolar II, but this condition does not result from an external cause. Traumas of that magnitude, rather, are likely to lead to post-traumatic stress disorder. See
Aside from weeding out those on the “lunatic fringe” and people otherwise unsatisfactory for the positions that they sought, the evaluations uncovered serious moral ambiguity in some of the candidates. A significant example is one of the few female applicants, who most likely was in Orff’s class as her report has the same date as his. She, like Orff, was granted a license with no provisions (to produce a radio program for women) despite a “‘Grey C’, acceptable” rating. Her report states that she bought furniture that had been taken from Jewish people, thereby providing financial assistance to the Nazis, but nevertheless her “attitude is entirely antinazi. There is no doubt that she helped many people persecuted by the Nazis, but in order to do this she did enter Nazi organizations. She played both sides. It would be hard to say for which side she did the most.”

The portrait of a person divided between doing the right thing and compromising with an immoral government, someone truly in the “grey” zone, is important to keep in mind when studying the Third Reich. As the officials at the ICD screening center rightly observed, Carl Orff was one of the countless people who inhabited that zone.

“‘Grey C’, acceptable”: Carl Orff’s Political Evaluation

Despite the ICD screening center’s carefully reasoned criteria, their process was ultimately subjective, which raises the question of whether or not Carl Orff was classified appropriately. Because the officials at the ICD Screening Center did not scrutinize several of Orff’s claims about his reception in the Third Reich (as will be addressed subsequently), some scholars have claimed that Orff effectively fooled the center’s personnel and that the assessment of the composer was too lenient. On 6 July 1996, David Monod interviewed Jenkins, six months before the latter’s death on 21 December at the age of 81. According to Jenkins, Orff was “shocked when he found out he [had been listed] only gray-acceptable and not lily-white…. [Orff] was convinced that the man at Bad Orb—the doctor who had interrogated him—was a

American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5* (Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association, 2013). It is within the realm of possibility that Carl Orff may have suffered from some kind of mental illness (to which no stigma should be attached, and which should not be likened to character flaws), but this is a matter beyond the scope of this dissertation and the expertise of its author.

59 Report of Dr. Gabriele Strecker (born Schneider), 1 April 1946, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2. Dr. Strecker’s description fits that of a woman described anonymously in Schaffner, *Fatherland*, 124 (reprint of ICIS No. 43).

very stupid man. And he was so much brighter than all the other people about him. The ego was there. And he was convinced completely that he was the victor.”

Based on Jenkins’s testimony, Monod wrote that Orff “was sharp enough to have taken advantage of the Americans’ lack of knowledge and to have utterly bamboozled the psychiatrist [i.e. Schaffner],” while Kater assessed that the composer was pleased to have “duped” successfully both Jenkins and his Bad Orb interlocutors. The German scholar Fred K. Prieberg wrote that Orff’s case was typical of a greater failing of the denazification process: “The US specialists ignored the normal experience that every defendant lies until reproached with evidence; thus these ‘experts’ did without verification. Such failure colored many political assessments after 1945.”

A closer evaluation of Orff’s report, which was discovered by the eminent Viennese historian Oliver Rathkolb in 1998, reveals that the composer did not in fact fool the ICD personnel about his reception in the Third Reich. The report suggests that the American officers likely did not have all of the pertinent information about Orff, but they did have enough of the most important information and were able to glean enough about his personality to arrive at a well-founded conclusion.

Carl Orff’s report is dated 1 April 1946 and is three pages long, which is average in length. The brief section detailing his biographical information reveals that he had traveled to Italy and Switzerland and that he spoke “a little French and English.” He listed his religion as “Catholic,” although there are no further details about his religious convictions or worldview.

---

61 Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 301–302, internal quotation marks omitted. See also Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 137.

62 Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 301–302 (first quotation, 302); Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 137 (second quotation). Monod also commented that, while Orff had expressed to Jenkins his surprise at having received a “grey” rather than “white” classification, he “should have been grateful for what he got” (Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 302).


64 Karner, Komponisten unter Hakenkreuz, 211. Rathkolb was Karner’s dissertation advisor.

65 Orff also listed his religion as Catholic on the questionnaire for the Reichsschrifttumskammer, Bundesarchiv, Berlin, RK I 0448, 0748. On this same field he was asked to list his racial “belonging” (Rassezugehörigkeit) but simply declined to do so.
and (as the American officials may or may not have learned) there is evidence that Orff was not a practicing member of the church.\textsuperscript{66} Perhaps he found it most convenient to list the religion of his family than to explain his individualistic views on the subject. In any case, that he listed Catholicism as his religion suggests that he had not made a public break from the Church. Orff’s listed vocations are teacher at the \textit{Güntherschule} from 1925 to 1938 and, after that, “independent composer.”\textsuperscript{66} The record accurately reflects that he was never a member of the NSDAP, but that he was in the RMK for the entirety of the Third Reich. This was not a problem, however, as this “professional organization” (as it is called on the report) was on the list of those in which membership “would not necessarily eliminate a person from ‘A’ classification.”\textsuperscript{68}

It is impossible to know to what degree the interviews contained oversights and omissions and to what degree details were omitted from written reports for the sake of brevity. Perhaps the most remarkable omissions in this document are Orff’s partially Jewish ancestry and his military service in World War I. It stands to reason that adducing his Jewish grandmother would have been to Orff’s advantage during his denazification process, and so it is especially striking that he did not do so. One even may wonder in light of this fact if Orff was aware of his ancestry, although there is evidence to suggest that he was (as addressed in Chapter 1).\textsuperscript{69}

The “military” section on the first page of the report simply notes that Orff was deferred as a composer during World War II, but strangely makes no mention of his service during World War I. This is a peculiar inconsistency in the extant reports; World War I service is listed for many candidates in Orff’s age group but omitted for many others.\textsuperscript{70} One candidate even had been injured in a trench cave-in, as had Orff.\textsuperscript{71} The composer had listed his service as \textit{Kanonier} (artilleryman) on his application for membership in the \textit{Reichsschrifttumskammer} (RSK, the

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{66} See interview with Gertrud Willert Orff in Palmer’s \textit{O, Fortuna!} See also Chapter 1.
\item \textsuperscript{67} As of this writing I have not determined the basis on which Schaffner wrote that Orff left the school in 1938, as he remained involved in colleagues’ pedagogical work after this point. Nor has the OZM at present been able to find documentation to support Schaffner’s account.
\item \textsuperscript{68} David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 1, “Classification List,” dated 11 October 1945, page 2.
\item \textsuperscript{69} I thank and credit Oliver Rathkolb for this observation. It is remarkable that so few commentators have noted this glaring absence in the report. An exception is Brembeck, “Mitläufer oder Widerstandskämpfer?”: “Strange, that Orff did not defend himself at Bad Homburg with a reference to this” (\textit{Seltsam, daß Orff sich in Bad Homburg nicht mit diesem Hinweis verteidigt hat}).
\item \textsuperscript{70} See, for example, Schaffner’s reports of Bertil Wetzelsberger (15 April 1946), Gerd Briese (7 June 1946), Max Maurice Hofmann (28 May 1946), and Adolf Hieber (6 May 1946; this person’s name is difficult to make out due to the poor quality of the document), all located in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2.
\item \textsuperscript{71} See David M. Levy, report (undated) on Josef Kirmaier, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 35.
\end{itemize}
equivalent of the RMK for writers).\textsuperscript{72} The omission of this information from the record of his denazification is especially striking given that attitudes toward the military were of great concern to Schaffner and his colleagues.\textsuperscript{73} It is all the more puzzling given that describing his World War I experiences would have provided Orff a further opportunity to express his dislike for militarism and authority.

The increase in Orff’s income posed a serious liability during his denazification. According to the report, he earned about 5,000 RM in 1932, 3,000 RM in 1934, and 4,000 RM in 1936. The next year listed is 1941, in which he earned 7,400 RM. While this is a substantial increase from the first three years reported, it is dwarfed by the increases that followed: his income more than doubled to 16,900 RM in 1942 and escalated to 28,500 RM in 1944. It is remarkable that the report makes no comment on this drastic increase, especially in the apocalyptic years of “total war.”\textsuperscript{74} Despite the lack of explicit commentary, however, one may assume that the ICD Screening Center personnel noted Orff’s income as a red flag, given that one of the eight enumerated criteria for a candidate to be blacklisted was “benefited to a marked extent from the Nazi system.”\textsuperscript{75} David Levy explicitly listed income as a reason for blacklisting at least one candidate.\textsuperscript{76} David Monod has noted that Orff would have fared worse in other venues of the ICD denazification process, such as that overseen by the Czech intelligence officer Paul Moeller:

Moeller would have taken one look at the combination of factors—the composer’s steadily rising income, the fact that he had written works for Nazi Festivals—and would have blacklisted him. As an intelligence officer with a book of regulations on what to hold against an application, he could not have done otherwise…. For ICD’s intelligence officers, unlike its psychiatrists, the point was not whether one knew Jews, or even had helped individuals fleeing from oppression; the point was to prove that one had not

\textsuperscript{72} As described in Chapter 1, in 1942 Orff was released from membership in the RSK as he already paid dues to the RMK (both organizations were of the Reichskulturkammer, Reich Cultural Chamber, RKK). See Bundesarchiv, Berlin, RK I 0448, 0746–0751 (application) and 0754 (for the waiver of Orff’s requirement to join the RSK).

\textsuperscript{73} See also Schaffner, Fatherland, 62–66.

\textsuperscript{74} In contrast, the report of Max Maurice Hofmann mentions his income at the beginning of the sixth paragraph in the “political” section (second page). See also the fifth paragraph of the “political” section (second page) of the report of Gabriele Strecker. Both reports are located in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2.

\textsuperscript{75} “Classification List,” David M. Levy Papers, Box 34, Folder 1, 2 (item “d” on a list of eight items, beginning on the preceding page). The rest of the enumerated criteria do not apply to Carl Orff (see document in Appendix 2).

\textsuperscript{76} See David M. Levy, report on Maxi Baier (born Herber), David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 23 (page 2).
carried on as best one could, that one had actually suffered some drawback.\textsuperscript{77}

That the same candidate could receive a different rating from two different branches of the ICD underlies the inconsistencies, and even dysfunction, of the denazification process.

The introductory information in Carl Orff’s report is followed by a political report that comprises eight numbered paragraphs. The first entry reiterates his membership “only [in] the professional organization, RMK,” and the second states: “He has always been an independent composer without a fixed position except at the Guenther School in Munich, of which he was a founder in 1925 [in fact 1924 is the correct year]…. He left the school in 1938 because he felt music was becoming less and less important in the school program.” The report also describes Dorothee Günther, who was in charge of the \textit{Günther-Schule} and its “owner,” as a “convinced Nazi” who joined the Party in 1933. The basis on which Schaffner made this statement is not clear, and there is testimony from people who knew Günther that she was compelled to join the NSDAP for the sake of her school’s survival.\textsuperscript{78} It would have been strange for Orff to describe his close colleague as a “convinced Nazi,” as doing so only could have been to his disadvantage. Schaffner also noted that Orff “had a fixed income from the municipal theatre in Frankfurt and the State Opera in Vienna,” and that he had not finished all of the “operas” he was supposed to write for the latter.

The report then relates Orff’s most questionable claim:

He said that his music was not appreciated by the Nazis and that he never got a favorable review by a Nazi music critic. His great success came after the performance of “Carmina Burana” in La Scala in Milan, in 1942; this performance was not under the auspices of the Propaganda Ministry. During the war his music was played in occupied countries (Haag, Agram) and in Switzerland (Zuerich).\textsuperscript{79}

Although there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the terms “favorable review” and “Nazi music critic,” even with the most generous interpretations of these questions it is difficult to

\textsuperscript{77} Monod, \textit{“Verklärte Nacht.”} 302 (quotation, emphasis in original) and 292 (on Paul Moeller). It is not clear to what Nazi festivals Monod was referring here; the Olympic Festival is the strongest candidate. As of this writing I have not found further information on Paul Moeller.


\textsuperscript{79} Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “political” section, no. 4 (spacing normalized).
justify this claim in light of Orff’s positive treatment by such critics as Fritz Stege, as outlined in the previous chapter.\textsuperscript{80} The motivation for Orff’s substantial misrepresentation may be found in the letter he had received from Jenkins (as previously quoted) in which he was told that he must “acquit [himself] of any instances of being a beneficiary” of the Third Reich.\textsuperscript{81} Orff evidently deemed that convincing his evaluators that he had not been a “beneficiary” was sufficiently important to merit the risk of providing testimony that easily could have been disproved.

Orff’s claim that his breakthrough was in 1942 contradicts his later account in \textit{Dokumentation}, published in 1979, in which he stated that the 1940 production in Dresden had marked the turning point in his success.\textsuperscript{82} Kater aptly has described Orff’s aim here as “moving himself, his oeuvre, and his civic and artistic responsibilities out of the jurisdiction of the Third Reich.”\textsuperscript{83} While Orff attempted to distance his works from the Third Reich, however, he could not escape totalitarianism. The Milan performance took place in the fascist Italy of Benito Mussolini (1883–1945), albeit before the Italian Social Republic (\textit{Repubblica Sociale Italiana}) in Salò, the puppet state of Nazi Germany. As the report accurately notes, Switzerland is the only country in which \textit{Carmina Burana} was performed during the Third Reich that was not controlled by the Axis Powers.\textsuperscript{84}


\textsuperscript{81} Letter from Newell O. Jenkins to Carl Orff, 7 January 1947, National Archives, Records of United States Occupation Headquarters, World War II (Record Group 260), Entry A1 1681: Correspondence and Related Records, 1945–1949, Box 928. Original language of quotation: \textit{Dich jeglicher Nutznieserei freisprechen}.

\textsuperscript{82} Orff in \textit{Dokumentation}, Vol. 4, 71. For further details on the reception of \textit{Carmina Burana} in the Third Reich, see Chapter 2. Heinrich Strobel’s snide review of the premiere of \textit{Die Bernauerin} in 1947 refers to the 1940 Dresden staging of \textit{Carmina Burana} as “the true premiere” ([d]ie wahre Premiere) of the work and the beginning of the composer’s ascent (Aufstieg). In the review’s imagined dialogue between an \textit{Orffiker} (devotee to Carl Orff) and a \textit{Kenner} (learned person), Strobel assigned this line to the former, suggesting that this is what Orff and his supporters were saying at the time (Heinrich Strobel (signed H. St.), “Orffische Zwiesprach zur Uraufführung der Bernauerin,” \textit{Melos}, 14. Jahr, Heft 10/11, August/September 1947:297–299, 297).

\textsuperscript{83} Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 136; Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 301 (“…what information survives from that [i.e. Orff’s] screening clearly reveals the composer to have modulated the truth to the American key”).

\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Carmina Burana} was performed in six countries outside of Germany between 1941 (before which all performances were in Germany) and 1945: Switzerland (premiere 1941), Italy (premiere 1942), Austria (premiere
Beyond the critical reception of his works, including *Carmina Burana*, there is additional evidence that Orff misrepresented his reception during the Third Reich after 1945. In the 1963 *Orff-Institut Jahrbuch (Orff Institute Annual)*, Orff wrote that the *Schulwerk* had been deemed *unerwünscht* (undesirable) during the Third Reich. In *Dokumentation*, he wrote that the *Günther-Schule* had suffered from harassment from the National Socialists and claimed that further volumes could not be published during the Third Reich. In fact, several volumes of the *Schulwerk* were published until 1939, although they became fewer as the years went on. During the denazification period, there are at least two contemporary references that Orff’s advocates (who are not specified in either case) attempted to distance him from the Third Reich. In 1946, Captain Edward Kilenyi (1910–2000), the Music Control Officer for Bavaria and himself a pianist, wrote in *The New York Times* that Orff’s “dramatic works enjoyed considerable success [during the Third Reich]. His admirers insist that he succeeded despite the Nazis, but the claim bears investigation.” The prominent critic Heinrich Strobel (1898–1970) made a mocking reference to Orff’s followers claiming that the composer’s works from later in the Third Reich (very likely referring to *Die Kluge*) contained elements of resistance. The latter example is especially striking given that, at present, there is no known instance in which Orff claimed on the record that his works were subversive in content, excepting in the provocative use of Latin.

The next paragraph of the report deals with Orff’s two most contentious projects, the music

---


87 Edward Kilenyi, “The Record of German Musicians: Many Played Ball With The Nazis—Only Very Few Did Not,” *The New York Times*, 2 June 1946, X5. Kilenyi added: “Eventually, his works will have to stand on their own merits,” raising the fraught question between the person and the work.

88 Strobel “Orfische Zwiesprach zur Uraufführung der Bernauerin,” 297. In the review’s imagined dialogue between an *Orffiker* (devotee to Carl Orff) and a *Kenner* (learned person), Strobel assigned this claim to the former, suggesting that this is what Orff and his supporters were saying at the time, although whether or not Strobel agreed is difficult to determine from his satirical tone. In this ungenerous review, Strobel mocked Carl Orff by characterizing the *Orffiker* as overly generous in his appraisal of the composer, clouded in judgment by his admiration, and generally irrational. The *Kenner* is presented as the voice of reason.

for the Olympic games in 1936 and his music for *Ein Sommernachtstraum*:

He composed a festival for children for the opening of the Olympic games, and a new version of Mendelsohn’s [sic] “Midsummer Night’s Dream”. He said that he received no order from Nazi authorities to do so, and that he did it from his own private musical point of view. It was performed twice; then, he withdrew it and wrote a new version which has never been performed. He swears that it was not written to try to replace Mendelsohn’s [sic] music, and he admits that he chose an unfortunate moment in history to write it.\(^90\)

In fact there were several more performances of the 1939 version of *Ein Sommernachtstraum* in addition to the two that Orff listed. It is unclear if he explained that his new version would have been performed had it not been for the closure of Germany’s theaters.\(^91\) Otherwise, the language of the report is accurate in that Orff did not receive an “order” (as it was not the norm for composers to receive “orders” to write anything during the Third Reich), but he did in fact receive a commission from Frankfurt-am-Main through National Socialist Mayor Friedrich Krebs.\(^92\) That he composed the score voluntarily is arguably more incriminating than had he been coerced. Whether or not the American officials knew that Orff’s *Ein Sommernachtstraum* was connected to the city of Frankfurt and its mayor, they were aware that, regardless of the composer’s intentions, his work was potentially usable by National Socialist cultural officers in the furtherance of their goal to eradicate the music of the Jewish Mendelssohn.

It is in the next paragraph of the report that the ICD screeners cast serious doubt on Orff’s account of his relationship to the Third Reich, citing his wartime deferral, known in German as being “UK” (*unabkömmlich*, literally “unavailable”):

The fact that he was deferred (UK) during the war is contradictory to his claim that he was not well thought of at the Propaganda Ministry. There were only 12 composers on the UK-list, all more or less known as Nazis. He does not give a very good [e]xplanation. He states that he did not know that he was deferred for the first two years, and that since most of the composers had a position in the theatre, they did not need to be one on [sic] this list. He states that he made no request to be placed on the UK-list and had nothing to do with such a list. At this time it is not known whether he was on the list of the so-called “Party-Composers”. He said that he does not know who is in [sic] the list and believes

\(^90\) Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “political” section, no. 5.
\(^92\) Michael H. Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 136 (the quoted words are Kater’s); Monod, “*Verklärte Nacht*,” 312 n. 18. See also Taruskin “Orff’s Musical and Moral Failings” (AR 35) and *The Dangers of Music*, 163.
that he would never have been considered for it.\footnote{Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “political” section, no. 6. Regarding Orff’s statement, it seems unlikely that artists were placed on deferment lists by request.}

It is unclear what list Schaffner and his colleagues consulted. A logical candidate is the \textit{Gottbegnadeten-Liste} but, as noted in the previous chapter, Orff was one of 19 composers on this list.\footnote{Oliver Rathkolb, \textit{Führertreu und gottbegnadet: Künstlereliten im Dritten Reich}, Wien: ÖBV, 1991, 176. The figure of 19 includes the three musicians who were \textit{unersetzliche Künstler} (indispensable artists), although it seems highly likely that Wilhelm Furtwängler was included (along with Richard Strauss and Hans Pfitzner) because of his conducting career rather than his composition.} These were not the only German composers who received deferred (UK) status during World War II.\footnote{See Appendix 2 for further details. Richard Taruskin has referred to Orff as “one of only twelve composers to receive a full military exemption from Goebbels’s propaganda ministry,” suggesting that he was using Schaffner’s report as his source (“Orff’s Musical and Moral Failings,” AR 35; \textit{The Dangers of Music}, 162), but this figure is not accurate.} Because it is unclear who the other 11 composers were on whatever list Ernest Rott was consulting, it is not possible to evaluate the degree to which these others were “more or less known as Nazis.”\footnote{David Monod’s interpretation of this report is that the interviewers “knew about, but had not seen, the Party’s list of musicians exempted from military service” (“Monod,” \textit{Verklärte Nacht}, 301). If this were the case, however, it is not clear how the interviewers would have known that Orff was on the list. Monod here also wrote that Orff “tried an outright lie” when he denied knowledge about this list. While it is conceivable that Orff did not know who exactly among his colleagues had received what benefits, it seems highly unlikely that he did not know the major details about his own deferred status, even if he had not been well informed, or cared to know, about the bureaucratic particulars.} Of the 19 composers on the \textit{Gottbegnadeten-Liste}, only six were members of the NSDAP, although others were involved in National Socialist culture to varying degrees.\footnote{See Appendix for more information. Please note that, as of this writing, I have not been able to determine conclusively that one of the composers on this list, the Austrian Joseph Marx (1882–1964), was not a member of the NSDAP, although I have found nothing that suggests he was a member.} The confusion regarding this list demonstrates the imperfections of the screening center’s system. No doubt it was difficult to obtain all of the necessary records from the massive bureaucracy of the Third Reich. The reference to the list of “Party-Composers” is curious, as the defining characteristics for this classification are unclear, nor is it even clear how the ICD personnel were aware of such a list. There is, however, evidence that Orff already had a UK status as early as August 1942, prior to the \textit{Gottbegnadeten-Liste}.\footnote{See the reference to Orff’s UK status in Dr. Willeibald Götze report of 13 August 1942, “Dienstreise nach München und Salzburg; 4. August – 10. August,” in BA, R 55 / 20497, 153–158, here 154.}

The following paragraph in the report records Orff’s claims “that he had never composed for an official festival, attended one, and never received a prize or title” and “that he had never
had any connection with prominent Nazis.”99 While the stipends Orff received from Frankfurt and Vienna were not prizes, he did receive 2,000 RM from the RMK in 1942, which is entirely absent from the report. Although Orff disclosed his relationship with the city of Frankfurt, there is likewise no mention of the 500 RMK award he received after the premiere of *Carmina Burana*. This prize was not on behalf of an NSDAP organization, as was the RMK award, but it was approved by the Nazi mayor Friedrich Krebs, who arguably should have been mentioned as a “prominent Nazi” with whom Orff had a connection.100 The report notes that Orff “was introduced to Baldur von Schirach in Vienna when his opera was performed,” presumably a reference to the 1942 Viennese premiere of *Carmina Burana*. In fact Orff’s contact with Schirach was somewhat more extensive than the report suggests; as noted in the previous chapter, Orff was Schirach’s guest on at least two occasions in Vienna.101 The report also states that Orff never met Joseph Goebbels, which the available evidence supports.102

The question of whether or not Orff composed music for “an official Nazi festival” is a grey area, as there is ambiguity as to what constitutes such an event. One could make the argument that some of the activities of the *Günther-Schule* (with some of which, albeit, Orff was not involved)103 fall into the category of official National Socialist events, as described in Chapter 1. The most prominent example is the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games, although evidently neither Orff nor the American officers categorized the games as “a Nazi festival.” While the Berlin Olympics were international in nature, they were designed to improve Germany’s image in the eyes of the rest of the world and thereby to discredit the Third Reich’s critics. It is striking that, while Orff tried to extenuate his composition of *Ein Sommernachtstraum*, no such self-defense is recorded for the Olympics project, nor do the Americans seem to have been particularly concerned with this event.104 Perhaps the Americans did not treat Orff’s involvement

99 Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “political” section, no. 7.
100 Kater has criticized Orff’s omissions of both the RMK and Frankfurt awards (Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 136).
102 See *Die Tagebücher von Joseph Goebbels*, ed. Elke Fröhlich, Teil II Band 13, Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995, 466. See also Chapter 2 for more details, including the quotation of the relevant passage.
103 See Chapter 1 for more information.
104 As to the 1936 Olympics, Monod has written: “His work for the Olympic Games, he asserted, was only a festival piece for children; he failed to mention that it had involved six thousand of them” (Monod, “*Verklärte Nacht,*” 301). It is not clear, however, exactly how Orff characterized the event and his participation to his examiners; it is possible that Schaffner and Ernest Rott did not think the details were worth mentioning in the report. In any case, the Olympic Games are generally associated with grandeur and extravagant spectacle.
in the Olympics with more gravity because they could not have done so without a certain degree of hypocrisy, given their own country’s participation in that event. Several Germans from various political backgrounds who were interviewed during denazification noted that participation in the Olympics had lent credibility to Hitler’s government, both within Germany and in the international community.

The concluding paragraph of the political report renders the final verdict on Carl Orff as a political being:

O.’s attitudes are not Nazi. One of his best friends, Prof. Carl [sic] Huber, with whom he published “Musik der Landschaft”, a collection of folk songs, was killed by he Nazis in Munich in 1943. Nevertheless he was a “Nutzer” [i.e., beneficiary] of the Nazis and can at present be classified only as “Grey C”, acceptable. In view of his antinazi point of view, his deliberate av[oidance of positions and honors which he could have had by cooperating with the Nazis, he may at a future date be reclassified higher.

There is no evidence that Orff was ever reclassified, but given that he had been granted his license, a reclassification would have made no practical difference. It is curious that the content of Orff’s works receive no mention in this report, even though he already had completed the clearly anti-authoritarian *Die Bernauerin*, which was dedicated to Huber’s memory.

The Americans’ final assessment is somewhat puzzling: only in the sixth paragraph of the document does Schaffner give any indication that he and his colleagues were skeptical of Orff’s claims, whereas the rest of the document recounts the composer’s claims without commentary. As a result, it is difficult to determine what specific evidence the evaluators used to arrive at their conclusion that Orff was a Nutzniesser. By the report, it seems that Schaffner and Rott were concerned primarily with Orff’s deferred (UK) status. Schaffner was so laconic in his report on the point of the Sommernachtstraum and Olympics projects that it is difficult to know to what, if

---

105 See Chapter 1 for more on the 1936 Olympics. There are several references to this phenomenon in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 37, Folder 22 (materials pertaining to collective guilt). See a document titled Anti-Nazis, Class 15, No. 6, page 7, (v. Blucher): “Guilt not only in Germany but in rest of world who came to Olympicade [sic] in ’36 impressing all the little fellows”; rough draft of an report called “Collective Guilt Hausham S. S. Studies,” dated 19 November 1947, No. 5, page 5 (Lahr, 47 y., Ministerial Direktor, Staatskanzlei Volkschule): “Also if U.S. wouldn’t enter Olympic Games. If they hadn’t on basis that government was criminal, we would know what ausland felt.” A document with “code” handwritten at the top, originally labeled as page 9 but with the page number crossed out by hand, describes a subset of the interviewees blaming others, including the United States for participation in the Olympics. This suggests that the officials who wrote this list considered the statement that the United States had any complicity to be an attempt to deflect blame on the part of the German interviewees. One could argue that the American officers were deflecting their own complicity in turn—the guilt of Germany is not mutually exclusive with the complicity of other nations. See also Daniel Brown, *The Boys in the Boat: Nine Americans and Their Epic Quest for Gold at the 1936 Berlin Olympics*, New York: Viking, 2013.

106 Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “political” section, no. 8.
any, degree they factored into Orff’s classification. While the composer’s drastic increase in income in the last years of the Reich is reported without commentary, this must have been a significant factor as well. However they arrived at their conclusion, the Americans were correct to note that Orff had indeed benefitted in several respects from the Third Reich, an uncomfortable fact he obviously did not want them to know.

**The Relevance of Carl Orff’s Childhood to His Psychological Evaluation**

The evidence for Carl Orff’s non-Nazi “attitudes” is addressed further in the psychological portion of the evaluation, which comprises three numbered paragraphs. The first paragraph is an assessment of Orff’s personality, and the second addresses his political attitudes:

1. A highly gifted, creative individual who scored high on intelligence tests at the Screener [sic] Center. Orff is diplomatic, ingratiating and ingenious. Retiring and unob[tr]usive, accustomed to independence and solitude since childhood, he has steadfastly pursued his career as an unattached composer. He has little personal need of “belonging” to a group, public honor or recognition, and prefers to work alone rather than in organizations. He is emotionally well-adjusted, purposeful and egocentric.

2. Orff scored highest in his group on the political attitudes test. Psychiatric studies of his environment and development are consistent with an antinazi att[i]tude. On psychological grounds, nazism [sic] was distasteful to him; likewise on psychological grounds, he remained a passive antinazi, and tried to avoid official and personal contact both with the Nazi movement and with the war.

The final paragraph notes that Orff did not desire a license as intendant and that he “states that he has already refused such an offer, because the work would be primarily administrative and not musical.” Along with the “‘Grey C’, acceptable” rating, Schaffner recommended Orff’s license

---

107 The statement that Orff did not feel the need for “public honor or recognition” should be qualified. It seems likely that Schaffner meant that the composer had sufficient inner motivation and conviction such that he did not feel the need for external validation. This does not mean, however, that Orff did not desire accolades and recognition, and it certainly does not mean that he was not concerned with financial success. As Karen Painter has written of Orff around the premiere of *Carmina Burana*: “The composer did not shy away from publicity... (he sat for several photographers, developing a large publicity portfolio).” (*Symphonic Aspirations*, 264). That Orff sought to achieve fame and success on the one hand but preferred to live a quiet life of relative solitude in the countryside on the other may seem to be a curious contradiction in his character, although desiring success is different from extroversion. Kater has referred to Orff’s “obsessive quest to become famous since youth” (*Composers of the Nazi Era*, 139). His citation of Godela’s memoirs, however, appears to be inaccurate (ibid., 329 n. 201), (see G. Orff, *Mein Vater und ich*, 1992 version, 84; Kater’s book was published when only this edition was available).
“as composer and Orchestra conductor.”

The statement that Orff “scored highest in his group on the political attitudes test” is extraordinary in light of the fact that of the four other extant reports dated 1 April 1946, three were of publishers who were classified as White A. The fourth was of the candidate referenced earlier who sought a license to produce radio programs for women and also was rated “‘Grey C’, acceptable.” Of the three publishers classified as “White A,” however, two were granted provisional licenses and the third was “not recommended” for a license. Both of the candidates rated “‘Grey C’, acceptable,” including Orff, were granted licenses without provision. In this respect, Orff’s group was anomalous and serves as a vivid demonstration of how the individualized evaluation process could yield seemingly contradictory results.

The description of Orff as “diplomatic, ingratiating...[r]etiring and [unobtrusive]” suggests that he had a talent both for charming people and, when it suited him, not calling attention to himself as he went about his work—no doubt qualities that helped him through both the Third Reich and the denazification process. That Schaffner described Orff as “diplomatic” and “ingratiating” suggests that the evaluators perceived that Orff was attempting to garner their approval, and perhaps also that he was performing for them to some degree. It is of special interest that Orff is described as “emotionally well-adjusted” in light of his World War I trauma, which is strangely absent from the report. David Levy noted signs of post-traumatic stress disorder stemming from World War I for at least one other candidate, who was himself unaware of these symptoms. That Orff was deemed fundamentally well-adjusted does not, however, signify that he was not profoundly affected by his experiences in World War I. It would not be surprising for Orff, with his closely guarded nature, to avoid mention of the painful ramifications

---

108 Schaffner, report on Orff, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2, “psychological” section and recommendation.
109 See reports of Max Ernst Fraas, Reinhold Adolf Mueller, Carl Orff, Dr. Heinrich Winnes, and Dr. Gabrielle Strecker (born Schneider) in the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2. In Box 35, Folder 40, Rorschach tests, marked “Class 23,” are present for all of the candidates except for Strecker.
110 Monod wrote that “Orff’s denazification was an anomaly” that “reveals the injustices that might flow from the assessment of individuals rather than categories” (Monod, “Verklärte Nacht,” 302). While there certainly were difficulties in reaching fair conclusions when judging each case individually, there are likewise possibilities for injustice when each person is rigidly assigned a category based on inflexible criteria. In no system of denazification was justice assured. Monod’s opinion that Orff was unfairly rated is addressed elsewhere.
111 Kater has noted this quality of Orff in the context of an overall negative assessment of the composer’s character as a manipulator of others (Composers of the Nazi Era, 139–142, especially 142, where “tremendous charm and charisma” is included in an enumeration of Orff’s personal characteristics).
112 See notes on Barnabás von Géczy, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 32 (no final report is extant in the David M. Levy Papers for this candidate).
of World War I, including his nightmares, even in an environment in which openness was fostered.\footnote{See the section on World War I in Chapter 1. Orff’s student Wilfried Hiller has written that Orff had depressive tendencies and endorsed Luise Rinser’s description of Orff as “…a genius, a man hunted and worked to death by his Daimon” (…ein Genie, ein Mann, der von seinem Daimon gejagt und geschunden war). Quoted in Wilfried Hiller, “Selbstporträt der Künstler-Begegnungen,” in Disziplinos: Eigensinnige Lebensbilder zwischen Wissenschaft und Kunst, ed. Eduard A. Wiecha, Munich: oekom, 2013:309–326, 311, internal quotation marks omitted.)}

Unfortunately, the extant materials from Orff’s proceedings give no specific details as to what led Schaffner to determine that the composer’s “environment and development are consistent with an anti-authoritarian [attitude].” At first glance, this is not what one would expect, given Orff’s Bavarian military upbringing.\footnote{In 1995 the American reviewer Matthew Gurewitsch even insinuated that Orff’s military family background may be “suggestive” of his political leanings, although he did mention “a brief, traumatic tour of duty in the First World War.” Gurewitsch, who conceded that he had “not studied Orff’s biography in depth,” concluded his article with the astounding claim that a photograph of the three-year-old Carl with a tin drum (figure 1.1) may be “the most haunting clue” as to his politics. See Matthew Gurewitsch, “Cosmic Chants,” The Atlantic Monthly, 276/2, August 1995:90–93, 93.} A closer examination of the American officers’ system of psychological profiling in conjunction with the details of Orff’s early life, however, sheds light on why Schaffner reached his conclusions about the composer. In many respects, Orff’s childhood, at least as recounted in his and his daughter’s memoirs, was consistent with Schaffner’s profile for anti-Nazi attitude.

The American officials were particularly concerned with the influence of German militarism on postwar Germany. Schaffner wrote that the rigidity and caste system he had identified in German society “emotionally prepared” young men for the military, an environment “in which nationalistic feelings are given concrete expression.”\footnote{Schaffner, Fatherland, 64–66 (both quotations found on 64).} Therefore, Carl Orff’s childhood and family life have special relevance to his psychiatric evaluation. His experience in World War I would have been especially relevant, making it all the more puzzling why it is absent from his report.

Orff’s rejection of his family’s military tradition is significant in light of Schaffner’s statement in Fatherland: “It would not occur to him [i.e., the average German young man] to think of rebelling against the army in the German social system.”\footnote{Ibid., 64–65.} As Godela Orff wrote of her father’s childhood: “At that time it was so customary that one ‘served the Fatherland.’”\footnote{G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 29; previous version, 27. Original language: Es war damals so üblich, man »diente dem Vaterland«.} In Nazi Germany, wounded and disabled soldiers were treated as heroes who had made a noble and
worthy sacrifice, not as victims of atrocity.\textsuperscript{118} The controversy over Erich Maria Remarque’s (1898–1970) novel \textit{Im Westen nichts Neues} (1928, published in English as \textit{All Quiet on the Western Front}), illustrates the hostility of right-wing ideologues toward negative portrayals of war. The book was burned and screenings of the 1930 American filmic adaptation were disrupted by Nazis, leading to the film’s ban by the German police.\textsuperscript{119} In a briefing titled “A Report on our Problem in Germany,” dated 1 July 1946, Alfred Toombs, the chief of the Intelligence Branch Office of the Director of Information Control, wrote that “the Germans have been taught that war is glorious.”\textsuperscript{120} Orff’s early works “Die Närrin” and \textit{Gisei}, as addressed in Chapter 1, clearly demonstrate that he was not of this opinion.

Schaffner was especially concerned about childhood indoctrination and rigid parental authority.\textsuperscript{121} In \textit{Fatherland}, he noted a correlation between anti-Nazi attitudes and rebelling against authoritarian parents, although he stipulated that this is not “the only, or even the commonest precursor of opposition to political traditionalism.”\textsuperscript{122} In the “incomplete sentence” test given to the candidates, each subject was asked to describe his or her views about the “revolt of a young man against his father.”\textsuperscript{123} Although Orff’s questionnaire is not extant, his answer can be surmised from his description in his memoirs of standing up to his rigid uncle at the age of 16 and insisting that he go to music school instead of university.\textsuperscript{124} In recounting this episode in his

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{120} Alfred Toombs, “A Report on Our Problem in Germany,” 1 July 1946, pages 4–5, emphasis in original, David M. Levy Papers, Box 37, Folder 34. David Monod has noted that Toombs was particularly zealous, and that “his attitudes may have been influenced by the fact that the 12\textsuperscript{th} Army Group intelligence officers under his command were the first Americans into the Buchenwald concentration camp” (Monod, \textit{Settling Scores}, 34).
\textsuperscript{121} See Schaffner, \textit{Fatherland}, 41–71.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 69–71, quotation from 71. See 84–85 for a striking example of authoritarian parenting even among a group of Germans who were anti-Nazis.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 127 (see question No. 18 on the “incomplete sentence” test, reprinted here in English translation).
\textsuperscript{124} In describing the teenage Orff’s rejection of his family tradition, Ulrich Rühle wrote: “What luck that the mother is his ally” (Ulrich Rühle, “... ganz verrückt nach Musik”: \textit{die Jugend grosser Komponisten}, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1995, 375, original language: \textit{Welch ein Glück, dass die Mutter seine Verbündete ist}). In fact,
memoirs, Orff wrote: “In this difficult situation my mother alone had the correct understanding of me because she profoundly realized how things stood with me.” Godela wrote that her father and his sister, Mia, “were watched over and with loving tolerance supported.” She further noted that, although Orff broke from the Catholicism of his deeply religious parents, they “nevertheless always remained lovingly inclined toward him, even when his way of life did not meet their expectations.” That the young composer’s creativity was fostered and encouraged has significance in light of Schaffner’s statement that, for many German children, their “own free fantasy is discouraged by the system of training and education.” In marked contrast, the philosophy of Orff’s Schulwerk is largely based upon encouraging children’s creativity. Godela described the environment of her upbringing as far more encouraging of free thought than in the rigid model that disturbed Schaffner and his colleagues.

That Orff had a strong mother and supportive father is significant in light of Schaffner’s theories. Godela Orff described her grandfather Heinrich Orff as “a kingly Bavarian officer” who “stood always somewhat in the shadow of his wife, but this did not hurt his feelings; he had much humor, he loved his peace and comfort…. It was a happy community, a good marriage.” If Orff gave a similar account to Schaffner, the psychiatrist would have been impressed at Heinrich’s attitude toward his wife, as he and his colleagues considered attitudes toward maternal affection, and women’s equality more generally, to be a potential counterbalance to paternal authoritarianism.

---

Orff was doubly fortunate: first for the support of his loving mother, and second for the positive impression his account of her likely made on Schaffner.


127 Schaffner, Fatherland, 46.

128 See interviews with Carl Orff in Palmer’s O, Fortuna!, in one of which the composer described fantasy as one of the most important things in a person’s life.


130 G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 29; previous version, 27. Original language: ein königlich bayerischer Offizier […] stand immer etwas im Schatten seiner Frau, was ihn aber nicht kränkte; er hat viel Humor, liebte seine Ruhe und Bequemlichkeit….Es war eine glückliche Gemeinschaft, eine gute Ehe.

131 See the “incomplete sentence” test, Questions 16, 18, 21, 24, 30, 31, and 37 (some of which address the role of the father as well as the mother in the German family), Schaffner, Fatherland, 127–128.
On the whole, Godela’s account of her father emphasizes his independent thought, introspection, and inward drive. Perhaps these are the qualities that led Schaffner to call Orff “purposeful and egocentric.”" 132 Godela’s description (written after her father’s death) is certainly consistent with Schaffner’s observations that Orff was “accustomed to independence and solitude since childhood,” had “steadfastly pursued his career as an unattached composer,” had “little personal need of ‘belonging’ to a group…and [preferred] to work alone rather than in organizations.” In 1960, Orff told an interviewer that he was not interested in having establishing a school of followers: “Everyone must make his own way.” 133 The previous year, around the premiere of Oedipus der Tyrann, he told Time magazine that he belonged to no school and was not concerned with criticism. 134 In Orff’s memorial edition of the prominent music journal Zeitschrift für Musik, György Ligeti (1923–2006) called Orff the most important (bedeutendsten) music-dramatist of his time and praised his individuality: “Orff was at all times himself, independent and strong: this man, extremely kind in private, was without compromise as an artist—without compromise also before the demands of ‘modernity.’” 135

As to Orff’s desire to “work alone rather than in organizations,” the Günther-Schule is the primary exception, and even in this case he seems not to have taken on a great deal of administrative work. The intendant position in Stuttgart was not the first time that Orff had declined a public position. In 1938, Orff wrote to Ludwig Strecker about his reticence to accept a teaching position in Berlin from the educator and conductor Fritz Stein:

Stein still holds tenaciously to his proposal and absolutely would like to have me in Berlin. Since he has provided for my demands very broadly, it is only up to me whether I can decide to [take] the step. Something other than a quarter-year course is certainly not

---

132 Regarding Godela Orff’s account of her father, see Chapter 1. Michael Kater has noted similar traits in Orff but arrived at a more negative interpretation of the composer’s personality. Kater wrote that Orff “thought mainly of himself” (Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 116). Kater also wrote of “Orff’s extreme egocentricity, observed by Bad Homburg psychiatrist Schaffner” (ibid., 139), although Schaffner’s report makes only one reference to Orff as “egocentric” and does not suggest that this was a dominant or excessive personality trait in the composer.


so possible for me. But even that really goes against my true nature.\textsuperscript{136}

While there are many instances in which Orff collaborated with colleagues—such as with the \textit{Günther-Schule} or his work on \textit{Musik der Landschaft} with Kurt Huber and Hans Bergese—it was not at the behest of others. In 1950, Orff declined Theodor Heuss’s request for him to provide music for a new German national anthem, after Heuss had become president of Germany.\textsuperscript{137} This is consistent with Orff’s attempts to maintain an apolitical persona. He further declined at least two opportunities to collaborate with significant figures after World War II. The first was an offer from the eminent director Stanley Kubrick (1928–1999), who hoped that Orff would compose the music for his \textit{2001: A Space Odyssey} (1968). Orff responded that he was too busy with his own projects to oblige.\textsuperscript{138} As Orff never wrote film music, it is not surprising that he declined Kubrick’s offer, but it is striking that he also declined an opportunity to collaborate with Bertolt Brecht, one of the most important artistic figures in his life. In the fall of 1952, Brecht hoped that Orff could provide music for his play \textit{Der Kaukasische Kreidekreis} (\textit{The Caucasian Chalk Circle}, 1944).\textsuperscript{139} In November 1952, Orff wrote to Brecht that he hoped they could meet at the West German premiere of the latter’s \textit{Der gute Mensch von Sezuan} (\textit{The Good Person of Szechuan}) in Frankfurt, but doubted that he could take on the project: “I am just too deeply involved in my \textit{Oedipus} work and have nothing else in mind, but there would be much to say about this.”\textsuperscript{140} Orff’s solitary nature and dedication to his own projects thus prevented him even from working with an artistic kinsman. While such collaboration was clearly not within


\textsuperscript{137} See letter from Theodor Heuss to Carl Orff, 27 September 1950, and Orff’s reply, 2 October 1950, Bundesarchiv Koblenz, Nachlass Theodor Heuss, N 1221/620.

\textsuperscript{138} Letter from Carl Orff to Stanley Kubrick, 1 April 1966, AK, COS/OZM. Unfortunately, the \textit{Nachlass} of Carl Orff does not have Kubrick’s letter to Orff (information according to OZM, 24 October 2014).


Orff’s nature, one still may join his theater critic friend Karl Heinz Ruppel in lamenting that an opera by Brecht and Orff never came to pass, as indeed it would have been (in his word) an “event” (*Ereignis*).\(^{141}\)

### An Evaluation and Analysis of Carl Orff’s Classification by the ICD Personnel

Given that Michael Kater, David Monod, and Fred Prieberg have criticized the ICD personnel for oversights in their evaluation of the composer, it is worth considering whether or not further scrutiny of Orff’s record in the Third Reich might have changed their classification. Had they known of the 1942 award of 2,000 RM from the RMK, this would have provided them with further evidence that Orff was a *Nutzniesser* (beneficiary), but evidently they reached that conclusion even without this piece of evidence. As previously described, Schaffner and Ernest Rott were thoroughly unconvinced by Orff’s attempt to explain his presence on the deferred (UK) list and were aware of his dramatic increase in income, even though the report lacks any commentary about it. While their assessment may seem to lack rigor in that they seem not to have examined Orff’s press clippings from the Third Reich, they still arrived at the correct conclusion that Orff had been substantially better received than he had been willing to admit. Thus Orff did not successfully deceive his evaluators, at least regarding his reception in the Third Reich.

That Schaffner and Rott were discriminating in their assessments is demonstrated in the reports on two of Orff’s colleagues, the conductors Bertil Wetzelsberger and Hans Rosbaud (1895–1962). Both conductors’ reports are dated 15 April 1946, two weeks after Orff’s, and both men also were classified “Grey C.” Unlike Orff, however, neither was given a license without restrictions. Schaffner described Wetzelsberger as a “shifty character and not especially trustworthy” who offered “no excuse for his acceptance of Nazi musical invitations, admitting that he was not able to refuse the lure of travel and publicity,” and that he felt “guilty and depressed.” This abject admission of guilt was insufficient to redeem the conductor, however, even though he had refused to join the Nazi Party at the expense of his intendant position at the

---

\(^{141}\) Karl Heinz Ruppel (article in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 19 July 1965), quoted in Hennenberg, *Orff-Studien*, 70.
Rosbaud, who was classified “‘Grey C’, acceptable,” made a much better impression: “Political attitude tests show excellent comprehension of political and social problems of the present era, and a high degree of antinazi responses for the sake of his musical career.” The last qualification—“for the sake of his musical career”—suggests an underlying doubt about Rosbaud’s sincerity. Rosbaud was deemed “suitable for employment, but should not be considered for licensing.” In contrast, the report on Orff contains no doubt about his professed political attitudes or his reliability, even though some of his claims about his actions in the Third Reich are rightly questioned. While Schaffner did note Orff’s “diplomatic” and “ingratiating” nature, he did not call Orff unreliable, as he had called Wetzelsberger, or an “insincere individual,” as he had described a blacklisted film producer. It appears that, although Schaffner and his colleagues were aware that Orff had not been entirely truthful with them, they determined that he had let them see certain important aspects of his character.

David Monod has suggested that “good fortune and an ingratiating manner carried [Orff] through ICD vetting.” While Orff was indeed fortunate to have avoided a more stringent venue of denazification (although, as noted earlier, he could avoided an evaluation altogether), this is not the only reason why he fared well. Schaffner recognized in Orff a strong internal artistic drive and anti-authoritarian mindset that he had not identified in many of the other candidates. Orff’s report, especially when examined in conjunction with his family background, accurately reflects several significant aspects of his character. Previous analyses of Orff’s
denazification report have not examined his early life in light of the Americans’ criteria, which clearly explains his classification. Ultimately, Orff’s report makes a strong case for his anti-Nazi attitudes while accurately noting that he had received multiple benefits under the Third Reich, even if the specifics of the latter are curiously unspecified. The classification of “‘Grey C’, acceptable” is well justified according to the criteria of the ICD screening center.

Controversy Over Professor Kurt Huber and the White Rose

In 1994, 12 years after the composer’s death, controversy erupted over Orff’s alleged use of his association with his friend and colleague Kurt Huber to clear his name during denazification. Huber had been murdered on 13 July 1943 by the Nazis for his involvement with the White Rose, a nonviolent anti-Nazi resistance movement founded by a group of Munich university students. 146 Huber was a professor at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität in Munich with expertise in philosophy, psychology, and musicology. By some accounts, Orff met Huber through his first wife, Alice Solscher, who was Huber’s cousin.147 The two musicians were united by a mutual interest in Bavarian folk music, and their collaborations include radio programs and two collections of Bavarian folk music that were published in piano arrangements by Orff’s Schulwerk associate Hans Bergese.148 Huber’s politics were more complicated than his


147 DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 86–87; see Hiller, “Selbstporträt in Künstler-Begegnungen,” 314. According to DCamp’s account, Kurt Huber and Carl Orff first met in Munich in 1930, but this date is likely erroneous, as Orff married Solscher in 1920 (see Chapter 1).

148 These radio programs aired on 6 March 1932 and 26 December 1935; the latter was a Christmas program. See Bruckbauer, “... und sei es gegen eine Welt von Feinden!” 141. For the folk music publications, see Carl Orff, Kurt Huber, and Hans Bergese, Musik der Landschaft : Volksmusik in neuen Sätzen, Vol. 1. Lieder und Tänze, (Mainz: Schott, ED 3569, 1942); Carl Orff, Kurt Huber, and Hans Bergese, Musik Der Landschaft : Volksmusik in Neuen Sätzen, Vol. 2. Zwiefache Tänze, (Mainz: Schott, ED 3570, 1942). Bergese was offended that he was only credited as an arranger on this project (Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 140–141; letter from Hans Bergese to Erich Katz,
involvement with the White Rose might suggest. On 15 February 1940 he applied to join the NSDAP. His politics were conservative and nationalistic, and he was thoroughly opposed to Bolshevism. Nevertheless, Huber became disillusioned with Hitler and became the only professor to be involved in the inner circle of the White Rose.

In May 1942, several Munich students, including siblings Hans (1918–1943) and Sophie Scholl (1921–1943), began a campaign of nonviolent resistance against the Third Reich known as the White Rose. Between 26 June and 12 July, the group distributed four leaflets written by Hans Scholl and Alexander Schmorell (1917–1943), outlining their opposition to Hitler’s rule. Kurt Huber met the Scholls in early June 1942, a few weeks before the leaflets were distributed, at an evening event at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, and by 20 December of that year he had been inducted into the group’s inner circle. He helped to write the fifth leaflet in January 1943 and is the sole author of the sixth leaflet. It was the distribution of this sixth leaflet at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität that led to the apprehension of Hans and Sophie Scholl on 18...
February 1943, when they were turned in by the custodian Jakod Schmid.\textsuperscript{153} Within two days, their fellow student Christoph Probst (1919–1943), a young father of three children, also was arrested.\textsuperscript{154} The three students were given a sham trial on 22 February 1943, which was presided over by the ruthless Nazi judge Roland Freisler (1893–1945) at the so-called People’s Court (Volksgerichtshof). All three were sentenced to death and decapitated on the same day as the trial. Hans Scholl’s last words were “Long live freedom!” (Es lebe die Freiheit!).\textsuperscript{155} Huber was arrested five days later.\textsuperscript{156} On 4 March his teaching credentials and university position were rescinded, which had serious ramifications for his family’s financial stability.\textsuperscript{157} On 8 March Huber was stripped of his doctorate. He was tried and condemned to death on 19 April 1943 and executed with Alexander Schmorell on 13 July.\textsuperscript{158}

Kurt Huber’s conservative politics seem never to have changed, based on signed transcripts of his Gestapo interrogations and other documents from his arrest.\textsuperscript{159} In his political confession to the Gestapo on 8 March 1943, Huber explicitly stated that he did not share the politics of Hans Scholl and clarified that he agreed with many principles of National Socialism.

\textsuperscript{153} Jakob Schmid (1886–1964) was a member of the Sturmabteilung (SA), the paramilitary branch of the Nazi Party. See Söhne Zankel, “Vom Helden zum Hauptschuldigen – Der Mann, der die Geschwister Scholl festnahm” in Die Universität München im Dritten Reich Aufsätze. Teil I, ed. Elisabeth Kraus, Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2006:581–608.

\textsuperscript{154} Ruth Hanna Sachs noted that there are contradictions in the details of Probst’s arrest that “can be attributed to the oral nature of memory,” but that his farewell letter to his sister, Angelika, suggests that he was taken in to custody on Saturday, 20 February 1943 (Sachs, White Rose History; Vol. II, 2007 update, Chapter 48, 1). Another source gives 19 February 1943 as the date of the arrest (http://www.weisse-rose-stiftung.de/fkt_standard2.php?action=ls&ma=cs&c_id=mamura&id=11411785&page=1&&PHPSESSID=hqh75sah51ndos78gpmn5dth0, accessed 1 November 2014).

\textsuperscript{155} Sachs, White Rose History, Vol. II, Chapters 45–50 (quotation Chapter 50, 14). Hans Scholl’s last words are recorded in the official report of the execution; the story is not apocryphal.

\textsuperscript{156} In Composers of the Nazi Era, Kater misidentified the date as 27 March 1943 (138); Dumbach and Newborn give the date as early in the morning on Friday, 26 February 1943 (Sophie Scholl and the White Rose, 166).

\textsuperscript{157} Dumbach and Newborn, Sophie Scholl and the White Rose, 168.

\textsuperscript{158} Bruckbauer, “...und sei es gegen eine Welt von Feinden!”, 15. DCamp erroneously has given June 1943 as the date of Huber’s sentencing (DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 88), although there was a certification of the death sentence dated 21 June 1943, sent to the chief prosecutor of the Volksgerichtshof in Berlin on 25 June (Sachs, trans., The Gestapo Transcripts, 147).

\textsuperscript{159} See Sachs, White Rose History, Volume II (Chapter 3A, 6–13; Chapter 52, 15; and Chapter 53, 3); Potter, Most German of the Arts, 114, 120–124; Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 27; Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 137–138; DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 88–91. DCamp’s statement that Huber was “unarguably opposed to the National Socialists” (ibid., 88) is not entirely accurate in light of Huber’s testimony to the Gestapo. Given that Huber pled guilty and spoke frankly about his criticisms of Hitler in his interrogation and political confession (see following note), it seems unlikely that he would have made any pro-National Socialist statements in an effort to save himself—by some accounts, he seems to have been quite prepared to face a death sentence (Sachs, trans., Gestapo Interrogation Transcripts, 21 and 54; Sachs, White Rose History, Vol. II, Chapter 60, 10). See also Bruckbauer, “... und sei es gegen eine Welt von Feinden!”, 194–195.
Huber’s opposition to the Third Reich was predicated on the National Socialists’ limitations on freedom of speech and freedom of religion and Hitler’s handling of the war. Huber also objected to what he perceived to be the National Socialists’ leftward political turns and concessions to Bolshevism. This fact of Huber’s politics does not diminish the heroism of his sacrifice, but rather demonstrates that resistance to Hitler came from many different perspectives, some of which one may not expect.

The controversy surrounding Orff and his relationship with Huber began when Kater presented the findings of his research at the Orff-Zentrum München in 1994. Kater’s information was based on an interview with Newell Jenkins, which he had conducted on 20 March 1993 at the 78-year-old Jenkins’s home in Hillsdale, New York. Although Jenkins’s account of Orff in his later interview with Monod in 1996 was rather unflattering (as quoted previously), Kater reported that in 1993 Jenkins “remembered [Orff] mostly sympathetically.”

When Kater asked what evidence Orff had used to prove his anti-Nazi credentials, Jenkins replied:

His proof was that he had worked together with Kurt Huber, they had founded some kind of a youth group. The danger came when he and some kids or maybe Huber himself were discovered passing out leaflets. Huber was arrested and killed. Orff, as far as I remember, told me that he had gotten help through some friends and had fled into the mountains. He did not tell me where. And he stayed there until it was safe for him to

---

160 See Ruth Hanna Sachs, trans., Gestapo Interrogation Transcripts: Professor Kurt Huber and Falk Harnack (Lehi, Utah: Exclamation! Publishers, 2008), 43–48 (signed political confession of Kurt Huber, 8 March 1943). Huber’s statement is striking for many reasons, not least being that he outlined a characteristic that Hannah Arendt would later ascribed to totalitarianism: the unpredictability and inconsistency of the state’s political apparatus (including the so-called justice system; see ibid., 44–45; Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, New York: Schocken Books, 2004). See also Sachs, Gestapo Interrogation Transcripts, 5–7 (signed transcript of Huber’s statement from 16 April 1943 interrogation), 19–31 (signed transcript of Huber’s statement from 27 February 1943 interrogation, the night of his arrest), 32–34 (signed transcript of Huber’s statement from 1 March 1943 interrogation), and 89–90 (undated statement, likely on or around 10 March 1943).

161 DCamp has articulated this point as well: “We must consider [Huber’s] political resolve, his spirit of sober humanity, and his personal decision, all of which stand opposed to the vocabulary and thoughts of the existing political powers. This does not stop us from using his fate as testimony to the contradictions and the complexity of the intellectual situation of that time” (DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 90–91).

162 Kater’s presentation was part of a conference at the OZM titled “Zur Situation der Musik in Deutschland in den dreissiger und vierziger Jahren” (“On the situation of music in Germany in the ’30s and ’40s”), 21–28 November 1994. A brochure from this event, which including remarks from then-director Hans Jörg Jans, may be accessed at the OZM. Kater’s paper, delivered 23 November 1994, was titled “Selbstgleichschaltung oder Widerstand—Carl Orff im Dritten Reich” (“Self-enforced political conformity or resistance—Carl Orff in the Third Reich”), which presents a false dichotomy that Kater problematized in his later work. A version of the paper was published in January 1995 (Kater, “Carl Orff Im Dritten Reich”).

163 Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 135.

164 It was, in fact, Hans and Sophie Scholl who were apprehended distributing leaflets.
come back.\textsuperscript{165}

Around the time of Kater’s interview with Jenkins in Hillsdale, Richard DCamp interviewed Kurt Huber’s widow, Clara Huber (born Schlickenrieder, 1908–1998), in Munich on 25 May 1993. Clara also gave testimony to Tony Palmer for his film \textit{O, Fortuna!} and to Kater, to whom she wrote at least two letters (dated 30 September 1993 and 28 June 1994).\textsuperscript{166} The contradictions among these accounts illustrate the problems inherent in oral history, especially when several decades have elapsed and the subject matter is emotionally charged.\textsuperscript{167}

Clara Huber told both DCamp and Palmer that Orff came to the Hubers’ house—they were neighbors in Gräfelfing, a suburb of Munich—on 28 February 1943, the morning after his arrest. When Clara told Orff what had happened, he reacted with panic about his own future: “I am ruined! I am ruined, I will never be able to compose again.”\textsuperscript{168} It is likely that Orff feared for his personal safety at this moment; indeed, there are reports that this reaction was near universal among Huber’s friends and acquaintances.\textsuperscript{169} As DCamp reported: “Frau Huber stated without

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{165} Quotation collated from Kater, \textit{The Twisted Muse}, 191 and Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 135, internal quotation marks omitted. In the second source only, there are ellipses between the first two sentences and the last three sentences are paraphrased; as a result, the important phrase “as far as I remember” is omitted. See also Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 26–29. The interview took place on 20 March 1993 in Hillsdale, New York (Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 135 and 327 n. 172).
\bibitem{166} DCamp, \textit{The Drama of Carl Orff}, 86–88 and 91–92 (DCamp here wrote that the meeting was on 25 May 1993 in the garden of the Orff Institut, which is located in Salzburg, but presumably he meant the Orff-Zentrum München); Tony Palmer, \textit{O, Fortuna!} (Tony Palmer Films, 2009, originally released 1995); Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 328 n. 185 and 190; Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 27 n. 158 and 28 n. 164 (letter of 30 Sept. 1993); Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 28 n. 166 (letter of 28 June 1994). Clara Huber’s dates of life according to the OZM (7 February 2014).
\bibitem{167} It must be noted here that Kater and DCamp give very little direct quotation, instead largely paraphrasing what Clara Huber said.
\bibitem{168} DCamp, \textit{The Drama of Carl Orff}, 88 (internal quotation marks omitted). Original language: \textit{Ich bin ruiniert! Ich werde nie wieder komponieren können}. See also interview with Clara Huber in Palmer, \textit{O, Fortuna!}, in which Clara Huber specified that this occasion was one of Orff’s usual visits to show Huber his work. In DCamp’s quotation, the phrase “I am ruined!” (\textit{Ich bin ruiniert!}) is not repeated, as it is in the recorded interview in Palmer’s film. Palmer’s film cuts abruptly away after the second utterance of that phrase to a singer performing part of Act 1 of \textit{De temporum fine comoedia} (an apt choice given that this work is a philosophical statement about the nature of guilt). If one watches Clara’s mouth closely, it seems that she was not finished speaking: her mouth continues to move as the sound is cut off. Hans Maier gave a similar account to DCamp’s in a speech on the occasion of Orff’s centennial given on 7 July 1995 at the Prinzregententheater in Munich, but with slightly different wording: “Now I cannot compose any more” (\textit{Jetzt kann ich nicht mehr komponieren}). See Maier, “Carl Orff in seiner Zeit,” 139, internal quotation marks omitted), in 1995 publication, 10, in English translation by Margaret Murray (which differs from translation here), 10.
\bibitem{169} Dumbach and Newborn, \textit{Sophie Scholl and the White Rose}, 169. This source reports that Clara Huber was not actually present when her house was searched and her husband was taken, but that she was “food ‘hamstering’ in the country” and learned about Kurt’s arrest from her daughter Brigitte upon her return. This account is consistent with Sachs’s (\textit{White Rose History}, Vol. II, Chapter 52, 15).
\end{thebibliography}
any resentment that Orff kept a very low profile during the trial of her husband.” In a letter to Kater dated 28 June 1994, however, Clara Huber reported that Orff had attempted to intervene on her husband’s behalf through Baldur von Schirach, whom he met in April 1943, after Huber’s arrest and shortly before his sentencing.

Although Clara Huber said in her interview for Palmer’s film that she never saw Orff again after giving him the news of her husband’s arrest, there is evidence that Orff and his wife continued to be in contact with her for several years following the war. When Clara assembled a collection of essays in tribute to her husband, published in 1947 as Kurt Huber zum Gedächtnis: Bildnis eines Menschen Denkers und Forscher (In Memory of Kurt Huber: Portrait of a Thinking Person and Researcher), Orff contributed a letter written to Huber as though his friend were still alive. That Clara Huber published this letter suggests that she had retained some degree of respect for the composer. In Gertrud Orff’s diary there are several references to visiting with Clara between 1945 and 1948 (these visits likely involved Carl Orff as his wife’s diary largely chronicled his life). Some of these meetings regarded the publication of the Huber memorial book. Orff, presumably with his wife, attended a ceremony for Huber in the

170 DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 91. For alternate accounts by Orff’s friends who knew him after the fact, see ibid., 92 (a contradicting account by Hannelore Gassner, Orff’s secretary and former archivist of the OZM); Hiller, “Selbstporträt in Künstler-Begegnungen,” 314 (but compare his account that Orff accompanied Clara to pay the expenses for her husband’s expense—she obscenely was billed 3,000 RM—to the account that she never paid this bill in Dumbach and Newborn, Sophie Scholl and the White Rose, 182–183).

171 Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 28 (see 28 n. 166 for citation). The letter is not directly quoted. This testimony from Clara Huber rarely has been noted in other sources, one exception being Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 256. In “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” Kater reported that Orff met von Schirach in April 1943 (citing entries in Gertrud Orff’s diary from 2–11 April 1943; ibid., 28 n. 166). In the subsequent accounts of Carl Orff in the Third Reich in The Twisted Muse and Composers of the Nazi Era, Kater did not include this information, nor is Clara Huber’s letter from 28 June 1994 cited in either work.

172 Interview with Clara Huber in Palmer’s O Fortuna!

173 Clara Huber, ed., Kurt Huber zum Gedächtnis, 166–168. In the reissued version of 1986, »...der Tod...war nicht vergebense«, Orff’s letter appears 164–167. Shortened version of the letter appear in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 167–168 and Udo Klement, Das Musiktheater Carl Orffs (Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaftlichen Forschung in der DDR, Band 14), Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1982, 98–99, n. 59. In Dokumentation, the letter is not dated, but Orff reported it was written in 1947 (in fact the year of its publication). Because Kater referred in an interview in Palmer’s O, Fortuna! to Orff’s letter to the dead Huber but did not mention that it had been published in Orff’s lifetime, reviewer Jessica Duchen described the letter as an apparently “private” act (Duchen, “Dark Heart of a Masterpiece”) while Martin Kettle erroneously stated that the letter “was, of course, never made public” (Kettle, “Secret of the White Rose”).

174 According to Gertrud Orff’s diary, Orff met with Clara Huber regarding the publication of the memorial book on 21 January, 26 January, and 16 July 1946. On the second anniversary of Huber’s murder, 13 July 1945, Gertrud noted a meeting with the publisher Cotta regarding the Huber memorial. Further visits to Clara Huber are recorded in entries dated 1 November 1945, 25 March 1946 (date corrected from 26 March in original), 9 April 1946, 30 July 1946, 11 August 1946, and 28 January 1948 (diary of Gertrud Orff, COS/OZM; information according to OZM, 24
Schauspielhaus on 4 November 1945. On 8 March 1946, Gertrud recorded that Clara Huber “gives favorable information” (gibt günstige Auskunft), as did Albin von Prybram-Gladona, Orff’s persecuted ally from the Bach-Verein. Presumably they were providing character references for Orff’s denazification, but unfortunately no further information has been found as of this writing. In June 1949, Orff transferred all of his profits from his and Huber’s collaboration Musik der Landschaft to Clara. Clara sent Orff a New Year’s card around 1960, and in 5 March 1960 she sent Orff a list of books with the following note: “It would make me happy if I may send you the books that interest you, in commemoration of my husband.”

Orff’s posthumous letter to Kurt Huber was the first of at least four published tributes he wrote for deceased friends, the others being Karl Amadeus Hartmann, the composer Winfried Zillig, and his Schulwerk associate Erich Katz. Michael Kater has noted that these letters have a “highly emotional quality, which is rather untypically Orffian.” Kater has identified in Huber’s letter in particular an element of atonement and aptly described it as one of the most important extant documents as it pertains to Orff’s psychology. One may sense that Orff was praising in Huber qualities that he judged to be somewhat lacking in himself:

---

176 Diary entry of Gertrud Orff, 8 March 1946, COS/OZM (information according to OZM, 24 October 2014). See also Rathkolb, “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin,” 20. The reference to the favorable report from Prybram-Gladona is somewhat curious in that Orff’s Nachlass has correspondence with Albin von Prybram-Gladona only from 1935, 1943, and 1948 to 1971 (information according to OZM, 6 November 2014).
177 Orff wrote to his publisher: “I clarify that I transfer my accumulated rights to Musik der Landschaft for all editions to Frau Prof. Clara Huber and [her] heirs” (Erklärung von Orff, 5 June 1946, SK, COS/OZM; information according to OZM, 5 November 2014; original language: Ich erkläre, dass ich meine anfallenden Rechte an „Musik der Landschaft“ für alle Auflagen Frau Prof. Clara Huber und Erben übertrage). See also Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 256.
178 Undated New Year’s card from Clara Huber to Carl Orff, ca. 1959/1960 or 1960/1961; letter from Clara Huber to Carl Orff, 5 March 1960 (the list of books unfortunately is not preserved), AK, COS/OZM (information according to OZM, 24 October 2014).
179 For more on Erich Katz, see Chapter 1. For the other three letters, see “Lieber, lieber Amadeus” in Karl Amadeus Hartmann and die Musica Viva: Essays, bisher unveröffentliche Briefe an Hartmann Katalog, publication of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Piper & Co. Verlag, München/Schott (Schott/Piper ED 6929), 1980, 94 (notably, this letter uses the familiar Du forms, although the correspondence between Orff and Hartmann in Hartmann’s Nachlaß in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Ana 407, uses Sie forms and is otherwise formal in tone); “Nachruf für Winfried Zillig,” Musica, 18. Jahrgang, Heft 2, March-April 1964: 66–67 (originally for a broadcast by the Norddeutsche Rundfunk); and The American Recorder, XIV/4, November 1973, 119 (letter to Erich Katz, published in German). See also Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 142–143 (although Kater did not mention the Zillig tribute and incorrectly wrote that “Orff had made no attempt to resume” contact with Katz; see Chapter 1).
180 Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 143 (quotation); “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 29; interview with Kater in Palmer, O, Fortuna!
Reverenced, dear friend! Never in life did I write you a letter. You were there and always near and your presence was a blessing to experience…. Rarely, very rarely did you speak of your own plans; so much did you suppress entirely during your life—in particular you hid your musical works from me, always attentive to me. Almost exclusively, you carefully considered that which occupied me…. Please accept this greeting and thanks of friendship as a sign of my bond. For all time, Your Carl Orff.

Orff included in this letter a story of telling Huber about his plans to write Die Bernauerin and stated that he wrote the work “in remembrance of a distant friend, who as in a private dialogue was always so present in all of my work.” Orff announced in his letter that he had dedicated his work to Huber’s memory. The letter is dated 19 January 1946—the same date that appears at the end of the manuscript of Die Bernauerin, a work about another martyr killed at the hands of an unjust state. According to the diary of Gertrud Orff, however, the composer wrote the letter in April 1946, which suggests that Orff chose the date for the letter as a further symbolic connection between Die Bernauerin and Huber. On 9 April, Gertrud wrote: “Huber letter sketched. Letter to the departed friend—the conclusion: dedication…. In the evening Huberin [i.e. Clara Huber].” Orff’s denazification report makes no mention either of Die Bernauerin or of Orff’s tribute to Huber, which he was already planning by that time. While it is impossible to know whether or not Orff addressed these things, it remains striking that the report makes no mention whatsoever of the content of his works. Perhaps the American officers were not sensitive to the importance of such a study, and perhaps Orff, true to form, did not care to discuss the meaning and intention of his works.

---


182 Original language: im Gedenken an den fernen Freund, der wie in geheimer Zwiesprache in all meiner Arbeit immer so gegenwärtig war.

183 This is the date given in the facsimile of the manuscript in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 166, although it is notable that this manuscript appears to be that of the final revised version. Presumably, Orff chose to record the date on which the original version was completed.

184 Diary of Gerturd Orff, entry of 9 April 1946, COS/OZM, quoted in Rathkolb, “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin,” 20. Original language: Huber Brief entworfen. Brief an den Freund — der fortgegangen Schluss: Widmung….abends Huberin. On 12 April Getrud recorded that the letter was “written” (geschrieben), while the entry from 22 April notes “Huber letter” (Brief Huber; diary of Gerturd Orff, COS/OZM, information according to OZM, 24 October 2014). “Huberin” is the female form of “Huber,” and therefore signifies Clara Huber.
Sensationalism and Scandal

Newell Jenkins’s testimony that Carl Orff claimed to have been a member of the White Rose has been taken as damning evidence against the composer’s character. It is clear that Orff was never involved with any resistance movement. After Michael Kater first presented his findings in 1994, his claims were challenged by Hans Jörg Jans, director of the Orff-Zentrum-München from its founding in 1990 to 2002, and Orff’s close friend and biographer, Werner Thomas. In the spring of 1995, Jans asked the distinguished Viennese professor of history Oliver Rathkolb to research the matter of Orff’s denazification. This led to Rathkolb’s discovery of Schaffner’s report three years later.

On 10 February 1999, the Orff-Zentrum München held a press conference in Munich to distribute the newly discovered denazification report along with other materials. Although Rathkolb’s discovery of Schaffner’s official report on Orff revealed that the composer had not claimed on the record to have been involved with the White Rose, and although the distinguished historian seriously doubted that Orff ever had made such a claim, this revelation did little to alter public perception. Otto Karner has noted that the discovery “was surprisingly entirely

---

185 See interview with Clara Huber in Palmer, O, Fortuna! Kater cited several testimonies that Orff was not involved with the White Rose in his private archive: letters from Gertrud Orff (12 November 1993, Munich), Clara Huber (29 September 1993), and George (Jürgen) Wittenstein (b. 1919), a friend of the White Rose circle (21 October 1997, Santa Barbara); see Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 328 n. 190–193. Ruth Hanna Sachs has questioned Wittenstein’s involvement in the White Rose’s activities (Sachs, White Rose History, Vol. II, Chapter 3A, 1 n. 2), but he certainly knew many of the key members of that movement.


187 Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 211.


190 See Brembeck, “Mitläufer oder Widerstandskämpfer?”
underplayed by the German press.’’

As Reinhard Schulz noted in the *Neue Musikzeitung*, the acrimonious conflict, which he called a “scholarly cockfight” (*wissenschaftlichen Hahnenkampfes*), surrounding Carl Orff had eclipsed any productive dialogue. Schulz also sensibly questioned the utility of focusing on a single alleged statement, as this is but one component of a far more complex picture.

An inordinate amount of attention has been placed on one alleged statement decades after the event by the then-elderly Jenkins, and the discourse has become sensationalistic. The controversy over the White Rose has taken a central role in the debate about Orff and has often become quite personal. Because there has been relatively little primary research on Orff and the Third Reich in English-speaking countries, Kater’s account has gained wide acceptance in North American scholarship, including among distinguished scholars. Fred Prieberg also

———


192 Schulz wrote: “And already one is at the point where nothing is contributed [that may provide] clarification….For in truth, this indeed is not only the small field of verifiable facts; it includes the whole complex of a sincere—in an emphatic sense—creative action and life. Far more important than a single fact would be an understanding of this connection” (Reinhard Schulz, “‘Alter Schnee’?” *Neue Musikzeitung*, Ausgabe März, 48. Jahrgang, 1999, 48, original language: *Und schon ist man dort, wo zur Klärung nichts beigetragen wird…. Denn Wahrheit, das ist ja nicht nur das kleine Feld der nachweisbaren Fakten, sie umfaßt den ganzen Komplex eines im emphatischen Sinne aufrichtigen schöpferischen Tuns und Lebens. Viel wichtiger als das einzeln Faktische wäre eine Verstehen solcher Zusammenhänge*). See also Stefan Hanheide, “Einleitung,” in Hugo Distler im Dritten Reich: Vorträge des Symposions in der Stadtbibliothek Lübeck am 29. September 1995, ed. Stefan Hanheide Osnabrück: Universitätsverlag Rasch, 1997, 11 (the author noted that Kater’s 1995 article was not an entirely negative portrayal, despite the “annoyance” (*Unmut*) that it caused in Orff’s circle).

193 In his first publication of these findings in 1995, Kater thus introduced the Jenkins revelation: “The following is nothing less than sensational” (Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 26, original language: *Das folgende ist nichts weniger als sensationell*). Four years later, Reinhard J. Brembeck referred to Kater’s discovery as “causing a sensation” (*aussehenerregende*) and reported that “The amazement was great” (*Das Erstaumen war groß*) following the revelation (Brembeck, “Mitläufer oder Widerstandskämpfer?”). In 2000, Hans Jörg Jans, evincing some vexation, called Kater’s finding a “purportedly sensational discovery” (Jans, trans. Robinson, “Behind the Scenes,” 697). Kater, in an article responding to Jans, characterized his work with unusually strong language: “In my paper [in 1994], I accused Orff…of manipulating Jenkins in a scheme to whitewash himself as a suspected Nazi collaborator” (Kater, “In Answer to Hans Jörg Jans,” 711).


accepted Jenkins’s account. A line from Kater’s 1995 article demonstrates the importance he attached to the White Rose scandal: “Orff’s testimony about his alleged involvement with the ‘White Rose’…provides a key to understanding his character and thus also his tactic of survival in the Third Reich.” It is striking that this one component of the multifaceted picture of Orff and the Third Reich has come to dominate the discourse.

The story that Jenkins recalled Orff telling him does have at least one partly accurate component. Orff did retreat to a sanatorium in Ebenhausen late in the war, as noted at the end of the previous chapter. In his 1975 memoirs, the opera director Rudolf Hartmann (1900–1988), who had directed the world premiere of Der Mond, gave a corroborating account that Orff was in the sanatorium in Ebenhausen at this time, which he described as “a refuge…located at high altitude.” While some of Orff’s family members, including his daughter Godela, drew a correlation between his sojourn in Ebenhausen and Huber’s arrest, in fact Huber was arrested on 27 February 1943 and Orff did not go to the sanatorium until November 1944. It is

---

196 See Prieberg, Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945, 5390–5391 (Geschichtsfälschung III). Surprisingly, the meticulous Prieberg did not give a source for this “falsification of history” (Geschichtsfälschung). Prieberg expressed his strong disapproval of Kater’s scholarship elsewhere in this publication (ibid., 12–14 and 2883, among others). As to Prieberg’s respect for Rathkolb, see his reference to the “absolutely dependable and critical Viennese expert” (den absolut zuverlässigen und kritischen Wiener Experten, ibid., 7510). In his condemnation of Kater, Prieberg quoted a letter he had received from Rathkolb, dated 11 May 2005 (ibid., 14). He also credited Rathkolb for having given him a copy of Schaffner’s report (ibid., 5390).


199 Rudolf Hartmann, Das geliebte Haus: Mein Leben mit der Oper, München: Piper, 1975, 181. Original language: Ein Refugium...oben auf der Höhe. There is another reference to meeting Orff in Isartal early in 1945 (ibid., 269).

200 G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 56; in earlier version, 53. See also Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 138 (in which Kater cited a variant account by Gertrud Orff); Luise Rinser, Saturn auf der Sonne, Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1994, 94.

201 An entry from Gertrud Orff’s diary dated 21 November 1944 reads “to Ebenhausen” (nach Ebenhausen; information according to OZM, 6 November 2014). Orff himself recalled that he retreated to the sanatorium after a
therefore more likely that Orff was escaping the horrendous conditions of the final months of the war, and that both Jenkins and Orff’s family members conflated his retreat and Huber’s murder in their recollections decades later.

Several months after Orff’s evaluation at the ICD Screening Center, Jenkins told fellow Orff student Heinrich Sutermeister of Orff’s association with Huber as the two shared a car ride to Mannheim. In a letter to Orff dated 15 December 1946, Sutermeister wrote:

Finally I heard some details about you, I knew nothing at all about Prof. Huber, about the difficult time that you, persecuted, had to undergo. Your music and your work were probably your only foothold then. I still remembered then well how you told me of the Gestapo’s methods of torture, and at the time did not suspect that you yourself and your best friends were in the highest danger. ²⁰²

Given that this letter is a third-hand account of Orff’s remarks, filtered through both Sutermeister and Jenkins, it must be taken *cum grano salis*, especially given Jenkins’s eagerness to portray Orff as an active resister. In addition, as Kater has noted, Sutermeister “tended to conspiracy and intrigue.”²⁰³ That Sutermeister referred to Orff as “persecuted” (verfolgt) and “in the highest danger” (in höchster Gefahr) does suggest that Jenkins told Sutermeister that Orff had been imperiled. Especially given his general mistrust of authority, it is likely that Huber’s arrest was very frightening to Orff, as he testified to Fred Prieberg in 1963: “As I had to expect my arrest as a friend and collaborator of Professor Kurt Huber in those days, I have burned all related documents.”²⁰⁴ It is plausible that Orff had described this fear to Jenkins without necessarily claiming to have been involved in the resistance himself. Orff’s response to Sutermeister offers little clarification:

---


It also follows from your lines that you have not received some of my messages at all. Now at least you have learned all sorts of things through Jenkins. If you could come once to Stuttgart, it would be a very nice opportunity to visit with you; [it] seems to me fairly hopeless, it would be so necessary that we could express ourselves once after so long a time, extensively and in peace.\textsuperscript{205}

In this highly veiled passage, it seems that Orff was unwilling to comment on Jenkins’s account in writing (especially as the privacy of correspondence was hardly guaranteed during the occupation). His suggestion that the two of them should speak in person implies that he had much to tell Sutermeister that he did not want to commit to writing.

In 1960, Orff made one of his few statements about his experiences in the Third Reich in a newspaper interview with Bert Wassener. Wassener reported:

He knew the Scholl siblings and was friends with their spiritual leader, Professor Huber. But he was not actively involved in their resistance movement. [Orff said:] “I warned them and said to them that one can drive out demons only with demons and not with slogans.” Nevertheless, this acquaintance brought him into the greatest personal danger. To the end of the war he had to go into hiding. “Yet for a long time after the downfall it made me highly nervous when someone rang my bell.”\textsuperscript{206}

Although Kater has called this claim by Orff “highly unlikely and merely another attempt at fabricating legends,”\textsuperscript{207} Orff’s portrayal of himself in this interview is emphatically un-heroic. He made clear that he had not put himself at risk through his actions and even that he had discouraged others from taking heroic action.\textsuperscript{208} Whatever else, the interview demonstrates that, 15 years after the war, Orff was not publicly portraying himself as having been involved with the resistance.

Orff also did not claim that he resisted the Third Reich through his art. As noted earlier,

\textsuperscript{205} Letter from Carl Orff to Heinrich Sutermeister, 8 January 1947, BSB, HSL, Fasc. germ. 1 Nr. 1–144, Nr. 59, emphasis in original (underlining in pencil on typed letter). Original language: \textit{Aus Ihren Zeilen geht auch hervor, dass Sie manche meiner Mitteilungen gar nicht erhalten haben. Nun haben Sie wenigstens durch Jenkins allerhand erfahren. Wenn Sie einmal \textit{nach} Stuttgart kommen könnten, wäre es sehr schön.} Eine Möglichkeit Sie zu besuchen, scheint mir ziemlich aussichtslos, es wäre so notwendig, dass wir uns nach so langer Zeit mal in Ruhe und ausgiebig aussprechen könnten.

\textsuperscript{206} Wassener, “Keine Parolen gegen Dämonen!” Original language: \textit{Er kannte die Geschwister Scholl und war mit ihrem geistigen Führer, Professor Huber, befreundet. Aber er beteiligte sich nicht aktiv an ihrer Widerstandsbelebung. „Ich habe sie gewarnt und ihnen gesagt, daß man Dämonen nur mit Dämonen und nicht mit Parolen austreiben kann.“ Trotzdem brachte ihn diese Bekanntschaft in die größte persönliche Gefahr. Bis zum Ende des Krieges mußte er untertauchen. „Noch lange Zeit nach dem Zusammenbruch fuhr ich nervös hoch, wenn man bei mir klingelte.\textquotedblright.}

\textsuperscript{207} Kater, \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 138.

\textsuperscript{208} Kater’s description of this interview does not acknowledge the sentence about Orff not having been involved in the resistance, while Karner’s does acknowledge it (see Kater; \textit{Composers of the Nazi Era}, 138; Karner, \textit{Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz}, 213).
Heinrich Strobel’s bilious review of Die Bernauerin in 1947 suggests that Orff’s enthusiasts described his works from later in the Third Reich as statements of resistance, but there is no evidence that the composer himself ever said anything to this effect. As noted in the previous chapter, the author Hugo Hartung reported that Die Kluge was treated as a protest song on one occasion in the summer of 1944, but again there is no indication in his article that Orff ever commented that this was his intention. When the 80-year-old Orff said in an interview in 1975 that his use of Latin in Carmina Burana “was a mystery to the Nazis and also very suspect,” interviewer Martin Konz asked: “Could one understand the Carmina as a musical act of resistance?” Orff replied: “I would not like to see quite so great an interpretation.” He immediately changed the subject to the relationship between music and speech. Although after 1945 Orff attempted to portray himself as undesirably (undesirable) by the National Socialists, he declined the invitation to take the next logical step and portray himself as an active opponent (albeit in artistic terms). One can only speculate as to why Orff drew this line. While his desire to maintain an apolitical persona is a likely reason, it is also possible that he did not think that he deserved to be called an active opponent. These options are not mutually exclusive.

To date, Orff’s 1960 account of having known the Scholl siblings has been neither corroborated nor disproven. While Huber only had been involved in the White Rose since December 1942, he had known the Scholl siblings since the preceding June. Although it is possible that Orff and the Scholl siblings crossed paths, it would have been strange for the

209 Strobel “Orffische Zwiesprach zur Uraufführung der Bernauerin,” 297. In the review’s imagined dialogue between an Orffiker (devotee to Carl Orff) and a Kenner (learned person), Strobel assigned this claim to the former, suggesting that this is what Orff and his supporters were saying at the time, although whether or not Strobel agreed is difficult to determine from his satirical tone. In this ungenerous review, Strobel mocked Carl Orff by characterizing the Orffiker as overly generous in his appraisal of the composer, clouded in judgment by his admiration, and generally irrational. The Kenner is presented as the voice of reason.


212 The OZM informed me (31 October 2014) that the archivists have not been able to find any concrete evidence that Orff met Hans or Sophie Scholl. There are references to a man named Scholl in relation to a production of Carmina Burana (Scholl thought the Latin texts would pose problems) in two letters from Orff to Heinrich Sutermeister from 1936. While Orff could have met Hans Scholl through Angelika Probst, it seems unlikely that he would have been consulting the then 18-year-old young man about a performance of his work (letters from Carl Orff to Heinrich Sutermeister, 8 January 1947, BSB, HSL, Fasc. germ. 1 Nr. 1–144, Nrs. 9 and 27, respectively 23 May 1936 and without date, but probably summer 1936). As noted in Chapter 2, a possible candidate for the Scholl mentioned in Orff’s letters is Wilhelm Scholl (see Prieberg, Handbuch Deutsche Musiker 1933–1945, 6691).
siblings to have told the composer of their involvement in the White Rose, given the group’s highly secretive nature.\footnote{213} In March 1946, shortly before his evaluation at the ICD Screening Center, Orff received a letter from Inge Scholl (later Aicher-Scholl, 1917–1998), the elder sister of Hans and Sophie, requesting that he give a lecture at the Volkshochschule at Ulm. She wrote: “But I always had the feeling that one may find in your music a breath of that archaic quality, which even so seems to belong to each newly rising cultural epoch. Therefore what a great joy it was for me to learn that you worked together with Professor Huber, the beloved and dear teacher of my siblings.” Inge Scholl remained in contact with Orff until 1955.\footnote{214} Her tone in the quoted passage suggests that she had not heard anything to the effect that Orff had claimed to have been involved with the White Rose, nor that he had known her siblings personally.

Orff and his daughter both had connections to at least one of the family members of another member of the White Rose inner circle, albeit several years prior to the formation of the resistance group in 1942. The elder sister of the executed Christoph Probst, Angelika Probst (later Knoop, 1918–1976), was a student at the Günther-Schule from 1936 to July 1937, during which time she became good friends with Godela Orff.\footnote{215} As Werner Thomas has written of Angelika’s relationship with Orff: “Between Orff and Angelika there presumably developed a romantic relationship in the early summer of 1936, which according to various indications abruptly broke off well before the premiere of Carmina Burana (June 1937).”\footnote{216} Whatever transpired at the abrupt end of the romance was enough to elicit a strangely vehement reaction from Alexander Schmorell (the student who was executed on the same day as Huber) when he

\footnote{213 As Ruth Hanna Sachs has written, the students seem to have been cautious even in their decision to include Huber in their conspiracy, as adults with families and careers stood to lose a great deal from the risks involved with being part of the resistance (Sachs, White Rose History, Vol. II, Chapter 25, 1–2).
\footnote{214 Letter from Inge Scholl to Carl Orff, 1 March 1946, AK, COS/OZM; Orff’s Nachlass has correspondence with Inge Scholl from 1946 to 1955 (information according to OZM, 29 and 31 October 2014). Original language of quotation: Aber immer hatte ich das Gefühl, dass in Ihrer Musik ein Hauch jenes Archaïschen zu finden ist, der doch jeder neuaufkommenden Kulturpoche eigen zu sein scheint. Deshalb war es für mich eine grosse Freude, zu erfahren, dass Sie mit Professor Huber, dem geliebten Lehrer und verehrten Berater meiner Geschwister, zusammen gearbeitet haben. This letter predates Orff’s memorial letter to Kurt Huber, and so Inge Scholl most likely learned of Orff’s collaboration with Huber through Musik der Landschaft.
\footnote{215 Alexander Schmorell and Christoph Probst, ed. Christiane Moll, Alexander Schmorell, Christoph Probst: Gesammelte Briefe (Schriften Der Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand. Reihe B, Quellen und Berichte: Band 3), Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2011, 678 (letter from Christoph Probst to his sister, 31 March 1941 in which he described seeing Godela in a play) and 679 n. 444.
\footnote{216 Werner Thomas and Orff-Zentrum München, Orfs Märchenstücke: Der Mond, Die Kluge, Schott Musikwissenschaft; Variation: Schott Musikwissenschaft. (Mainz: Schott, 1994), 85. Original language: Zwischen Orff und Angelika entwickelte sich vertumlich in Frühsommer 1936 ein Liebesverhältnis, das verschiedenen Indizien nach wohl noch vor der Uraufführung der Carmina Burana (Juni 1937) jäh abbrach.}
thought that Angelika might have been resuming contact with Orff in 1941.217 Angelika worked with Orff on the libretto of *Die Kluge*, which by chance had its premiere when her brother was in the custody of the Nazis; given that *Die Kluge* opens with an unjustly imprisoned man, this is a grim case of dramatic irony.

By 1948, Orff and Angelika Probst had resumed contact. Orff’s papers include a letter from Angelika Probst to Gertrud Orff from 1948 (requesting a score of *Der Mond* or *Die Kluge* for a colleague), four further letters to Gertrud in 1950 and 1951, and a postcard from Paris to both Carl and Gertrud Orff in 1949. In 1950, she thanked Carl and Gertrud Orff, using the familiar pronouns, for the “nice, beautiful evening…that you gave me the other day…. Your friendship means a great deal to me.” Unfortunately, none of these letters contains any reference to Christoph Probst or Kurt Huber, and so they offer no further clues as to Orff’s reaction to his friend’s heroism and martyrdom.218 Orff’s connection to Angelika Probst does, however, indicate that his connection to the White Rose circle extended beyond his friendship with Huber, which opens the possibility that the apprehension and murder of the Munich students may have had a personal resonance for the composer beyond what has been previously acknowledged. This possibility has special bearing on *Die Bernauerin*, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter.

It is an uncomfortable fact that Orff and others who had not joined the resistance were able to benefit from their association with those who made enormous sacrifices in the fight against the Third Reich.219 This phenomenon was widespread: Pamela Potter has written that some of Huber’s musicology colleagues, like Orff, used their association with him to their

217 Schmorell and Probst, *Alexander Schmorell, Christoph Probst*, letters from Alexander Schmorell to Angelika Probst (after 1937 Angelika Knoop) from 10 November 1936 (288 and 289–290 n. 7), 30 November 1936 (290 and 291 n. 15), 27 June 1937 (307 and 307 n. 544), July 1937 (309 and 309 n. 55), 18 June 1941 (421, also 422 n. 346), and 26 June 1941 (427–428). See also ibid., 89, 91 n. 308, and 296 n. 31, and three letters from Christoph Probst to Elise Probst, from 4 May 1936 (569 and 570 n. 136), 19 November 1936 (602–603 and 603 n. 240), and 11 February 1937 (617–618 and 618 n. 277).

218 Postcard from Angelika Probst to Carl and Gertrud Orff from Paris, 16 November 1949; letter from Angelika Probst to Gertrud Orff, 19 May 1950 (quotation; information according to OZM, 24 and 30 October 2014). Original language of quotation: *lieben, schönen Abend […], den Ihr mir neulich gemacht habt…. an Eurer Freundschaft ist mir viel gelegen.*

219 Inge Aicher-Scholl serves as an example: she has drawn criticism as someone who unequivocally benefitted from her association with the White Rose despite having been far removed from the group ideologically. See Klaus Krippendorff, “Designing In Ulm and Off Ulm,” Departmental Papers, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, 1 January 2008: 55–72, 59 and 59–60, n. 6, accessed at http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/138, 18 January 2014.
On the other hand, Orff’s friendship with Huber, and the ramifications of Huber’s arrest on Orff’s life, were significant experiences for the composer, and it is natural for him to include them in speaking of his life. In any case, the evidence at present suggests that Orff accurately represented his relationship with Huber and the White Rose when speaking on the record. The one possible exception is portraying himself as a counselor to Hans and Sophie Scholl—albeit counseling them away from heroism.

The degree to which Orff was aware of the White Rose’s activities before Huber’s arrest is unclear. In her interview with Palmer, Clara Huber reported that, upon learning of Huber’s arrest, Orff first asked, “Yes, yet is it not [to do] with the White Rose? I have heard something [of it].” According to the Hubers’ guestbook, which Clara made available to Richard DCamp, the last time Orff was a guest in their house prior to Huber’s arrest was 22 December 1942, a matter of days after Huber had been told by his students of their activities in the White Rose. If Clara Huber’s testimony is accurate, it suggests that Orff and Huber, contrary to the common wisdom, did have some political discussions, at least to the extent that Orff knew that Huber had become disillusioned with the Third Reich. This is a curious contradiction to Clara Huber’s testimony to Michael Kater that “Carl Orff and my husband shared a really good friendship, which manifested itself above all in the musical realm.” On this occasion, she reported that the two men had not discussed matters of politics.

While Orff had motive to bend the truth in his favor following the Third Reich, it has

---

220 Pamela Potter has written: “Friendship with Kurt Huber emerged as a potential vehicle for proving anti-Nazi leanings…. Huber came to symbolize the moral integrity of musicology, and some of his former associates tried to capitalize on his martyrdom.” Potter mentioned Otto Ursprung (1879–1960) and Heinrich Besseler (1900–1969), as well as Orff (Potter, Most German of the Arts, 241–242).

221 Interview with Clara Huber in O, Fortuna! Original language: Ja, wird doch nicht mit der Weißen Rose? Ich hab’ etwas gehört (English translation differs from the film’s subtitles, which are often inaccurate).

222 The guest book reports that during 1942, Orff visited the Hubers on 14 June, 6 July, 17 August, 24 September, 30 September, 21 October, 18 November, and 22 December (DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 88). Kater erroneously has written: “By the time that Huber actively joined the White Rose student resistance cell in January 1943, the Huber and Orff couples had not been seeing each other for about three months” (Composers of the Nazi Era, 138). Kater’s citation is Gertrud Orff’s diary entry on 24 September 1942 (ibid., 328 n. 189), a date confirmed by the Hubers’ guest book.

223 See, for example, DCamp, The Drama of Carl Orff, 91: “Orff appears to have never been aware of Huber’s philosophical and political opposition to the Nazi regime. This illustrates Orff’s apparent political disinterest.” DCamp also wrote: “Orff’s relationship to Huber seem to further underscore the hypothesis that Orff strove to remain politically neutral during the Third Reich” (ibid., 86).

224 Clara Huber, letter to Michael Kater, 30 September 1993, quoted in Kater, “Carl Orff im Dritten Reich,” 27, internal quotation marks omitted. Original language: Carl Orff und meinen Mann verband eine wirklich gute Freundschaft, die sich vor allem auf musikalischem Gebiet äußerte. This is the only part of the letter that Kater’s text provides verbatim.
been curiously little remarked that Jenkins likewise had motive to clear his teacher’s name, as he had hoped that Orff would take the intendant position in Stuttgart. In 1995, Orff’s friend Renatus Wilm (1927–1998) wrote to the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung that he remembered that, around 1946, Orff had told him of an American officer who was “attempting to build him up as a resistance fighter. [Orff] had difficulty braking the overzealousness of his student.” It is difficult to know how Jenkins reacted to Orff’s refusal to take a public position, but he told Kater that, by the time he left Germany on 15 July 1947, tension had developed between him and Orff, although he could not recall the reason. After Jenkins’s departure, he and Orff did have some contact, as Orff invited his old student to the premiere of Antigonae in 1949. The interaction between Orff and Jenkins following the fall of the Third Reich may well serve as a case study in the mutualistic relationship between the occupiers and the occupied: the Americans needed acceptable Germans to fill positions in public life as much as Germans needed those positions for their livelihoods.

Jenkins’s treatment of Orff certainly put the composer at an unfair advantage, but it is impossible to know the degree to which Jenkins’s counsel shaped Orff’s answers at the ICD screening center. It stands to reason, however, that Orff and his fellow candidates did not need an insider to inform them that the Americans were looking for people with anti-Nazi records and viewed with disfavor any instance of benefiting from the Third Reich. One therefore cannot say definitively that Orff benefitted during his evaluation from the unfair advantage that Jenkins had handed him.

After all of the strife and confusion regarding Jenkins’s recollection that Orff had claimed to have been a member of the White Rose, we are left with no definite answers. Jenkins told

---

226 See Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 136, 140, and 329 n. 205.
227 Karner, Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz, 263. According to Karner, this brief exchange was the first contact between Orff and Jenkins in the AK, COS/OZM since Jenkins had left Germany.
228 I thank Professor Wolfgang Rathert of Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität in Munich for bringing this phenomenon to my attention in our conversations during my year of research in Germany. It is notable that Kater, in his own words, “accused Orff...of manipulating Jenkins in a scheme to whitewash himself as a suspected Nazi collaborator” (“In Answer to Hans Jörg Jans,” 711) but did not consider the possibility that Jenkins to some degree may have been manipulating Orff. One must consider both possibilities, as they are by no means mutually exclusive.
Kater at least twice that his memory of events from decades earlier was not perfect. Given that Jenkins had urged Orff to produce evidence that he was actively opposed to the Third Reich, a scenario in which Jenkins led his old teacher into saying that he had had some direct involvement with the White Rose is within the realm of possibility. If, however, Orff had told Jenkins about his involvement with the White Rose as a key to clearing his name, it is highly unlikely that the matter would have been kept in confidence as Jenkins would have encouraged Orff to share the information with his evaluators. In addition, Orff was still in contact with Clara Huber and was well aware that she could be asked to verify his story.

The question of whether and to what degree Orff misrepresented himself following the fall of the Third Reich is important, and indeed the way he characterized the reception of his works during that period is at odds with the state benefits he received and the overall critical response in the German press from 1937 to 1945. It is likewise clear that Orff invoked his friendship with Huber in his favor on at least three occasions: during his denazification proceedings, in the 1960 interview with Bert Wassener, and in his 1963 letter to Prieberg as quoted previously. In addition, Luise Rinser adduced Orff’s friendship with Huber in her memoirs as a political defense of her ex-husband. Ultimately, the controversy surrounding Carl Orff and the White Rose Resistance rests on a collection of contradictions and eyewitness testimony from decades after the fact.

While many details remain murky in the story of Carl Orff, the Third Reich, and the denazification era, what remains clear is his “‘Grey C’, acceptable” status: there is strong evidence in support of Orff’s anti-authoritarian and individualist stances, just as there is strong evidence that he was in fact a Nutzniesser (beneficiary) of the Third Reich. The goal of the following chapters in this dissertation is to evaluate how the “‘Grey C’, acceptable” Carl Orff assimilated the morally compromised situation of his society and addressed the crises of his day through his art. In his report on Wetzelsberger, Schaffner wrote that the conductor was “too intelligent not to be aware of the significance of his behavior.” This statement may be applied

---

229 Kater, *The Twisted Muse*, 191 (Jenkins used the phrase “as far as I remember”); Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 329 n. 205 (regarding Jenkins being uncertain as to what had caused the strain on his relationship with Orff).

230 Kater noted that this likely was a reason that Orff did not claim to have been part of the White Rose at the ICD screening center, but he did not account for why the composer may have felt comfortable making such a claim to Jenkins (Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, 137).

231 Rinser, *Saturn auf der Sonne*, 94.

232 Schaffner, report on Wetzelsberger, David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folder 2.
equally well to Orff. It is unlikely that the highly intelligent Orff, with his pronounced dislike for authority and respect for individuality, would not have been troubled by the knowledge that he had benefitted under the same government that had driven several of his friends into exile and killed his friend Huber.\footnote{As noted in the previous chapter, Orff’s family members have reported that the composer suffered from terrible nightmares. Based on Luise Rinser’s testimony to this effect in Palmer’s \textit{O, Fortuna!}, Kim Kowalke has speculated that, although Orff had “navigate[d] treacherous water…with considerable skill” and had “emerged with few visible scars” from the Third Reich, “[t]here may have been hidden costs” (Kowalke, “Burying the Past,” 73; note that Kowalke referred to Rinser as Orff’s “wife at the time,” although she was not married to him during the years of the Third Reich—as noted in Chapter 1, however, Orff’s nightmares likely date back to his World War I trauma).}

Perhaps the most telling clue to Orff’s inner feelings about the Third Reich lies in \textit{Die Bernauerin}, which he completed two months before his denazification screening in Bad Orb. This work was composed in Dr. Zimmermann’s sanatorium in the final six months of the war and was dedicated to Kurt Huber’s memory. In it, we find the attitudes described in Schaffner’s denazification report. \textit{Die Bernauerin} is Carl Orff’s most overt statement against authoritarianism and in favor of the rights and dignity of the individual. This work is the subject of the following chapter.
Grouped according to rating

| White rating: 109 (62.3%) | White A: 50 (28.6%) | License granted: 39 (22.3%)  
License refused: 2 (1.15%)  
Provisional/Temporary License: 9 (5.15%) |
| White B: 59 (33.7%) | License granted: 30 (17.1%)  
Provisional/Temporary License: 25 (14.3%)  
License refused: 4 (2.3%) |
| Grey C: 46 (26.3%) | Acceptable-License Granted: 11 (6.3%)  
Provisional/Temporary license: 20 (11.45%)  
Unacceptable-License refused: 15 (8.55%) |
| Black/D-License withheld without rating: 19 (10.85%) | Black: 12 (6.85%)  
No letter: 7 (4.0%)  
* D: 4 (2.3 %)  
E: 1 (0.55%) |
| * Total D-rated candidates: 8 (4.6%) | No color rating: 7 (4.0%)  
* D: 4 (2.3 %)  
License denied: 2 (1.15%)  
Temporarily denied: 1 (.55%) |
| Disqualified for refusing to complete the examination: 1 (0.55%) |

Grouped according to licensing

| License granted: 80 (45.75%) | White A: 39 (22.3%)  
White B: 30 (17.15%)  
Grey C: 11 (6.3%) |
| Provisional license: 54 (30.85%) | White A: 9 (5.15%)  
White B: 25 (14.3%)  
Grey C: 20 (11.4%) |
| License withheld: 40 (22.85%) | White A: 2 (1.15%)  
White B: 4 (2.3 %)  
Grey C: 15 (8.55%) |
| * Total D-rated candidates: 8 (4.6%) | Black: 12 (6.85%)  
No letter: 7 (4.0%)  
* D: 4 (2.3 %)  
E: 1 (0.55%) |
| No color rating: 7 (4.0%)  
* D: 4 (2.3 %)  
License denied: 2 (1.15%)  
Temporarily denied: 1 (.55%) |
| Disqualified for refusing to complete the examination: 1 (0.55%) |

Table 3.1: Statics on subjects of the ICD screening center in Bad Orb. This information is based on the David M. Levy Papers, Box 35. Of 191 subjects, information on their political classification is extant for 175. Please also note that these tabulations are based on the final ratings (several candidates’ initial ratings were revised). Those candidates who were suitable for employment not licensing are counted in the “provisional” category. Note: Percentages are rounded.

---

234 Provisional licenses were granted to some “Grey C” candidates who were rated “unacceptable.” This includes cases where further investigation was called for. In some cases it is not specified whether or not an “acceptable” or “unacceptable” candidate was granted a license.

235 At least one candidate’s license was “temporarily withheld” (Karl Anton, see David M. Levy Papers, Box 35, Folders 2 and 21).

236 The exception is one of the candidates who was rated “White A” but denied a license; ultimately, he was given no formal classification whatsoever (see note 45).
CHAPTER 4
THE CORRUPTION OF THE HOMELAND:
Die Bernauerin, the Question of Collective Guilt,
and Carl Orff’s Crisis of Conscience

After such knowledge, what forgiveness?


As Carl Orff stayed in Dr. Heinz Zimmermann’s sanatorium in Ebenhausen during the final six months of the war, he was occupied with Die Bernauerin (The Lady Bernauer), his retelling of a regionally famous episode from fifteenth-century Bavarian history. Orff’s account depicts an unjust state, wrongful execution, and a populace that acknowledges its collective guilt in horror, all issues that had pressing importance at the time of the work’s genesis and premiere. Orff completed Die Bernauerin on 19 January 1946, eight months after the fall of the Third Reich. At this time, while in the midst of the denazification process, his future was uncertain. The world premiere of Die Bernauerin took place in Stuttgart on 15 June 1947, over a year after he had been classified as “‘Grey C’, acceptable” and granted his license.


2 See Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 17. The title literally means “The Lady Bernauer.” Adding the feminine suffix “–in” to proper names is a practice in southern Germany, and the practice of adding the definite article (here Die) before a proper name continues in that region to the time of the present writing. For more on Orff’s work, see Inka Stampfl, Die Bernauerin: Theatrum Mundi, Mysterienspiel, Ballade, Antike Tragödie, Munich: Deutscher Tonkünstlerverband, Manuskriptarchiv Nr. 1271, 1995; Gerhard Kramer, “Musiktheater sui generis: Carl Orff’s ‘Die Bernauerin’ an der Wiener Volksoper,” in Österreichische Musikzeitschrift, 53. Jahrgang, Heft 2, March 1998:55–56.

3 This is the date given in the facsimile of the manuscript in Carl Orff und sein Werk: Dokumentation, Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1980, Vol. 6 (“Bairisches Welttheater), 166, although it is notable that this manuscript appears to be that of the final revised version. Presumably, Orff chose to record the date on which the original version was completed. The printed score gives 1944–1945 as the date of composition (see page 1), as does Andreas Liess in Carl Orff: Idee und Werk (Zürich: Atlantis Musikbuch-Verlag, 1977, 112; in the English translation by Adelheid and Herbert Parkin (Carl Orff: His Life and Music, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1966, 110). In her diaries, Orff’s second wife, Gertrud Willert Orff recorded the completion of the text of Die Bernauerin on 19 April 1945 and the completion of the score, excepting the fair copy, on 31 December 1945 (Oliver Rathkolb in “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin: Zeithistorischer Rahmen zur Entstehungsgeschichte 1942–1947,” in the program for Wiener Volksoper Season 1997/98:15–25, 18–19.
to participate in the culture of the new Germany. With its firmly anti-authoritarian message, *Die Bernauerin* contains more overt parallels to the tyranny and atrocities of the Third Reich and its aftermath in German society than any of Orff’s other works. The parallels are made explicit by Orff’s inscription at the end of the score: *in memoriam Kurt Huber*. Thus Orff explicitly connected his work to a victim of National Socialism.

Because of its subject matter, *Die Bernauerin* has an important relation to the present controversy about Carl Orff and the Third Reich, as has been outlined in the previous chapters of this dissertation. While this work is a strong repudiation of authoritarianism, it is also an illustration of Orff’s greyness. In this work, Orff attempted to sort through the issues of conscience that faced him and the many other grey figures of his society as they sought to come to terms with their complicity, in most cases by inaction, in the atrocities of their state. An examination of *Die Bernauerin* reveals a more nuanced perspective on Orff and the Third Reich than the focus on his guilt or innocence that has been so prevalent in the discourse to date. Hans Jörg Jans, during his tenure as the director of the Orff-Zentrum München, aptly wrote that “the scholarly debate on Orff and the Third Reich has taken on all the implacability of a criminal lawsuit.”

*Die Bernauerin* is Orff’s recounting of an event in Bavarian history in which a commoner, reputed to be an exceedingly beautiful and virtuous woman, was executed by drowning for marrying the son of the Bavarian duke and disrupting the social order. Orff drew from many of the previous accounts of this story, his most relevant source being Christian Friedrich Hebbel’s (1813–1863) *Agnes Bernauer*, written in 1851. While Orff’s *Die Bernauerin* has many structural similarities to Hebbel’s play, Orff soundly rejected Hebbel’s message that the sacrifice of the individual is necessary for the greater good. Orff’s work, in stark contrast, takes a stand in favor of individual freedom and against tyranny. Although Orff’s fear of authority and desire for professional success prevented him from openly protesting the Third Reich, *Die Bernauerin* serves as an expression of opposition, which he only could bring himself to convey through his art. While Orff’s criticism of authority in his works from the Third Reich is safely couched in sardonic humor, he was able to express his antipathy for authoritarianism and injustice more directly and emotionally after the threat of

---

National Socialism no longer loomed over him.

In this chapter, I shall demonstrate that Die Bernauerin reveals a previously unappreciated level of engagement with the moral crises of Orff’s day, including societal failure, the question of collective guilt, and the corruption of the idea of Heimat ("homeland") by the Third Reich, all ideas that Orff added to his interpretation of the story of Agnes Bernauer. The idea of Heimat had personal significance to Orff because of his deep connection to his native Bavaria. The question of collective guilt was a widely discussed topic following the Third Reich, and the discourse continues through this day. Previous analyses of Die Bernauerin have not considered that this work could be Carl Orff’s acknowledgment of his society’s guilt and his own part in it, a statement of penitence that he was to revisit in the culmination of his stage works, De tempore fine comoedia.

The Story of Agnes Bernauer

The subject of Die Bernauerin is based on events from fifteenth-century Bavarian history. Agnes Bernauer (ca. 1410–1435) was the daughter of a bathhouse owner in Augsburg who married Albrecht III (1401–1460), the son of Ernst, Duke of Bavaria (1373–1438). Their morganatic marriage posed a threat to the political order of Bavaria, which was then in a state of upheaval and divided into three parts. Duke Ernst therefore had Agnes executed by drowning in the Danube River on charges of witchcraft on 12 October 1435. Albrecht initially wanted to go to war with his father after Agnes’s death, but the two reconciled and Albrecht subsequently remarried. This story, a classic tale of conflict between the individual and the

---

5 See, for example, Roland Hill, “Der 'Gaukler aus München': Orff in London,” in Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (S), 30 May 1956. The issues of societal failure, collective guilt, and the ruination of the concept of Heimat, however, have not been addressed in the previous literature.

6 Newell Jenkins recalled to Michael Kater in 1993 that he had offered Orff the opportunity to come to America and that the composer had refused (Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 139). In her memoirs, Godela Orff wrote that emigration never would have been an option for her father (Godela Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, Leipzig: Henschel, 2008, 54, in previous version, Godela Orff, Mein Vater und ich: Erinnerungen an Carl Orff, Munich/Mainz: Piper/Schott (Band 8332), 1992/1995, 51).


8 Agnes and Albrecht were married by 1432. Ernst ruled from 1397 to his death in 1438; Albrecht succeeded him in 1438 and ruled until his own death in 1460.
state, has been a frequent topic of folk stories, poetry, and tragic dramas since at least the early sixteenth century.\(^9\)

In 1942 Orff’s daughter Godela, by that time already an accomplished actress,\(^{10}\) had great success in playing the title role in Hebbel’s *Agnes Bernauer*.\(^{11}\) In *Dokumentation*, Orff wrote that neither he nor Godela liked Hebbel’s play, although he counseled her to take the role as it was an important opportunity for her career.\(^{12}\) Orff decided to write his own account of the story with the idea that his daughter would play the leading role.\(^{13}\) According to Orff’s account from 1946, Kurt Huber responded with enthusiasm when told of this plan and played the Bavarian folksong “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin” (“Song of the Beautiful Bernauerin”) at the piano. He told Orff that his new work “must become a Bavarian ballad!”\(^{14}\) Orff took several elements of the folksong for his own work, both in the narrative and the music. The most significant example is the departure from history at the ending, in which Duke Ernst dies before Albrecht can go to war with him. Huber was not able to witness the development of *Die Bernauerin*; he was arrested on 27 February 1943.

Despite a close structural relationship between Orff’s *Die Bernauerin* and Hebbel’s *Agnes Bernauer* than has previously been acknowledged in the scholarly literature, there is a

---

\(^9\) A lengthy listing may be found at http://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Agnes_Bernauer#Gedichte, accessed 11 November 2014.

\(^{10}\) G. Orff, *Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich*, 72–79, in previous version, 72–78; letter from Hans Bergese to Erich Katz dated 15 April (begun) and 15 May (continued) 1947 (Erich Katz Collection, Series 1, Carton 1; see second page), in which Bergese reported that Godela’s success as an actress in the years immediately after the Third Reich (her name is misspelled as “Godola”); See G. Orff, *Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich*, 72–79, in previous version, 72–78; letter from Christoph Probst to his sister Angelika, 31 March 1941, in Alexander Schmorell and Christoph Probst, ed. Christiane Moll, *Alexander Schmorell, Christoph Probst: Gesammelte Briefe*, in series *Schriften Der Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand. Reihe B, Quellen und Berichte: Band 3* (Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2011), 678 and 679 n. 440–441 (Probst wrote that he had seen Godela in a major role in a play, which he did not specify); see also list of actors on Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, ED 145, Band 2, 12.

\(^{11}\) The play opened on 20 November 1942. See Orff in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 9–11.

\(^{12}\) See, for example, Liess’s section on *Die Bernauerin* in his book, which Orff oversaw. Liess gave the “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin” as an important source (113; English translation 112) and mentioned Hebbel’s play only as a point of contrast, thereby distancing Orff from Hebbel’s source material: “The comparison with Hebbel’s tragedy, which is made psychological, lets one recognize the entire individuality of Orff’s minting” (*Der Vergleich mit Hebbels gleichnamiger psychologisierender Tragödie läßt die ganze Eigenart der Orffschen Prägung erkennen*, 112). The published English translation is somewhat different in meaning: “The whole individuality of Orff’s approach may be demonstrated by comparing his work with Hebbel’s tragedy of the same name” (111).


\(^{14}\) *Kurt Huber zum Gedächtnis*, 166; *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 168. Original language: *Es muß eine bayerische Ballade werden!* This is the central event described in the posthumous letter he wrote to Huber.
drastic difference between the messages that the two works convey. Hebbel’s play clearly presents his belief that at times it is necessary for the individual to be sacrificed for the sake of the collective.\textsuperscript{15} Orff firmly repudiated this message in his own work, creating an elegy to victims of authoritarianism and injustice in tribute to his slain friend. That Orff rejected Hebbel’s message while retaining many structural elements from his play represents a subversion of Hebbel’s work.\textsuperscript{16}

This rejection is especially significant in light of the reception of Hebbel’s Agnes Bernauer in the Third Reich. As William John Niven has reported, National Socialist critics were able to identify in this work ideas that matched their ideology: “For was not the Staatsidee [idea of the state] in the play – the idea namely that the welfare of the state always takes precedence over that of the individual – equivalent to the National Socialist ideas on state supremacy?”\textsuperscript{17} Agnes Bernauer was the only one of Hebbel’s plays that received over four times as many performances under National Socialism as it had in the Weimar Republic.\textsuperscript{18} Hebbel’s positive reception in the Third Reich strengthens the theory that Orff’s alteration of Hebbel’s message in Die Bernauerin constitutes a rejection of National Socialist ideology. Orff’s portrayal of Duke Ernst as the villain is among the most striking elements of his interpretation. In Orff’s version, Duke Ernst is spoken of and quoted but never appears onstage; he is a dark shadow of authority that looms over the action.\textsuperscript{19} Orff’s portrayal of Duke

\textsuperscript{15} See the afterword (signed “B.”) in Hebbel, Agnes Bernauer, 110.
\textsuperscript{18} There were 986 performances in the Third Reich (Germany, Austria, and the other occupied territories), 910 of which were in Germany itself, compared to only 211 performances in the Weimar Republic (a slightly longer span of time). See Niven, The Reception of Friedrich Hebbel in Germany in the Era of National Socialism, 92.
\textsuperscript{19} One may note a parallel between Orff’s portrayal of Duke Ernst and the slightly characterization of Big Brother in 1984 (1948, published 1949), the celebrated novel and theorization of totalitarianism by George Orwell (pen name for Eric Arthur Blair, 1903–1950); see George Orwell, 1984, New York: Signet Classics, 1950.
Ernst as the unseen antagonist (which is traceable to the “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin”) is in stark contrast to Hebbel’s portrayal of Duke Ernst as a tragic hero. Agnes’s death weighs on Hebbel’s Ernst so heavily that he abdicates and retires to the Andechs monastery.

While it is impossible to known the degree to which Kurt Huber’s arrest and murder shaped Orff’s libretto for Die Bernauerin, the diary of Orff’s wife from the time, Gertrud Willert Orff, provides important clues. On 23 February 1943—four days before Huber’s arrest—Gertrud Orff wrote in her diary that her husband initially planned for the Devil to be the antagonist of Die Bernauerin. It is significant that Orff later replaced the devil with a head of state, as if to say the tyranny of the state was villain enough, and focused on the complicity of the people (the Volk) in Agnes’s death. In Orff’s final version, the forces of evil are depicted through a disturbing male chorus of witches who exult in Agnes’s death at the hand of the unseen Duke Ernst. Witches are the embodiment of the hatred directed against Agnes, a degree of which is expressed by all of her human opponents.

There is a special focus on the Volk in Orff’s Die Bernauerin, unlike in Hebbel’s work. Of the work’s twelve scenes, half do not feature either of the main characters, and there are

---

20 See Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 14–16.
21 Hebbel, Agnes Bernauer, 90; corresponding passage in English translation, 256. One of the significant passages in which Hebbel attempts to portray Ernst positively occurs in ibid., 59–63 (Act IV Scene 4), corresponding passage in English translation, 229–233. In Joseph August von Törring’s (1753–1826) previous account of the Agnes Bernauer story (Agnes Bernauerin, 1780), with which both Orff and Hebbel were familiar (see Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 11), the author went even further in exonerating Ernst by creating a fictional villain who orders Agnes’s execution, from which the Duke unsuccessfully attempts to save her. The premiere of Törring’s play took place in 1781. See Joseph August von Törring: Agnes Bernauerin: Ein vaterländisches Trauerspiel, ["Agnes Bernauerin: A Tragedy of the Fatherland"] Hamburg: Tredition Classics, 2012. Ernst’s failed attempt to save Agnes is found in ibid., 72–74. This play came to the English speaking world through an adaptation (with an altered happy ending) by Mariana Starke (1762 [?]–1836). This adaptation was published in 1800 and performed in 1803 in New York. Mariana Starke, The tournament, a tragedy; imitated from the celebrated German drama, entitled Agnes Bernauer, Which was Written by a Nobleman of High Rank, And founded on a Fact that occurred in Bavaria about the Year M,CCC,XXXV, New-York: David Longworth at the Shakspeare gallery, L. Nichols, 1803 (as performed in New York).
22 According to Gertrud’s diary entry on 23 February 1943, the devil, a collector of rarities, desires Agnes for his collection. The devil has staged the love affair with Albrecht and tempted her in her jail cell by sending in priests to tempt (that is, presumably, to seduce) her, although Agnes does not succumb and the devil’s plan is thwarted. Orff intended to have the devil chop off his tail upon being thwarted. Orff ultimately included this gruesome scene in Comoedia de Christi resurrectione (see score, Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (39 297), 1957, 38). In her diary entry of 28 May 1944, Gertrud recorded that Orff planned to have the devil want to rescue Agnes and keep her for himself. In this projected version, the devil shows her how she can avoid death. The Volk see Agnes swimming and think they have seen a miracle, but then she disappears (these diary entries are quoted by Rathkolb in “Carl Orff und Die Bernauerin,” 16–17). It is difficult to interpret this strange plan from Gertrud’s brief entry; it is especially difficult to tell if Orff intended for Agnes to succumb to the Devil’s trickery or if she was to maintain her virtue, which he depicted with great admiration in his finale version. In any case, Agnes’s final disappearance seems ambiguous based on Gertrud’s description.
only two scenes with Albrecht and Agnes alone. Because Die Bernauerin is an account of a society’s failure (allowing the atrocity of Agnes’s death) and its subsequent attempts to come to terms with its complicity, much of the story is described from the perspectives of townspeople and other indirectly involved characters. While Orff’s chorus is modeled on that of Greek tragedy, the Volk (as the chorus is called in the libretto) in Die Bernauerin are drawn into the action more urgently than in a Greek tragedy, in which the chorus normally stands outside of the action. In Die Bernauerin, the Volk are morally implicated by the atrocity ordered by their duke, and so they do not have the luxury of offering commentary from the outside; they must come to terms with their own role in the murder of an innocent. As they are themselves implicated, they cannot sit in judgment.

The Dramaturgical Innovations of Die Bernauerin

In many respects, especially the musical language, Die Bernauerin is similar to Orff’s previous five large-scale works from the Third Reich, but there are also significant differences. The dramaturgy is unlike any of Orff’s previous stage works. The major roles consist almost entirely of spoken lines, excepting Agnes’s song in part 2, scene 5. Die Bernauerin resembles a play with incidental music (Schauspielmusik) more than any other genre. The music of Die Bernauerin, however, is integrated too fully into the drama to be called incidental music in the traditional sense. As Godela wrote in her memoirs: “With this Bernauerin my father created a new theatrical form, in which the music and the language coalesce with one another. The music supports the words; where the words fail, the music speaks.” This echoes what her father had

---

23 See Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 18: “As through a transparency one sees the contours of ancient tragedy light up. This applies not only for the ‘Burghers of Munich’ of the third scene, who have adopted the function of the ancient choir here, or for the Witches’ scene of the second part, which employs the classical means of teichoscopia, but most strongly for the final scene of the work, which has its models in Attic tragedy with its large form in blocks [and] its mixture of dramatic action and reflection stasis” (original language: Wie durch ein Transparent sieht man die Umrisse der antiken Tragödie aufleuchten. Das gilt nicht nur für die „Bürger von München“ des dritten Bildes, die hier die Funktion des antiken Chores übernommen haben, oder für die Hexenszene des zweiten Teils, die sich des klassischen Mittels der Teichoskopie bedient, sondern am stärksten wohl für die Schlusszene des Werks, die mit ihrer blockhaften Großform, ihrer Mischung von dramatischer Aktion und reflektierender Statik ihre Vorbilder in der attischen Tragödie hat).

24 Most often, the incidental music may be removed from a performance of the play without detriment to the storytelling and structure of the work. In the case Orff’s Ein Sommernachtstraum of 1939, he wrote music to accompany the play centuries after Shakespeare’s death, as had Felix Mendelssohn, Rudolf Wagner-Régeny, and many others (see Chapter 2). In Die Bernauerin, by contrast, the music was conceived as part of the work and has a crucial role in conveying the story.
The music is almost the sole means by which the central relationship between Agnes and Albrecht is portrayed, as there is remarkably little dialogue between them. Although Orff professed not to be interested in psychological portrayal in his work, the music illustrates the characters’ state of mind, serving to convey what is omitted in the words. The characters’ inability or unwillingness to speak their true feelings outside of music have a parallel in Carl Orff’s own mode of expression.

Here more than in any of his other works, Orff brought into Bertolt Brecht’s theatrical model an uninhibitedly emotive quality at odds with Brecht’s ideal. The Ansager (announcer) at the beginning of each of the two parts and the reliance of secondhand accounts to relay information are classic uses of Brecht’s Verfremdungseffekt (alienation effect). The namelessness of most of the characters (excepting the historical figures of Agnes, Albrecht, and their respective fathers) likewise has a distancing effect typical of Epic Theater. Although it shares many characteristics with the traditionally unsentimental Epic Theater, Die Bernauerin contains more lyrical and tender music than any other piece in Orff’s output.

Taking into account the intimate lyricism of this work, the naturalism of the opening three

25 Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, Leipzig: Henschel Verlag, July 2008, 85 (quotation); in previous version (Mein Vater und ich, Munich/Mainz: Piper/Schott, 1995, Serie Musik Band 8332) 80; Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 18–19. Original language of quotation: Mit dieser Bernauerin schuf mein Vater eine neue Theaterform, in der Musik und Sprache miteinander verschmelzen. Die Musik unterstützt die Worte; wo die Worte versagen, spricht die Musik. As Orff wrote of the orchestral music following Agnes’s monologue in Part II Scene 2: “What Agnes cannot say, as she does not have the words for it, breaks out in the music, infiammato (‘ardently’)” (Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 87, original language: Was Agnes nicht sagen kann, da ihr dafür die Worte fehlen, bricht in der Musik „infiammato“ — leidenschaftlich — auf).

26 Both lovers appear together in only three of the twelve scenes (not counting Agnes’s apparition at the conclusion of the finale): Part I Scenes 1 and 5 and Part II Scene 2. Albrecht speaks far more than Agnes in the two scenes in Part I, while Agnes speaks all of the text in Part II Scene 2 except for one word (Albrecht calls out her name following her monologue). See especially in the score, 54–74 and 89–95.

27 Orff’s friend Karl Heinz Ruppel (1900–1980), a music and theater critic, called Die Bernauerin a work of Epic Theater and “a monumental folk play” (ein monumentales Volksschauspiel): “Orff’s Bernauerin is no drama, but a scenic history. Orff wants no psychology, but pictorial objectivity….As in ancient Drama, monologue is prevalent, as in that case the choirs frequently have a reflective and communicative function. The dynamic in the epic structure of the whole is speech….One should not consider the music in isolation from the scenic proceedings….As the scene is not handled dramatically but epically, so too the music knows no symphonic working of the thematic material, but only the order and repetition.” “Bemerkungen zu Orffs „Bernauerin”” (“Remarks on Orff’s Bernauerin”) in Blätter der Bayerischen Staatsoper, 2. Jahrgang (1949/1950), Heft 10/11:170–172, 170. Original language: Orffs „Bernauerin” ist kein Drama, sondern eine zsenische Historie. Orff will keine Psychologie, sondern bildhafte Gegenständlichkeit….Wie im antiken Drama überwiegt der Monolog, wie dort haben die Chöre vielfach betrachtende und kommentierende Funktion. Das dynamische Element in der epischen Struktur des Ganzen bildet die Sprache….Die Musik…darf man nicht losgelöst von den zsnischen Vorgängen betrachten….Wie das Zsenische nicht dramatisch, sondern episch behandelt ist, so kennt auch die Musik keine symphonische Verarbeitung des thematischen Materials, sondern nur die Reihung und Wiederholung. Richard DCamp has written: “Since this work is not labeled either an opera or drama, it might be classified more appropriately as a play of epic theater for the musical stage” (The Drama of Carl Orff, 237).
scenes (in a sense “slices of life”), and Albrecht’s love monologue (all to be described below), one could argue that Die Bernauerin is a synthesis of two disparate stylistic traditions: it is Epic Theater imbued with the spirit of verismo opera. In this respect it is unique among the works of Carl Orff. The emotional nature of this piece is not surprising considering that it was written with his daughter in mind for the central role. As Godela Orff’s husband, Dr. Gerhard Büchtemann, has testified: “My wife found Die Bernauerin to be her father’s most heartfelt [and] most intimate music. He wrote it for his daughter. Die Bernauerin is, as Godela Orff herself writes, very near to her ‘life expression.’”

In addition, Die Bernauerin is dedicated to the memory of Orff’s good friend and collaborator, Kurt Huber, who was murdered by the Nazis, ostensibly, like Agnes, for the good of the state. Personal dedications are seldom used in Carl Orff’s works. The reference to Huber suggests that Die Bernauerin was not for Orff an abstract statement on clashes between the individual and society, but a commentary upon the tyranny that had taken a close friend from him. In 1956, nine years after the premiere of Die Bernauerin, the journalist Roland Hill wrote in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung: “Perhaps one must have experienced a time of tyranny firsthand to detect in Die Bernauerin the tremendous impression of might, fear, and intolerance. Without the events in Munich from 1943 and Orff’s friendship with Professor Kurt

---


29 G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 85–86 (regarding Die Bernauerin), 64–68 (regarding troubles with her father), in previous version, 81 (regarding Die Bernauerin), 65–68 (regarding troubles with her father),

30 One of the few other examples is the second of the three a cappella choral works that constitute the Concento di Voci, “Laudes Creaturarum quas fecit Beatus Franciscus ad Laudem et Honorem Dei” (“Praises of the creatures that St. Francis made to the praise and honor of God,” text by St. Francis of Asisi (1181/1182–1226), composed 1954, Mainz: Schott Music International, 1983, C 39 560AP), which is dedicated to “L.R.” This is presumably Orff’s third wife, Luise Rinser (1911–2002), whom he married the year of the work’s composition and divorced in 1959. Orff’s Nänie und Dithyrambe (1956, revised 1981), choral settings of texts by Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805), is dedicated to the Philharmonische Gesellschaft Bremen, presumably because the premiere of the work took place in Bremen on 4 December 1956 (Dokumentation, Vol. 7, 385). The third version of Ein Sommernachtstraum (1939) is dedicated to the city of Frankfurt, the mayor and Intendant of which commissioned his work (see vocal score, arranged by Hans Bergese, Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 3190), 1939; Institut für Stadtgeschichte der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, MA 7939 (formerly 6112, 2. Band) 1240 (letter from Carl Orff to Friedrich Krebs, 1 October 1939)). Orff similarly dedicated his revised version of Entrata to the mayor of Frankfurt, Friedrich Krebs (see Rösch, Carl Orff: Musik zu Shakespeares Ein Sommernachtstraum, 78; Rösch’s source is a letter from Friedrich Krebs to Carl Orff dated 4 November 1941 in the OZM, AK). This decision was, however, an expression of his gratitude for Krebs’s financial support. At the age of 16, Orff dedicated Eliland: Ein Sang von Chiemsee to his grandfather Karl Köstler, who financed its publication (see Chapter 1).
Huber, this work would not be what it became.”31 This is one of relatively few overt acknowledgments in the scholarly literature or critical reception of the anti-totalitarian message inherent in Die Bernauerin. The following analysis serves to explore this aspect of Orff’s work more fully and to situate it in the discourse of collective guilt that urgently pressed on the consciences of many Germans at the time Die Bernauerin was written.

### Carl Orff’s Die Bernauerin as an Allegory of Totalitarianism

Each act of the two parts (Orff did not call them “acts”) of Die Bernauerin opens with the same festive intrade in D major, which incorporates the music of the “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin” folksong (musical examples 4.1–4.2). In the first part, an announcer describes the tumultuous political climate of early fifteenth-century Bavaria, a divided state not unlike the one in which Die Bernauerin had its 1947 premiere. While this element pervades Hebbel’s version, Orff’s makes only a few mentions of the political history surrounding the story; Orff was more concerned about the people involved than with the history.

![Musical Example 4.1. “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin.”](image)

---


The setting of the first scene is Kaspar Bernauer’s bathhouse in Augsburg, at which his famously beautiful daughter Agnes also works. It is in this vulgar setting that Albrecht, having strayed far outside the appropriate realm for the son of a duke, meets Agnes. Orff’s work follows the model of Hebbel’s play in depicting the meeting of the two lovers, and in both works Albrecht is the initiator while the prudent Agnes is initially hesitant.

Orff’s opening scene, however, is much less dignified. Bathhouse guests sing and shout
obscene poetry. The tone is similar to the bawdy scenes of *Carmina Burana* and *Der Mond*, including the opening music’s direct quotation from *Carmina Burana* (the middle-high German no. 9, “Swaz hie gat umbe,” i.e. “Those who dance around here”). The bathers’ chorus of *Die Bernauerin* juxtaposes the C major and D minor and major triads (and pitches therefrom) that pervade the entire “profane cantata.” While Agnes’s father, Kaspar Bernauer, is portrayed as a kind and dignified man in Hebbel’s play, in Orff’s he is crass and venal. Kaspar Bernauer serves as a counterpart to Duke Ernst: both of the main characters have ruthless fathers, implying a repudiation of paternal authoritarianism.

As Orff later wrote of the historic Agnes Bernauer: “It is admirable that this woman, coming from such a dubious background, ultimately reached undisputed inner greatness.” In his work, Agnes does not engage with the vulgarity of the bathers, and she is reserved in her interactions with Albrecht. She perceives the inherent danger in a relationship between people of two different classes, which Albrecht does not grasp. Albrecht’s inability to understand his situation is apparent through *Die Bernauerin*. In addition to evoking the trope of German Romantic opera in which the heroine has more wisdom than her male counterpart, Albrecht’s lack of awareness may be read as a commentary on those in the Third Reich who were unable, or unwilling, to understand the full implications of what was happening around them.

Unlike in Hebbel’s work, Orff’s first scene ends with the bathers’ singing, instead of the dialogue

---

32 Orff, *Die Bernauerin*, pages 6–12; *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 21; Edelmann, “Carl Orff’s Bairisches Welttheater,” 141. Texts come from Clara Hätzlerin *Liederbuch* and the French poet François Villon (ca. 1431–1464), who was known to be a disreputable character.

33 Compare *Die Bernauerin* pp. 6–12 and *Carmina Burana* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, Edition Eulenburg No. 8000, 1937/1965), pp. 65–66 and 70–71. In one passage of the section of the bathers’ music that occurs twice, a ratchet is briefly used in the percussion section (score, 16 and 30.) As will be addressed in the next chapter, the ratchet is used in association with the terrorizing prospect of hellfire in *De temporum fine comoedia*. The brief use of the ratchet in this scene therefore may signify the aggressive nature of Agnes’s surroundings.

34 As Orff wrote in *Dokumentation*: “According to accounts no longer verifiable, the bathhouse of the old Bernauer hardly could have been a harmless establishment....” (Orff in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 11, original language: *Nach heute nicht mehr überprüfbaren Überlieferungen dürfte die Badstube des alten Bernauer kaum ein harmloses Etablissement gewesen sein...*).

35 Ibid., 14. Original language: *Bewundernswert bleibt, daß diese Frau, solch zweifelhaftem Milieu entstammend, letztlich zu unbestritten innerer Größe gelangte*. The bathers’ singing from the first part of the scene is reprised after Albrecht leaves and encases the dialogue between Agnes and her father. The bathers’ intrusions demonstrate the degree to which Agnes has been enveloped in her seedy surroundings but not been corrupted by them, thereby highlighting the contrast between her and her environment.


---
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between father and daughter. This establishes that Die Bernauerin is as much about society as about individuals.

The second scene is a brief interlude without music in which Albrecht’s friends warn him of Ernst’s inevitable reaction to his behavior. Orff’s version of this scene functions to introduce the unseen antagonist, Duke Ernst, and to demonstrate that Albrecht is dangerously unaware of the risk he is taking. As is typical in Orff’s works, authority is portrayed as a destructive force.

The third and fourth scenes do not feature Agnes and Albrecht, instead shifting the focus onto the townspeople of Bavaria. The music that frames this scene includes a quotation of an old Bavarian folksong from the town of Mittenwald about returning home: “Home, home, home should I go, there should I remain.”37 (Musical examples 4.3–4.4.) Although the text is not uttered in the libretto, the intertextual connection emphasizes the importance of the Heimat (“homeland”). The references to Heimat in the first part of Die Bernauerin at first appear to be a celebration of Bavaria, but as the society becomes complicit in the atrocity of Agnes’s murder the concept of Heimat becomes painfully corrupted.

Musical example 4.3. Folksong from Mittenwald.

---

37 Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 47. Original language: Hoam, hoam, hoam sollt i geh, da sollt ma bleibn…,
Musical example 4.4. Die Bernauerin, part 1, scene 3, excerpt.

In the ensuing dialogue between the burghers of Munich, we learn that Albrecht has made Agnes his wife, and that popular opinion (as represented by the burghers onstage) is divided. This scene functions to highlight the importance of the Volk in Die Bernauerin and their investment in the lives of their heads of state. From their dialogue we learn that there is grave concern as to how Duke Ernst will react to his son’s morganatic marriage, and that Albrecht is perceived to be as impetuous and obstinate as his father. One of the burghers, who is favorably inclined toward Agnes, mentions Albrecht’s deceased mother, a noble woman whose virtue links her to Orff’s noble portrayal of Agnes.

In the following scene, the same burgher notices a statue of the Madonna on the side of the road, a symbol of virtue that will be linked to Agnes throughout the work. The burgher notes that the statue shines in the darkness: “Dark, completely dark, pitch-black it must become, so that this light again may be recognized correctly.”38 Orff quoted this line in his

38 Score, 54. Original language: Dunker / ganz dunker, / stockdunker muass’s wern, / auf dass ma dös Liacht / wieda richti derkennt. This line is reminiscent of a quotation attributed to Francis Bacon (1561–1626): “In order
letter to the dead Kurt Huber; that he used these words to memorialize his murdered friend indicates that they held special significance for him. There is an ominous undertone here: if the light, here a symbol for Agnes, can only be appreciated properly in total darkness, then Agnes must be subsumed by total darkness. This scene is the first of several references to the Virgin Mary in *Die Bernauerin* that link Agnes with the ultimate paragon of virtue.39

The fifth and final scene of part 1 returns to the two central characters. The music of this scene is a dramatic change in tone from what has preceded it. Its tenderness depicts the love between Agnes and Albrecht, and compensates for how little dialogue there has been between them. The opening is in Orff’s favored key of D minor, with passages in the parallel major.40 Both sections of the ternary form (ABA) are for reduced orchestra: the first is entirely instrumental, scored for a reduced wind section, contrabasses, two pianos, harp, celesta, glockenspiel, and antique cymbals. In the second section, a tenor sings wordlessly in the distance over a reduced string section, with four woodwinds and harp added to the ends of the phrase each of the two times it is stated.41 Both sections emphasize the dominant, especially in the vocal line of the tenor, as is typical of Orff’s music. The use of the human voice adds a personal quality to the music, enhancing its intimate character.

The majority of this scene is Albrecht’s monologue as he envisions the adulation that the people of Bavaria will lavish upon his new wife, emphasizing her title of duchess (*Duchessa*) and thereby implying that her legitimacy will not be questioned.42 Agnes has only two lines during this scene, one before and one following Albrecht’s monologue. As Godela Orff wrote, her father “wanted this figure [of Agnes] to be shaped from ‘being’ without the ‘sham’ of helpful externalities. The almost entirely silent presence of Agnes during the first

---

39 *Himmelsmuatter* is “Heavenly Mother” in the Bavarian Dialect.
40 Originally there was an additional statement of the first two sections, creating an ABABA form. Orff evidently considered this too long, and indicated an optional cut in the 1956 score. In the final revisions, he implemented this cut permanently.
41 The composition of the string section is unusual: there are three violins, six violas, three cellos, and contrabass. A second contrabass is added to the ends of the phrase both times it is stated, along with the four woodwinds and harp. In the concluding passages, the cellos play in their high register, above the violins: this unusual use of register is characteristic of Orff’s writing.
part demands absolute concentration in ‘presence,’ in emanation.”

Orff’s portrayal of Agnes through presence rather than words in the first part of his work sets her apart, establishing her as a beatific and otherworldly character.

Albrecht’s lengthy monologue evinces the character’s unfettered optimism. His imagery of pealing bells, fanfares with drums, and Agnes’s name emblazoned in the sky all will return in the final scene of *Die Bernauerin*, but horribly tainted. Agnes is considerably more aware than Albrecht of the reality of their situation. She says nothing during Albrecht’s lengthy euphoric monologue, and after he is finished speaking asks: “What is it that everyone is now talking about in secret?” Presumably Agnes is referring to the gossip about her and Albrecht’s marriage, similar to the debate between the burghers two scenes earlier. It is clear that Albrecht does not share his wife’s concern, which, as with those who did not heed the signs of danger during the rise of National Socialism, will be to his detriment.

The music that ends the scene is a reworking for orchestra and wordless chorus of a previous composition: the last of the three *a cappella* choruses in the second set of Orff’s 1930 *Catulli Carmina*, a setting of Catullus’s Poem No. 31. As with the folksong from Mittenwald, the idea of *Heimat* is central to the Catullus poem, a paean to the poet’s beloved peninsula of Sirmio on Lake Garda: “O what is more blissful than when worries are released, when the mind sets aside its burden, and we, weary from foreign labor, have come to our home, and relax on the bed we have longed for?” The brilliantly scored orchestral music that follows Albrecht’s monologue begins with a section marked *molto estatico* (“very ecstatic”) and a subsequent section is marked *esuberante* (“exuberant”) in the final version of the score. At its climax the off-stage chorus is added, sustaining the syllable

---


44 In this respect, Orff’s work is similar to both Hebbel’s and Törring’s sources.

45 Score, 63. Original language: *Was is na dös Heimliche, / was alle sagn?* While she does not specify the subject of this secret talk, the context strongly suggests that it pertains to her and Albrecht’s marriage.

46 *Catullus: The Poems*, ed. Kenneth Quinn, London: Bristol Classical Press (Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.), 1970/1996, 18, lines 7–10. Original language: *O quid solutis est beatius curis, cum mens onus repont, ac peregrino labore fessi venimus lorem ad nostrum, desideratoque acquiescimus lecto?* These lines are repeated several times in Orff’s original setting, and in reworked material in *Die Bernauerin* the music to which the line is sung is the basis for a lengthy and dramatic episode sung by the chorus *a cappella*. For the original score, see *Dokumentation*, Vol. 4, 33–37.
“ah,” together with the ringing of the glockenspiel and triangle in the orchestra. This is followed by an off-stage chorus and tenor soloist singing *a cappella* and vocalise, the music to which the important line “O what is more blissful” (*O quid solutis est beatius curis*) is set in the 1931 composition.47


While the first two sections depict the ecstasy of love and sex similar to the *Trionfi* triptych, the scene concludes with soft but thickly textured orchestral music (with the choir

47 In the choral setting of “Sirmio,” this line is repeated several times by a solo tenor, which stresses its significance.
added as before in the closing measures) that ennobles Agnes and Albrecht’s love. In the final revisions, Orff specified that the act should end with an image of the lovers posed as in a traditional betrothal picture, a dignified final image. For now, Agnes’s worry seems to have been set aside, but the threats to Albrecht’s and her happiness still cloud over the action. This intertextual connection complements Albrecht’s loving reference to “my city of Munich” (meine Minkerne Stadt) in his monologue.\(^48\) Albrecht is linking Agnes’s acceptance by his society with his love for Munich. The implicit corollary is that Agnes’s rejection by her society, a possibility that he seems either not to consider or to be unwilling to face, constitutes a betrayal that would damage his relationship to his Heimat. Love of Heimat has been set up for a tragic fall.

The second part of Die Bernauerin opens with the same festive music as the first, and the announcer describes what is going to happen: “The play of the lady Bernauer. The other part. Of Agnes Bernauerin – Duchessa – of her love and faithfulness, and sad death, and how heaven at the end reversed everything.”\(^49\) Despite the sudden twist of fate in the final scene, which will be described below, it is unlikely that Orff wanted his audiences to feel that everything had been set aright. The first scene begins with mournful music that is given a truncated reprise after the dialogue. The music features several symbolically significant instruments that have not been heard in the previous part: the expressive timbre of the English horn, the quietly ominous strokes of the tam-tam, and the tolling of tubular bells. In the middle section, also omitted for the restatement at the end of the scene, the orchestral texture becomes thin as the high instruments, including two piccolos, hover over the bass instruments, including the pianos in their lowest register. The somber music establishes the change in tone between the first two parts.\(^50\) Two citizens of Munich relate the news of Duke Ernst’s outrage at his son’s marriage, the unrest it has caused, and the fact that Albrecht still does not grasp the implications of this situation. They also report that a portion of the Volk agrees with Ernst, foreshadowing the damning portrayal of the mob three scenes later.

\(^{48}\) Orff himself noted this in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 71.

\(^{49}\) Orff, Die Bernauerin, page 80. Original language: Das Speil von der Bernauerin[,] Der ander Teil[,] Von Agnes Bernauerin – „duchessa“ – von ihrer Lieb und Treu, und trauigem Tod und wie der Himmel zum End alles gewendt hat. Original language of third quotation: D’Bernauerin / is a hochgmuete / liabmächtinge Frau….., Un Angelo, sceso dal cielo” (ellipsis in original; no intervening text has been omitted).

\(^{50}\) Orff, Die Bernauerin, pages 81–87. Note especially the two piccolos hovering over the bass instruments, creating the effect of a chasm (82–83).
In the next scene, Agnes speaks a monologue to her husband, a counterpart to Albrecht’s from the last scene of part 1 with an entirely different tone. While Albrecht’s monologue was joyous, Agnes’s augurs her downfall, invoking the Goddess Fortuna and her wheel from *Carmina Burana*:

And further the wheel turns, only further and further. And this causes it to cast down the high and mighty one, and fall he must. No one can remain, not one, not one.
When I then think upon this, my heart almost stops. And I know: if I yet today, yet today must fall into the abyss, still it all is only because I stand at the highest point,
……
and for this I am not sorry.
……
Yet this is not all that I want to say to you; for that I cannot even find any word, not in the most furtive night.\(^{51}\)

Agnes’s words reflect a fatalistic worldview. She is resigning herself to her death, yet another example of Carl Orff’s lifelong obsession with this theme.

In his memoirs, Orff characterized the orchestral episode at the conclusion of this scene as an expression of what Agnes is unable to express in words, as indicated in the final sentence in her monologue.\(^{52}\) This is the last time that Agnes and Albrecht will see each other alive, and Agnes’s sibylline monologue suggests that she is aware that this is likely the case. The melodic line is stated entirely in diatonic parallel thirds, the effect of which is textural as the parallel motion prevents them from being heard as two separate voices. The melody begins in two solo violas doubled by two oboes, proceeds to all of the violas and cellos (both sections in the same octave, *divisi* in thirds), and finally to a *tutti* texture. The key is A major, and the music opens over a dominant pedal on the pitch E that does not change until the climax, at which point the bass changes to D, alternating with Es in the middle register. Just as Agnes has evoked the Wheel of Fate in her monologue, so does Orff evoke it in the music that follows her words: the “O Fortuna” chorus of *Carmina Burana* opens with a D in the bass that is answered by an E in the upper voices.

\(^{51}\) Orff, *Die Bernauerin*, 89. The ellipses are in the score to indicate breaks in the text; there are no elisions in this quotation. Original language: *Und weiter dreht’s Rad, / allens weiter und weiter. / Und werfn tut’s ihn, / und falln muass er, / der hohe Grossmächtinge. / Keiner kann bleiben, / kein einer, / kein einer. // Wann i da dran denk, / steht mir’s Herz schier still. / Und dennert: / Wann i no heunt, / heunt no in’n Abgrund / amächt miass stürzn, / ist alls doch nur, / weil i zur Höchsten stehn, …… und für dies / waar’s mir nit leid. …… Do is dös alls nit / was i sagn dir wollt, / denn dadefür kann i ka Wort / garnet findn, / nit in der heimligstn Nacht.*

\(^{52}\) Orff in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 87.
After the climax, the E pedal returns (literally a pedal now, with the introduction of the organ), and the music is interrupted by a distant tolling bell on the foreign pitch F natural. From the darkness of the stage, Agnes has one further line: “Must you ride away tomorrow? Don’t be away for long!” For this line Orff gave the instruction “as if impartial,”53 suggesting that Agnes, having shared her foreboding with Albrecht and opened her heart to him through the orchestra, has now decided to conceal what she is truly feeling. Perhaps she has perceived that Albrecht, who does not demonstrate her depth of understanding, is unable to cope with the reality. The A major music recommences at this point, now over a tonic rather than dominant pedal and sparsely scored, with all voices marked piano or pianissimo. The thirds in the high flutes, just above which A6 is sustained in violin harmonics and piccolo, hover above the bass, dominated by the organ pedal. This scene marks the only instance the organ is used excepting on the final chord of the last scene. The effect here is different than the wide registral gap in the previous scene: here it seems that the sweet music of the flutes is hovering over an abyss.

The third and fourth scenes of part 2 are spoken, and once again Agnes and Albrecht are absent from the stage. In the brief third scene, the duke’s chancellor reports that Ernst has signed the death warrant. This is perhaps the most direct allusion to the Hebbel play in Orff’s work.54 Like Hebbel’s chancellor, named Preising, Orff’s chancellor is deeply troubled by Agnes’s warrant, and as in Hebbel’s play he expresses sympathy for her. Orff’s chancellor is the only person in the work who describes Ernst sympathetically (the others who take Ernst’s side are depicted as cruel and violent), and through him we learn of Ernst’s rationale for condoning Agnes to death. Aside from the announcer at the beginning of part I, the chancellor’s monologue is the only other time in Orff’s work that the historical tumult surrounding Agnes and Albrecht’s union is described. Orff’s chancellor explains why the political unrest is exacerbated by Albrecht’s illicit marriage. This is the only instance in the libretto of an apologia for Agnes’s murder. The one instance in which Orff gave voice to the Duke’s concerns is, however, hardly sufficient to offset the sympathy he has encouraged for Agnes elsewhere in the piece. It is significant that the chancellor, and therefore the duke, is granted no music. In many cases the music of Die Bernauerin represents the emotional core of

54 Orff, Die Bernauerin, Die Bernauerin, 96; Hebbel, Agnes Bernauer, 57–59; corresponding passage in English translation, 227–229.
the work, and the authority figures are denied a part in it.

Orff’s chancellor portrays the duke as ordering the execution with a heavy heart, similar to the portrayal of Ernst in Hebbel’s play. Orff’s character says: “He spoke no word; it was hard for him, the old man. How embittered he is.”55 The chancellor’s monologue gives a drastically different picture of Duke Ernst than any other in Die Bernauerin. It is difficult to know if the chancellor, who is closely allied with Duke Ernst, is providing a reliable account. Orff’s chancellor’s partly redeems himself by showing compassion for Agnes, but he is not as strong an ally to her as Preising, his counterpart in Hebbel’s play. Although Preising remains loyal to Hebbel’s Duke Ernst and admonishes Albrecht that his marriage is against the natural order, he desperately attempts to find ways to save Agnes. At the play’s conclusion, he wishes to follow Ernst into monastic life at the Andechs. 56 Significantly, no authority figure in Orff’s Die Bernauerin—and arguably no authority figure in any other mature work of Carl Orff—demonstrates Preising’s moral conviction. Perhaps Orff’s chancellor does not attempt to intervene because he understands his own lack of agency, a pervasive theme in the works of Orff, or perhaps he is a fundamentally decent person who has become so entrenched in the dominant power structure that he has come to justify its evil acts.

The fourth scene is taken from a single line in Hebbel’s play (act 4, scene 2), a reference to a Franciscan father who is fomenting hatred of Agnes. In Orff’s scene, a fanatic monk viciously rouses public sentiment against Agnes. His grotesque opening calls of Garrit gallus (an imitation of the sound of a rooster) are punctuated by the belligerent sound of ratchets played by altar boys; this religious figure has appropriated innocent children for his wicked cause. The monk accuses Agnes of witchcraft and of entrancing Albrecht, at times using sexually degrading language. Agnes is no more a witch in Hebbel’s work than she is in Orff’s, and yet in both works many people believe the Franciscan father’s slander simply because of the patina of authority he has borrowed from his position. As the servant Stachus says in Hebbel’s play: “A reverend Franciscan father has already cursed the Bernauerin from the

55 Orff, Die Bernauerin, 96. Original language: Gredt hat er kei Wort, / schwar is ’s ihm gfalln, / dem altn Mann. / Wie er so verbittert is....
56 See Hebbel, Agnes Bernauer, 74–79 and 50–51; corresponding passages in English translation, 242–247 and 222. Note that Ernst retires to the Andechs Monastery, which in fact Albrecht III founded and where Carl Orff is buried.
pulpit; he said she is worthy of being burned alive, as it surely will be true!”

As in Orff’s early song cycle *Eliland*, the portrayal of religious authority in *Die Bernauerin* is damning. The libretto specifies that the Monk is “a bought individual” (*ein gekauftes Individuum*). This detail raises a provocative question: was the Monk hired because of his deluded beliefs, or is he simply an amoral mercenary? Whatever the Monk’s motivation, this scene is a powerful depiction of the sinister and toxic effects of demagoguery. Both Richard DCamp and Bernd Edelmann have suggested that Orff’s model in creating this scene was Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels. Regardless of whether or not Orff had anyone specifically in mind in creating the character of the monk, this scene is a scathing indictment against authority, in particular the Catholic Church.

The monk’s scene introduces the thorny question of religion and the Third Reich. At least some of the American denazification officers had serious concerns about the Church following the war. In a briefing dated 1 July 1946 titled “A Report on our Problem in Germany,” Alfred Toombs, the chief of the Intelligence Branch Office of the Director of Information Control, wrote that the German people perceived Christian churches as “an anti-Nazi influence” and that active members of the Catholic Church took “some pride in the stand of the Church against the Nazis.” Nevertheless, Toombs criticized the German Church for its

---

57 Hebbel, *Agnes Bernauer*, 58, lines 6–11; corresponding passage in English translation, 228. Original language: *Ein hochwürdiger Pater Franziskaner hat die Bernauerin schon von der Kanzel herab verflucht, er hat gesagt, sie sei wert, bei lebendigem Leibe verbrannt zu werden, da wird’s doch wohl wahr sein!* Orff’s monk also claims that Agnes is responsible for the death of the Duke’s young brother; while Stachus does not report explicitly that the reverend father made this claim, this is likely the case as Stachus believes Agnes to be the cause of the brother’s illness.

58 Score, 97. This remarkable indication was added in the last stage of Orff’s revisions and occurs only in the description of the setting at the beginning; it is not specified in the spoken text and is thus known only to those who have read the score or libretto. One may assume that Orff intended for this fact to be relayed to the audience through direction.

59 DCamp, *The Drama of Carl Orff*, 246–247 (DCamp here noted that Goebbels was Catholic); Bernd Edelmann wrote: “…or should one no longer yet recognize the rhetoric Goebbels’s diatribes behind it?!” (…oder sollte man dahinter nicht mehr noch die Rhetorik Goebbelscher Hetzdreden erkennen?!, Edelmann, “Carl Orff’s Bairisches Welttheater,” 145). One may note a certain irony between this interpretation and Goebbels’s positive assessment of *Carmina Burana* in his diaries (*Die Tagebücher von Joseph Goebbels*, ed. Elke Fröhlich, Teil II Band 13, Munich: K. G. Saur, 1995, 466, entry from Tuesday, 12 September 1944; see also Chapter 2).

60 There is a similar observation in DCamp, *The Drama of Carl Orff*, 247: “Orff could be criticizing the role played by both of the state endorsed Christian denominations in the Third Reich, but he is more obviously critical of persons in positions of power….The process of brainwashing is obviously portrayed as the crowd parrots verbatim the words of the monk, line by line.”

61 Toombs’s assessment was by no means entirely negative. He observed that “membership in the Catholic Church in Bavaria actually insulated citizens against the extreme Nazi teachings.” His criticism, however, was harsh: “The political expressions of clergymen throughout the American Zone have frequently been shocking
efforts “toward the preservation of traditional German culture” and was concerned that it represented “a dangerous, reactionary influence” and a threat to democracy. As noted earlier, Godela Orff described her father’s early break with the Church. Gertrud Willert Orff described her ex-husband as a spiritual person who had little affinity for the Church. According to Gertrud Orff’s diary, one of Orff’s early plans for Die Bernauerin included priests, sent by the Devil, making sexual advances on Agnes in her jail cell, which she rejects. This is a highly unflattering portrayal of the Church.

The monk’s vituperation is interrupted by a group of young people who decry him, which has a parallel to the White Rose’s protest against Nazism. Agnes’s advocates manage to turn enough of the malleable crowd against the monk to overtake him. In this scene, the mob seems easily persuaded, accepting rhetoric without critical thought. Public opinion is chaotically divided, with some calling for the death of the monk and others for the death of Agnes. After much of the crowd has dispersed, an old burgher who remains onstage ominously notes that the damage wrought by the monk cannot be undone: “They can kill the monk! That would be no shame. The poisonous weed—where he dropped it, there will it bear fruit.”

violations of Military Government regulations, and, in many cases, of good taste. The Church, while to a certain extent anti-Nazi, has not influenced its membership away from German nationalistic thinking….It has fought against de-Nazification, against social changes and has urged resistance against the occupying forces. All observations lead to the conclusion that, whatever the role of the Church may have been in opposing the extremes of Nazism, it represents today a dangerous, reactionary influence on German culture and its activities are a stumbling block in the way of democracy” (Alfred Toombs, “A Report on our Problem in Germany,” 21–22, David M. Levy Papers, Box 37 File 34).


Ibid., 137–139; in previous edition, 126–129; interviews with Gertrud Willert Orff in Palmer’s O Fortuna!


The leader of this group says that the Monk is “shaming to God” (gottschändrischen), similar to the White Rose’s accusation that Hitler’s use of Christian rhetoric was insincere and opportunistic. In the fourth of the six leaflets that the White Rose distributed, the resistors wrote: “Every word that comes out of Hitler’s mouth is a lie. When he says ‘peace,’ he means the war, and when he in a blasphemous manner names the Almighty, he means the power of evil, the fallen angel, Satan” (Jedes Wort, das aus Hitlers Munde kommt, ist Lüge. Wenn er Frieden sagt, meint er den Krieg, und wenn er in frevelhaftester Weise den Namen des Allmächtigen nennt, meint er die Macht des Bösen, den gefallenen Engel, den Satan—Die Flügblatter der Weißen Rose, Bremen: Dogma, 2013, 36–37). An English translation of the six leaflets of the White Rose may be accessed at http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/whiterose.html (accessed 24 November 2013).

Score, 98. Original language: Den Mönch könnt ’s erschlagen! / Kei Schad net um den. / Des giftige Unkraut, / dös wo der ausgeworfn hat, / dös geht auf. The outcome is unclear and at the end of the scene his cries of Garrit gallus are still heard from afar.
words are especially grim in light of National Socialism.

Originally, there was to be no break between the dialogue of part 2 scenes 4 and 5. After the first version of the piano reduction was printed, Orff added an instrumental interlude in F♯ minor. Again the music serves to convey the work’s emotional content. The interlude features a mournful duet for English horns, which includes such markings as *piangendo* (“weeping”) and *fleble* (“feeble”). The introverted lamentation is violently interrupted by the full orchestra, foreshadowing the violent intrusion of the duke’s men into Agnes’s chamber, before the music ends in quiet and gloomy resignation. The music at *erompente* is the only instance in the score in which all three flautists play piccolos, in unison and in the highest octave. In this passage an important figure is introduced: repeated F♯s preceded by quick G grace notes, the same figure that accompanied the death of the four moon thieves in *Der Mond*. 69

---

68 Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 100 (in this passage Orff explicitly described what he intended to convey in this interlude). See also the 1946 piano reduction. For the relevant passage, see score, pages 99–102 (also printed in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 96–99). In this passage (score, page 101; Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 98) an important figure is introduced: the same repeated F♯s preceded by quick G grace notes, as accompanied the death of the four moon thieves in *Der Mond* (although in *Der Mond* the grace note was only applied to the notes on strong beats, rather than to every note; see score of *Der Mond* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6481), 1939/1947), pages 96–97). This may be a reference to Richard Strauss’s opera *Die Frau ohne Schatten* (“The Woman without a Shadow,” Opus 65), in which the same musical figure is sung by the falcon’s voice, accompanied by high woodwinds, as a warning of impending doom that begins “How should I not weep?” (*Wie soll ich nicht weinen?*) *Die Frau ohne Schatten* was written 1914–1917 and the premiere took place in 1919 in Vienna. The libretto is by Hugo von Hofmannsthall (1874–1929). The relevant passages may be found in the score (New York: Dover Publications, 2005) on pages 41–46, 70–72, and 577.

69 This is the only use of the second English horn in the score. The indication *piangendo* is missing from the final revised score (see page 100), although it is present in the 1956 piano reduction (see page #). This is especially odd given that Orff added so many expressive indications in his last revisions and rarely rescinded any. One may wonder if this omission was an oversight, as the *piagendo* indication fits the music as well in the final version as it did previously.

70 Score, 99–102 (also printed in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 96–99). In *Der Mond* the grace note is only applied to the notes on strong beats, rather than to every note; see score of *Der Mond* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6481), 1939/1947), pages 96–97 and 105). This may be a reference to Richard Strauss’s opera *Die Frau ohne Schatten* (“The Woman without a Shadow,” Opus 65), in which the same musical figure is sung by the falcon’s voice, accompanied by high woodwinds, as a warning of impending doom that begins “How should I not weep?” (*Wie soll ich nicht weinen?*) *Die Frau ohne Schatten* was written 1914–1917 and the premiere took place in 1919 in Vienna. The libretto is by Hugo von Hofmannsthall (1874–1929). The relevant passages may be found in the score (New York: Dover Publications, 2005) on pages 41–46, 70–72, and 577.
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The fifth scene first focuses on Agnes’s frame of mind and then depicts her kidnapping by the duke’s men. Once again Agnes demonstrates that she is highly aware of what is going on around her: she notes that her silent servant girl is crying and obviously frightened by rumors from elsewhere in the castle that Agnes is a witch. We learn from Agnes’s monologue that she and Albrecht have in common not only tyrannical fathers but also deceased mothers; Agnes’s mother died so long ago that she has no memory of her.\(^71\) That both protagonists of *Die Bernauerin* have unsympathetic fathers and have lost their mothers illustrates that they come from a damaged world. Orff’s focus on the absent mothers is especially noteworthy in light of his close relationship with his mother.\(^72\)

After dismissing the servant girl, Agnes sings to herself, expressing her love for Albrecht and the pain his absence is causing her. Agnes’s lullaby is in Orff’s favorite key, D minor, the

---

\(^{71}\) Agnes tenderly remembers a quilt her mother made for the daughter’s bridal bed that was destroyed in a fire: “And I, I stand here, and think: There surely can be no bed in the world so soft and heavenly warm as that on which [lies] the quilt that your mother spun for you” (score, 103, original language: *Und i / i steh da / und denk ma: / So weich und so himmlisch warm / kann do gar kei Bett net sei auf der Welt, / als dös, aus’m Federitt, / den dir dei Muatta hat gspunna*). Motherly love was cruelly taken from Agnes twice, and she is aware of her profound loss, just as she is aware that the world is turning against her.

\(^{72}\) See Bertram Schaffner, *Fatherland: A Study of Authoritarianism in the German Family*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1948, 12–71. See Chapter 1 for more information on Orff’s relationship with his parents. It should be noted that Orff’s relationship with his father, Heinrich Orff, was fundamentally positive, according to the available evidence, and so it is unlikely that the negative portrayals of Kaspar Bernauer and Duke Ernst were influenced by Orff’s personal family experiences; rather, Duke Ernst is a distillation of Orff’s negative views of authority. An important clue as to the composer’s relationship with his father is found in the letters he wrote to Heinrich Orff from his time at the Akademie der Tonkunst through his forced service in World War I (see Thomas Rösch, *Carl Orff – Musik zu Shakespeares Ein Sommernachtstraum: Enstehung und Deutung*, Munich: Orff-Zentrum München (KAT 295-99), 2009, 12–27).
same key as the love scene in part 1, the other most intimate music in the work. Her song is interspersed with a prayer to the Virgin Mary. This lullaby stands out from the rest of the work in that it is the only time that either of the main characters sings. Bernd Edelmann has noted a parallel between Agnes’s song and Desdemona’s “Ave Maria” in Giuseppe Verdi’s Otello. In both works an innocent woman who is about to be wrongfully killed prays to the Virgin Mary as she prepares for sleep. The connection may go deeper than Edelmann acknowledged. Arrigo Boito’s libretto for Otello features a significant addition to the “Ave Maria” prayer that has a striking resemblance to the themes of fatalism and injustice in Die Bernauerin: “Pray for those who bow their heads under outrage and under the evil fate.”

Orff has ensured that the audience sympathizes wholly with Agnes: while she was enigmatically silent throughout much of the first part of Die Bernauerin, we have come to understand her through her lullaby and two monologues. The assuring D major chord on which the lullaby ends is cruelly cut off by the intrusion of the duke’s men into Agnes’s chamber. The intruders include a captain, a judge, riders, bailiffs, and the malicious monk from the previous

---

73 Godela Orff wrote that she especially loved Agnes’s song: “...I found it to be a motto for the figure of Agnes—and not only for her.” G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 84; in previous edition, 80. Original language: ...ich empfand es als Motto für die Figur des Agnes—und nicht nur für sie. Orff’s characteristic prolonged dominant pedal creates an effect of unresolved tension, as does the strained sound of the sola viola’s repeated plucking of a high A (A5) with a plectron, the effect of which is reminiscent of the tightness in the chest that accompanies weeping. The piece ends with a quotation of the ritornello from “Omnia sol temperat” in Carmina Burana, which also describes the anxiety of love, and ends on a colorfully orchestrated D major chord.

74 Agnes’s song uses a text from the Clara Hätzlerin Liederbuch (No. 11, page LXIX). The lines from the Clara Hätzlerin Liederbuch are sung and given in quotation marks in the score and libretto. They are interpolated with spoken words written by Orff. (See score, 104–110; inconsistencies in punctuation have not been retained here.) “I have love, so I have distress,” / Heavenly mother, today is so heavy for me— / “If I shun my love, then I am dead.” / Take the great pain in my heart away from me. / “Now, ere I would want to lose my love with its sorrows” / —a wall candle, decorated in gold, made of honey wax I’ll give to you— / “Rather I would have love in sorrows.” / —If only he would come home again.” Original language: „Hab ich Lieb, so hab ich Not,” / Himmelsmuatter, mir is heunt so schwaar— / „Meid ich Lieb, so bin ich tot.“ / Nimm die gross Herznot von mir. / „Nun eh ich Lieb durch Leid wollt lan,” / —a Wandkerzen, guldner verziert, aus Honigwachs tu i dir stiftn— / „Ich will ich Lieb in Leiden han.“ / —Kaam er nur wieder hoam.

75 Score, page 110; compare with Carmina Burana score, pages 25–26.

scene. Although Agnes initially remains numb (bleibt starr) as the judge reads out her warrant “in the name of the Duke, the Duke of Munich” (Im Namen des Herzogs, des Herzogs von Munich), she then finds her strength and delivers an eloquent and defiant monologue asserting her legitimacy as Duchessa and rebuking Duke Ernst, just as Kurt Huber had stood firm in his convictions in the Volksgerichtof (the People’s Court) on 19 April 1943.77

(harshly accusatorily) The Duke of Munich comes in the night—and this is his hour, the hour of violence and of darkness—that he lets an unprotected woman, all alone be ambushed quickly by bandits. This is his shame, which he does to himself; this is his shame, yet almost everything is too low. His only son, whom I, no one else but I, should make into a joker, a child of a witch? The Bernauerin has nothing to do with this. Say this to your Duke. And there you have my answer to it all. (Without having taken another look at it, she tears up the document and throws it to the ground.) Why do you just stand there? Has my speech struck you dumb? Don’t shoot bolts at me from your eyes!78

The most striking lines of Agnes’s monologue are those spoken to the judge: “Say the rest, what you yet have to; this is what they have asked of you; yes, you do it only at their behest. I make no charge against you, and heaven should forgive you.”79 These words echo the infamous Nürmberg defense, with which Nazis attempted to exonerate themselves after the fall of Hitler by claiming that they merely had been following orders and thus had no culpability in the war crimes. Is Agnes—and through her, Carl Orff—sincerely endorsing the defense that was rejected at the Nürmberg Trials? Or is she invoking it ironically? Or is she simply trying to say something that will flatter the judge in an attempt to enlist his aid? This crucial detail of interpretation is left entirely to the discretion of the director and performances; there is neither any music nor any expressive indication in the libretto to provide clues. Orff’s judge only reads

78 Orff, Die Bernauerin, page 111. Original language: [hart anklagend] Der Herzog von Munichen / kommt bei der Nacht, / —und dies is sein Stund, / die Stund der Gwalt / und der Finsternus— / da lass er / a einschichtig / alleinigs Weib / von Raubern / gaach überfalln. / Do is ihm der Schand, / die er selm si antut, / do is ihm der Schand / schier alls no z’gering. / Sein einzernen Sohn, / den soll i, / neamd anderst als i, / zum Schalk / und zum Bubn einer Hexn / ihm machn. / Da tuet die Bernauerin net mit. // Dös sagts enkerm Herzog. / Und da habts mein Antwort auf alls. ohne einen weiteren Blick darauf getan zu haben, zerreißt sie die Urkunde und wirft sie zu Boden. Was steht’s nacher da? / Hat’s d’Red euch verschlagn? / Schiasst’s net mit Bolzaun / auf mi?). The direction “harshly accusatorily” (hart anklagend) is in not in the piano reduction of the previous versions of the score (1956 version, 92).
79 Idem. Original language: Red du macher dös, / was d’sagn no muasst, / dös was s’dir habn auffragn, / tuest’s ja auf Gheiss nur. / Dir rechn i’s nit an / und der Himmel / soll’s dir vergebn.
aloud the warrant: he is a mouthpiece for Ernst. There is no indication in Orff’s text as to what the Judge himself believes: the actor and director could portray the character anywhere along the spectrum from frightened and unwilling participant to authoritarian criminal.

One may interpret the character of Orff’s judge as similar to Orff’s chancellor, who two scenes earlier was portrayed as a fundamentally decent person who was troubled about his involvement with Agnes’s murder. Further evidence for the latter interpretation is the 1957 recording of excerpts from Die Bernauerin, as Orff directed the spoken scenes. In this recording, the actress Käthe Gold (1907–1997) delivered the line in question in a compassionate tone, suggesting that Orff did have sympathy for the judge. The question of whether or not “heaven should forgive” those who are indirectly involved in Agnes’s death will be revisited in the final scene of Die Bernauerin, in which it will become evident that Orff was himself ambivalent about this difficult subject.

In contrast to the judge in Orff’s work, the stonily silent Judge Emeran (who only appears in this scene) is the only character in Hebbel’s play who serves the dramatic function of antagonist, rather than Ernst. Even in her prison cell, Hebbel’s Agnes absolves Duke Ernst, although she has never met him: “But I have no worry for myself; yes, I am not in the hands of robbers, and Duke Ernst is as just as he is strict!… No, no, my husband has not spoken of his father such that I could believe [that he would act unjustly].”

In stark contrast, Orff’s Agnes condemns Duke Ernst as the villain.

Hebbel’s portrayal of the authoritarian state is more benevolent than Orff’s in that Agnes is offered the opportunity to save her life through renouncing her love and retiring to a cloister. In Orff’s Die Bernauerin, she is given no such choice: as so often in Orff’s works, the character is completely trapped by her fate. The final words that Hebbel gave Agnes demonstrate that she is dying not just for her love, but also for her virtue: “Ask him [i.e. Albrecht], when I am gone, if he would rather curse an unworthy woman than mourn a dead

---

80 Carl Orff: Die Bernauerin, Ausszüge, Heliodor (2548 731), 1957.
81 Ibid., 75, lines 25–27 and 35–36; corresponding passage in English translation, 243. Original language: Aber für mich besorg ich nichts, ich bin ja nicht in Räuberhändeln, und Herzog Ernst ist ebenso gerecht, als streng!… Nein, nein, so hat mein Gemahl nicht von seinem Vater gesprochen, daß ich dies glauben dürfte! This suggests that Hebbel’s Albrecht is unaware of the dangerous reality of their situation, similar to Albrecht in Orff’s work.
82 Orff’s Agnes does, however, sing in her lullaby that she would choose love in pain over letting go of love to be free from pain: Orff thereby made clear that his Agnes would have made the same choice as Hebbel’s had she been granted the opportunity.
one!... My first breath was pure; my last also should be pure!\(^{83}\) While Orff’s Agnes also defends her virtue, she decries the injustice of her death with far greater force than her counterpart in Hebbel’s work. Both works portray the character as a principled and dignified woman even unto her death. While in both works Agnes is martyred for love and honor, in Orff’s, she also is martyred for freedom and justice.

During her capture, Agnes prays to the Virgin Mary for strength, reinforcing the connection between her and the Madonna. Agnes’s final words are a testament to her strength of character:

(standing, to the Judge and Bailiffs) He can force bodily death on me, Duke Ernst—not rightfully—the power I cannot fight off. But other things he is not free to do. (sibylline, as if spoken from afar) Yet for others there will be something else, it will be something else! (to the bailiffs, who want to approach her) Don’t touch me! (now wholly the Duchess) Show me the way! (She goes, followed by everyone, through the door)\(^{84}\)

In his final revisions, Orff added two significant stage directions. “Sibylline, as if spoken from afar” suggests that Agnes is channeling a great and mysterious wisdom, while “now wholly the Duchess” poignantly indicates that Agnes’s final moment on stage is one of dignity and control: it is she who leads the way in her exit.\(^{85}\)

In Orff’s *Die Bernauerin*, Agnes’s execution by drowning is not depicted onstage but rather is described by the malevolent men’s chorus of witches, who spew invective against Agnes as they gleefully watch her death. The narrative device of describing action as it is happening is known as *teichoscopia*. Orff’s work is a departure from the precedents in classical literature, in which it serves primarily as a device through which to relay character exposition.\(^{86}\) Orff’s extensive use of *teichoscopia* to relay crucially important events is one of

---

\(^{83}\) Ibid., 79, lines 8–14; corresponding passage in English translation, 246–247. Original language: *Fragt ihn, wenn ich dahin bin, ob er lieber eine Unwürdige verfluchten, als eine Tote beweinen möchte!* ... *Rein war mein erster Hauch, rein soll auch mein letzter sein!* Agnes also says: “I soon will know if it was done with justice!”


\(^{85}\) By the time Orff added this direction, he already had written *De temporum fine comoedia*, which features nine sibyls, the first of whom at one point prophesies and is answered by an echo (a recording of the same singer). There is, however, a significant difference between these two passages: Orff’s Agnes is wholly credible, while the Sibyls’ prognostications of hellfire are subsequently repudiated (as will be described in the following chapter).

\(^{86}\) While cataclysmic events often were not portrayed on stage in Greek tragedy, it is more typical that they be
his most striking uses of the Verfremdungseffekt (“alienation effect”). The use of such an unfamiliar and strange narrative device makes the scene even more disconcerting. It is clear that the witches represent the agents of evil that hunger for Agnes’s destruction and therefore serve to eradicate any sympathy the audience may yet harbor for any of her antagonists, especially Duke Ernst. The witches’ vituperation is especially disturbing given their evident sexual fixation on Agnes, as they call her a “depraved, slutty, ruined, base, bilious twat” (Scholdrige, lüdrige, lottrige, gmaint, gailinge Füttin), “horney” (bufitzinge, Bavarian for läufig, an especially degrading term as it normally signifies animals in heat), a highly vulgar slang term for the vulva (Fotz), and a “stinking, suggestive whore” (stinkicht zwiefotzte Hur). The cruel language and unhealthy attitude toward sexuality (especially coming from the composer of the Trionfi) underscores the irredeemable nature of those who destroy Agnes.

described after the fact. The practicalities of staging were likely a factor. Teichoscopia is found more frequently in poetry than in drama. The most famous instance of teichoscopia in Classical literature is in Homer’s Iliad (3.146–244) when Priam asks Helen to identify members of the Greek army as the two stand on the city walls (hence the term, which literally means “viewing from the walls”). See Homer: Iliad, Books 1–12, trans. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (the Loeb Classic Library), 1924/1999, 138–147. The Iliad dates from ca. 760–710 BCE; Homer’s dates of life are unknown. For more on teichoscopia, see Helen Lovatt, The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic, Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press, 2013, 217–250; Tim Stover: Epic & Empire in Vespasianic Rome: A New Reading of Valerius Flaccus’ Argonautica, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 207–216.

In the same year as Orff completed Die Bernauerin Benjamin Britten (1913–1976) used the device extensively in his second major opera, The Rape of Lucretia (Opus 37; libretto by Ronald Duncan, 1914–1982, after the 1931 French play Le Viol de Lucrèce by André Obey, 1892–1975). Like Die Bernauerin, Britten’s opera tells the story of a historic-mythic event in Roman history involving the destruction of an innocent woman. The opera was composed and first performed in 1946 and revised the following year. The extensive use of the chorus (a solo soprano and a solo tenor), as in Die Bernauerin, clearly evokes Greek tragedy and has a Brechtian distancing effect. (Score, London: Boone & Hawkes, Ltd., B. & H. 16289, 1949; see pages 67–89, 139–156, and 183–184. The last excerpt is especially notable for its use of parlando accompanied by non-pitched percussion, similar to the Witches’ Scene of Die Bernauerin.) In his dissertation, Scott Alan Southard has explained the teichoscopia in The Rape of Lucretia (without using the term) as a demonstration of the technique of focalization (Scott Alan Southard Focalization and masculine subjectivity in the early operas of Benjamin Britten (University of Michigan, 2011, 417–419). While not addressing Epic Theater explicitly, Southard noted that “the Chorus’s intervention allows us to maintain some distance” (ibid., 417).

While some of the texts from this scene are taken from the Clara Hätzlerin Liederbuch (LXVII–LXVIII, No. 4 and No. 6), Orff added many more sexually degrading insults of his own, demonstrating that he considered this element to be especially significant. The text quoted here is Orff’s own.

Orff’s scene seems to condemn the notion that female sexuality is somehow a threat to men, a notion that is espoused by others of Agnes’s opponents, including the monk as described above (in addition, see Orff, Die Bernauerin, 27 and 50; for more on this concept and its traditional representaion in Western music, see Susan McClary, Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, & Sexuality, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991/2002, especially around 4). Orff’s message is again a clear contrast to Hebbel, who considered his work a tragedy of beauty in which the Agnes’s demise is necessary in part because others cannot handle her beauty (see William F. Oechler, Motivation in the Drama of Friedrich Hebbel, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1948, 88; Hebbel,
This scene introduces a supernatural element to the work that will continue into the finale. It is scored for a five-part men’s chorus of witches, who rise out of the ground and disappear when the scene is over.\(^9\) Their scene is set apart by its musical language, which is unlike any other in the work: rhythmically spoken text accompanied only by pianos and a highly unusual percussion ensemble.\(^9\) While Orff had used rhythmic speech as early as his incidental music to Georg Büchner’s *Leonce und Lena* (1918–1919) and even employed it in several compositions during the Third Reich,\(^2\) the witches’ scene of *Die Bernauerin* is his most extensive and daring use of this compositional technique to date. Orff went on to create similar scenes in *Ludus de nato Infante mirificus* (*Miraculous scene of the birth of the child*, 1960) and *De temporum fine comoedia* (premiere 1973), in both instances again in the context of malevolent supernatural forces.\(^3\) At one point during the composition of *Die Bernauerin*, Orff considered adding a section within part 2 scene 4 of rhythmic speech and percussion for Agnes’s adversaries, both the monk and the *Volk*, in which they repeat the text “Down with the Bernauerin! Down with the witch!”\(^4\) This would have provided a clear connection between the

---

\(^9\) *Agnes Bernauer*, 76, lines 21–30; corresponding passage in English translation, 244—Hebbel’s passage encapsulates what today is often called rape culture.

\(^9\) Score, 112 and 130. In *Dokumentation*, Orff credited this scene as one of many in his output that would have been “unthinkable without Shakespeare” (ohne Shakespeare nicht denkbar; Orff in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 5 (1979), 219). Presumably he had in mind the Witches of *Macbeth* (ca. 1603–1607) with their eerie and peculiar use of language (see William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Macbeth*, New York: Penguin (Signet Classics), second edition, 1998, 3 and 60–61).

\(^9\) Most of the instruments in this ensemble includes several instruments unique to this scene are bass xylophone: eight various rattles, eight to ten *Steinspiel* disks (that is, small stone disks), two large wooden slit drums, a second suspended cymbal, and a small tam-tam. Among the unusual playing techniques, two high timpani are played with the hands and the two pianos on the interior, with felt timpani mallets rolled over the strings, creating a sound in which no definite pitch is discernible. At one point the pianos are also played on the keyboard. The scene also features the first suspended cymbal, crash cymbals, ratchet, bass drum, and large tam-tam.


\(^3\) At the opening of *Ludus de nato Infante mirificus* there is once again a group of Witches (as in *Die Bernauerin* played by men) expressing hostility toward the protagonist (in this case the newborn Jesus). (Score—Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (40 427), 1960, pages 1–33). While there is extensive speech over non-pitched percussion in *De temporum fine comoedia*, the writing that most resembles the Witches’ Scene is at the end of the first act as the Sibyls declare that the wicked are doomed to Gehenna (Study score (early version)—Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 5407), 1974, pp. 66–67; final version—Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 7365), 1980, pp. 66–67).

\(^4\) A page of this manuscript is reprinted in the program of a 1955 performance of *Die Bernauerin* at the Wiener Volksoper (page 4), accompanying an essay by Andreas Liess (OZM). The quoted text occurs in the scene as
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hostile crowd, as well as its leader, and the witches. Orff rescinded the idea, however, presumably so that the witches’ scene could have its own, distinct musical language. In either case, the mob scene clearly presages the poisonous attitude that leads to Agnes’s death.

The most significant lines of the witches’ scene are spoken by a solo voice in falsetto, who reports that a group of fish has assembled to watch Agnes’s execution in silence. In Dokumentation, Orff wrote that the fish represent the passive onlookers described in at least two historical accounts of the execution. When Agnes Bernauer was thrown into the Danube on 12 October 1435, a large crowd was assembled. She came up for air and screamed out for help, but no one dared intervene. The executioners then forced her under the water with large poles, pulling her by the hair. Orff’s passage from Dokumentation intersperses the descriptions from his libretto:

According to these reports the on-looking Volk dared not, out of fear for Herzog Ernst, to rescue the drowning woman.
“—in the water the fish watch everything”
They thereby stand, practically, on the side of Duke Ernst and his justice.
“—in the water the fish close their eyes”
They know and feel and take responsibility for nothing.
“The fish have swum away, none of them heard as she screamed in death.”

The issues Orff raised in Die Bernauerin were uncomfortably timely, as Germany was still undergoing the denazification process, during which time American officials placed great importance on the Germans’ acceptance of collective guilt. Orff’s remark that the silent Volk stood effectively on the side of Duke Ernst is especially damning.

written (score, 98). Original language of quotation: Nieder mit der Bernauerin, nieder mit der Hex! The sound of ratchets that opens the Monk’s scene also recurs in the Witches’ scene.

Orff in Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 130. Original language: Nach diesen Berichten wagte das zuschauende Volk aus Furcht vor Herzog Ernst nicht, die Ertrinkende zu retten. “—im Wasser die Fisch, die schaun alle zu” Es stellt sich damit gleichsam auf die Seite des Herzogs Ernst und seiner Justiz. “—im Wasser die Fisch, tun d’Augn fest zu” Sie wissen und fühlen und verantworten nichts. “D’Fisch san fortgeschwomma, hat’s koaner vernomma, wia s’gschrien hat im Tod.” It is notable that when Orff quoted Lipowsky’s description of Agnes’s death in this same passage, he omitted the final sentence: “So died, so fell Agnes as a sacrifice for Bavaria’s welfare, on Wednesday, 12 October 1435” (So starb, so fiel Agnes als ein Opfer für Baierns Wohl, am Mittwoch den 12. October, 1435; Lipowsky, Agnes Bernauerinn historisch geschildert, 37). It seems somewhat unlikely that he omitted this short sentence merely out of concern for space; rather, he may have refused to acknowledge the idea that Agnes was sacrificed for the greater good, as he rejected this idea in his work.

Much of the information in this paper about the American denazification efforts is based on documents in the David M. Levy papers, Boxes 34–37. See also Monod, Settling Scores. As to collective guilt, Alfred Toombs, expressed concern that Germans on the whole were hostile to that concept (“A Report on Our Problem in Germany,” 14). Toombs’s essay may be considered problematical due to its essentialism of the German people.
The line about the fish all watching from the water is repeated several times, and it is not until the last minute that the fish avert their eyes and swim away before they can hear Agnes’s final scream. The assembled crowd is well aware of what is happening, but they turn away at the critical moment, perhaps in the belief that if they do not witness Agnes’s death then they may escape being implicated. Orff’s depiction of the execution is entirely different from Hebbel’s, in which it is reported that the executioner refused to carry out the death sentence and that no one in the crowd was willing to do the deed. Ultimately, the judge, earlier established as the villain, had to grant one of his serfs freedom to persuade him to push her into the Danube, to the outrage of those assembled. Unlike Orff’s allegorical fish, Hebbel’s onlookers voiced their protest, albeit to no effect. Hebbel thus absolved the German people of complicity in his play, whereas Orff made their complicity absolutely clear.

Orff’s condemnation of the crowd also may be interpreted as an act of self-reproach. Godela Orff described her father as a silent observer during the Third Reich:

My father was no hero. He always went on the path with less conflict, also in this evil time; he had – like so many – simply fear. He did not possess the talent of a martyr…. …he attempted as much as possible to go out of the way of dangerous situations, and thus he also did not speak about it. He stood with deep aversion against the gruesome ideology of the Third Reich; he had seen through it from the beginning…. He was silent about it.  

Looking at the texts of father and daughter together it appears that Orff was reproaching himself in Die Bernauerin. Her statement is consistent with Orff’s personal antipathy to Nazism and his actions from the Third Reich period, as has been addressed in the preceding chapters. The extensive finale of Die Bernauerin, the longest of the work’s twelve scenes, may offer more insight into Orff’s mindset from the time of the Third Reich than any other source.

Following the witches’ imprecatory laughter that ends their scene, the Volk slowly enter a twilit field. In his final revisions to the score, Orff added the extraordinary expressive direction “anxious and with a bad conscience” (ängstlich und schuldbewußt—the latter word literally means “aware of guilt”). It is not clear if this is the same crowd that called for Agnes’s death.

97 Hebbel, Agnes Bernauer, 80; corresponding passage in English translation, 247–248.
three scenes earlier; regardless, the mutability of public opinion is striking. The citizenry show repentance almost immediately, and this too has a parallel with the aftermath of the Third Reich. Orff made his meaning clear in Dokumentation: “But from the failure to help [there] arises in the Volk, hidden, a sense of complicity.” The reference to a “failure to help” has pungent relevance to German society at the time of the Third Reich. As the White Rose wrote in their second pamphlet in the summer of 1942: “For through his [i.e., the German citizen’s] apathetic behavior he gives these evil men first the ability, thus to act.” Orff’s Volk in this final scene face precisely the same moral challenges as did he and so many in his society.

As so often in the works of Carl Orff, from his teenage years to the end of his life, the Volk are trapped and made powerless by a force beyond both their control and their understanding. The Volk are accompanied by an ominous ostinato going back and forth between B minor and D major chords, played by two pianos, bass drum, and tam-tam placed behind the scene. They perceive unknown evil forces about them. The situation becomes supernaturally terrifying as the sun begins to go dark. The chorus declaims the text, either singing or in spoken rhythm, over the chord G–B–D–F♯, with dissonant F naturals in some of the voices. The orchestra’s chord is one heard during the death of the four moon thieves in Der Mond (in the same passage, described earlier, that features the repeated F♯s with G grace notes). The chorus sings on the pitch F♯, which is also sustained in the horns: this pitch is one of Orff’s characteristically long dominant pedals, an intense preparation for the sustained

---


100 Die Flügelblatter der Weißen Rose, 22–23. Original language: Denn er gibt durch sein apathisches Verhalten diesen dunklen Menschen erst die Möglichkeit, so zu handeln….

101 Orff, Die Bernauerin, page 131.

102 Orff, Die Bernauerin, pages 131–138. While the libretto here states Beginnende Sonnenfinsternis (“beginning darkening of the sun”), this is at odds with the indication at the beginning of the scene that the setting is in twilight; presumably the sun has in fact already begun to darken. In addition, the description z’mitten am Tag (“in the middle of the day”) suggests that the action is not meant to be taking place in the evening, when twilight normally occurs. An alternate explanation for this contradiction in the libretto is that the work is allegorical rather than naturalistic, as characteristic of Carl Orff’s creations, and so such practical details are of low priority. The chorus declaims the text, either singing or in spoken rhythm, over the chord G–B–D–F♯, with dissonant F naturals in some of the voices. The orchestra’s chord is also heard during the death of the four moon thieves in Der Mond (in the same passage, described earlier, that features the repeated F♯s with G grace notes). Der Mond score, 96. This passage is preceded by the arpeggiation of the G–B–D–F♯ (in a different inversion) in the cellos and contrabasses. In the piano reduction of the 1940 version, the pitch A also occurred as a passing tone in the descending figure.

103 Orff, Der Mond, page 96. This passage is preceded by the arpeggiation of the G–B–D–F♯ (in a different inversion) in the cellos and contrabasses. In the piano reduction of the 1940 version, the pitch A also occurred as a passing tone in the descending figure.
B minor of the next section. The passage opens with an oscillating minor third, D and the dissonant F natural, in the spooky low register of the xylophone, doubled in one piano. This same minor third moves into higher octaves, reinforced by the second piano and celesta, for the ensuing crescendo, during which the antiphonally divided chorus speaks on pitch until the peak.\(^{104}\) The percussion is augmented during this crescendo, including an alarum-like tremolo in the glockenspiel’s high register.

Following the extinguishment of the sun, the previous B minor–D major ostinato returns with greater force, punctuated by a powerful blow from the tam-tam. The offstage ensemble is replaced by the orchestra, as though the distant menace has now caught up to the townspeople. The *Volk* turn their attention to the next supernatural horror: the bells have started ringing by themselves. They come to a grim conclusion as to why this is: “They make an accusation; an atrocity has been done. They have brought an innocent woman to death. Bernauerin!”\(^ {105}\)

The music to which the townspeople cry out Agnes’s name resembles the lamenting cry in *Der Mond* when the people have had the moon taken from them, another instance of the disappearance of light.\(^ {106}\) This is interrupted when a lone voice shouts, “The stars flare up; heaven is enraged!” (*D’Stern brechn aus, der Himmel verzürnt si!*). There is an irony in this apocalyptic imagery: the monk evoked the Apocalypse in condemning Agnes, implying that she would cause such a calamity, when in fact it is he and his allies who have brought about the catastrophe by advocating Agnes’s murder. Agnes’s death causes a disruption of the natural order, such that heaven is enraged and supernatural forces are causing bells to toll in accusation. This is in direct opposition to Hebbel’s text, in which it is the natural order, or at least social order, that necessitates her sacrifice.

There is a dreadful irony in the ringing of the bells: Albrecht assured Agnes that the bells

---

\(^{104}\) It is not entirely clear what Orff’s notation signifies here: the notes are written with “x” note heads on the five-line staff with clefs as the pitch F♯, whereas other rhythmically spoken passages are notated with regular note heads on single one-line staves. This suggests that the “x” note heads on the five-line staff should be between speech and singing, although it is different from the *Sprechstimme* notation (traditional note heads with an “x” through the stem).

\(^{105}\) Original language: *Anklagn tun s’, Untat is gschehgn. Unschuldi habn sie s’ zum Tod hinbracht. Bernauerin!* In his last revisions to *Die Bernauerin*, Orff underscored the words *Anklagn tun s’* with three bell plates. This is an impressive emphasis, as it marks the only time the bell plates are heard in the entire piece: the terrible revelation thus stands out from the music surrounding it. See score, pages 142–146; 1956 vocal score, pages 153–154.

\(^{106}\) *Der Mond* score, pages 40–41. Note the use of the ratchet in both passages.
would ring for her as she was welcomed. The bells do ring for her, but instead of welcoming her, they are deploring her death. The destruction of Albrecht’s dream is complete, and even his own imagery has turned against him. Here again one may note a parallel with the verismo tradition, specifically with the celebrated aria “Un bel di vedremo” (“One fine day we’ll see”) from Giacomo Puccini’s (1858–1924) Madama Butterfly.

The eponymous heroine, abandoned by her so-called husband, imagines him one day calling her name when he returns to her. This does come to pass, but in the context of her betrayal and suicide. So too in Die Bernauerin are Albrecht’s predictions realized but in a horribly twisted way, maximizing the cruelty.

Albrecht bursts onto the scene with the cry “Where is the Bernauerin?” (Wo ist die Bernauerin?). He proceeds to subject the chorus to a painfully prolonged interrogation, every answer begetting another question. The rhetoric of this section of the libretto is taken from the “Lied von der schönen Bernauerin,” with each verse ending with a repetition of the last word, preceded by ja (“yes”) for emphasis. As Albrecht interrogates the Volk, he restates the Volk’s

---

107 Even though there is relatively little use of bells in the percussion section throughout this first section (tubular bells as the sun dies and the bell plates), the ostinato has the effect of tolling: the two alternating chords are like the two alternating points to which a large bell swings, representing the bells that the townspeople are observing in horror.

108 This aria may be found in the score (New York: Dover Publications, 1990) on pages 230–240. For a literal English translation, see Nico Castel, The Complete Puccini Libretti, second edition, Volume I, Mt. Morris, New York: Leyerle Publications, 1994/2002, 333–334. The translation of the incipit is taken from this source (ibid., 333). The eponymous heroine of Madama Butterfly is convinced that her husband, Lieutenant Benjamin Franklin Pinkerton, will return to her despite his three-year absence. However, dialogue to which she was not privy in the first act makes explicit to the audience that she is tragically mistaken. She imagines Pinkerton’s return: “He will call Butterfly from far away” (Translation by Castel, 334. This passage is found in the score on page 235. Original language: Chiamerà Butterfly dalla lontana). The music of “Un bel di vedremo” is played by the orchestra as Butterfly spots Pinkerton’s ship through her telescope and again as she keeps wait for him, suggesting that in her mind she is watching her prediction come true. At the opera’s conclusion, Butterfly tells Pinkerton’s lawful American wife to instruct their inequitably shared husband to climb the hill to collect their child himself, sung to the same music as when she had imagined him climbing that same hill for a happier reunion. Immediately thereafter this music is heard in the orchestra, and later on it accompanies Pinkerton as he does indeed climb the hill. As predicted, Pinkerton calls Butterfly’s name from afar (he is offstage).

109 At this point the orchestra blares out the music to which Butterfly sang that she would sooner die than return to being a Geisha: the events described in both of Butterfly’s arias have each come to pass (see in score, respectively, pages 336–338, 397, 458–460, 461, 481–483, and 311–318. In the Castel translation see 371, 373, and 349–350. Andrew McManus initially alerted me to some of these musical connections. Similar observations may be found in Iris J. Arnesen, The Romantic World of Puccini: A New Critical Appraisal of the Operas, Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company Inc., 2009, 149, 152, and 155–157; Taruskin, The Oxford History of Western Music, Vol. 3, 668; John Bell Young, Puccini: A Listener’s Guide (Unlocking the Masters Series, No. 16), New York: Amadeus Press, 2008, 118 (Young identified a different motive here, but his interpretation is similar).
answer to each of his questions, “repeated back as if in a heavy stupor.” In a dazed state of mind, Albrecht asks questions to which he should be able to deduce the answers easily or know them already; for example, even if he does need to be told who sent the executioners, upon being told it was the duke he certainly does not need to ask the duke’s name. Dramatically, this catechism serves two functions. First, it reinforces that Albrecht lacks the insight and awareness of Agnes—how else could her abduction and murder come as a surprise to him? Second, and perhaps more importantly, Albrecht’s insistence on drawing out the discomfort of the townspeople has the effect of exacerbating their bad consciences, forcing them to acknowledge in full the enormity of what has happened.

Albrecht awakens from his dazed state when his father’s name is finally uttered. He says: “Duke Ernst, so was my father named; no longer do I have a father. The Danube has swallowed him up, [away] from me.” Not only has Albrecht rebelled against his father; his father has betrayed him. Because Duke Ernst is both Albrecht’s father and the head of state, it seems reasonable to construe his character as a representation of the Fatherland. The final scene of Die Bernauerin suggests that the idea of Fatherland had been ruined for Orff, and that he felt, to a degree, betrayed by his beloved Bavaria, the birthplace of National Socialism. Albrecht’s sense of betrayal has a parallel in the disillusionment that many German citizens, regardless of their initial opinions of Adolf Hitler, came to feel as conditions deteriorated over the course of the war. The Holocaust survivor Primo Levi (1919–1987) reported that one of his correspondents, a German woman who had been an anti-Nazi during the Third Reich, wrote to him that “for many among us words like ‘Germany’ and ‘Fatherland’ have forever lost the meaning they once had: the concept of the ‘Fatherland’ has been obliterated for us.”

The Volk proceed to comfort Albrecht by telling him that fishermen retrieved Agnes’s body and laid it in a chapel. They return to the B minor of the opening and are accompanied by a sparse ensemble with more wind instruments than strings: there are no violins, only a solo

---

110 This is yet another crucial direction added only during the last revisions. Score, 152; 1956 vocal score, 162. Original language: wie in einer schweren Betäubung nachsprechend.

111 See score, 166–167. The dramatic expressive indication for Albrecht was added in Orff’s last revisions (1956 vocal score, 170). Original language of quotation: Herzog Ernst, so hat si mein Vatern / gnennt, / kein Vatern hab i / nit mehr. / Den hat mir die Donau / verschlungen (score, 167).

viola, a solo cello, and two stands of contrabasses. The passage is marked *flebile* ("feeble") with only *piano* and *pianissimo* dynamic markings. At the end of the strophe, which is heard twice, the repeated F♯ with the grace note from Agnes’s passion music returns quietly, in one piccolo and one piano, a sound of mourning. The *Volk*, whose singing begins “as great weeping” (*wie ein großes Weinen*), are portrayed as empathetic and humane.113

Orff’s *Volk*, like him, are grey figures: they offer their sympathy to the victim of the crime in which they are implicated through their inaction. It is reasonable to suppose that, in this finale, Orff was working through his own conflict and the conflict of those like him. The emotional quality of both the music and the text in this scene suggests that these people are sincere in their remorse, whether they sided with Agnes all along or now have come to realize the error of their previous position. The innocent (in the context of the Third Reich, those who were persecuted and freedom fighters) are not included in his finale as they did not share in the dilemma, while the unrepentant and insensitive (people like the Monk and the fanatic burgher from part 1 scene 3) are excluded because they are unwilling to grapple with their consciences as Orff’s *Volk* are compelled to do.

The gentle mourning of the *Volk* gives way to Albrecht’s monologue of vengeance, recited without musical accompaniment. The language of this monologue is some of the harshest and most violent in the libretto:

> Over there, in Munich, there stands a strong castle, which now comes to my mind. The castle, it must burn ablaze, for a funeral candle I want to set fire to it.

> And all around, my city of Munich, my Munich, my much-beloved city, as penance must it burn: burn up, be reduced to ashes, burn out completely, burn out, nearly to the ground, so that the disgrace, the dishonor, and the curse will not poison the land all around. They must be uprooted from of the earth.

> Then is brought to me thence, from the burning castle, the man who is responsible for this all, and he is placed before me as prisoner. Then I look on him, I do not even recognize him; I do not know who this man has been. Then I step before him and pose the question, and pose the single question which tears [open] his ear as the cry of the Last Trump: “Where is the Bernauerin? Where is the Bernauerin?”

> The horns are blown harshly, nay, the horns of war, that they ring and blare; the drums are beaten, that they startle the dead down below; a hellish firebrand is brought along!

---

113 The indication *wie ein großes Weinen* was added in the course of the final revisions (see score, page 168; 1956 vocal score, page 171).
To Munich!  

As with the imagery of the bells earlier, the imagery of Albrecht’s love monologue is perverted with terrible irony. In part 1, he described clarion trumpets and drums, but they were warmly greeting him and Agnes, instead of raging against the murder of his wife death.  

Another reference to the earlier monologue is the phrase “my city of Munich” (mei Minkerne Stadt). This has special poignancy when one thinks back to the affection with which Albrecht used the same phrase in the earlier scene, and even more so when Albrecht refers to Munich as his “much-loved city” (vielliebe Stadt). Albrecht’s statement that he no longer acknowledges his father and his desire to destroy something so close to him makes clear the excruciating degree of the betrayal he has suffered. Albrecht’s description of the city of Munich ablaze is harrowing in any context, but would have had enormous impact when first heard in 1947 in war-devastated Germany. This grim reality is illustrated in a letter that Heinrich Sutermeister wrote to Orff in December 1946, describing a car ride with Newell Jenkins: “The main theme in the car was Die Bernauerin, which I saw for the first time in the piano reduction… We — Jenkins and I — sang through the whole Bernauerin together while we drove past the ruins of Mannheim outside of the car windows. Truly an apocalyptic ensemble.”  

At least one reviewer of the first performance took umbrage at this imagery: “we ask ourselves if Carl Orff, in the years in which he buried himself in a Bavarian monastery to study the history of the Bernauerin, did not notice that not only does the Munich of today’s people lie in rubble and ashes, but also Coventry, Oradour, and Lidice, and that we today expect more

---

114 Score, page 174. Original language: Drobn, z’Minka, / da steht a fest Burg, / die kummt mir / itzt in den Sinn. / Die Burg, die muss brennen / lichterloh, / zur Sterbkerzn / will i s’anzüdn. // Und druma herum, / mein Minkerne Stadt, / mei Minka, / mei vielliebe Stadt, / zur Sühnen / muss die mitbrennen: / aufbrennen, verbrennen, / ausbrennen ganz, / ausbrennen schier bis zum Grund, / auf dass die Schmach, / der Schimpf und der Fluch / das ringserne Land / nit vergift. // Dann holt’s mir den Mann / der dös alls hat verschuldt, / her, aus der brennendn Burg, / und stellt’s ihn / gfangner vor mi. / Dann schaug i ihn an, / derkenn ihn gar nit, / weiss nit, / wer der Mann / is gwen. / Dann tret i vor ihn / und stell die Frag, / und stell di einzerne Frag, / die ‘s Ohr ihm aufkrallt / wie der Schrei / von der letzten Pusaun: / „Wo ist die Bernauerin, / wo ist die Bernauerin?“ // Stesst’s hart in die Hörner, / die Weighörner nein, / dass s’ schelln, aufgelln, / schlagt’s Trummeln, / dass drunt die Toten / aufschreckn, / nehmt’s hellische Brandwerfer / mit! / Nach Munichen!  

115 The score gives mein, but the libretto as accompanying the CD of the Eichhorn recording gives mei; this is likely correct as mein is the wrong gender and mei is used twice immediately after.  

from a German poet.”  

Perhaps this reviewer could not believe that Orff intentionally could have written something so brutal. The reviewer omitted a crucial detail: Albrecht’s statement that his desire for destruction is meant to prevent the earth from being poisoned by the “the disgrace, the dishonor, and the curse” (die Schmach, der Schimpf und der Fluch) of Agnes’s murder. Albrecht’s plan is to cleanse through fire, reminiscent of Richard Wagner’s Der Ring des Nibelungen.

Had Orff shown his new libretto to Dr. Schaffner and his colleagues during his denazification interviews, this passage likely could have served as evidence in his favor. Each of the candidates was asked to complete forty sentences to determine his or her political attitudes. No. 20 on this questionnaire asked candidates to complete the following sentence: “The bombing of open cities in Germany was….” While Orff’s sentence completion test is regrettably missing, other surviving tests indicate that subjects who accepted the bombings as an appropriate measure in the fight against the Third Reich tended to be among the more highly rated, while those who expressed resentment did not fare as well. Given the debate surrounding the ethical justification of the Allied bombing campaigns, this question is highly contentious, and one may argue that it was excessive for the Allies to ask German citizens to grant their approbation to the destruction of their cities. In the context of Orff’s work, the threatened immolation of Munich in Die Bernauerin may not be a sign of acceptance of the recent bombings of German cities as much as a portrayal of the brutality brought on the common people by the heads of state (as happens often in Greek tragedy and the works of Shakespeare), a fact all too well known to those in the audience of this work’s first

---


118 Schaffner, Fatherland, 127.

119 Ibid., 127 (questionnaire in English) and 148, 159, 169, 181 and 190 (responses). The questionnaires from five respondents who were assigned different classifications are here printed anonymously and translated into English (the original German is not given). The two lowest classified respondents replied that the bombing was “not a civilized act” (181, rated Grey C, Unacceptable) and “the worst thing that any people in the world ever had to go through” (190, rated Black). Evidently the Americans had little sympathy for these replies. Regardless of how appropriate or inappropriate one may deem this question, the response of the Black-rated individual that the bombing was the worst experience in all of human history bespeaks a lack of sympathy and awareness for what others had suffered.

120 See, for example, A. C. Grayling, Among the Dead Cities: The History and Moral Legacy of the WWII Bombing of Civilians in Germany and Japan, New York: Walker & Co., 2006.
performances.

Following Albrecht’s monologue, the Volk drop to their knees, raise up their hands and beg for absolution: “Agnes Bernauerin, may your wretched death not now come upon us! Lord God in heaven, Lord God in heaven, reject us not, ruin us not, smash us to pieces not, trample us not, cut us to pieces not, annihilate us all not—not us all!”¹²¹ The desperation of the Volk suggests that they are aware that the absolution they seek is unattainable. They understand only too well of what German philosophy professor Karl Jaspers (1883–1969), a professor of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg who had been compelled to resign his post in 1937,¹²² called metaphysical guilt, which is “the lack of absolute solidarity with the human being as such…. This solidarity is violated by my presence at a wrong or a crime…. If it happens, and if I was there, and if I survive where the other is killed, I know from a voice within myself: I am guilty of being still alive.”¹²³ Orff likely felt that guilt was as inescapable as fate.¹²⁴ In his final stage work, as will be addressed at length in the following chapter, he expressed a philosophy in which forgiveness is unattainable and guilt will be erased only at the end of time.

At this point, there a *deus ex machina*, a common feature in the works of Carl Orff, halting Albrecht’s plan for vengeance before it has even begun. The duke’s chancellor enters

---

¹²¹ Score, pages 175–176. Original language: *Agnes Bernauerin, dein elender Tod, komm itzo nit über uns! Herrgott im Himmel, Herrgott im Himmel verwirf uns, verdirb uns, zerschlag uns, zertritt uns, zertig uns, zernicht uns nit all, nit all!* It is notable that the Witches used the same word, *elend* (“wretched”), to describe Agnes as the Volk use to describe her murder (score, 116 and 129), although the word is sufficiently common that it may not be as striking to a native speaker of the language. The percussive flourish that punctuates each of the two sentences is scored for two glockenspiels with two players each (although the first part easily could be played by one percussionist with four mallets), triangle, pianos, and a cymbal crash, which is reminiscent of the sacring-bell-like effect of the three glockenspiels in No. 24 (“Ave formosissima,” i.e. “Hail most beautiful one”) in *Carmina Burana*. The sustained chord is G–B–D–F♯, the same as the chord during the death of the sun, but without the dissonant F natural, and identical to the chord that recurs throughout their music of consolation to Albrecht. The same major seventh chord is associated with death in *Der Mond*. There is another similarity to “Ave formosissima” at the end of this passage in the chorus’s final *nit all*: the chorus’s notes are the parallel open fifths G–D and A–E, and the high winds and brass change from the G major seventh chord to an A major triad on the following downbeat. This is identical to the last two chords of “Ave formosissima,” although in the earlier piece the bass moves from G to A and here the bass is E to A. In both instances, the music is subverted on the following downbeat. See *Carmina Burana* score, pages 154–157. In *Carmina Burana* the tam-tam ushers in the return to “O Fortuna,” a sudden change of events for the worse, and so listeners to *Die Bernauerin* familiar with Orff’s most famous work may have recognized this music as setting up disaster, perhaps the destruction sworn by Albrecht.


¹²⁴ Michael H. Kater has noted that Orff suffered from persistent feelings of guilt (Michael H. Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 142). Regarding Kater’s psychiatric assessment of Carl Orff here, see Chapter 3.
with the shocking news of Duke Ernst’s death, which Orff described in Dokumentation is “as if in atonement for the murder.”\(^{125}\) The chancellor presents the ducal staff to Albrecht, who stands numbly.\(^{126}\) Orff does not indicate whether or not he accepts the it. The question of taking the staff poses a significant directorial decision in Orff’s work. If Albrecht takes the staff then this implies he willingly accepts his duty. If he does not take it, it suggests he is unwilling and highlights his powerlessness. Regardless of what choices are made in any given production, there is no indication from Orff that Albrecht is going to fight his destiny.

After Albrecht collapses to his knees, Agnes’s image appears in the clouds, dressed in the royal garb of a Duchessa. This image is another reference to Albrecht’s monologue in part I, as he imagined her name written across the sky.\(^ {127}\) While the Volk are instructed to sink to their knees without looking up at Agnes’s image in all versions of the score, in his final revisions Orff clarified that the apparition is “only visible to Albrecht” (nur Albrecht sichtbar).\(^ {128}\) That only Albrecht can see Agnes creates a sense of ambiguity: is she really there, or are we seeing a figment of Albrecht’s imagination? Or do the Volk not deserve to see her?

A wordless soprano, placed high in the theater, accompanies Agnes’s image, representing Agnes’s spirit in heaven.\(^ {129}\) In the original version of this solo, the soprano ascended to C6 as her highest pitch and descended to A5, thereby ending in the minor mode. In his final revisions, however, Orff added in two measures in which the soprano begins the final phrase on C\(^ {\#6}\) and going as high as D6, as if Agnes’s spirit is soaring aloft, liberated. The high C natural that follows is thus no longer the highest pitch; as a result, one clearly hears the change from A major to A minor as sinking, as if the spirit is being pulled downward.\(^ {130}\) The soprano


\(^{126}\) Score, 179. “The stage directions here: Er übbericht Albrecht den Herzogstab / Albrecht steht starr. (Ellipses used to separate lines in the original.)

\(^{127}\) Score, page 63.

\(^{128}\) Score, pages 179–180, 1956 vocal score, page 181. Interestingly, the libretto that accompanies the Eichhorn gives the 1956 version of the stage directions. Orff’s only indication as to how the audience is to realize that only Albrecht can see the apparition is that the crowd is not supposed to look at it, suggesting they are unaware of it. Presumably he intended for this to be further clarified by stage directors; for example, by having Albrecht react to the image while those immediately around him do not look up but rather watch his reaction with perplexity.

\(^{129}\) Orff’s initial plan at this moment was to have a reprise of the A major music from the second scene of Part II (from the beginning through the interruption by the distant bell on F4), a logical dramatic link in that it was heard the last time Albrecht saw Agnes in life, followed by the music from the end of the first part (now in A major instead of F major). For the first performances, however, Orff omitted the first lengthy reprise and replaced it with a wordless high soprano solo a cappella, also in A major.

\(^{130}\) Sinking from A major to A minor is a pervasive theme in Gustav Mahler’s (1860–1911) Sixth Symphony (1903–1904, revised 1906; Frankfurt: C. F. Kahnt (KT 4526), 1998). The gesture is perhaps not sufficiently
mysteriously trails off not only in the minor mode but on the unresolved second scale degree; perhaps Agnes’s apotheosis has not after all set everything right.

The orchestra’s solemn music is the same that concluded the first part, albeit in a different key.\textsuperscript{131} The return of this music is bittersweet. Similar to the bells that were supposed to have welcomed Agnes but only pealed after death, the love music has been transformed into a memorial. In between statements from the orchestra, the \textit{Volk}, on their knees, intone Agnes’s name very quietly and in a low register, \textit{a cappella}.\textsuperscript{132} The townspeople have the last words: they are the Greek chorus, and their tribute to Agnes, as their prayer to be absolved of guilt in her death, reflects a society’s troubled conscience. It is on the last chord that Agnes’s image disappears in the clouds.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{musical_example_4_9.png}
\caption{Musical Example 4.9. \textit{Die Bernauerin}, part 2, scene 7, original soprano solo.}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{131} There are repeated quiet strokes from three off-stage tam-tams at this point, clearly carrying the traditional connotation between that instrument and death. There are several alterations to the orchestration as well, as the texture is thicker. There is also less counterpoint (specifically, the counterpoint with the bass that is played by the clarinets, bass clarinet, and viola in the corresponding passage in Part I).
\item\textsuperscript{132} The pitch F natural is especially important given that it is the tonal area of the end of part 1 and . The F natural is especially striking after the C♯-E-F♯ in doubled timpani and two pianos, played four times in the measures immediately before the Volk’s \textit{a cappella} music (credit for this observation belongs to Andrew McManus). Although Orff did not mention Martin Greif’s (1839–1911) dramatic adaptation in \textit{Dokumentation}, it is likely he knew it as he had set one of Greif’s poems (his Opus 17 No. 1) in June 1912 (see Early Works Chart.) In Greif’s \textit{Agnes Bernauer: Der Engel von Augsburg} (“Agnes Bernauer: The Angel of Augsburg,” 1894), the final image of Greif’s work, in which the assembled people say an “Ave Maria” on their knees, resembles the final image of Orff’s. Martin Greif, \textit{Agnes Bernauer: Der Engel von Augsburg, Vaterländisches Trauerspiel}, in Martin Greifs Gesammelte Werke: Dritter Band. Dramen. Zweiter Teil, Leipzig, C. F. Amelangs Verlag, 1896: 397–474, 474.
\end{itemize}
The Early Reception of Die Bernauerin

At the time of the premiere of Die Bernauerin, a few commentators noted parallels between the end of the war and the apocalyptic finale, although they were the exception. An acknowledgment of the relation between Die Bernauerin and the devastation of postwar Germany even appeared in the program for the world premiere in Stuttgart, in an essay by Rudolf Bach: “To be sure: it is one of our tragic, overshadowed time. How much this new work of Orff’s rises from the depth of our own experience, becomes clear to all in the tremendous second act.”\(^\text{133}\) The critic Werner A. Schlippe observed not only the connection between the horrific imagery of the final scene and the destructive final years of World War II, but also the theme of guilt: “This final scene expands into an apocalyptic vision, into a retribution with guilt and atonement. It is not insignificant that this work was conceived exactly in the winter of 1944–1945, in the months of collapse and purgatory. Only from this point does the inner meaning of the piece become wholly clear.”\(^\text{134}\)

---

\(^\text{133}\) Rudolf Bach, “Carl Orff und seine Bernauerin,” essay in the program of the world premiere of Die Bernauerin (Württembergische Staatstheater, Stuttgart, 15 June 1947), 12–13. This document was accessed at the Orff-Zentrum München. Original language: Freilich: eines aus unserer tragisch überschatteten Zeit. Wie sehr diese neue Arbeit Orff’s aus der Tiefe unseres eigenen Erlebens steigt, wird vor allem in dem großartig gesteigerten zweiten Akte deutlich. As of this writing I have not found biographical information for Rudolf Bach, although he also wrote the program notes and provided Latin translations for the premiere of the 1943 Catulli Carmina (program at Orff-Zentrum München).

Orff’s musicologist colleague Eric Doflein likewise perceived in *Die Bernauerin* an "accusation against violence and injustice, a creation from the emergency of our time...." It is remarkable that such commentaries as Bach’s, Schlippe’s, and Doflein’s have been in a small minority among the writings on *Die Bernauerin*. Andreas Liess made no such comment in his 1966 book on Orff, which the composer himself supervised. Surprisingly few commentators, not even those named above, have addressed the parallel between Agnes Bernauer’s execution and that of Orff’s friend Kurt Huber, despite the dedication to Huber at the end of the score. In a newspaper review of the premiere, Paul Müller mentioned the dedication to Kurt Huber (in the context of the work’s Bavarian nature) but made no comment as to its significance, or even the circumstances of Huber’s dreadful execution. Liess duly reported the dedication *in memoriam Kurt Huber* in his book but provided no more commentary on it than he did on the dates of composition, date and location of the premiere, and instrumentation.

Remarkably, Orff’s treatment of the question of collective guilt in *Die Bernauerin* has gone almost entirely unnoted outside of Schlippe’s review of the premiere. It is in keeping with Orff’s nature that he wrote a work in which collective guilt is such an important component and yet never spoke about this matter in public. Such a discussion would have forced him to address his own regrets and shortcomings from the period of the Third Reich, a taboo subject for many individuals in postwar Germany. It is also possible that Orff felt that it would have been vulgar to call attention to his anti-authoritarian artistic statements when he had done nothing to fight National Socialism.

A possible reason that relatively few people commented on the issues of state-sanctioned atrocity, collective guilt, and societal failure in *Die Bernauerin* is that such

---

*Sinngebung des Stückes völlig verständlich.* As of this writing I have not found biographical information for Werner A. Schlippe.


137 See, however, Hill, “Der ’Gaukler aus München’: Orff in London.”

discussion was too uncomfortable. Another reason is that many people resented Orff’s success. Already his triumphs from the Third Reich were causing him to be associated with National Socialist culture. In addition, difficulties surrounding the premiere caused a distraction, as Orff was so unhappy with the production by Reinhardt Lehmann and Wilhelm Reinking that he left Stuttgart several days before the premiere, despite Godela’s excellent performance. This unfortunate event caused a rift between Orff and his conductor friend Bertil Wetzelsberger, who had led the successful premiere of *Carmina Burana*.

The Munich premiere on 6 July 1947 was substantially better than the world premiere in Stuttgart. Following this success, which garnered Orff an award of 2,500 RM from the city of Munich, the composer wrote to his student Paul Kurzbach:

...so the Munich performance, which had excellent success, was the starting point for turbulence as I had not yet experienced. It went from enthusiastic excitement, combined with a prize, to the meanest political suspicion and vituperation, the Scala of reactions.... Heinrich Strobel and Heinrich Scherchen, among others, indulge themselves in the rudest invective against me, and I do not even know why. In any case they make me out to be a complete reactionary and representative of the former time.

Heinrich Strobel’s attack on Orff came after the unfortunate premiere in Stuttgart. In his journal *Melos*, Strobel wrote a mocking imaginary dialogue between a *Kenner* (i.e. a learned person) and an *Orffiker* (clearly not intended to represent a learned person). The fictive

---


140 See letter from Hans Bergese to Erich Katz, 25 December 1947, Series 1, Carton 1, Erich Katz Collection.

Orffiker reported: “[Orff] became the center of the musical resistance movement. No German musician has given the opponents of Nazism so much of a lift on a German stage as Carl Orff in his last works that came out during the worst terror.”\footnote{Strobel, “Orffische Zwiesprach,” 297. Original language: Er wurde Mittelpunkt der musikalischen Widerstandsbewegung. Kein deutscher Musiker hat auf einer deutschen Bühne den Gegnern des Nazismus so viel Auftrieb gegeben wie Carl Orff in seinen letzten Werken, die während des schlimmsten Terrors herauskamen. Perhaps this quotation is alluding to the anti-authoritarian undertones of Die Kluge. It is ironic that Strobel made no mention of the fact that Die Bernauerin, the work he was reviewing so ungenerously, was arguably Orff’s strongest anti-Nazi statement to date, as will be addressed in the following chapter.} It seems likely that Strobel was referring to Die Kluge here. While Strobel previously had defended both Orff and his friend Egk from the charges that they had written National Socialist music,\footnote{See Heinrich Strobel, untitled article, Melos: Zeitschrift für neue Musik, Heft 1/14. Jahr, November 1946:1–5, 4–5: “Carl Orff and Werner Egk stood clearly at odds with the drill regulations of the Party. In their music one can find everything but the heroic whinnying of party stallions” (original language: Carl Orff und Werner Egk standen in klarem Widerspruch zum Exerzierreglement der Partei. In ihrer Musik kann man alles eher entdecken als das heroische Wiehern des Parteihengstes).} here he saw fit to mock Orff’s advocates who, as alluded to in Chapter 3, were painting the composer as a resister.

Werner Egk described the situation to Gottfried von Einem:

Concerning little Carl, he has gone through lots of difficulty. Die Bernauerin has had about 80% scorching or mediocre reviews in Stuttgart. The performance in Munich was excellent but opinions were very divided despite powerfully successful opening nights. It’s embarrassing that Strobel laughed himself to death over this “higher Bavarian idiocy,” as he openly declared. Great enmity of the master against this wretched scribbler. It seems that an anti-Orff front is forming with [Hans Heinz] Stuckenschmidt, Strobel, the Munich Hartmann [i.e. Karl Amadeus Hartmann], and other not entirely unimportant musicians. Also our friend [Boris] Blacher seems not to be very delighted over the youngest children of the Orffian muse.\footnote{Letter from Werner Egk to Gottfried von Einem, 11 July 1947, Ana 410, BSB HSL. Original language: Was Carlchen betriﬀt, so hat er eine Menge Schweres durchgemacht. Die Bernauerin hat etwa 80% Verrisse oder mässige Besprechungen in Stuttgart gehabt. In München war die Aufführung hervorragend aber die Meinungen trotz starken Premieren Erfolge sehr geteilt. Peinlich ist, dass Strobel sich über diesen „höheren bayerischen Blödsinn“, wie er öffentlich verkündet hat totgelacht hat. Grosse Feindschaft des Meisters gegen diesen elenden Skribenten. Es scheint sich eine Anti Orff Front zu formieren mit Stuckenschmidt, Strobel, den Münchner Hartmann und anderen nicht ganz unwichtigen Musikern. Auch unser Freund Blacher scheint nicht sehr entzückt über die jungsten Kinder der Orffschen Muse (spacing modernized). As of this writing, I have found no evidence that Hans Heinz Stuckenschmidt was hostile to Orff. It is significant that Egk, despite his personal problems with Orff from that time, chided Strobel for being “a bloody dilettante as an Orffian” (als Orffiker ein blutiger Dilletant) in a letter dated 12 January 1948 (BSB HSL, Ana 410).} In fact Karl Amadeus Hartmann resented both Orff and Egk for their prominent positions.\footnote{Barbara Haas, Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Zeitzeugen und Dokumente. Zum 100. Geburtstag des Komponisten, Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel Verlag (Heinrichshofen-Bücher), 2004, 57–58; Barbara Haas, “Die Münchner Komponisten-Trias: Das nicht immer unproblematische Verhältnis zwischen Orff, Egk und Hartmann,” in Karl Amadeus Hartmann: Komponist im Widerstreit, ed. Ulrich Dibelius, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004:228–250, 246–249.} Hartmann, who had spent the 12 years of National Socialism in a state of inner...
emigration, wrote of his frustration to Hans Ferdinand Redlich, Orff’s former pupil who had gone into exile in England. In August 1947 Hartmann wrote:

In Munich the first music prize of the city was given out — to Herr Carl Orff. What do you say to that? This summer a Bavarian piece, *Die Bernauerin*, was performed; nasty tongues, to which mine also belongs, said *Die Braunauerin* [evoking *Braun* (brown), the color associated with National Socialism]. At least one must admire that this gentleman is capable [i.e. of succeeding] in all circumstances.”

The last sentence makes very clear that Hartmann was aware that Orff was highly adept at navigating perilous waters. Hartmann’s tone suggests that, in his judgment, Orff had done so at the expense of his honor. In November 1947, Egk alluded to mean-spirited *Braunauerin* comments in a letter to Heinrich Strobel, in which he reported that a British radio program had summed up Bavarian cultural politics with the names of Bavarian cultural minister Alois Hundhammer (1900–1974), the politician Jakob Fischbacher (1886–1972) of the Bayernpartei (Bavarian Party), and Carl Orff. The comparison to the right-wing Hundhammer is especially unflattering. In *Fatherland*, Bertram Schaffner criticized Hundhammer for his decision to reinstate corporal punishment in schools, which had been rejected in most other parts of Germany, and for his regressive views on gender roles.

The degree to which Hartmann and the other “nasty tongues” were unwilling to see *Die Bernauerin* as any sort of statement against Nazism is suggested by the wordplay with *Braunauerin*, evoking *Braun* (brown), the color associated with National Socialism. In February 1948, Hartmann lamented to Redlich that Orff had won another award, the Thuringian state prize, for *Die Bernauerin*, and made clear that he considered Orff to be aligned with National Socialist culture: “What do you say, dear friend of our old comrade Carl Orff?...Oh God! How poor we are….Please! Two prizes in one year, we still live entirely under the Nazis’ machinations!” On the same day, Hartmann wrote to Egon Wellesz, a Jewish

---


148 Letter from Karl Amadeus Hartmann to Hans Ferdinand Redlich, 1 February 1948, cited in idem. Original language: Was sagen Sie, lieber Freund zu unserem alten Zunftgenossen Carl Orff? ... — Oh Gott! Wie sind wir arm....Bitte! 2 Preise in einem Jahr, wir leben noch ganz unter den nazistischen Machenschaften! Zunftgenossen
Austrian composer who had emigrated to England: “The public thinks with longing on the last 12 years, art for the Volk: that was beautiful, that the philistine could join in. Therefore a completely inartistic person, like Orff, is covered today with honors. When one sees all of these impossibilities…it drives one to despair, and it seems dreadful to live with this German Volk.” While Wellesz did not mention Orff in his response to Hartmann, Redlich seems to have been no more sympathetic to Orff than Hartmann. He was amused at the play on words with Braunauerin and wrote to Hartmann: “People do not write the best things about Orff here [i.e. in England] and I can well imagine your concerns about him. He talks out of both sides of his mouth.”

Redlich’s account, which corroborates the negative characterization of Egk had heard on English radio, suggests that some of Orff’s colleagues were aware that he was willing to attempt to win the favor of those in power regardless of whether their beliefs aligned with his own.

Based on the correspondence in Orff’s estate, it appears that he and Redlich never resumed contact after 1934. Orff and Hartmann, however, salvaged their relationship in the years after the war. Hartmann dedicated the revised version of his opera Simplicius

---


150 Letter from Hans Ferdinand Redlich to Karl Amadeus Hartmann, 14 September 1947, BSB HSL, Ana 407. Original language of quotation: Orff ist hier nicht zum besten angeschrieben und ich kann mir gut die Bedenken vorstellen, die Sie gegen ihn haben. Er läßt halt kalt und warm aus einem Munde. In a letter from the same archival source dated 18 November 1947, Redlich told Hartmann that he was under the impression that Schott Music had an affinity for former Nazis and Nazi sympathizers, repeated Hartmann’s sarcastic reference to Orff as an “our old comrade” (unser alter Zunftgenosse), implied that he shared Hartmann’s resentment of Orff’s success, and reiterated Orff’s bad reputation in England. Letter response from Wellesz that does not mention Orff is in the same archival source, dated 20 February 1948. (Information according to BSB, 19 November 2014.)

151 The Nachlass of Carl Orff contains correspondence between Orff and Redlich from 1930 through 1934 (information according to OZM, 6 November 2014).

152 According to Gertrud Orff’s diary, the two men began meeting in 1948 (information according to OZM, 12 September 2014). See also Hass, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, 62–67; Haas, “Die Münchner Komponisten-Trias, 246–249.
*Simplicissimus* to Orff, which is especially significant given that the work originated in the early years of the Third Reich and is a clear protest against the ravages of war and tyranny.\(^{153}\)

As quoted in Chapter 1, Hartmann wrote Orff a kind letter of sympathy following Paula Orff’s death in 1960, in which he wrote that, as both composers were very close to their mothers, “I can therefore especially sympathize with the entire gravity of the loss.”\(^{154}\) Hartmann’s son, Richard (b. 1935), included a tribute from Orff in a memorial volume for his father, which Orff, as with the Huber letter, addressed to the deceased directly.\(^{155}\)

While Hartmann’s letter suggests that it was Orff’s success during the Third Reich that prompted him and others to add the word “brown” into the title of *Die Bernauerin*, Orff’s actions during the period of denazification also may have clouded what others thought of his new work. Orff participated in Werner Egk’s denazification trial in 1947 with evident reservation, as Hans Bergese reported to Erich Katz:

> It is interesting, by the way, that Master Orff answered the interview, conducted by a denazification interrogator, so ambiguously, as the written record of his statement reads, that Egk has only the National Socialist press to thank for his successes, thus not his artistic prowess, as all witnesses…said in unison. Orff himself did not even appear at the trial to stand by his “friend”…. One can still say that his behavior in the entire matter was more than strange.\(^{156}\)

Prior to this trial, Orff had extended an invitation to Egk and his wife Elisabeth to spend Christmas Eve with him and Newell Jenkins in 1945, suggesting that at least initially he had tried to help Egk. Two weeks later, however, Jenkins informed Orff that he saw little possibility to help Egk, who around the same time wrote to Strobel that he was sorely

---

\(^{153}\) See dedication page of Karl Amadeus Hartmann, *Simplicius Simplicissimus*, Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 5019), 1957/1960. The libretto to Hartmann’s opera is by the composer with Wolfgang Petzet and Hermann Scherchen, based on the work of the same name by Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen (1621–1676).

\(^{154}\) BSB HSL, Ana 407, Briefe von Karl Amadeus Hartmann an Carl Orff. This letter does not have an exact date. Original language: Ich…kann daher die ganze Schwere des Verlustes besonders mitempfinden.

\(^{155}\) Orff’s tribute to Hartmann is printed in Renata Wagner, Margot Attenkofer, and Helmut Hell, *Karl Amadeus Hartmann und die Musica Viva: Essays, bisher unveröffentliche Briefe an Hartmann Katalog* (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Ausstellungs-Kataloge. 21), Schott/Piper & Co. Verlag, München (ED 6929), 1980, 94. See ibid., 353 for information on the original publication.

disappointed that Jenkins was not doing more for him.\footnote{Letter from Newell O. Jenkins to Carl Orff, 7 January 1947, National Archives, Records of United States Occupation Headquarters, World War II (Record Group 260), Entry A1 1681: Correspondence and Related Records, 1945–1949, Box 928; letter from Werner Egk to Heinrich Strobel, 16 January 1946 (reverse side of first page), Ana 410, BSB HSL.}

There is evidence that Orff may have tried to do more for Egk than previously has been acknowledged. After Egk’s denazification trial, Orff wrote to his director friend Oscar Fritz Schuh (1904–1984), who was working in Austria that time. He told Schuh that Egk’s career was no longer in danger, but that the trial had been an enormous strain on him: “I ask you to attempt everything to help him somehow. A production abroad would be of great use to him.” Orff also reported that Egk’s unhappy situation had had an adverse effect on their relationship: “In my humble opinion, lately he has made many mistakes out of understandable nervousness; I even reproached him about it, on account of which he is angry with me.”\footnote{Letter from Carl Orff to Oscar Fritz Schuh, 17 December 1947, AK, COS/OZM (information according to OZM, 20 November 2014). Original language (both quotations; there is no break in the text in the original): Ich bitte Dich, alles zu versuchen, um ihm irgendwie zu helfen. Eine Aufführung draussen würde von grossem Nutzen sein. Meinem unmassgeblichen Dafürhalten hat er in letzter Zeit aus begreiflicher Nervosität viele Fehler gemacht, ich habe es ihm auch vorgehalten, worüber er mir zürnt. Orff asked that this matter be kept confidential (he used the phrase unter uns gesagt, i.e. “just between us”).}

Under the peculiar and uneasy circumstances of denazification, it is difficult to know how to interpret this strange and contradictory evidence other than to note that, in this case, personal relationships were suffering during the upheaval.

The complications do not end here. Despite Orff’s attempt to intervene with Schuh, Egk again had reason to be upset with Orff following the denazification trial. Characteristically averse to controversy, Orff did not speak out on Egk’s behalf, and in favor of free artistic expression, when Egk’s ballet \textit{Abraxas}, based of Heinrich Heine’s dance-poem \textit{Der Doktor Faust}, was censored by Alois Hundhammer on the grounds that its subject matter may be offensive to Catholics.\footnote{See the five folders of materials (including newspaper articles and correspondence) regarding the \textit{Abraxas} ban in BSB HSL, Ana 410 (Nachlass Werner Egk).} In December 1947, Egk told Gottfried von Einem of his suspicion that “little Carl” (\textit{Carlchen}) may have sabotaged the possibility for a production of \textit{Abraxas} in Milan,\footnote{Letter from Werner Egk to Gottfried von Einem, 30 December 1947, BSB HSL, Ana 410. At this writing, I have not found evidence to corroborate Egk’s suspicions.} although (presumably unknown to Egk) a few days before Orff had written to Heinrich Sutermeister: “Based on the score, I consider this [\textit{Abraxas}] to be Egk’s best
work.” In May 1948, Egk informed von Einem that “little Carl” was not invited to the party following the world premiere of the controversial ballet. In the late winter of 1949, Egk wrote to both Heinrich Strobel and von Einem that Orff was one of only two people who had not expressed their support for him in public, again sarcastically referring to “our dear little Carl” (unser liebes Carlchen) with von Einem. These conflicts notwithstanding, Orff and Egk seem to have reconciled eventually.

Egk was not the only person whom Orff disappointed during the denazification era. When Hans Meissner was interned following the war, his wife sent two letters to Orff in the summer 1946 asking him to intervene on her husband’s behalf. There is no record that Orff responded to these letters, nor to a letter from Meissner from a year later. Orff and Meissner did, however correspond in the mid–1950s. Orff experienced other interpersonal difficulties in the years following the Third Reich. His relationship with Hans Bergese also deteriorated at this time. Bergese had been under enormous strain, as he had spent six years at the front and a year and a half in American captivity. After the war, Bergese felt that Orff had not sufficiently credited him for his work on Musik der Landschaft (Music of the Landscape), their project with Kurt Huber. Although Bergese is credited on the publication as the arranger for piano, he felt that this was not sufficient recognition. He wrote to Erich Katz in December 1947 that Orff “really [had] swindled my intellectual property” in their last publication, presumably Musik der Landschaft. At this writing, it is difficult to know the extent of Bergese’s involvement in this project. In the same letter to Katz, Bergese wrote that he agreed

---

161 Letter from Carl Orff to Heinrich Sutermeister, 25 December 1947, BSB HSL, Fasc. germ. 1, Nr. 1–144, Nr. 65. Original language: Der Partitur nach halte ich dies für Egks bestes Werk. Orff wrote that he had been unable to attend a performance, to his regret, but mentioned nothing of the ban. The other person who failed to support Egk, according to these letters, was the director and Intendant Alois Johannes Lippl (1903–1957).
162 Werner Egk to Gottfried von Einem, 14 May 1948, BSB HSL, Ana 410.
163 Letter from Werner Egk to Heinrich Strobel, 26 February 1949; letter from Werner Egk to Gottfried von Einem, 7 February or March 2014 (quotation; it is difficult to determine if a 2 is typed over a 3 or vice versa for the date in the month position), BSB HSL, Ana 410.
165 The letters from Hansi Meissner to Carl Orff are dated 15 June and 19 July 1946; the letter from Meissner is dated 1 July 1947. The OZM archive contains correspondence between Orff and Meissner from 1953 to 1956 (information according to OZM, 5 November 2014). See also Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 140.
166 Regarding Bergese, see letter from Hans Berges to Erich Katz, 10 November 1946, Series 1, Carton 1, Erich Katz Collection; Kater, Composers of the Nazi Era, 140–141.
with Strobel’s negative assessment of *Die Bernauerin*. It is striking that at least two of Orff’s most important working relationships, those with Egk and Bergese, suffered in the immediate aftermath of World War II. No doubt the strain of this time was taking its toll on all involved.

*Die Bernauerin in the Context of Post–World War II Germany*

The troubled personal situations of Carl Orff and the people in his life at the end of the war add a personal dimension to the *Volk*’s anxiety at the conclusion of *Die Bernauerin*. Orff’s work presents a bleak view of the future. There is no indication as to how Albrecht and the *Volk* will be able to reconstruct their lives. There is a definite sense that justice has been thwarted by the sudden and unexplained death of Ernst. The second poem Orff selected for his *Carmina Burana* warns the king sitting atop the Wheel of Fate of his inevitable downfall, but in *Die Bernauerin* Orff presents a case in which the ascent is at least as cruel as the fall. Perhaps the closest link between Orff’s and Hebbel’s works is their shared fatalism. In Hebbel’s play Duke Ernst sadly invokes the Wheel of Fate after Agnes’s death: “The great wheel has rolled over her – now she is with him who turns it.”

Just as Fate overtakes Agnes in both Orff’s and Hebbel’s works, so too in both works does it overtake Albrecht. He is stripped of his agency even as he is put into a position of power—ironically, the very position of authority against which he had rebelled. While Hebbel’s Albrecht is given the chance to reconcile with his father and is persuaded into

---


169 Orff described Ernst’s early death as just punishment for Agnes’s death, demonstrating the degree to which he considered Ernst to be culpable (Orff in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 6, 14). Nevertheless, there is a sense of aborted justice at the end of his work.

170 *Carmina Burana* score, pages 14–17.


172 In the program to the 1968 American premiere of *Die Bernauerin* (performed as *The Ballad of Agnes Bernauer* at the University of Missouri-Kansas City), Fritz Andre Kracht (1926–2005), who staged the work and whose authorized English translation was used for the performance, wrote: “The work ends with a touch of dark irony: at the very moment young Albrecht, consumed with horror and pain, decides to march on Munich and destroy the forces which caused the death of an innocent, he learns that the Duke has died and that he, as prince of Bavaria, is now vested with the same powers which caused death and destruction to Agnes and to him” (program accessed at OZM).
accepting his duty, Orff’s Albrecht is given no opportunity to come to terms with what has happened. Just as there is no indication that he is going to fight against his new position as duke, there is no indication that he has made his peace with Agnes’s death and his father’s betrayal. Orff thereby suggested that, while German society would continue on after the fall of the Third Reich, it had to do so without forgiveness or resolution.

The Volk’s plea for absolution makes far more sense in the context of an allegory for National Socialism than in the historical context of Agnes Bernauer’s execution. In a system of hereditary monarchy in 1435, there was hardly any way for a peasant to prevent a state execution or to make amends for it afterward, although the image of the gawking crowd, as represented by the fish in the witches’ scene, remains disturbing. Nor did the people in 1435 have any say in who ruled them, in contrast to the National Socialists’ democratic ascent to power (albeit with about 33% of the vote in 1933). In the Third Reich, resistance was possible although highly dangerous: in addition to such underground organizations as the White Rose, there were many individuals who helped to protect Jews and other victims of Nazi persecution.

At the end of Die Bernauerin there is no indication that the grey Volk (let alone those who may have been vehemently against Agnes) will receive the absolution for which they plead, and it is unclear if they deserve to. Orff’s work suggests that he was himself ambivalent. His perspective was most likely affected by his fatalistic worldview. Nevertheless, the desperation of the Volk’s plea for absolution demonstrates that he did not hold his society, or himself, to be innocent. In his late revisions to the score, he clarified that the Volk are “aware of guilt” (schuldbewußt). This brings to mind the White Rose’s second leaflet from the summer of 1942: “And not only compassion must he [i.e. the German citizen] feel, no, yet much more: complicity…. Everyone wants to be absolved of such complicity, everyone does it and sleeps again with the calmest, best conscience. But he cannot be absolved, everyone is guilty, guilty, guilty!”

175 Die Flügelblatter der Weißen Rose, 22–23. Original language: Und nicht nur Mitleid muß er empfinden, nein, noch viel mehr: Mitschuld….Ein jeder will sich von einer solchen Mitschuld freisprechen, ein jeder tut es und
Although Orff acknowledged his and many of his fellow Germans’ complicity, the portrayal of the Volk in the last scene of Die Bernauerin is sympathetic. It seems that Orff was asking for compassion for the large segment of German society that, like him, inhabited a grey zone during the Third Reich. Orff’s implicit plea for some degree of sympathy is a contentious matter. Many victims of National Socialist crimes have stated that they blame Germany on the whole and have no intention to forgive.\(^{176}\) Recent scholarship, however, has challenged the paradigm of universal German guilt and acknowledged the suffering many German citizens experienced during World War II.\(^{177}\) To acknowledge this fact in no way diminishes the suffering of the direct victims of the Third Reich’s crimes against humanity. According to Orff, extending compassion to grey figures like him need not entail absolution. The devastation at the end of Die Bernauerin suggests that Orff did not believe that such absolution was even possible.

At the time he composed Die Bernauerin, Orff was not the only composer for the stage addressing the issue of societal culpability. In 1945, Benjamin Britten (1913–1976) completed his opera Peter Grimes (Opus 33).\(^{178}\) Both Peter Grimes and Die Bernauerin depict the conflict between the individual and the collective, and in both works the chorus is a central character.


\(^{177}\) See Dagmar Barnouw, The War in the Empty Air: Victims, Perpetrators, and Postwar Germans, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005. See also Bill Niven, ed., Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany, New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006; Giles MacDonogh, After the Reich: The Brutal History of the Allies Occupation, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Basic Books (Perseus Book Group), 2007; Grayling, Among the Dead Cities; Jans, trans. Robinson, “Behind the Scenes,” 699–700. It must emphatically be noted that acknowledging the suffering of German citizens during the Third Reich in no way excuses the crimes of National Socialism. To say that acknowledging the suffering of one group detracts from the suffering of another is a fallacy, as well as inhumane.

Both works feature mob scenes and take a strong stance in the individual’s favor. Orff’s work, however, does not have the moral ambiguity of Peter Grimes, in which the society portrayed features no unflawed characters, even the protagonist. For the pacifist Britten from victorious England,\textsuperscript{179} war cannot be a clear matter of right versus wrong (rather, all sides are wrong), and so it is fitting that no character in his opera in his opera is clearly in the right. In Orff’s work, in contrast, Agnes is in the right while Ernst is unequivocally the antagonist. While the ending of Die Bernauerin portrays a repentant citizenry, the denizens of Britten’s borough demonstrate absolutely no self-awareness at the close of the opera; they begin another ordinary day mere hours after they had been a lynch mob. Perhaps Britten saw that most people in his society were unaware of the harm that the Allies had caused over the course of the war,\textsuperscript{180} while Orff and his fellow Germans who had not been persecuted by National Socialism were forced to face the atrocities that had been committed in their names.

While Carl Orff did not fight against the Third Reich or discuss that painful subject matter in public in the years following World War II, Die Bernauerin appears to be a statement of opposition to National Socialist tyranny through allegory. The vehicle was another atrocity that took place in Orff’s native Bavaria 500 years earlier, onto which he projected the issues of societal failure and collective guilt that were weighing on his conscience. By subverting Hebbel’s message that the natural order at times demands the sacrifice of the individual, Orff clearly expressed opposition to such a worldview. While Orff’s early work Gisei expresses the horror of the sacrifice of an innocent, the tone is primarily one of fatalistic resignation. Die Bernauerin, in contrast, expresses a sense of outrage against the injustice, as signified by the disruption of the natural order. Die Bernauerin is at once Orff’s expression of penitence, his plea for compassion for grey figures, and his statement of protest against injustice, which he could only make after the Third Reich had fallen.


\textsuperscript{180} This moral question remains even if one concludes that the Allies’ actions were necessary to defeat the Axis powers.
Both Orff’s and Hebbel’s works begin around the time of Agnes and Albrecht’s meeting (although Hebbel’s begins slightly earlier).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orff Part 1, Scene 1</th>
<th>Hebbel Act I 5, 7, and 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnes is reserved in her interactions, especially with Albrecht, and seems not to want to be the object of romantic interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 1, Scene 2</td>
<td>Hebbel Act II, Scenes 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albrecht’s friends warn him of the potential danger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 1, Scene 5</td>
<td>Hebbel Act IV, Scene 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note certain similarities in the imagery of these two scenes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 2</td>
<td>Hebbel Act II, Scene 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes makes reference to fate (Schicksal).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 2</td>
<td>Hebbel Act V, Scene 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to the Wheel of Fate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 3</td>
<td>Hebbel Act IV, Scenes 1 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chancellor’s monologue, expressing concern over the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 4</td>
<td>Hebbel Act IV, Scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fanatic Monk in Orff’s scene may be traced to Stachus’s account of a Franciscan father condemning Agnes and turning the populace against her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 5</td>
<td>Hebbel Act IV, Scene 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes alone; see also Törring’s play, Act II Scene 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 5</td>
<td>Hebbel Act V, Scene 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes before the judge. In both scenes, she demands that her captors not touch her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 7</td>
<td>Hebbel Act V, Scene 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albrecht enters calling out Agnes’s name. In Orff’s work, he later explicitly uses her name as a battle cry. Albrecht expresses his desire to wreak mass havoc to avenge Agnes’s murder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orff Part 2, Scene 7</td>
<td>Hebbel Act V, Scene 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albrecht is presented with ducal staff and is reluctant to accept it (based on Orff’s direction that Albrecht remains numb).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Parallels between Carl Orff’s *Die Bernauerin* and Friedrich Hebbel’s *Agnes Bernauer*
CHAPTER 5
CARL ORFF AND THE END OF TIMES:
Responses to the Third Reich Era in Carl Orff’s Post-1945 Works

You must go on, that’s all I know.
—Samuel Beckett (1906–1989), The Unnamable (1953)¹

After the curious and chaotic process of denazification had run its course, German society rebuilt itself and began the painful and lengthy process of coming to terms with the past.² For the remainder of his life, Carl Orff rarely spoke of the Third Reich in his public statements. On the occasions he did address his actions from the National Socialist Era, he oversimplified his complicated relationship to the Third Reich, highlighting his early professional difficulties and omitting the many successes that outweighed them.³ In his artistic statements, however, there are signs that Orff was not at peace with his past actions, as he continued to explore the themes of injustice, guilt, and societal failure with which he grappled in Die Bernauerin. Orff’s three Greek tragedies, to be described below, likewise deal with injustice and the disastrous effects of the failings of those in power. Orff’s final major composition, De temporum fine comoedia (Play on the End of Times), first performed on 20 August 1973 at the Salzburg Festival, is a philosophical exploration of the nature of guilt and, more significantly, absolution. It is in some ways a wish fulfillment, depicting relief from all suffering, but there is a darker implication to this work that has not been noted in the previous literature: the idea of forgiveness is entirely absent.

The highly guarded Orff expressed himself in abstract, even cryptic, terms in De temporum fine comoedia, which is arguably his most personal work, leaving his audience to draw their own conclusions as to how it may apply to them either as individuals or as a society. The available evidence suggests that Orff intended this work as the culmination of his creative output for the

² See, for example, Martha Sprigge, Abilities to Mourn: Musical Commemoration in the German Democratic Republic (1945–1989), dissertation, University of Chicago, 2013.
theater; he lived for eight and a half years after the premiere and seems never to have considered writing another work for the stage. It was at this point that he began work on *Dokumentation*, chronicling his life and works.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how Orff’s postwar compositions reflect his experiences during the Third Reich. This subject is omitted in the work of his contemporary biographers and is addressed only fleetingly in the previous literature. The following examination of Orff’s work during this critical period will demonstrate that the composer’s conscience was far more troubled than some scholars have maintained. This is reflected not only in his choice of subject matter following World War II, but also in the somber tone of many of his compositions with the exception of *Astituli*, his mordant satire of human fallibility. This chapter will address Orff’s *Astituli*, his three severe settings of Greek tragedy, and *De temporum fine comoedia*, the last of which is the chapter’s primary focus.

**Carl Orff’s Post–WWII Musical Style**

On 8 January 1947, Carl Orff wrote to his pupil Heinrich Sutermeister: “*Die Bernauerin*, in which you could take a look, is the last piece in the series of my earlier work; *Antigonae* starts a new phase.” While the subject matter toward which Orff gravitated following World War II is similar to that of his earlier works, the tone is markedly different. Orff’s compositions from this period are less often tempered by the sardonic humor and burlesque tone of his five major works that came into being during the Nazi period, with *Astituli* being the most prominent exception. Tuneful melody is replaced by vocal declamation alternating with melisma and extremely percussive instrumental writing.

---

4 An example from the scholarly literature is Otto Karner, *Komponisten unterm Hakenkreuz: Sieben Komponistenportraits während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, dissertation, Universität Wien, 2002, 265 (Karner, however, described *De temporum fine comoedia* in terms of forgiveness, a concept absent form the work).

5 For instance, David Monod has listed Orff among the artists who, following the Third Reich, “believed they and their art were victims of Nazi oppression: they congratulated themselves for carrying on through the dark years and…were proud of having—through their repertoire choices—preserved their integrity” (David Monod, *Settling Scores: German Music, Denazification, and the Americans, 1945–1953*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005, 259).

6 Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Handschriftenlesesaal (hereafter BSB HSL), letters from Carl Orff to Heinrich Sutermeister (Fasc. germ. 1 Nr. 1–144), Nr. 59, 8 January 1947. Original language: *Die “Bernauerin” in die Sie einen Blick werfen konnten, ist das letzte Stück in der Reihe meiner früheren Werke, ist der Antigone geht ein neuer Abschnitt an.*
No doubt there were several factors that affected Orff’s changes in style following World War II. It is possible that Orff was cognizant of a need to distance himself from the style with which he had found favor during the period of National Socialism. Given that Orff was trying to distance himself from the Third Reich, it is not surprising that he turned away from the aesthetic of Carmina Burana toward one that was less in keeping with the National Socialist ideals of accessibility and nearness to the Volk. As noted in Chapter 2, when Orff reissued his 1930 Werfel cantatas in 1968, he omitted the prefatory note that his works “should lead from the subjectivity and the alienation of the individual to a binding, public, universal feeling of community.” During the Third Reich, Orff had seen the dark side of community feeling, especially as it pertains to undermining individual subjectivity. At no point, however, did he make any statement distancing himself from his works from the period of the Third Reich.

It is highly likely that some of the changes to Orff’s style were a result of the removal of the pressures of totalitarianism, although he did not embrace the high modernism of the Darmstadt School. Orff’s postwar aesthetic was objectionable to at least one totalitarian government: the Soviet Union. As the ideals of Socialist Realism began to pervade East Germany, his Antigonae, in the American scholar Joy Haslam Calico’s description, became “the token example of musical formalism [i.e. the opposite of Socialist Realist ideals] in official

7 Richard DCamp has speculated that the change was due to the fact that Orff no longer was able to show his music to Huber, and suggested that perhaps Huber’s influence on Orff’s music was more significant than previously has been acknowledged. Given the lack of documentation of Orff’s and Huber’s creative relationship outside of their work on folk music, DCamp’s theory cannot be verified. Richard DCamp took Orff’s reported statement to Clara Huber on learning her husband’s death—“I am ruined; I will never be able to compose again” (Ich bin ruiniert, ich werde nie wieder komponieren können)—to mean that the composer was afraid that he was dependent on Huber for his work, rather than that he was afraid of being implicated through association. (The two concerns are not, of course, mutually exclusive.) See The Drama of Carl Orff: From “Unerwünscht” to Post-Modernity, dissertation, University of Iowa, 1995, UMI Company Microform 9536168, 88 and 91. Regardless of whether or not the loss of Huber was a factor in Orff’s stylistic changes, it is highly likely that there were other factors at work.
8 I am thankful to Professor Steven Whiting for our discussions on this subject.
9 This passage appears in all three of the Werfel Cantatas published as three volumes of Orff’s Werkbuch I by B. Schott’s Söhne (Mainz) in 1931: I. Veni Creator Spiritus (“Come, creative spirit,” Schott ED 3261, BSS 33058), II. Der gute Mensch (“The good man,” Schott ED 3262, BSS 33094), III. Fremde sind wir (Schott ED 3267, BSS 33518). It is reprinted in Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 67. Original language: von dem Subjektivismus und der Isoliertheit des Einzelnen zu einem bindenden allgemein gültigen Gemeinschaftsempfinden führen soll. See also Chapter 2 at note 121.
10 The exception is the 1939 version of Ein Sommernachtstraum, but he continued to revise this project after World War II (see Chapter 2).
resolutions since 1949.”  Antigonae was deemed “unmelodic, even repulsive, and full of noise.” Antigonae was paired in its denunciation with the 1951 opera Das Verhör des Lukullus (The Trial of Lucullus) by Paul Dessau (1894–1979) and Bertolt Brecht. Part of the judgment against Dessau’s opera was that the orchestra lacked the “noble” sound of the violins and featured unusual percussion and a prepared piano—characteristics very similar to Orff’s Greek tragedies.  

In addition to the absence of totalitarian restrictions, it is possible that Orff felt the need to reflect the great traumas of the Third Reich and the war through his art. Orff’s severe settings of Greek tragedy and his arcane De temporum fine comoedia may be considered among the post–World War II works of European art music that reflect the horror of the recent past through their dark subject matter and modernist musical language. The examples of this range from Bernd Alois Zimmermann’s (1918–1970) nihilistic opera Die Soldaten (The Soldiers, 1957–1965) in Germany, Luigi Nono’s (1924–1990) Il canto sospeso (The Suspended Song, 1955–1956) in Italy, and Benjamin Britten’s (1913–1976) War Requiem (Opus 66, 1961) in England. In this regard, Orff does not stand “apart from the mainstream of the history of music” to the degree that Paul Henry Lang claimed in criticizing his compositional style. It is surprising that commentators and even his official biographers rarely made the obvious connection between Orff’s postwar compositions and the cataclysmic events of the Third Reich and World War II.  

Orff’s stylistic changes following World War II do not represent as drastic a difference as one finds between the works of his late teenage years and the style he adopted in the Werfel and Brecht cantatas of 1930 and 1931. Nor is it as drastic as those between the so-called “Russian,” “neo-classical,” and “serial” phases of Igor Stravinsky’s oeuvre. Although his music became less

---

13 See Nicolas Slonimsky, Music Since 1900, 5th edition, New York: Macmillan (Schirmer Books), 1994, 571. The word “noble” comes from a review that Slonimsky quotes, unfortunately without giving the original language.
14 *Die Soldaten* (score: Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, ED 6343, 1975) was first performed in 1965. It is based on a 1776 play by Jakob Michael Reinhold Lenz (1751–1792). The texts of *Il canto sospeso* are taken from letters by opponents of fascism who had been condemned to death (see Luigi Nono, *Il canto sospeso*, Edition Eulenburg No. 8029, 1957, III–X). *War Requiem* interpolates the Latin *Missa pro defunctis* (Mass for the dead) with the poetry of Wilfred Owen (1893–1918), who was killed in battle exactly one week before the Armistice (11 November 1918). Britten wrote this work for the reopening of the bombed out Coventry Cathedral on 30 May 1962.
inviting to the casual listener, it retained many of Orff’s defining compositional techniques, including his use of ostinato and often declamatory text setting. Because the success of Carmina Burana had secured his prominence and financial security, he could afford to take greater risks in his subsequent works, in terms of the demands on both performers and listeners.

Part of Orff’s rationale for the style of his post-World War II compositions, specifically the Greek tragedies, is found in an episode from his early life. In Dokumentation, Orff described attending a performance of Richard Strauss’s Elektra (Opus 58, 1908–1909) in 1914, shortly before his nineteenth birthday. While he “was again moved, gripped, and entranced by this magnificent work,” he nevertheless felt that Elektra was as much an endpoint (Endpunkt) as a high point (Höhepunkt): “The highly chromatic orchestra in Elektra…runs the risk of drowning out the singers’ voices, thus putting the intelligibility of the text in question. It was clear to me that a new musical ensemble must be found, which could restore the word again to its central importance on the stage.”16 As early as Carmina Burana, Orff achieved this goal by eliminating counterpoint and instrumental countermelodies (largely inspired by the writings of Curt Sachs), and his postwar compositions employ monody even more heavily.17 Orff’s unusual vocal writing often uses long stretches of repetitions of the same pitch, punctuated by bursts of fast melisma. Following Die Bernauerin, Orff’s music often employs static pedal notes in lieu of extended ostinato patterns, although the latter still occur. The musical background for the textual declamation thus has become even more static. In this texture, the voice is heard clearly.

Many of Orff’s choices in his instrumental writing may be explained by the value he placed on textual clarity and his desire to create an alternative aesthetic to the romanticism of Strauss. Of the conventional bowed string instruments, only contrabasses are employed in Orff’s other postwar compositions, with frequent use of harmonics (although he had favored this effect as early as Carmina Burana).18 In lieu of the standard string section, the backbone of the

---

18 Orff’s Easter and Christmas plays (respectively Comoedia de Christi Resurrectione, “Play of Christ’s Resurrection,” 1955 and Ludus de nato Infante mirificus, “Miraculous scene of the Child’s birth,” 1960) are both
traditional orchestra, Orff’s instrumental ensembles are centered on percussion, often with special emphasis on marimba and various kinds of xylophone. The percussion forces include several pianos in all cases excepting *Austutuli*. The increased importance of percussion, especially non-pitched percussion (including a wide variety of drums), mirrors the increased importance of rhythmic speech. Thus the witches’ scene in *Die Bernauerin*, as described in the previous chapter, may be seen as a watershed. Likewise are the several sections of *Die Bernauerin* without the high strings in keeping with Orff’s postwar instrumental ensembles. *Austutuli*, as noted previously, predominantly features spoken dialogue or rhythmic speech with percussion accompaniment.

Although the word “orchestra” technically applies to large instrumental ensembles of any composition, the sonic world Orff created in his post-WWII ensembles (excepting those with traditional strings) are so far removed from the sound of the standard orchestra, especially as conceived in the nineteenth century Austro-German tradition, that this word seems inappropriate.\(^{19}\) While the use of four pianos in *Les noces* is a unique instance in Igor Stravinsky’s output, the use of more than two pianos is common in Orff’s works. The Sophocles-Hölderlin tragedies are the most drastic example with six grand pianos each, a distinction they share with the early Franz Werfel setting *Des Turmes Auferstehung (The Resurrection of the Tower)* of 1921.\(^{20}\) Orff’s instrumentation list for *De temporum fine comoedia* specifies 25–30 percussionists. While the beginning of the score of *Antigonae* specifies a mere 10–15 percussionists, this was a gross underestimate on the composer’s part, as one passage in this Greek tragedy requires 32 players.\(^{21}\) Not only are these percussion sections enormous; they are scored for pianos, harps, organ, contrabasses, and percussion, and the latter work also for piccolo. The three Greek tragedies, the Schiller settings, and *De temporum fine comoedia* have similarly constituted ensembles, with the addition of varying sections of wind instruments. only two of Orff’s post-WWII works feature the traditional string section: the relatively early *Trionfo di Afrodite* (which was completed in 1951 and still features three pianos and a massive percussion section) and the final two versions of *Ein Sommernachtstraum*, the latter of which retains some elements of the earlier versions from the Third Reich era and therefore do not entirely belong to the period in question.


\(^{20}\) *Des Turmes Auferstehung* was first performed on 6 December 1995. The score of *Des Turmes Auferstehung* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, 1995) is the only of Orff’s works to have six pianos and a full string section—with extra cellos and contrabasses at that. This likely explains why, as of this writing, the work, alas, has only had one performance.

\(^{21}\) See the score of *Antigonae*, Figure 303. This figure assumes that the “a3” indication for the crash cymbals at Figure 295 still applies, that all the trough-xylophones are being played, that the two xylophone parts may be played
also highly unusual in their configuration, as Orff employed a wide array of non-Western percussion instruments in his ensembles. No doubt the incorporation of such instruments was made easier by the fall of the Third Reich.

Orff’s writing for pianos and percussion from this period also frequently calls for playing techniques that were still unusual at the time, some of which have remained so. Notably, the strings of the pianos are frequently struck with various percussion implements. The traditional string section is often absent. In most of these cases, the score eschews clarinets, bassoons, horns, and tuba.\(^{22}\) *De temporum fine comoedia* is the only one of Orff’s works from this era to employ horns and clarinets while abjuring the standard string section. The way these instruments are employed is hardly typical of the Romantic tradition, however, especially given that some passages feature six clarinets in E-flat, an extremely strident, and unusual, choice in instrumentation.\(^{23}\) The six horns in this work serve to expand the brass section; at no point did Orff see fit to include expressive horn solos or the majestic writing idiomatic to the orchestral horn in the nineteenth century. Werner Thomas wrote that Orff’s rationale for omitting clarinets and horns from *Des Turmes Auferstehung* was that clarinets and horns are the “romantic” instruments, reasoning which may apply equally to the post-World War II works.\(^{24}\) The sounds of Orff’s post-World War II compositions are even more drastically removed from the Romantic tradition—and, indeed, from conventional Western orchestral and vocal writing—than *Des Turmes Auferstehung*, or even *Carmina Burana*.\(^{25}\)

A further important innovation in Orff’s sonic world following World War II is his use of recorded music (on tape, the technology available to him at the time). While Orff was one of

by one musician, and that one percussionist with two mallets in each hand may strike two of the glockenspiels simultaneously.

\(^{22}\) The exceptions are *De temporum fine comoedia* and the revised version of *Astutuli*, with its tuba oom-pahs in the finale. In addition to the instruments described later in this paragraph, *De temporum fine comoedia* also features a contrabassoon in Act 1.

\(^{23}\) In the 1974 and 1979 versions of the score, one passage in Act 1 is scored for six flutes and six clarinets in B♭, marking the only time that all six clarinets are on the more conventional instrument. In his final revisions, however, Orff evidently decided that the passage was insufficiently shrill, and so he substituted six piccolos and six E♭ clarinets. Although the sound itself is not “romantic,” such strident effects long since had infiltrated into traditionally romantic orchestras, notably in the works of Gustav Mahler (1860–1911). I thank Kevin Fitzgerald for drawing my attention to this important distinction.


\(^{25}\) As Attfield has written of the instrumentation in the Sophocles-Hölderlin tragedies: “None of these [instruments] is present, though, for its melodic capabilities. Rather, each is used almost exclusively for percussive purposes, for choked gasps of tone colour alone” (Attfield, “Re-staging the Welttheater,” 358).
many composers of his day to use this technique, he did not explore the new sounds of electronics in the vein of Edgar Varèse, Pierre Schaeffer (1910–1995), Milton Babbitt (1916–2011), or Mario Davidovsky (b. 1934). Rather, Orff used this technological innovation to expand the acoustic space of his stage works.\textsuperscript{26} The use of taped music creates an effect of distance without the difficulty of setting up ensembles offstage, which may pose problems of space in smaller theaters. The use of tape also obviates the need for musicians to move between the orchestra pit and the wings (as he had called for as far back as \textit{Gisei} in 1913), or for their numbers to be increased for live performance.

Orff is one of many twentieth-century composers who, although he did not abandon tonality for the high modernism of such composers as Pierre Boulez (b. 1925) or Karlheinz Stockhausen (1928–2007), was not in the strictest sense a tonal composer. After World War II, he largely abandoned the diatonicism of \textit{Carmina Burana}. Nicholas Attfield has written of the Sophocles-Hölderlin tragedies that, while the music is triadically rooted, “there are…few perceivable functional [emphasis in original] relationships between tones or harmonies…and no desire to resolve dissonance. Instead, Orff’s technique is to pile mainly diatonic pitches, often with one or more chromatic barbs.”\textsuperscript{27}

Orff’s use of “chromatic barbs” is not new to his postwar style. As early as \textit{Carmina Burana}, he often inserted clashing pitches into a few voices, creating just a hint of dissonance (although in this case the dissonances are most often part of the diatonic collection). Starting with \textit{Antigonae}, however, “barbs” occur with increased frequency. Throughout act 1 of \textit{De temporum fine comoedia}, for example, chromatic clusters frequently are added to pedal tones and chords, thereby thickening the texture. Polychords are frequently used throughout the Greek tragedies and \textit{De temporum fine comoedia}, often with added chromatic dissonance. Often, the bass note is the fifth scale degree of one of the triads therein, thus possibly implying a cadential second inversion chord. Orff’s penchant for prolonged dominant pedals and nonfunctional second-inversion chords is traceable all the way to 1911 with the song cycle \textit{Eliland} and occurs in his music as late as \textit{De temporum fine comoedia}. Orff’s dissonances do not function as in

\textsuperscript{26}This characterization is indebted to Andrew McManus.

traditional Western tonal music; rather, they are blocks of sound in a noncontrapuntal context. The blocks of sound usually change at such a slow rate that it is difficult to perceive any harmonic progression.

As for melodic lines, Orff’s scores often employ an idiosyncratic mixture of chromaticism and octatonicism, sometimes with subsets of different octatonic scales, and less frequently Phrygian and Locrian scales. In his postwar music, Orff gravitated toward specific chords, pitches, and pitch collections that recur throughout many of his scores. In particular he was drawn to the trichord B♭–C–D♭ and collections containing these pitches. He even added a three-note cluster of these pitches into Der Mond in a postwar revision. In addition to mixing octatonic and chromatic collections, Orff’s scores also often mix tetrachords or trichords from different octatonic collections. Starting with Trionfo di Afrodite, he often used the pitches C–D♭–E♭–F–G♭–A♭–B♭ in melismas: this collection takes an 0134 tetrachord from one octatonic collection and an 013 trichord from another, resulting in the unusual heptachord 0134689. Orff’s penchant for octatonicism is evident as early as Nos. 12 and 15 of Carmina Burana. This is not, however, the earliest instance in which such musical language may be found in Orff’s music. As different as his teenage Lieder sound from Orff’s mature compositions, the 0134689 collection may in fact be traced back to 1910. In Orff’s early song “Die Närrin” (described in Chapter 1), the 0134689 collection occurs in the first two of the song’s three varied strophes in the form of an ascending scale (musical example 5.1). Variants of the 0134689 collection occur in several of Orff’s post–World War II works, including Trionfi di Afrodite, Oedipus der Tyrann, Ludus de nato Infante mirificus, and De temporum fine comoedia (musical examples 5.2–5.5).


28 Der Mond study score (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6481), 1939/1947), 241. This version of the score is the 1970 revision (although the date of publication is not updated).
29 See Chapter 2 for more on the harmonic language of Carmina Burana.
30 See Chapter 1 for more information on this song. This manuscript may be viewed at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Musikelesaal (Orff ms. 31). The relevant passages are respectively in mm. 18–19, 22–24, 51–52, and 55–57.


Musical Example 5.5. *De temporum fine comoedia*, opening of act 1 (vocal line only). 0134689 collection centered on F.

Orff’s unorthodoxly quasi-octatonic heptachord also is found in a work that fascinated the composer: Maurice Ravel’s (1875–1937) *Boléro* (1928). According to Orff’s student Wilfried Hiller, “the central grave song of *Antigonae*, a tango dance of death, is based on the melody of Ravel’s *Boléro*.31 An examination of the relevant passages in the two scores reveals that Orff took the first three pitches (his favored trichord, B♭–C–D♭) of the second theme (the first departure in the piece from the principal theme, played in the bassoon’s high register).32 In


32 The tango rhythm that pervades Antigonae’s lament is a repeated C major chord with an added D, the same chord in the ostinato of *Boléro* at this moment. Another connection between Ravel’s score and Orff’s postwar music is found in the remainder of the phrase of which Orff quotes the opening notes. The bassoon finishes its phrase with a descending scalar figure, D♭–C–B♭–A♭–G–F–E: 0134689 (in the version for two pianos (Paris: Durand (D. & F. 11,828), 1930) this passage occurs on p. 4 at mm. 6–10 of Figure 2)32 That Orff’s use of this heptachord predates
Ravel’s work, this passage concludes with a descending 0134689 heptachord.\textsuperscript{33} “Die Närin” demonstrates that Orff had discovered the 0134689 before Boléro was composed, but the fact that the collection, with Orff’s favored pitches, occurs in the same passage from Ravel’s work that Orff quoted in Antigoneae is unlikely a coincidence; rather, Ravel’s work likely reinforced his penchant for unusual octaonically based collections. In any case, that Orff drew from Ravel and tango reveals that his musical interests and influences extended beyond what many of his contemporary biographers noted in their writings.\textsuperscript{34}

![Musical Example 5.6](image)

**Musical example 5.6.** Maurice Ravel, *Boléro*. Note the 0134689 collection in the bassoon.

*Boléro* demonstrates that he did not discover this collection in Ravel, but nonetheless the fact that Orff’s quotation involves a pitch collection that was to become so important in his subsequent works suggests a further reaching impact of Ravel’s work.

\textsuperscript{33} The bassoon finishes its phrase with a descending scalar figure, D♭–C–B♭–A♭–G–F–E: 0134689 (in the version for two pianos (Paris: Durand (D. & F. 11,828), 1930) this passage occurs on p. 4 at mm. 6–10 of Figure 2).

\textsuperscript{34} See also Hiller’s commentary in Hiller, “Selbstporträt in Künstler-Begegnungen,” 317; Attfield, “Re-staging the Welttheater,” 364–368.
Musical example 5.7. Antigonae, Antigonae’s grave song. Note the same rising B♭–C–D♭ as the bassoon solo in Boléro, including the emphasis on D♭. Note also that in both cases the ostinato uses the pitches C–D–E–G (a subset of the pitches of the C and D triads, similar to the underpinning of Carmina Burana).
No Lessons Learned: Carl Orff’s Parable of Human Fallibility in Astutuli

After Die Bernauerin, Orff wrote another Bavarian play, a mordant satirical comedy called Astutuli, which was first performed on 20 October 1953 in Munich. The name is the diminutive plural form of the Latin astutus ("clever"), and may be translated as The Clever Little Ones. The use of the diminutive here is demeaning and ironic, as Werner Thomas clarified: “‘Astutuli’ are the reasonably clever people who believe themselves to be particularly clever.”

These people are easily conned by a stranger who takes advantage of their willingness to follow him even as he impoverishes them. Astutuli is a satirical presentation of something that Orff depicted in Die Bernauerin: the gullibility of the masses. While the demonic figure who leads the people astray in Astutuli is not a hateful demagogue like Adolf Hitler, the mass persuasion satirized in Astutuli is the same phenomenon that allowed the rise of National Socialism.

Orff created his own libretto, again using the Bavarian dialect. Astutuli consists

35 Andreas Liess described Astutuli as the satyr play to the tragedy of Die Bernauerin. Andreas Liess, Carl Orff: Idee und Werk (Zürich: Atlantis Musikbuch-Verlag, 1977, 117; in English translation by Adelheid and Herbert Parkin, Carl Orff: His Life and Music, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1966, 116. The practice of following tragedies with a satyr play comes from Ancient Greek drama. While in fact the word “satire” does not derive from the word “satyr,” the satyr play, because of its coarse and biting nature, has been associated with satire.

36 Original language: »Astutuli« sind die ziemlich Schauen, die glauben, besonders gewitzt zu sein. This definition comes from Dr. Werner Thomas’s “Übersetzungen und Worterklärungen,” which accompanies Carl Orff, Bairisches Welttheater, Munich: Süddeutscher Verlag, VIII. This publication is a reprint of the libretti of Die Bernauerin, Astutuli, Ludus de nato Infante mirificus, and Comedia de Christi Resurrectione. No year is given, but the publication does give an ISBN 37991 57026. It should be noted that the Latin astutus either can have a positive connotation of shrewdness or a negative connotation of cunning deception; in the latter definition, the word applies to the Gagler, although hardly with the diminutive form.

37 Before the “show” begins, a burgher tries to convince a second burgher, who is highly reluctant, to join him in attendance. The man is eventually persuaded, and early on says that he does not see the giant Onuphri that the others claim to see, and his less prudent friend (that is, the first burgher) admits that he doesn’t either. In fact, there is nothing there; the others have succumbed to the Gagler’s power of suggestion. The initially reluctant man, who seems to be the only truly “clever” person in the town, then says “I wish I were at home in bed” (Ich liegert am liebern daheim in meim Bett; Car Orff, Astutuli, 1953 score, 8). Yet he has no more lines after this: what has happened to him? Has he been caught up in the deception with the rest of the crowd?

primarily of spoken text and is scored for voices, percussion ensemble, and two brass instruments.\(^{39}\) The fatuous townspeople are swindled out of their clothing by a Gagler, the Bavarian word for Gaukler (a traveling entertainer or storyteller). The Gagler announces that only those who are clever will have insight into the play, and that those who are stupid should stay at home, therefore encouraging people to pretend they see the things that he describes. The Gagler convinces people to take off their clothes, which he promptly steals, by presenting them with exquisite, but imaginary, garments. The townspeople realize that they have been deceived long after the culprit is out of reach, and they are quick to assign blame to anyone but themselves. They take no responsibility for their own gullibility. The Gagler returns and, unsurprisingly, dupes them all over again.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of Astutuli is that the few attempts of the townspeople to resist the Mephistophelean Gagler fail.\(^{40}\) Furthermore, when the Gagler returns after his successful swindle, the townspeople initially resist his new claim that a goldsmith with alchemic powers has arrived in town. For a moment it looks like they have learned to resist, but it takes little persuasion for their greed to trump their skepticism. This view of a populace easily duped again and again by self-anointed experts who cynically exploit the public for personal gain has obvious parallels with the Third Reich, although the parallels are not as strong as those in Die Bernauerin. Astutuli is a more general statement about human fallibility.

While there is clearly an element of social commentary in Astutuli, Orff was loath to acknowledge it in his public statements. In his authorized biography of Orff, Andreas Liess wrote of this work: “Orff placed no value on the actuality of the work as a satire on mass suggestion and illusionism. Consequently, there were eight years between composition [1945–1946] and first performance [1953].”\(^{41}\) In this curious and cryptic statement, Liess presumably meant to say that the performance was delayed to prevent it from being perceived as a commentary on Hitler, although Liess took great pains not to mention the Third Reich explicitly.

\(^{39}\) The brass instruments are not present in the original version of the score. See Dokumentation, Vol. VII (1981), 242–254, compared with the previous score (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, 1953, ED 4314/BSS 38 592), 81–93.

\(^{40}\) This apt term (in German mephistopholischem) was used by Michael Schanze in an interview about playing the Gagler in 2007 (Astutuli DVD, 2009).

\(^{41}\) Liess, trans. Parkins, Carl Orff; 116. In original German: Orff legte keinen Wert auf den Schlagschatten der “Aktualität” dieses Werkes als einer Satire auf Massensuggestion und Illusionismus. So verstrichen acht Jahre zwischen Komposition und Uraufführung (Liess, Carl Orff, 117). That Liess wrote that Astutuli was composed 1945–1946 and that eight years elapsed before the 1953 premiere suggests that he was counting the “delay” as having starting at the beginning rather than at the end of the compositional process; yet another oddity in this passage.
The statement is even stranger considering that its timeline is inaccurate. Orff began work on Astutuli in 1946 but did not finish it for several years thereafter, and his correspondence with Heinrich Sutermeister confirms this fact.\textsuperscript{42} Even if Liess’s statement had been accurate, eight years is hardly sufficient time for the Third Reich to have faded from Germany’s national consciousness—in fact, it has not faded from the national consciousness in almost 70 years. This remarkable passage demonstrates that Orff and Liess preferred to deny the possibility reading of Astutuli as a satire about the Third Reich rather than use it as an opportunity to portray the composer as a dissident, albeit after the fact.

The undertones in Astutuli have not gone entirely unnoticed, however. The American scholar Carl Brennan has described the work as an “allegorical tale slyly criticizing Hitler and the Third Reich.”\textsuperscript{43} Matthew Gurewitsch, in an article about Orff’s works around the time of his centennial, followed Liess’s erroneous dating but flatly contradicted his claim that Astutuli was not intended as a political allegory: “Astutuli, conceived as an attack on Hitler, was completed in 1945 but not performed until 1953, the fall of the Reich having rendered it, for the interim, painfully redundant.”\textsuperscript{44} There is a telling implication in Gurewitsch’s statement, namely that the work’s value is diminished, perhaps even vitiated, because it could not serve as a statement of resistance during the Third Reich—a statement that could apply equally to Die Bernauerin. While indeed it was written too late to serve as a warning for Germany, the message of Astutuli is, alas, always timely.

Astutuli is another of Orff’s scathing criticisms of authority, as well as an indictment of mass gullibility. The town officials are misled just as easily as the rest of the crowd. The mayor,

\textsuperscript{42} Dokumentation, Vol. 6, 271. In several letters of 1947, Orff referred to the composition of Astutuli in letters to Heinrich Sutermeister (BSB HSL, Fasc. germ. 1 Nr. 1–144). On 2 February (Nr. 60) he wrote that he intended to finish Astutuli, and on 7 March (Nr. 62) he wrote that the text was completed. On 18 August (Nr. 64) he wrote that the work would be completed “soon” (demnächst). Sutermeister inquired in a to Orff letter dated 29 July 1950 (Nr. 145) “about your new children” (über Ihre neuen Kinder), mentioning that he had heard from “Uncle Ludwig” (Onkel Ludwig)—presumably their published Ludwig Strecker, Jr.—that Astutuli and Trionfi were both still in progress. He inquired as to whether Astutuli was completed in a letter dated 13 October (Nr. 146) of the same year.
\textsuperscript{44} Matthew Gurewitsch, “Cosmic Chants,” The Atlantic Monthly (276, 2), August 1995 (90–93), 93. Gurewitsch provided no evidence for his assertion of Orff’s intent. It should be noted that this sentence immediately precedes the article’s bizarre concluding sentence: “The most haunting clue [of Orff’s political affiliation] may be a photograph of Carl, age three, holding a tin drum.” This insinuation contradicts the preceding characterization of Astutuli as “an attack on Hitler.” It is likewise notable that, earlier in the paragraph, the author added the following disclaimer: “I have not studied Orff’s biography in depth.…“
who is reminiscent of the ineffectual drunkard of a mayor in Der Mond, is given the absurd and obscene name Jörg Zaglstecher, a combination of two Bavarian vulgar slang words for “penis” (Zagel and Stecher). In his opening monologue of deception, the Gagler says: “Before Emperor and Pope I’ve played this play, which they know well, and much drive it on, and play it themselves, and they watch it, and they always take pleasure in it!” At first, the Gagler seems to be complimenting the Emperor and Pope for being among “the clever ones” (die Witzigen), those privileged people who are able to understand the play. As the action progresses, however, it becomes apparent that this is a backhanded compliment, consistent with Orff’s generally negative portrayal of authority. The play depicts an action of malicious deception, of taking cruel advantage of the gullible. If these eminent authority figures are familiar with the play and take pleasure in it, then they must condone taking advantage of people. If they perform it themselves, then they too are culprits.

The most daring scene in Astutuli is when the townspeople realize that they have been robbed and attack the Gagler’s two accomplices, who ward them off by breaking the fourth wall. They point out that the audience has been observing the trickery and laughing at the townspeople’s misfortune. This statement provokes a prolonged scene in which the townspeople shout angrily at the audience. The townspeople’s reaction is another example of their refusal to acknowledge their foolishness, but there is a more disturbing aspect. Orff has implicated his audience in the crime of the Gagler. Not only is the audience doing nothing to help, like the gaping fish watching Agnes Bernauerin’s execution, but they are taking pleasure at the suffering of others. While Orff’s contemporary audiences clearly were implicated along with the Volk in Die Bernauerin, that implication is far more explicit in Astutuli with the vituperative breaking of the fourth wall. At the 1953 premiere, the condemnation from onstage was too much for the Munich audience; reportedly, people were genuinely distressed at being accused of complicity in the Gagler’s crimes. Perhaps they understood the analogy to the Third Reich and its unpleasant implications.

---

45 I am grateful to Elke Kramer for assisting me with this translation (email correspondence from 17 February 2014).
47 Idem.
48 Interview with Dr. Hellmuth Matiasek, Astutuli DVD, 2009.
The Fall of Heroes and the Injustice of the Gods: Carl Orff’s Greek Tragedies

As Orff was working on *Die Bernauerin* and *Astituli*, he also was planning his *Antigonae*, his interpretation of the tragedy by Sophocles. *Antigonae* is the quintessential drama of the conflict between the individual and the collective and therefore has a strong parallel to *Die Bernauerin*. Orff was aware that Friedrich Hebbel considered his play *Agnes Bernauer* to be a “modern Antigonae,” and it is no coincidence that he was drawn to both stories at the same time. Orff composed *Antigonae* between 1940 and 1949, and the premiere took place at the Salzburg festival on 9 August 1949. This was the beginning of a trilogy of Greek tragedies, all of which are verbatim settings of the texts. Orff composed his *Oedipus der Tyrann*, another Sophocles play (ca. 429 BCE) and part of the same mythology as *Antigonae*, between 1951 and 1958, the premiere of which took place on 11 December 1959 in Stuttgart. He next turned to *Prometheus Desmotes* (Προµηθεύς Δεσµῶτης, *Prometheus Bound*), which is attributed to Aeschylus (ca. 525–456 BCE). Orff composed this work between 1963 and 1967 and the premiere took place on 24 March 1968 in Stuttgart. For the Sophocles tragedies, Orff used the translations by Friedrich Hölderlin, while he used the original Greek for *Prometheus Desmotes*.

Orff’s austere musical style in his Greek tragedies, as outlined above, befits the somber tone of these works. *Antigonae*, *Oedipus der Tyrann*, and *Prometheus Desmotes* provide no solace or refuge of any kind: like Darius Milhaud before him, Orff chose to present these stories without softening their violence in any way. As with so many of his earlier works, Orff’s Greek tragedies address fatalism and unjust authority and, like *Die Bernauerin* the two Sophocles-


50 Rösch, *Die Musik in den Griechischen Tragödien von Carl Orff*, 17.

51 While *Prometheus desmotes* has been attributed to Aeschylus, its authorship is disputed and its date is uncertain (although it was produced no later than 430 BCE). See Alan H. Sommerstein’s introduction to the play in *Aeschylus I*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2008 (Loeb Classics Library 145), 432–434. This volume has the complete text of the play in Greek with English translation.

52 For the chronology of these projects, see *Dokumentation*, Vol. 7, page and Vol. 8 (1983), 355.


54 As Emily Richmond Pollock aptly has described *Oedipus der Tyrann* as “a monument to severity” (Pollock, *Opera after Stunde Null*, 84).

55 See Chapter 1 for a description of Milhaud’s approach to Greek tragedy in his *L’Orestie d’Eschyle*. I thank Dr. Thomas Rösch for our conversations on this subject.
Hölderlin tragedies depict the guilt of a head of state.

In *Antigonae*, as in *Die Bernauerin*, Orff commemorated a martyr on stage. In Orff’s interpretation of Sophocles’s play, the Theban King Kreon represents the rigidity of the law. He refuses to show any compassion to his niece Antigonae, who insists upon administering burial rights to her brother despite his treason against Thebes. Kreon’s hardheartedness leads ultimately to the suicides of his niece Antigonae, his son (who was her betrothed), and his wife. At the end, singing to his son’s dead body, Kreon admits his guilt: “You are dead, departed, through my folly, not thine.”

56 *Oedipus der Tyrann* also tells the story of the repentant downfall of a king. Oedipus’s folly wreaks havoc on the city of Thebes, a fact that must have had special resonance for German society after the disaster of National Socialism. In contrast to the sense of justice, and outrage against injustice, that pervades *Antigonae*, it is fatalism that is at the heart of *Oedipus der Tyrann*. Despite the great lengths to which the title character has gone before the action takes place to avoid his fate, ultimately he is powerless to escape it.

In *Prometheus desmotes*, Orff explicitly addressed the subjects of resistance, complicity, and powerlessness, all of which have clear allegories to totalitarianism. All three of Orff’s Greek tragedies are challenging to audience and musicians alike, but *Prometheus Desmotes* is the most demanding due to its use of Ancient Greek, including more prolonged passages of spoken dialogue (which is rhythmically notated) than either of the Sophocles-Hölderlin tragedies. 57

Prometheus, the defiant Titan who defied the head god Zeus as Antigonae defied Kreon, has several monologues railing against tyranny as he is chained to a cliff as punishment. 58

Prometheus has stolen fire for humanity, a self-sacrificing action of the kind that Orff, and most

---

56 Original language: *Gestorben bist du, geschieden, durch meine, nicht deine Thorheit*. Study score (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 5025), 1959), 307. Kreon’s uncomfortably high tessitura at this moment befits his agony. An interest point of comparison is Bertolt Brecht’s own treatment of the Sophocles-Hölderlin *Antigonae*, which he completed as Orff was at work on his own project. See Bertolt Brecht and Caspar Neher (scenic designer), ed. Ruth Berlau, *Antigonemodell 1948*, Berlin: Gebrüder Weiss, 1949. The text of the play begins on 105, and the prologue (placing the work in the context of the present day) is on 107–112. English translation Brecht’s adaptation was first performed in 1948 in Switzerland with his wife Helene Weigel (1900–1971) in the title role. In light of Brecht’s subsequent desire to work with Orff on *Der kaukasische Kriedekreis*, it is interesting to note that Brecht did not like Orff’s *Antigonae* (see Bertolt Brecht, “Bemerkung zu Orffs »Antigone«,” in Berolt Brecht Werke Band 23 (Schriften 3), ed. Werner Hect et al, Frankfurt-am-Main, Suhrkampf Verlag, 1993:114–115).

57 As Attfield has observed, there is an increase in speech between *Antigonae* and *Oedipus der Tyrann* (“Re-staging the Welttheater,” 352). As Orff explained *Dokumentation*: “In contrast to Antigone—she is ‘more soul than speech’ (Hölderlin)—I let the spoken word predominate in Oedipus, which leads to various styles of declamation to singing” (*Im Gegensatz zur Antigone—sie ist „mehr Seele als Sprache“ (Hölderlin)—ließ ich im Oedipus das gesprochene Wort vorherrschen, das über verschiedene Deklamationsarten bis zum Gesang führt*, Vol. VII, 209). In *Prometheus*, some scenes feature minutes on end with almost nothing from the instrumental ensemble.

58 The Titans race of deities in Greek mythology that Zeus overthrew in his struggle to become king of the gods.
Germans of his generation, did not take under Hitler. In the shadow of the Third Reich, the most interesting figure in *Prometheus Desmotes* is Hephaestus (Ἡφαίστως), one of the twelve Olympian deities and the god of metallurgy and fire. Hephaestus is forced to forge Prometheus’s chains by Zeus’s henchmen, symbolically named Kratos and Bia (Κράτος and Βία, respectively “Power” and “Force”), and this task torments his conscience:

But I have no heart to bind with might a kindred god to a cliff that has harsh winters. But it is absolutely a necessity for me to have the courage to do this. For it is grievous to be neglectful of the words of the father. [Addressing Prometheus] High-minded child of the right-counseling Themis, unwillingly I shall securely nail you, who are also unwilling, with indissoluble brass nails to this mountain peak, which is far from people.⁵⁹

Later Hephaestus’s shame and abjection are emphasized through the expressive marking nauseato (“sickened”) for his dialogue.⁶⁰ Despite predating Hitler by over two millennia, Hephaestus invites analogy with those Germans who complied with the Third Reich despite pangs of conscience. When Hephaestus curses the skills that he must use to imprison Prometheus, Power responds: “Why do you hate it? For the skill of your labors, in a word, is not at fault for the present state of affairs.”⁶¹ Later Kratos tells Hephaestus: “For no one is free except for Zeus.”⁶² This line encapsulates Orff’s sense of fatalism. As in the last scene of *Die Bernauerin*, one is left to ponder the degree to which people are complicit when their participation is coerced, a difficult question to which Orff supplies no simple answer. This issue is all the more difficult when applied to the Third Reich.

When Orff’s contemporary Rudolf Wagner-Régeny set an abridged German translation of this play, the premiere of which occurred in 1959, he assigned this line not to Zeus’s henchmen

---

⁵⁹ Original language: ἐγὼ δ’ ἀτολλός εἰμι συγγενῆ θεών δήσαι βία φάραγγι πρὸς δυσχειμέρῳ. πάντως δ’ ἀνάγκη τούτῳ μια τόλμην σχεθεῖν. εἰσφοράζειν γὰρ πατρὸς λόγους βαρύ. τῆς ὀρθοβούλου Θεμιδὸς αἰσθητὸν παῖ, ἄκοντά σ’ ἀκον δυσλόγος πάλιν ὑπανθρώπω τὸ ἀπανθρώπῳ πάγῳ…. Lines 14–20; study score (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6337), 1973), 4–5. In this passage, two words in the original Greek have significant double meanings. ἀνάγκη appears to mean “necessity” in this context, but the word may also mean “force,” “torture,” or “anguish.” Here ἀτολλός probably means “not to have the heart to [do something],” but the word also may mean “to be wanting in courage or spirit.” This may implicate Hephaestus for his failure to take a principled stand on behalf of another in the face of personal risk as Prometheus (and Orff’s friend Huber) had done. See *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon, founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott’s Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001 (original 1889), 53 and 130.


⁶¹ Ibid., page 8, lines 46–47. Original language: τί νῦν στυγεῖς; πόνων γὰρ ὡς ἀπλῶ λόγῳ / τὸν νῦν παρόντων οὐδὲν ἀτία τέχνη.

but to Hephaestus himself.\textsuperscript{63} From Hephaestus’s mouth, the line becomes an acknowledgment of powerlessness. This may be interpreted more as a defeatist statement than as an attempt to exonerate those who claim only to have followed orders, reminiscent of the trials at Nürnberg. In any case, there is no indication in either Orff’s or Wagner-Régeny’s works that Hephaestus’s conscience is ever assuaged.

\textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia: Carl Orff’s Vision of Das Ende}

\textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia} (\textit{Play of the End of Times}), which depicts hellfire, devastation, abandonment, and authoritarian surveillance, is Carl Orff’s final composition for the stage. \textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia} is one of the composer’s most personal statements, a probing contemplation of the nature of guilt, absolution, and the ultimate fate of humanity. While these matters have universal relevance, they have special implications for Germany in the aftermath of the Third Reich. The obscurities of \textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia}, the libretto of which features many obscure texts in ancient Greek, leave the work open to numerous interpretations beyond its surface meaning, which may reflect Orff’s deliberate decision to approach sensitive matters obliquely and to avoid providing easy answers to insoluble questions.

The philosophical message and implications of \textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia} have been relatively little explored in the literature to date, and the libretto has not previously been translated into English. As previously noted, scholars interested in Orff, especially those who knew him personally, have been reticent to assess his music in relationship to its social context, and the abstruse nature of \textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia} lends itself to abstract discussion (no doubt this was part of Orff’s goal). Yet a closer examination of Orff’s last major work reveals a powerful message hidden within. Through his abstract presentation, Orff posed the fundamental question of whether unspeakable crimes can be atoned or forgiven. \textit{De temporu\textsuperscript{m} fine comoedia} suggests that guilt can be erased only through the ending of time, when the world reverts to its pre-fallen state. This has significant implications in the context of a predominantly Christian society, as the Christian concepts of forgiveness and redemption through Jesus Christ are never attained.

\textsuperscript{63} See the score to Wagner-Régeny’s \textit{Prometheus} (Berlin: Bote & Bock, 1958, presently available from Boosey & Hawkes), page 26 (mm. 162–165, with pickup).
The premiere of *De temporum fine comoedia* took place at the Salzburg Festival on 20 August 1973 under the stage direction of August Everding (1928–1999) and the musical direction of Herbert von Karajan. According to *Dokumentation*, the work was composed between 1969 and 1971.\(^{64}\) Although Orff lived until 1982, he never expressed any intention of writing another major theatrical composition. As he said in a newspaper interview in 1979: “I know just as clearly today that the end of my composition is with *fine comoedia*.”\(^{65}\) Orff turned his attention to *Dokumentation*, revising some of his works (including *De temporum fine comoedia*), and composing a set of pedagogical works for speakers and percussion.\(^{66}\) It stands as the composer’s consciously final statement for the theater, the medium for which he composed the majority of his mature works. It is the culmination of Orff’s output, not only stylistically but also as a statement of his anti-authoritarian worldview and highly individual religious philosophy.

While *De temporum fine comoedia* was billed as an opera for its premiere at the Salzburg Festival, it is arguably best described as a staged oratorio.\(^{67}\) For the most part the work is dramatically static; the staging serves to enhance the text and music through visual imagery, while traditional development of plot and character is largely absent. The impersonal characters serve primarily as vessels for the text: only one of the 22 solo parts, Lucifer, is given a name. Orff himself wrote approximately half of the libretto using Ancient Greek, Latin, and German. The composer chose the remaining texts from relatively obscure sources in Greek and Latin: the *Sibylline Oracles*, the *Hymns of Orpheus*, a poem from the *Carmina Burana*, and a line of the early Christian philosopher Origen (ca. 185–254 CE).\(^{68}\) These features all have the Brechtian effect of creating distance between the work and the listener, possibly to mollify the disturbing implications of its apocalyptic subject matter. Unlike with *Carmina Burana*, the obscure language is not compensated by accessible and inviting music.

The abstruse texts of *De temporum fine comoedia* belie its simplicity. The work is divided

---

\(^{64}\) *Dokumentation*, Vol. 8, 355.


\(^{66}\) Orff’s *Sprechstücke für Sprecher, Sprechchor und Schlagwerk* was completed and published after *De temporum fine comoedia* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6711), 1977).


\(^{68}\) See Table 5.2 for specific information on textual sources.
into three acts and takes approximately one hour to perform. In the introductory pages to the score, Orff included an epigraph from Origen’s *Contra Celsum (Against Celsum)” 248 CE*: “The end of all things will be the annulment of offenses” (*Omnium rerum finis erit vitiorum abolitio*). This statement summarizes Origen’s conception of *apokatastasis panton* (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, literally “the original state of everything”), according to which the world will be restored at the end of time to its initial state, as before the advent of original sin. At this point the concepts of good and evil will cease to exist. In *apokatastasis*, forgiveness, as it is traditionally conceived in the Christian tradition, is conspicuously absent.

The first act of Orff’s work features nine sibyls (Christianized Greek oracles) who, quite in opposition to Origen, prophesy about the Final Judgment and its attendant miseries: hell for the guilty. In the next act nine anchorites (religious hermits whose tradition of asceticism dates back to the Middle Ages) profess their belief in *apokatastasis*, the dissolution of guilt, and rebut the sibyls, at one point quoting the Origen line of the epigraph. The third act is a vision of the end of time, granted to the anchorites by the Greek deity Oneiros. The “last people” (*die letzten Menschen*), who have survived the apocalypse, wander about the desolated earth until the Gates of the Underworld (*Portae inferi*) open. At the last moment, Lucifer appears and confesses that he has sinned. He is restored to the Angel of Light, and distant voices sing that everything has become perception. Origen is vindicated.

The composition of *De temporum fine comoedia* was a lengthy and arduous process for Orff. Characteristically, he made numerous revisions to his score over the period of almost a decade, with four conductors’ scores published in 1973, 1974, 1979, and 1981. A study score was published in 1973, evidently after the first printed conductor’s score, which strangely incorporates only some of Orff’s first revisions, whereas the next published conductor’s score (1974) incorporates almost all of them. Characteristically, many of Orff’s changes involved shortening the work. Not all of Orff’s handwritten corrections are reflected in subsequent

---

69 As will be addressed subsequently, the playing time was reduced significantly over the course of Orff’s revisions.
70 *Apokatastasis* bears some resemblance to the theology of Zoroastrianism, according to which there will be a battle between good and evil at the end of time, which will result in the ultimate triumph of good. Evil ceases to be according to both doctrines, but significantly in *apokatastasis* good ceases to exist as well, and neither good nor evil triumphs over the other. The resemblance is especially noteworthy in light of Orff’s teenage setting of Friedrich Nietzsche’s *Also sprach Zarathustra*. Werner Thomas has noted a thematic parallel with another of Orff’s early works, the Franz Werfel setting *Des Turmes Auferstehung* (see Thomas in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 8, 334).
71 Orff also made many structural alterations in the course of his later revisions, shortening the work considerably. Several instrumental passages throughout and several passages of text in Acts II and III were omitted. Handwritten
printings. In the final version, Orff stipulated at the outset of the score that the conductor may be granted some license in orchestration and that the difficult vocal writing for the sibyls may be altered as necessary. This disclaimer suggests that the composer still did not feel that he had a definitive version of his work. According to his student Wilfried Hiller, Orff felt the need to make further improvements to the score up to the time of his death; thus one may argue that there is no definitive version of the work. It also may be an acknowledgment that some of his demands are not entirely practical.

The action of De temporum fine comoedia, like the musical language, is largely static. Its three acts are interrelated to the degree that they cannot stand alone. The first two acts are a philosophical discourse between the nine sibyls and the nine anchorites, and Orff’s scoring highlights the contrast between the two groups. Although the sibyls have several passages of spoken text (rhythmically notated but non-pitched), the majority of the text in the first act is sung. In contrast, the anchorites’ text in the second act is primarily spoken, mostly in notated rhythm but also including passages of text written as in the script of a play. In contrast to the sibyls’ frequent melismas, the only sung text for the anchorites is on single unison pitches and, at the end of the act, on a single repeated chord. The sibyls’ music is characterized by metallic sounds, including celesta, two glockenspiels, tubular bells, crotales, and metallophone. In contrast, the anchorites’ music is largely non-pitched and makes heavy use of drums. While there is prominent use of brass and woodwinds in the first act, these sections are used sparingly in the second act. The anchorites’ sonic world is thus far removed from that of the sibyls.

deletions that appear only in Orff’s working copies of the scores suggest that he considered further deletions beyond those that appeared in the various printed editions. Orff’s only expansion in the course of his revisions—a lengthening of the Sibyls’ final statement—was made early on and later retracted (it is handwritten into the 1973 score and cancelled out in the revisions to the 1974 score). It thus appears that Orff wanted to make his statement as economical as possible.

This analysis is based on study of Orff’s hand-corrected scores at the Orff-Zentrum-München. I thank Frau Hannelore Gassner and Dr. Thomas Rösch, respectively the former archivist and the director of that institution, for their hospitality and assistance. The 1974 recording of De temporum fine comoedia, made with almost the identical cast of the Salzburg premiere, more closely follows the study score rather than either the original score or in the 1974 conductor’s score. The recording (Deutsche Grammophon CD, 429 859-2), however, retains some elements of the original 1973 score that are altered in the study score and all subsequent editions, suggesting that the piece was recorded while Orff was still in the process of revisions. Karajan’s recording in fact takes certain liberties with the score that do not appear in any printed edition, which makes it more difficult to determine what version of the score was used for the recording. Nevertheless, the study score remains the closest.


The term “metallophone” technically may refer to any number of metal idiophones, but the instrument for which Orff composed is similar to a vibraphone without fans or motor. In score of Catulli Carmina, Orff specifies that a vibraphone used without motor may be substituted for the metallophone part (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (Edition Eulenburg No. 8015), 1955/1990, XI).
The texts of the sibyls’ apocalyptic predictions are selected from the *Sibylline Oracles*, an eclectic compilation of Greek hexameters dating from the second to sixth centuries CE. The fieriness of the sibyls’ prophesying is reflected in their frequent use of melisma, disjunct vocal lines, extreme vocal register, and also in Orff’s expressive directions, such as *fanatico* ("fanatical"), *implacabile* ("implacable") and *quasi isterico* ("as if hysterical"). The final line of act 1 is the sibyls’ only Latin verse: “The wicked shall go to Gehenna, of eternal fire” (*Ibunt impii in Gehennam ignis aeterni*), accompanied by cries of “*vae*” (an exclamation expressing woe, homophonic with the German “*weh*”). (Gehenna is an ancient Jewish conception of hell that is retained in some early Christian writings. In light of the Third Reich’s official persecution of Jews, and of Orff’s own concealed Jewish ancestry, about which he may or may not have been aware, the decision to include a line with a Jewish reference here is striking.)

Just as the language changes in this section, so too is the scoring distinct from the preceding music. The first cries of “*vae*” are accompanied by several non-pitched percussion instruments and the following text by non-pitched drums, an effect not previously heard in act 1. The sibyls’ cries echo the malevolent men’s choruses of witches in *Die Bernauerin* and his 1960 Christmas play, *Ludus de nato Infante mirificus* (*Play of the birth of the miraculous infant*), both of which are also scored for non-pitched percussion and spoken text. By recalling the forces of evil in two of his previous works, Orff makes clear that the sibyls’ message is malevolent and destructive.

---

75 In the original Hebrew *Gey ben-Hinnom* (גֵּי בן הינום), “Valley of the Son of Hinnom.” Gehenna, a valley in which such depraved behavior as human sacrifice to foreign gods is performed, is referenced in the Hebrew Bible (2 Chronicles 28:3 and 33:6; Jeremiah 7:31 and 19:2–6).
Orff wrote the text of act 2 himself, excepting the two quotations as described below. The language is macaronic, flowing between Greek, Latin, and German, even within the same sentence. The figures on stage do not speak the language of any one people, which emphasizes the work’s universal application. Act 2 is largely a repudiation of act 1, as nine anchorites reject the sibyls’ prophecies of hellfire and everlasting torment. One of them mocks the sibyls by echoing their cries of *ignis aeterni* (“eternal fire”). The anchorites denounce the sibyls as not only false but also malfeasant: “Lies and deceit, delusion, trickery, a spook, a hellish ghost, an imaginary figment, a primeval cock-and-bull story. The empty fiction of a liar, a dishonest story, a false and absurd story, a clever sleight of hand…a most heinous fraud!”


---

76 In both scores, pages 73–74. Original language: *Lug, Trug, Gaukelspiel, Blendwerk, Spuk, hellisch Gespenst, Hirngespinst, uralte Ammenmär, Vana vanidici fictio, fabula mendax, fabula falsa, inepta, versutae praestigiae...NefandissimaFraus!* (pages 73–74 in both scores).
as the epigraph in the score: “The end of all things will be the annulment of offenses.”

While the holy anchorites offer a more positive vision of the end of time than do the sibyls, they are unsure how this end will be; they can provide no definitive answer. Thus they must turn to a higher power for help. In keeping with Orff’s unconventional approach toward religion, they invoke not the Christian God but Oneiros (Ὂνειρος), a lesser deity who sends dreams to mortals, to give them the gift of prophecy. The text of this prayer is the first six lines of Hymn No. 86 from the Hymns of Orpheus, a collection of poetry dating approximately from 500 BCE. As Werner Thomas noted in Dokumentation, Orff’s unusual subtitle Vigilia (vigil), which appears on the title page of the score but is not used in the libretto, refers to the anchorites at the end of act 2, the night watchmen for humanity.

The vision granted to the anchorites is depicted in the third act. Therefore, act 3 is a kind of play within a play, or rather a dream (granted by Oneiros to the anchorites) within a play. Even in the context of the work, Orff’s vision of the end is only fantasy; he is aware that he and his audience will never experience the relief of apokatastasis themselves. At the outset of act 3, the sibyls’ predictions appear to have come true. Orff titled this act “Dies illa” (“that day”), a reference to the “Dies irae” sequence, which describes the Last Judgment, from the liturgical Missa pro defunctis (Mass for the Dead). The opening lines of the “Dies irae” reference a sibyl, thereby establishing a connection with Orff’s first act: “The day of wrath, that day will dissolve the world into ashes, as attested by David with the Sibyl.” It is significant that Orff chose “that day” instead of “day of wrath” as the title of his act: the latter connotes damnation, while the former, despite its negative associations, does not itself specify what will happen on “that day.” The text of act 3 is Orff’s own, excepting a passage from the Carmina Burana codex, the collection of medieval poetry that he used for his cantata of the same name.

At the beginning of act 3, the Last People (die Letzten Menschen), who have survived the apocalypse, come onstage divided into three antiphonal groups. Their isolation is represented by the near silence of the orchestra: only a quiet bass drum roll is heard under their spoken text.

---

77 Study score, age 95, 1981 revision, page 87. Original language: Omnium rerum finis erit vitiorum abolitio. See also epigraph in both versions.
78 Dokumentation, Vol. 8, 290–291.
79 My interpretation of De temporum fine comoedia is indebted to conversations with Professor James Hepokoski about apokatastasis in another work, Gustav Mahler’s Symphony No. 2. Professor Hepokoski shared with me his interpretation that Mahler was aware that the transfiguration at the end of his symphony was a vision that he never could see come to pass.
80 Original language: Dies irae, dies illa / Solvet saeclum in favilla / Teste David cum Sibylla.
There are several parallels between the Last People and the townspeople in the final scene of *Die Bernauerin*, another fearful chorus that comes onstage divided antiphonally. In *Die Bernauerin*, the townspeople in increasing agitation watch the sun go dark. In *De temporum fine comoedia*, the Last People say several times: “Where is the sun? It comes no more.”\(^{81}\) This echoes one of the Sibyls’ predictions: “The night will be dark, in the middle of the day.”\(^{82}\) The chorus leader says, “Heaven is collapsed, with all the stars,”\(^{83}\) recalling the lone member of the chorus in *Die Bernauerin* who shouts, “The stars flare up; heaven is enraged!”\(^{84}\) The leader’s line about heaven collapsing is soon followed by the chorus’s text “Fade and fall into ruin will our star [i.e., the sun],”\(^{85}\) which uses one of the same German words (vergehen, “to fade”) that the townspeople in *Die Bernauerin* use to describe what happens to their sun (*D’Sunn vergeht...*). In act 3 of *De temporum fine comoedia*, references to the extinguished sun and the collapse of the stars refer back to the sibyls’ predictions, suggesting that their visions are coming true: “For the stars will collapse down from heaven, all of them will collapse into the sea.”\(^{86}\) The prophesied terror has become reality, and there is nothing to be done.

Unlike with the townspeople in *Die Bernauerin*, nothing in the text of *De temporum fine comoedia* suggests that the Last People have anything shameful in their past, either collectively or individually. The first words the Last People utter, however, seem to be hinting at some sort of transgression: “Whither do we go astray, lost, abandoned?”\(^{87}\) As there is no indication in the text about the Last People’s lives before the apocalypse, it is left to individual listeners to decide how these people may have gone astray. In a Christian framework, one may think of original sin, but *De temporum fine comoedia* resists traditional Christian theology. Nonetheless, the intertextual references to *Die Bernauerin* suggest that Orff’s post-apocalyptic vision may contain an

---

81 Original language: *Wo bleibt die Sonne? Sie kommt nicht mehr.* (Study score, page 134; 1981 score, pages 125–126.)
82 Original language: νυξ ἔσται σκοτόεσσα μέση ἐνὶ ἡματος ὄρη (page 49 in both scores). This line is strikingly similar to *Die Bernauerin*, in which the sun dies and “hangs there black as night, in the middle of the day” (Study score of *Die Bernauerin*, Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6856), 1946/1974, pages 136–137, original language: *nachtschwarz hängt s’ da, / z’ mitten am Tag*).
84 Study score of *Die Bernauerin*, page 146. Original language: *D’Stern brechn aus, der Himmel verzürnt si!*
86 Pages 21–22 in both scores. Original language: ἀστρα γάρ οὐρανόθεν τε θαλάσσῃ πάντα πεσόται.
87 Study score, pages 133–135; 1981 score, pages 125–126. Original language: *Wo irren wir hin, verloren, verlassen?* Although *irren* in this context means “to wander” or “to go about aimlessly,” the word usually means “to err.” Thus “to go astray” seems best to capture Orff’s dual meaning.
underlying and unspoken sense of shame.

The desperation of the Last People increases, and the full orchestra suddenly enters as they declare: “Nothing withstands” (Nihil restat). A repeated chromatic tetrachord played on the xylophone, pianos, and high woodwinds has the effect of a constant alarm as the chorus devolves into incoherent hysteria, which three times gives way to undulating screams, punctuated by alarm bells, in which the Last People abandon language altogether. Following the third such wail, they cry out to God (Kyrie!). Here for the first time all twenty-one brass instruments play at once, and all six flautists have now taken their piccolos. The chorus is made to sing in an uncomfortably high tessitura, illustrating the Last People’s strain and desperation. The music of the Kyrie! Cries, too, has a parallel in the last scene of Die Bernauerin, and, indeed, in Der Mond. In Die Bernauerin, the Volk cry out the slain woman’s name and the townspeople in Der Mond lament the theft of the moon to very similar music. In all three cases, the people have had light taken from them.

The Last People’s desperate pleas are met with no response. This is dramatized by pauses “lasting approximately 14 beats” (durata 14 battute circa) following the Last People’s two successive pleas for the end of their misery, in which they cry out “Make an end!” (Mach ein Ende!) The silence of heaven represented by these long pauses is foretold by the sibyls: “And then they will bewail—one here, another there from afar—their most lamentable fate, and they will not have their fill of tears, neither will be heard [emphasis added] the pitiable voice of those who lament here and there.” The sibyls’ gloomy prognostications are connected to the abject fear of the Last People through pitch language. For much of act 1, the harmony is either a

---

88 In his revisions to the 1974 score, Orff crossed out these undulating cries, resulting in a longer stretch of uninterrupted hysteria. This alteration, however, does not appear in any printed version of the score.
89 See study score, 162–163, 165, and 167–168; 1981 score, 154–155, 157, and 159–160; Die Bernauerin study score, 145–146; Der Mond study score, 38. This recalls Michael H. Kater’s statement in Tony Palmer’s O Fortuna! that “For many artists in the Third Reich, it seemed that the Nazis had taken the light like Orff’s puppets had stolen the moon.” (Kater was referring to puppet theater productions of Der Mond.) See forthcoming work by Thomas Rösch in Text, Musik, Szene – Das Musiktheater von Carl Orff (Symposium Orff-Zentrum München 2007, Mainz: Schott’s Söhne). This volume of conference proceedings has the same title as the original conference (17–19 October 2007, OZM). Rösch’s essay, which addresses the connections between the works here described, is titled “Zur Bedeutung der hypokryphen Citate’ im letzten Teil ,Dies illa’ von Carl Orffs De temporem fine comoedia.”
90 Study score, 167–168; 1981 score, 159–160. The 1973 score has three such cries, the first of which is followed by a short pause and the latter two by longer pauses. Orff crossed out the first cry in revisions, and it appears nowhere else.
91 Original language: καὶ τότε ὑπηνήσασιν ἐπ᾿ ἄλλῳς ἄλλῳ ἁπεθανοῦν οἰκτρώτατη μοιρή, οὐδὲ σφιν δακρύων κόρος ἔσσεται οὐδὲ μὲν αὐδὴ οίκτρα· ὀλοφυρμένων ἑσπακούστη ἄλλῳς ἄλλῳ.
sustained F pedal under clusters of G♭, F, and E♮, or E♭ minor chords with added dissonant tones, usually F and A, over a dominant (B♭) pedal. These pitch groups are used by the Last People as they cry out to God. The same dissonant pitch collection is also used in the Last People’s ensuing lament, after their cry has gone unanswered.

The Corifeo—that is, the chorus leader—attempts to exorcize unseen demons with a text from the Carmina Burana codex. When Orff was considering expanding his cantata Carmina Burana shortly after its premiere, he wrote to his collaborator, Michel Hofmann, that he was considering adding in a passage from a poem he called the “famous exorcism” (berühmten Beschwörung); presumably this is the text that appears in De temporum fine comoedia. The need to exorcise demons had been with Orff for several decades. The Corifeo’s attempt to drive out the demons fail, and the flames of Tartarus appear (this word for Hell comes from classical mythology and is retained in some early Christian writings), with them the Portae inferi (“Gates of the Underworld”). The chorus wails and the chorus leader bellows: “The dark eye looks down on us in darkness, in darkness,” perhaps the work’s most direct reference to totalitarianism. Again Orff connects this action to act 1 through pitch language. The pitches used at the moment when the Portae inferi appear are identical to those used in the sibyls’ passage (quoted above) about the collapse of the heavens (musical examples 5.6–5.7), which are similar to the pitches in several of the sibyls’ melismas (musical example 5.5). The Last People echo the sibyls’ final utterance with cries of vae. This moment is further linked to the end of act 1 and the Portae inferi through the prominent use of ratchets, which occur only in these two passages.

---

92 Letter from Carl Orff to Michel Hofmann, 26 June 1937, printed in Orff and Hofmann, Briefe Zur Entstehung der Carmina Burana, 139.
93 Original language: Oculus aspicit nos tenebrarius, tenebris, tenebris (study score, 178; 1981 score, 168).
94 This connection also is noted by Werner Thomas in Dokumentation, Vol. VIII, 331.
Musical Example 5.11. *De temporum fine comoedia*, pitch language in Act 1. (See pages 20–24 in both study score and 1981 revision).

Over the course of revising the score, Orff dramatically reduced the orchestral forces at the *Portae inferi*. The reduction of the ratchets is especially striking, given their prominence in the original version. Instead of three church ratchets, used three times and alternating with the unspecified number of regular ratchets (presumably the two from the end of act 1),⁹⁵ the final version has but one church ratchet, which plays only once.⁹⁶ Orff also shortened the climactic moment of the *Portae inferi* by removing the second iteration of the chorus’s cries of “vae.” In addition to the alterations of the *Portae inferi*, in successive revisions Orff also increasingly shortened the chorus leader’s exorcism until ultimately the references to the miseries of

---

⁹⁵ In his revisions to the 1974 score, Orff considered adding a “small ratchet” (*raganella piccola*) during the cries of *Portae inferi*, but this was removed in subsequent revisions.

⁹⁶ Orff considered abandoning even this passage in his final revisions (crossing it out in pencil but then indicating that it was to remain). Also in the final revisions, Orff decided to add ratchets back into the score at the final scream by writing “Here ratchets” (*Hier ratschen*), but curiously this did not make it into the final printed version.
Judgment Day were excised and the passage was reduced to a few spoken lines. The exorcism may be interpreted as Orff’s attempt to cast out his own demons, or the demons of his society. Perhaps Orff shortened the exorcism so drastically not just for reasons of pacing, but also because he decided that the passage, together with the original din at the *Portae inferi*, was too brutal.

After the final screams of the Last People, Lucifer appears. As in traditional depictions dating back to the twelfth century, he stands with outstretched arms resembling the wings of a bat.  

Lucifer thrice says the words that begin a Catholic confession, *Pater peccavi* (“Father, I have sinned”), as rays of light fall on him from above, and he is restored to the Angel of Light. Now it is the prediction of the anchorites, not of the sibyls, that is realized: “Not Satan, the adversary, the tempter; no, not Lucifer, not the insurrectionist, not the violator, found guilty: never will he be sentenced into eternity. The end of all things will be the annulment of offenses.” By linking the restoration of Lucifer to Origen’s philosophy, Orff suggests that Lucifer’s restoration will come at the end of time, when *apokatastasis* is achieved. In keeping with the concept of returning to the original state, the literal meaning of *apokatastasis*, Orff specifies at the end of Lucifer’s transformation: “He is again the Lucifer he once was.” Origen’s promise is fulfilled. Interjected between Lucifer’s recitations of *Pater peccavi* are trumpet fanfares on the perfect fifth of C and G. The inherent stability of this interval stands in contrast to the chromatic clusters that occur throughout much of the rest of the work. In act 2, the anchorites proclamation of God’s unity is heralded by the same trumpet figure, but followed by dissonant pitches in the six trombones (B♭) and the pre-recorded chorus of boys and tenors (called *Pueri* and *Iuvenes*, or “boys and young men,” in the score), singing the pitches B♭, C, and D♭. In act 3, however, the perfect fifth occurs without added dissonance, demonstrating that a state of purity has been achieved.

---


98 Original language: *Nicht / Satanas, / der Widersacher, / der Versucher / nicht, / nicht / Lucifer, / nicht der Rebell, / nicht der Verstone / damnatus / numquam condemnatus / in aeternum. / Omnium rerum finis / erit / abolitio viitorum.* (Study score, 95; 1981 score, 87. Both scores have a line break before the final sentence, which is the quotation from Origen.)

99 Original language: *Er ist wieder Lucifer von einst.* (Study score, 182; 1981 score, 172.)

100 In revising the score, Orff decided to reinforce the dissonant pitches in three pianos, presumably because these pitches were not clearly heard enough (as is the case on the recording) when only sung by the boys and tenors.
The remaining text of the work is sung by the *Vox Mundana* (“Earthly Voice”), followed by the *Voces caelestes* (“Heavenly Voices”). The *Vox Mundana* begins: “I come to you. You are the Paraclete [this word may mean “intercessor” or “comforter”] and the ultimate endpoint.”

The Latin word *finis* can mean either “end” or “goal,” which refers back to the anchorites’ language in act 2: “What is the endpoint? What is our destination, our final meaning?”

The *Vox Mundana* is followed by *Voces caelestes*, which sing τὰ πάντα νοῦς to the C–G perfect fifth. This text translates roughly as “All things are perception,” although the Greek νοῦς has several meanings, ranging from intellectual perception to a heightened spiritual and mental being. The *Vox Mundana* and the *Voces caelestes* are sung by disembodied voices, the latter by a boys’ choir. Both the innocent purity of the children’s voices and their placement at the highest point of the performance space illustrate that spiritual transformation has taken place, and that the world’s corruption is now a thing of the past.

The transcendence of physicality recalls the philosophy of Origenism, the movement based on Origen’s teachings. As the theologian Eric Junod has written of Origen: “Since we are composed of spirit, soul, and body, we are at odds with ourselves. The soul, the seat of free will, is subject to passions through the influence of the body, but the spirit, sharing the divine Spirit, draws it to God.”

Originally Orff intended to end the piece with a musical quotation from Orlando di Lasso (1532–1594), but ultimately he turned to a canon he had written in 1921 that uses, with some alteration, the opening phrase of J.S. Bach’s “Vor deinen Thron tret’ ich hiermit” (*Here I come before thy throne*, BWV 668), written shortly before Bach’s death. The canon is played by a hitherto silent consort of four viols. The title of Bach’s chorale refers to approaching God, which relates to the text of the *Vox Mundana* about approaching the ultimate spiritual goal (*summus finis*, as it is called in Orff’s text). The canon on this chorale is a mirror composition: after the

---


102 Study score, 127; 1981 score, 119. Original language: τί ἐστιν τὸ τέλος; *Was ist unser Ziel, unser endlicher Sinn?*

103 Study score, page 185; 1981 score, page 174.

104 The score suggests the cupola, but the exact location will likely vary depending on the theater.


106 Personal interview with Hannelore Gassner. It is notable that part of the text of Act 3 is similar to a text by di Lasso that Orff used in his *Conceto di Voci: Sunt lacrimae rerum* (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne, C 39534, 1957). See Appendix, “Textual Sources of *De temporum fine comoedia*.”

107 See *Dokumentation*, Vol. 8, XXVI (photographs included at the end of the volume).
canon stops, it begins again in retrograde. The beginning and the end are thus interchangeable, invoking the eternal.

It is significant that Orff, whose mature works are primarily texted, ended his final composition with purely instrumental writing. The music has transcended the need for words, just as spiritual being has transcended the physical world. The viols harken back to an earlier musical era, signifying that we are now removed from the turmoil of our present world. The viol canon is further distinguished from the preceding music in its harmonic language. Instead of chromaticism and static tone clusters, the language of the canon is pandiatonic (it is even all on the white keys of the piano): the concepts of functional consonance and dissonance do not apply.

There is a strong tonal center on D (thanks in part to the steadily repeated D1 in the first half), suggesting the Dorian mode. The canon creates a sense of cosmic harmony by freeing itself of the inherent tensions of tonal harmony. Thus Orff brings his oeuvre, and time itself, to an end.

Con sublima spiritualità $d=72–80$
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Musical Example 5.13. *De temporum fine comoedia*, viol canon subject


"Et summus finis": Decoding the Message of *De temporum fine comoedia*

The diversity of texts and imagery in *De temporum fine comoedia* suggests that Orff was avoiding a sectarian statement. Orff chose to transcend the boundaries of any particular religious tradition by creating a patchwork of imagery employing macaronic language. Orff’s choices of text are non-canonic, again reflecting his early break from the Catholic Church. The only reference to sin and forgiveness, central concepts to Christianity, is Lucifer’s *Pater peccavi*. The prophecies collected in the *Sibylline Oracles* are of uncertain provenance, and are likely a mixture of Pagan, early Christian, and Hellenized Jewish origin. While both the sibyls and anchorites declare the unity of God, it is unclear if they are referring to the Christian God. The

---

108 See Chapter 1 for more information.
anchorites’ professed monotheism is contradicted by their prayer to Oneiros, a figure from the polytheistic religion of ancient Greece. The prayer to Oneiros is punctuated by a Japanese dobači (the only time the instrument is used in the score), which signifies that the prayer is outside the Western Christian tradition. Orff also distanced his work from the Christian tradition by using antiquated references to Hell (Gehenna and Tartarus).

Despite Orff’s efforts to distance his work from specific religious traditions, the libretto of De temporum fine comoedia makes reference to Judeo-Christian prayers and scriptures. The Last People cry out to God using the word “Kyrie,” which occurs in the Latin Mass, and Lucifer’s Pater peccavi would have had resonance for the Catholic members of his audience. The Tetragrammaton, the holiest name for God used in the Hebrew Bible (יְהוָה), was at one point invoked in the exorcism (although this reference was omitted in Orff’s final revisions, when he decided to truncate this passage dramatically). In the New Testament, the Greek word parákletos (παράκλητος, literally “advocate”) refers to the comforter or intercessor sent by God after Jesus leaves the Earth.109

De temporum fine comoedia sometimes fits within the paradigm of Christianity, and in particular Catholicism, but at the same time Orff undermines this framework by including non-Christian imagery. The most strikingly Christian feature of the work is the constant presence of the numeral three, suggesting the symbolism of the trinity: three acts, a chorus divided into three groups, nine (that is, three times three) sibyls, nine anchorites, groups of three or six instruments in the orchestra, and tone clusters of three semitones. The anchorites thrice recite groups of nine attributes of God, representing the trinity perfectly by totaling 27, or three to the third power. In the syncretic religious philosophy of De temporum fine comoedia, the dream god Oneiros is as serious a figure as Lucifer, and so any trinitarian references are but one element of the collage rather than a serious profession of the Christian faith. There is, however, no obvious numeral nine in the third act as in the first two; perhaps the intent was to undermine the presence of traditional Christian theology. This undermining occurs near the end of the piece, when the audience may be expecting the nine pattern to continue. By setting up the expectation of a perfect 27 and then subverting it, Orff created a more dramatic departure from the Christian paradigm than had he omitted it altogether. Apokatastasis also is far removed from mainstream

109 See John’s Gospel (John 14:16 and 26, 15:26, and 16:7). In 1 John 2:1 it is used in the literal sense, referring to Jesus as an advocate for sinners.
Christian theology, even though Origen was a Church Father. After his death, Origen’s philosophy was rejected by the Church and his writings were suppressed.\footnote{See the entries on \textit{apocatastasis} (Anglicized spelling) and Origen in \textit{The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church}, Third Edition (edited by F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, 84 and 1200) and the entry on \textit{apocatastasis} in \textit{Nelson’s Dictionary of Christianity} (edited by George Thomas Kurian, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2005, 37 and 515).}

As has been noted in previous chapters, Godela Orff described her father’s relationship with religion as complicated, and the composer’s eclectic and personalized spiritual expression in \textit{De temporum fine comoedia} is a salient example of the composer’s freethinking, even heretical, approach to religion. Several of Orff’s works portray religious authority and established religion in a negative light. To offer a brief recapitulation, this trend starts before World War I with the strange apocalyptic poem of “Der letzte Hohepriester” and the oppressive Abbot in \textit{Eliland}. The cantata \textit{Von der Freundlichkeit der Welt} (\textit{Of the World’s Welcome}, 1931) is a setting of poetry by Bertolt Brecht that cynically parodies religious texts, and no. 13 of \textit{Carmina Burana} (“Ego sum abbas,” i.e. “I am the abbot”) is a vulgar parody of the clergy. The monk scene of \textit{Die Bernauerin} is perhaps the most damning portrayal of religious authority in Orff’s works.

Godela Orff wrote of \textit{De temporum fine comoedia}: “This work, his last, I perceive as a testament of his artistic pathway, his personal pathway, to ‘religio.’ From Greek philosophy about the Christian worldview to a vision of the end of the world.”\footnote{G. Orff, \textit{Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich} (2008), 140. Original language: \textit{Dieses Werk, sein letztes, empfinde ich als ein Vermächtnis seines künstlerischen wie persönlichen Weges zur „Religio“: Vom griechischen Gedankengut über das christliche Weltbild bis zu einer Vision des Weltunterganges}. In the previous version of her memoirs (\textit{Mein Vater und ich: Erinnerungen an Carl Orff}, 1992/1995, 134), Godela was less elaborate: “This last work I perceive as a testament of my father” (original language: \textit{Dieses letzte Werk empfinde ich als ein Vermächtnis meines Vaters}).} While Orff sometimes used Christian source material and imagery, he also drew from far outside this tradition: the Goddess Fortuna in \textit{Carmina Burana} and \textit{Die Bernauerin}, Aphrodite in \textit{Trionfo di Afrodite}, and the antagonistic Zeus in \textit{Prometheus}, presumably the same text he later included in \textit{De temporum fine comoedia}. When Orff wrote to Michel Hofmann about expanding \textit{Carmina Burana} and possibly including part of the exorcism that he later gave to the Last People’s Corifeo, he wrote: “Only it may be \textit{nothing Christian} \footnote{Helmut Lohmüller, “Carl Orff über sich selbst,” \textit{Melos}, 32. Jahrgang, Heft 6, 1965:194–195, 194. Original language: \textit{Griechentum und Christentum sind die Quellen abendländischer Kultur, an die ich mich halte...}.}
purely, since that does not fit at all."¹¹³ In his afterword to the 1970 revised score of Der Mond, Orff clarified the “great misunderstandings” (größten Mißverständnissen) about the figure of Petrus, who “is by no account the same as St. Peter…. There is no more a Christian heaven with a Christian figure of Petrus here than the underworld in the fairy story is Hell.”¹¹⁴ Given these precedents, and given the lack of any reference to Jesus Christ in his final stage work, it seems clear that Orff did not intend De temporum fine comoedia to be perceived as a Christian work in the traditional sense.

The religious philosophy of De temporum fine comoedia is complicated. Not only does Orff turn to non-Canonic texts and multiple religious traditions, but the philosophy of apokatastasis is also heretical according to doctrinal Christianity. Orff’s own version of apokatastasis is even more radical than Origen’s (as expressed in the line quoted as the epigraph and by an Anchorite in act 2). Origen’s conception of apokatastasis is contingent upon God’s love. The German scholar H. J. Vogt has written that “the simple restoration of the original state is not…the ultimate goal [emphasis added] of the history of salvation”.¹¹⁵ The phrase apokatastasis panton occurs only once (in a different grammatical case) in the New Testament (Acts 3:21), but in this instance it is tied to Jesus, repentance, and fulfillment of the prophecy of the Hebrew Bible: the restoration is an act of God. In De temporum fine comoedia, in contrast, the “simple restoration of the original state” is itself the final purpose. Not only is Jesus Christ entirely absent from Orff’s work, but he is supplanted as savior by Lucifer. Lucifer is a very different kind of savior: he causes the world to revert to its original state, and there is no absolution or forgiveness of guilt as with salvation through Christ. Thus, Orff’s conception of apokatastasis is more universal and more radical than Origen’s.

Orff’s work is ambiguous to the point of obscurity regarding the figure of Lucifer. From


¹¹⁴ Original language: …ist keinesfalls mit dem „heiligen Petrus“ identisch….Sowenig im Märchen die Unterwelt die Hölle ist, sowenig gibt es hier einen christlichen Himmel mit einer christlichen Petrusfigur. Carl Orff, afterword to Der Mond, Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 6481), 1947, 244. Despite the given year of publication, this is in fact the revised score of 1970. The name of Petrus is taken from the Brothers Grimm fairy tale that was Orff’s primary source in writing the libretto of Der Mond.

his *deus ex machina* (or rather *diabolus ex machina*) appearance, it is possible that Lucifer is not meant to embody the twentieth-century concept of evil. A solo anchorite refers to him as both *Satana* and Lucifer, and describes him as an “adversary,” “tempter,” “insurrectionist,” and “violator” (respectively *Wiedersacher, Versucher, Rebell, and Verstone*). This characterization emphasizes Lucifer (whose name literally means “light bearer”) as the fallen angel, banished from heaven because of his rebellion against God. Orff’s work does not imply that he has acted harmfully or maliciously toward others, let alone committed atrocities on the scale of Hitler. Lucifer’s portrayal is closer to an everyman whose flaws mirror those of humanity. By showing him restored to the Angel of Light, Orff’s work implies that Lucifer, and thus every individual, has retained some goodness beneath his dragon-like appearance.

*De temporum fine comoedia* does not contain an explanation for the existence or source of evil. The anchorites state that “the Devil walks about among people” (*der Teufel geht um, unter den Menschen*). This is the only instance in the libretto in which the Devil is referred to with the German *der Teufel*, and it is possible that Orff did not have in mind the fallen angel, Lucifer, with this word. From the eerie musical setting, one may conclude that *der Teufel* more generally refers to the presence of evil rather than to Lucifer specifically. Immediately preceding the section with the text about *der Teufel*, the anchorites indirectly implicate not Lucifer but God in the existence of evil when they declare: “All things are from God, all things are toward God, all things are God.” Consequently, nothing in this world can be ungodly: “Nothing is against God, if not God himself.” *Der Teufel* walks about according to God’s plan: “God has willed it.” There is an exonerative element to these statements, as arguably none can be guilty if all is according to divine plan. At the same time, inherent in the anchorites’ words is the implication that divine will does not always ensure happiness or justice. By linking God to the existence of evil and showing Lucifer restored to the Angel of Light, Orff’s work addresses the universal philosophical question of whether good and evil are intertwined. With *apokatastasis*, neither

---

116 Original language: *der Teufel geht um, unter den Menschen*. This text is repeated at various points in the study score from 102–126 and in the 1981 score from 94–118.

117 Original language: Πάντα ἐκ θεοῦ, πάντα πρὸς θεόν, πάντα θεός. (Study score, 95; 1981 score, 87.)

118 Original language: *Nihil contra Deum, nisi Deus ipsae*. (Study score, 120–121; 1981 score, 112. In the revised version, the repetition of this text is omitted, perhaps as part of Orff’s attempts to make his score more concise.)

119 Original language: *Gott hat es gewollt*. This text is repeated at various points in the study score from 103–120 and in the 1981 score from 95–112.
good nor evil conquers the other; rather, both concepts cease to exist.\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Apokatastasis} does not solve the problem of human crimes, in that nothing expiates the guilty or gives justice to the wronged.

Orff’s libretto is notably vague on the matter of sin, again suggesting a departure from Christianity. The only reference to forgiveness of sin is Lucifer’s \textit{Pater peccavi}. The Latin translation of the quotation from Origen refers to “the annulment of offenses [or wrongdoings]” (\textit{vitiorum abolitio}), rather than “forgiveness of sins.”\textsuperscript{121} This Latin verse is a translation from the original Greek, which has less ambiguity: τὸ τέλος τῶν πραγμάτων ἁναιρεθήναι ἐστὶ τὴν κακίαν: “The endpoint of all affairs [or ‘deeds’] is for wickedness to be annulled” (the word τέλος, “endpoint,” is of special note because of its significance to Orff’s libretto). Origen’s κακία (“wickedness”) has an unequivocally moralistic meaning, suggesting underlying immorality rather than bad actions.\textsuperscript{122} Orff’s decision to use the Latin translation rather than the original Greek (presumably a conscious one, given his proficiency in both languages) suggests a desire to distance his message from the idea of evil. Regarding the moralistic overtone, Orff’s own German translation (provided in the score) is arguably closer to Origen’s original line than the Latin rendering: “\textit{Das Ende aller Dinge wird aller Schuld Vergessung sein}” (“The end of all things will be the forgetting of all guilt”).\textsuperscript{123} Even here, however, the concept of “guilt” (\textit{Schuld}) exists both within and outside of the Christian concept of sin,\textsuperscript{124} leaving room for diverse religious interpretations.

There remains, however, one significant difference between Origen’s Greek (which is entirely absent from the score and libretto) and Orff’s German. Orff’s focus is not wickedness or vice (as in Origen’s Greek), or even wrongdoing as in the Latin, but rather guilt. This raises a critical question: are evil deeds truly undone, or is it only the guilt that is annulled? The word \textit{Schuld}, which Orff uses in his Origen translation, also occurs in the text of act 2 in a German

\textsuperscript{120} In this respect \textit{apokatastasis} differs from the ultimate triumph of good that is predicted in Zoroastrianism, although both cases are arguably Universalist.


\textsuperscript{122} See \textit{An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon}, 393.

\textsuperscript{123} Werner Thomas has clarified that the German translation is Orff’s own in \textit{Carl Orff: De temporum fine comoedia. Perspektiven einer neuer Werkbegegnung}, Munich: Orff Zentrum, 2010, 98. This is especially striking given that the score credits Thomas himself as the author of the interlinear translation, with Wolfgang Schadewaldt as the translator of the Greek.

passage written by Orff, although here it may be translated better as “fault” rather than “guilt”: “Expiation follows every fault in time, only in time.”

According to this philosophy, atonement is futile.

One negative implication of the work, at least from the Christian perspective, is that the apokatastasis precipitated by Lucifer’s confession does not truly represent the redemption of sins, which is a central tenet of Christianity. In Orff’s vision of the end of times, all offenses are erased without forgiveness. This may have had personal implications for the composer and his struggles with guilt. Luise Rinser, Orff’s third wife, said that the composer “for a long time lived his life with a feeling of guilt” and interpreted Lucifer’s confession as Orff’s own vicarious atonement to Godela, given that the father and daughter had had a difficult relationship, with Godela often feeling neglected. Wilfried Hiller likewise has said that Lucifer’s Pater peccavi is Orff’s own personal confession. There are several possibilities as to what Orff may have been confessing: difficulties with family members, his lack of resistance during the Third Reich, not having done more for friends in need, or simply having survived the trench collapse in World War I in which others presumably were killed.

Just as Orff’s use of dead languages, ancient texts, and archaic imagery serves to obscure his content, De temporum fine comoedia resists providing clear answers to the questions it raises. As Orff was in the process of writing his final stage work, he wrote to Heinrich Sutermeister: “The piece is called De temporum fine comoedia, a provocation!” In an interview at the time of the premiere, he made clear that he was not going to reveal his own interpretation: “It is all a

---
125 Both study score and 1981 revision, page 75. Original language: Jener Schuld folgt die Sühne in der Zeit, nur in der Zeit.
126 Interview in Tony Palmer’s O Fortuna! (quotation); Luise Rinser, Saturn auf der Sonne, Frankfurt: Fischer, 1994, 124. Original language of quotation: Original language of quotation: Er lebte also sein Leben lang mit ’nem Gefühl eine Schuld (the English translation given here differs somewhat in Palmer’s subtitles). In both sources, Rinser emphasized that De temporum fine comoedia speaks of forgetting but not forgiveness. The English subtitles in Palmer’s film nevertheless translate Pater peccavi as “Father, forgive me” and questionably say that Orff was asking “forgiveness from God.” Regarding Godela’s difficulties in her relationship with her father, see G. Orff, Mein Vater Carl Orff und ich, 58–59 and 64–68, in previous version, 57 and 65–68 (the previous version is somewhat more detailed).
127 Personal interview with Wilfried Hiller at his home in Munich, 30 May 2013.
128 Michael H. Kater has noted several of these possibilities and suggested that Orff’s feelings of guilt are relevant to the tributes he wrote to dead friends, addressed as though each one was still alive (Composers of the Nazi Era, 142–143). Kater’s problematic theory that Orff suffered from bipolar II disorder has been addressed in Chapter 4.
dream, only a fantasy. Pessimistic, optimistic, as anyone wants.”

Individual listeners are challenged to think about the implications of the work, a similarity with the model of Bertolt Brecht that is so important to the works of Orff. There is, however, an important distinction between Brecht’s work and De temporum fine comoedia. Orff’s final composition for the stage is far more open to interpretation than Brecht’s plays, which are generally overtly didactic in their commentary. By refusing to state his own interpretation, Orff allows those who wish to think of the work as a statement about guilt to do so, while those for whom this message may be objectionable or disturbing are free to ignore such implications. While Brecht often left his works open in the sense of leaving the audience to find its own solutions, his works leave little uncertainty about what issues he was raising. Because Brecht was outspoken in his Communist political views, he freely made such overt commentaries. Orff, in contrast, endeavored to maintain his “politics of the apolitical” and to call as little attention as possible to his actions during the years of National Socialism. Yet the composer was unable to remain silent, evidently seeking to express himself through a complicated web of ciphers.

Brecht’s statement against passivity in the face of evil, an issue with which Orff had grappled in Die Bernauerin, has special relevance to the Third Reich. Even through the present day, the attitude has persisted that those in Nazi Germany had either been actively in favor of Hitler or actively opposed to him. Thus nonresistance has carried the same opprobrium as Nazi sympathy. British journalist Martin Kettle described Orff as part of the generation of Germans “who wanted to forget their own and their society’s failings during the Nazi years.” He further noted that “it is tempting to see [Orff] as a recognisable type of postwar German, a man

130 Quoted in Doris Esser, “Das Lebenswerk ist wie eine Zwiebel,” Salzburger Nachrichten, 21 August 1973 (COS/OZM, Presearchiv, Kri XXc). Original language: Es ist alles ein Traum, nur eine Phantasie. Pessimistisch, optimistisch, wie jeder will. Orff notably wrote nothing about De temporum fine comoedia or Astutuli in Dokumentation, although his health may have prevented him from writing about the latter as the final volume was published in 1983, after his death. The review by Esser cited here is also notable the following quotation from the composer: “This work carries on the previous works and is nevertheless somewhat new. It is as with an onion: one layer follows the others” (idem., original language: Diese Werk setzt die bisherigen Arbeiten fort und ist dennoch etwas Neues. Es ist wie bei einer Zwiebel, eine Schale folgt auf die andere).


carrying his part of a shared trauma about which he preferred to remain silent.” While Orff did not speak publicly of this trauma, it is found in such works as *Die Bernauerin*, the Greek tragedies, and *De temporum fine comoedia*. All of these works demonstrate that Orff was not able to forget the failings of the Third Reich, however much he may have wanted to.

Despite the *apokatastasis* in *De temporum fine comoedia*, the disturbing imagery throughout the work suggests that Orff did not intend to excuse himself or his society, or to minimize the gravity of any wrongdoing. The positive outcome cannot erase the memory of what has come before. The sibyls’ act is both the most terrifying and the longest of the three. The optimistic anchorites are, like all of us, limited in their knowledge. The vision given to them by Oneiros does not immediately begin with Lucifer’s *Pater peccavi*: before Origen is vindicated, we witness a postapocalyptic nightmare. Despite the anchorites’ optimism, they cannot prevent human suffering. While the majority of Orff’s listeners may be confounded by the sibyls’ use of ancient Greek, this is not true of the opening of act 3, the longest section of German in the piece. Because of the accessible language and the spare instrumental accompaniment, a German-speaking audience should be able to comprehend every fearful word. So too could German-speaking audiences understand the Latin cries of “vae” due to their similarity with the German “weh,” which the Last People also use. Ultimately, both sides, sibyls and anchorites, are able to predict some things correctly but neither of their visions is entirely accurate: no one has all the answers.

Cynical listeners may interpret *De temporum fine comoedia* as an attempt to shed culpability: guilt has no purpose if ultimately all wrongdoings will be nullified. Yet, this work evinces a belief that relief from shame will come only at the end of time, and without forgiveness. Orff’s vision of *apokatastasis* is presented only as a dream; the composer was well aware that such a reprieve was not forthcoming, and that no one can escape responsibility so easily as long as the world still turns. This is the darker implication of Orff’s interpretation of Origen’s philosophy. Atonement may be impossible, or perhaps just too difficult and too painful. Lucifer’s brief confession has the effect of erasing all guilt, but there is no evidence of

---


135 One line is recited in both Latin and German (*Wir sind nicht bereit* and *Parati non sumus*, “We are not prepared,” study score, 137–138; 1981 score, 129–130); this is the only instance of either Latin or Greek in Act 3 until the entrance of the pianos and wind instruments.
forgiveness in the traditional sense, either from God or between people, as the world has ceased to be. In Orff’s final work, it seems that forgiveness in this life is unattainable.

Carl Orff never wrote a piece explicitly commenting on World War II or mourning its victims as did Karl Amadeus Hartmann or, on the other side of the conflict, Benjamin Britten with his War Requiem. Such a direct statement from Orff would have invited unwanted speculation into his past. Nonetheless, he was not silent on the catastrophe. Although safely couched in “hieroglyphics,” as Andreas Liess characterized it,¹³⁶ De temporum fine comoedia is arguably as much a response to suffering as Hartmann’s and Britten’s works. Yet it was only through his encoded music that Orff was able to convey his unspeakable message about the inexorable nature of guilt, a subject that has great resonance far beyond post–Third Reich Germany.

CONCLUSION

tà πάντα νοῦς.

All is perception.

—Carl Orff, De temporum fine comoedia

Carl Orff died on 29 March 1982 at a hospital in Munich, where he had been a patient for three months. The composer’s widow, Liselotte Orff, was with him when he died and later said: “I am so grateful for that, because, I think…it’s as great [a] moment, nearly…as giving birth to a child, if you are with somebody in this moment.” Although Orff was by no means a practicing Catholic, he chose to be buried near his home in Diessen (a suburb of Munich) in the tranquil Andechs Monastery, which was founded in 1455 by Albrecht III, Agnes Bernauer’s widower.

While Orff has been laid to rest, the controversy surrounding his life and works has lived on. Orff’s great success during the Third Reich became his greatest liability after its downfall. Despite the continued popularity of Carmina Burana with the concert-going public, its initial success under National Socialism always has cast a shadow on the work and has led to its continued association by some scholars and critics with the ill-defined concept of “Nazi music.” Previous studies have examined and evaluated how Orff comported himself during the National Socialist Era, ignoring the greater context of his earlier and subsequent works.

---

1 Study score of De temporum fine comoedia (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 5407), 1974), page 185; in 1981 version (Mainz: B. Schott’s Söhne (ED 7365), 1980), 174.
2 Information according to OZM (relayed in telephone conversation), 21 August 2014.
3 Interview with Liselotte Orff in Tony Palmer’s O Fortuna! (Isolde Films, 2008, original broadcast 1995). English is the original language of this statement.
4 See the Introduction and Chapter 2 for more information.
My work is an exploration of Orff, as both an artist and a person, with the aim of better understanding his responses to the Third Reich. Orff’s influences and experiences from his youth and early adulthood shaped his later work. The strong anti-authoritarian messages that I have identified in Orff’s works—especially those that were completed after the fall of National Socialism, like Die Bernauerin, a meditation on social failure, collective guilt, and the corruption of his beloved Bavarian Heimat—have not fully been explored in the previous literature. Orff’s critics may be swayed by his reputation as an opportunist and beneficiary of the Third Reich, and sometimes even as a collaborator or sympathizer, which has led many commentators to underestimate his interest in the moral issues that he and his society faced. Meanwhile many of his advocates have preferred not to discuss this sensitive and painful issue, and likely have been inhibited by the composer’s own wish to avoid addressing personal and political matters in his public statements.


6 See, for example, the description that Orff “effectively sold his soul to Hitler’s henchmen, and paid the price in his conscience for the rest of his life” in Jessica Duchen, “Dark Heart of a Masterpiece: Carmina Burana’s Famous Chorus Hides a Murky Nazi Past,” The Independent, 4 December 2008. Simon Heffer has called Orff a “Nazi monster” and noted that Carmina Burana “is held in critical disdain” (Simon Heffer, “TV review: O Fortuna! Carl Orff and Carmina Burana (Sky Arts 2),” The Telegraph, 9 April 2009, accessed at http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/5131428/TV-review-O-Fortuna-Carl-Orff-and-Carmina-Burana-Sky-Arts-2.html, 21 November 2014).
rather than with any sense of honor, as in the kabuki drama on which *Giselle* is based, or as fundamentally rightful, as is the case in Friedrich Hebbel’s play.

At the beginning of the Third Reich, Orff was in an uncomfortable position due to his association with progressive artistic circles, his important relationships with Jewish colleagues like Curt Sachs and Erich Katz, and his own concealed partly Jewish background. While Orff was able to remain true to his artistic ideals during the Third Reich, his correspondence, especially with his publishers, demonstrates that he went to great lengths to determine how he could present his work as compatible with National Socialism—a considerable moral compromise. While Pierre Bourdieu had not yet coined the term “symbolic capital,” Orff likely understood at some level that his works would be appropriated by the National Socialists as their own. This would indicate an awareness on Orff’s part that, to return to Stephen Spender’s phrase, his ideal of the “politics of the apolitical” was no longer possible in the context of the Third Reich.

As my analysis of Orff’s actions from the period of the Third Reich has shown, the conception of Orff as a Nazi sympathizer is not justified. Nor did Orff write “Nazi music,” although certain aspects of his work were easily coopted by National Socialism, such as his interest in *Volk* music and the communitarianism from his works at the end of the Weimar Republic. There are many instances in which Orff became involved in National Socialist culture but also instances in which he resisted doing so. While he sought to maintain his relationships with colleagues, such as the music educator Fritz Reusch, who had National Socialist politics, he attempted, albeit with some trepidation, to maintain his friendships with persecuted figures like Erich Katz and Max Sinzheimer. Part of Orff’s greyness stemmed from his attempts to remain in good standing with as many of his friends and colleagues as possible.

As the previous chapters have demonstrated, Carl Orff was, in the words of

---

7 See Chapters 1 and 2 for further information.
Schaffner’s report, a Nutznieser (beneficiary) of the Third Reich.\(^\text{10}\) Despite the benefits he received, including financial support and exemption from service during World War II, there is reason to believe that the period of National Socialism was difficult for him. Discussions of Orff and the Third Reich rarely address the full extent of the effects that living under totalitarianism had on the composer. In the early years of the Third Reich, he faced the threat of falling out of favor with the National Socialists, the fate that had befallen his contemporary Paul Hindemith.\(^\text{11}\)

Even after Orff had achieved a secure and comfortable position in the cultural life of the Third Reich, there is reason to think that he was not entirely at ease.\(^\text{12}\) He had lost several friends to exile, and in 1943 he lost Kurt Huber to the Nazi guillotine. In the context of totalitarianism, as Hannah Arendt has noted, no one is ever safe.\(^\text{13}\) While he had considerably less contact with the authorities than many of his colleagues, such as Paul Graener or Werner Egk, he apparently did not consider disengagement to be an option.

It is striking that previous analysis of Orff’s denazification has focused so extensively on the allegation that he claimed to have been a member of the White Rose, even though the only evidence for this assertion is a 47-year-old recollection of a private conversation. It is especially surprising that the discourse did not change after an eminent historian, Oliver Rathkolb, discovered Schaffner’s report and concluded that, although Orff adduced his friendship with Kurt Huber as a point in his favor, the composer made no claim to have been involved in any resistance movement.\(^\text{14}\) That this debate has become so acrimonious demonstrates how polarizing a figure Orff has been. Whatever

\(^{10}\) Bertram Schaffner, report on Carl Orff, 1 April 1946, David M. Levy papers, Box 35, Folder 2, Oskar Diethelm Library, DeWitt Wallace Institute for the History of Psychiatry, Weill Cornell Medical College, New York City, New York.


\(^{12}\) While this point rarely has been conceded in the English-language literature, an exception is found in Kim Kowalke, “Burying the Past: Carl Orff and His Brecht Connection,” The Musical Quarterly, Volume 84, No. 1, Spring 2000:58–83, 73. Note, however, that it was not Orff’s wife from the time of the Third Reich, Gertrud Willert Orff, who testified about her former husband’s nightmares, but rather his subsequent wife, Luise Rinser, whom he married in 1954.

\(^{13}\) Prieberg, Musik im NS-Staat, 324; Hannah Arendt, The Origins of Totalitarianism, New York: Schocken Books, 2004. Regarding Orff’s fear of guilt by association after Huber’s arrest, see Chapter 3.

\(^{14}\) See Chapter 3 for more information.
the flaws of the denazification process, and despite the strange lacunae in the reports on Orff, Dr. Bertram Schaffner and his colleagues correctly identified Orff as “‘Grey C’, acceptable,” a classification that takes account of Orff’s highly independent personality and anti-Nazi worldview.

As Peter Paret has noted, composers in the Third Reich “were victims, accomplices, and sometimes both.”¹⁵ Paret’s use of the word “accomplices” is perhaps too strong in some cases, although by its very nature totalitarianism made all artists who were involved with cultural life in the Third Reich complicit to some degree. There are several instances in which “beneficiary,” Schaffner’s characterization of Orff, may be the best description. Regardless of where one chooses to place Orff on the scale of complicity, Paret’s underlying idea vividly highlights the turbid and difficult ethical situation of artists, and indeed of many other citizens, under totalitarianism. The question of being both victim and beneficiary goes to the very heart of the matter of being grey.

When Orff’s friend and colleague Winfried Zillig died in 1963, Orff wrote a tribute for him that was published in the journal *Musica*. As he did for Kurt Huber, Karl Amadeus Hartmann, and Erich Katz, Orff addressed the tribute to his dead friend directly. In the last paragraph, he said: “It is good that the gift of forgetting was given to man. One must forget much, so that one can continue living; even so, there is much one must not forget, so that one can live with oneself; and in turn, other things one cannot forget.”¹⁶

One could argue that Orff’s experiences from the Third Reich fell into all three of these categories at once. *De temporum fine comoedia* vividly suggests that Orff wished for a time when the slate could be wiped clean: there is a reason that he translated Origen’s *vitiorum abolitio* (literally “the annulment of offenses”) as *aller Schuld Vergessung* (“the forgetting of all guilt”).¹⁷ Yet, at the same time Orff clearly was not

---


¹⁷ See the epigraph to the score of *De temporum fine comoedia*. 
able to forget. In *Die Bernauerin*, Orff portrayed the atrocity as a collective failure of society, reflecting the specific issues of the Third Reich that weighed so pressingly on Germany around the fall of National Socialism. The *Volk* attempt to come to terms with their moral greyness and find no peace or resolution. In the libretto of his last work, the *Vergessung* (“forgetting”) is achieved only at the end of all time. That Orff engaged with his crises of conscience through his art shows that he realized that, comforting though it would be to be relieved of the burden of his memories, one has an obligation to struggle with these matters. Even though the Third Reich is an era that one may feel “one must forget, so that one can continue living,” paradoxically it also is an era that “one must not forget, so that one can live with oneself.” For the remainder of his life, the “‘Grey C’, acceptable” Carl Orff carried these memories with him, dreaming of a peace—the “ultimate goal” (*summus finis*),¹⁸ as he called it in his final work—that he knew he could never achieve in this lifetime.

¹⁸ *De temporum fine comoedia*, study score, page 184; 1981 revision, page 173.
Figure C.1. Carl Orff’s gravestone in the Kloster Andechs, Bavaria. The inscription *summus finis* (“the ultimate goal”) is taken from the libretto of *De tempore fine comoedia*. Hannelore Gassner, the former archivist of the Orff-Zentrum München, informed me in personal conversation in July 2009 that Liselotte Orff and Werner Thomas chose this fitting epitaph. (Photograph by Andrew S. Kohler, July 2009.)
Appendix 1. Information About Carl Orff’s Extant Early Works

Pre–World War II compositions

_Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_ = Ferdinand Avenarius (1856–1923), ed., _Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_, München: Callwey, 1905 (page numbers given for 1905, 1904, and 1902 editions; pagination the same in 1905 and 1904 editions)

BSB ML = Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Musiklesesaal

Opus 1: _Frühlingslieder_ (“Spring Songs”) for soprano or tenor and piano accompaniment, texts by Johann Ludwig Uhland (1787–1862)

BSB ML, Orff.ms. 25


No. 1: “Frühlingsanfang” (“Beginning of spring”), ms. dated 31 January 1911
No. 2: “Frühlingsglaube” (“Faith of spring”), ms. dated 16 February 1911, text also found in _Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_, 4 (1905/1904), 4–5 (1902)
No. 3: “Frühlingsruhe” (“Quiet of spring”), ms. dated 1 February 1911
No. 4: “Frühlingsfeier” (“Celebration of spring”), ms. dated 17 February 1911
No. 5: “Lob des Frühlings” (“Praise of Spring”), ms. dated 31 January 1911, text also found in _Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_, 4 (1905/1904), 4 (1902)
No. 6: “Künftiger Frühling” (“Future of the Spring”), ms. dated 3 February 1911

Opus 2: 9 Lieder for soprano or tenor with piano accompaniment, BSB ML, Orff.ms. 26

No. 1: “Herbstnacht” (“Autumn night”), text by Princess Mathilde von Bayern (1877–1906)

Ms. dated 4 January 1911; textual source: _Traum und Leben: Gedichte einer früh Vollendeten_, Munich: Suddeutsche Monatshefte, 1910, 64.

No. 2: “Mondscheinballade” (“Moonlight ballad”), text by Princess Mathilde von Bayern

20 December 1910; textual source: _Traum und Leben_, 34

No. 3: “Gebet” (“Prayer”), text by Gustav Renner (1866–1945)


Note: Orff made alterations to the poem in his setting.

No. 4: “Schilflied” (“Reed song”), text by Nikolas Lenau (1802–1850)

Ms. dated 18 February 1911; textual source: _Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_, 98 (1905/1904), 89 (1902)

Note: there are five _Schilflieder_ in the _Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik_; Orff used the text of the fifth.

No. 5: “Somernacht” (“Summer night”), text by Adolf Friedrich, Graf von Schack (1815–1894)

Ms. dated 8 March 1911; textual source: Adolf Friedrich, Graf von Schack, _Gedichte_, Berlin: Verlag von Wilhelm Hertz, 1867, 171–172

No. 6: “Der See” (“The Lake”), text by Julius Mosen (1803–1867)

Ms. dated 12 January 1911; Julius Mosen, _Gedichte_, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1843, 120 (also _Gedichte_, Leipzig: Literature, Museum, 1836, 178)

No. 7: “Gute Nacht” (“Good night”), text by Rudolf Baumbach (1840–1905)

5 February 1911; textual source: Rudolf Baumbach, _Spielmannslieder_, Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta’sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, G.m.b.H., 1900 42

No. 8: “Ich liebe dich!” (“I love you!”), text by Detlev, Freiherr von Liliencron (1844–1909)

1 Date as given in _Dokumentation_, Vol. 1, 241; no date on manuscript or in Münster et al, _Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk_, 49.


3 Date as found in _Dokumentation_, Vol. 1, 241 and Münster et al, _Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk_, 49; the manuscript lacks a date.
No. 9: “Sonnenuntergang” (“Sunset”), text by Friedrich Hölderlin (1770–1843)
Ms. dated 26 February 1911; textual source: *Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik*, 35 (1905/1904), 32 (1902)

Opus 3: 3 *Lieder* for alto or baritone and piano accompaniment, BSB ML, Orff.ms. 27
No. 1: “Im Winter” (“In Winter”), manuscript gives author as “Aug. Kalkoff,” possibly in fact Auguste Kalthoff (1878–1964) or perhaps August Kalkoff (1823–?), a medical doctor.
Ms. dated 11 January 1911; textual source presently unknown
No. 2: “Begrabe nur dein Liebsten!” (“Bury only your dearest!”), text by Theodor Storm (1817–1888)
Ms. dated 15 March 1911; *Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik*, 203 (1905/1904), 181–182 (1902)
No. 3: “Weil du mir zu früh entschwunden” (“Because you vanished from me too early”), text by Hermann Lingg (1820–1905)
Ms. dated 16 March 1911; *Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik*, 195 (1905/1904), 177 (1902)

Opus 4: “Die Wallfahrt nach Kevlaar” (“The Pilgrimage to Kevlaar”), text by Heinrich Heine (1797–1856), for low voice with piano accompaniment; BSB ML: Orff.ms. 28; ms. dated 4 May 1911
(Originally *Buch die Lieder*, “Die Heimkehr”, 1823–1824)

Opus 5: “Zlatorog,” text by Rudolf Baumbach (1840–1905), for low voice and piano accompaniment
BSB ML: Orff.ms. 28; Ms. dated 12 May 1911; also arranged for voice and large orchestra (end of 1911)

Opus 6: BSB ML: Orff.ms. 29
No. 1: “Der letzte Hohepriester” (“The last high priest”), text by Ludwig August Frankl (1810–1894), for baritone with piano accompaniment
No. 2: “Schlaflied für Mirjam” (“Lullaby for Miriam”), text by Richard Beer-Hofmann (1866–1945), for low voice with piano accompaniment
This song is printed in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 1, 255–257 and in *Frühe Lieder* (Schott ED 7024), 9–11.

Opus 7: “Der sinnende Storch” (“The meditative stork”), text by Franz Josef Stritt (1831–1908)
Humoristisches Vocal-Quartett (“Humorous Vocal Quartet”)
BSB ML, Orff.ms. 30; Ms. dated 13 June 1911
Textual source: Hermann Vogel, ed. and illustrator, *Hermann Vogel Album II*, München: Braun und Schneider, Monatsblätter 1896, 44 (June)

Opus 8: 5 *Lieder* for soprano and piano accompaniment, BSB ML, Orff.ms. 31
No. 1: “Die Nachtigall” (“The Nightingale”), text by Theodor Storm (1817–1888)
Ms. dated 17 May 1911; textual source: *Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik*, 107 (1905/1904), 97 (1902)
No. 2: “Immer leiser wird mein Schlummer” (“My sleep always becomes softer”), text by Hermann Lingg (1820–1905)
Ms. dated 19 May 1911; textual source: *Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik* (under title “Lied”), 89–88 (1905/1904), 81–82 (1902)

---

4 No date is given in Münster et al, *Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk*, 49.
5 The date 26 August 1911 appears in *Dokumentation*, Vol. 1, 241 and Münster et al, *Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk*, 49, but a correction of this error was issued in a subsequent printing of *Dokumentation*.
6 The date 8 June 1911 is given in Schott ED 7024 and *Dokumentation*, Vol. 1, 257, but all other sources give 9 June 1911 (including *Dokumentation*, Vol. 1, 241).
This song is printed in Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 258–259 and in Frühe Lieder (Schott ED 7024), 12–13.

Ms. dated 27 November 1910; textual source: Traum und Leben [see Opus 2 Nos. 1 and 2], 33

No. 4: “Am Stadttor” (“At the city gate”), Hermann Vogel (1854–1921)
Ms. dated 26 May 1911, textual source: Hermann Vogel Album II [see Opus 7], 17 (Februar)
No. 5: “Es war einmal” (“It was once”), text by Hans Mayr (1871–1925)
Ms. dated 25 May 1911, textual source: Hermann Vogel Album II [see Opus 7], 38 (Mai); see also Hans Mayr, Gedichte, Münster: Universitäts-Buchhandlung Franz Coppenrath, 1906, 35 (here titled “Der Page”)

Opus 9: 6 Lieder for tenor and piano accompaniment, BSB ML, Orff.ms. 32
Texts of Nos. 2–4 and 6 by Heinrich Heine (1797–1856)
No. 1: “Die Mutter” (“The Mother”), text by Borries, Freiherr von Münchhausen (1874–1945)
No. 2: “Lehn' deine Wang' an meine Wang'” (“Lean your cheek on my cheek”)
Ms. dated 3 July 1911; textual source: Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 1, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 87 (originally Buch die Lieder, “Lyrisches Intermezzo”, 1823 – 1824)
No. 3: “Die Lotosblume” (“The Lotus Blossom”)
Ms. dated 12 July 1911; textual source: Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 1, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 88–89 (originally Buch die Lieder, “Die Heimkehr”)
No. 4: “Verriet mein blasses Angesicht” (“Reveal my pale face”)
Ms. dated 16 July 1911; textual source: Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 1, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 131 (originally Buch die Lieder, “Die Heimkehr”)
No. 5: “Frage” (“Question”), manuscript gives author as “Semper,” presumably Ernst Leberecht Semper (1722–1758); textual source presently unknown
Ms. dated 20 July 1911; textual source presently unknown
No. 6: “Wenn ich auf dem Lager liege” (“If I lie in the camp”)
Ms. dated 23 July 1911; Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 1, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 130 (originally Buch die Lieder, “Die Heimkehr”)

Opus 10: BSB ML, Orff.ms. 33
No. 1: “Belsazer,” text by Heinrich Heine (1797–1856)
Ms. dated 30 July 1911; textual source: Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik, 185 (1905/1904), 167–168 (1902)
No. 3: “Abend, Nacht und Morgen” nach Fischbachs Edda Übersetzung, translation of Edda epic by Friedrich Fischbach (1839–1908)
Ms. dated 5 August 1911; textual source: Die schönsten Lieder der Edda mit Erläuterungen als Volks- und Schulbuch herausgegeben von Friedrich Fischbach, Köln: K. A. Stauff & Co., 1903, 35–36 (No. 11)

Opus 11: BSB ML, Orff.ms. 34
No. 1: “Es muß ein Wunderbares sein” (“It must be something wonderful”), text by Oskar Freiherr von Redwitz (1823–1891)
Ms. dated 6 August 1911; textual source: Oscar v. Redwitz, Amaranth, Mainz: Verlag von Franz Kirchheim, 1860, 117
No. 2: Aus “Zarathustras Nachtlied” (from “Zartahustra’s Night song”), text by Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900)
No. 3: “Ballade,” text by Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769–1860)

Opus 12: BSB ML, Orff.ms. 35, text by Karl Stieler (1842–1885)
Orchestral version left as fragment (Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 242)


Published by München und Leipzig: Ernst Germann Verlag, Plate 661, 1912

Opus 13: BSB ML, Orff.ms. 36
No. 1: “Mir träumte von einem Königskind” (“I dreamed of a king’s child”)
Ms. dated 26 October 1911; Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 1, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 100–101 (originally Buch die Lieder, “Lyrisches Intermezzo”)
Published in Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 260–263.

No. 2: “Es war ein alter König” (“It was an old king”)
Ms. dated 26 October 1911; Heinrich Heine, Heines sämtliche Werke, Band 2, Berlin: Knaur, 1906, 23 (originally Neue Gedichte)

No. 3: “Märchen” (“Fairy Tale”), text by Max Haushofer, Jr. (1840–1907)
Ms. dated 30 December 1911; textual source: Max Haushofer, Gedichte, München: Fleischmann, 1864, 13.
Published (as Opus 13) by München und Leipzig: Ernst Germann Verlag, Plate 667, 9 July 1912

Opus 14: Also sprach Zarathustra (“Thus spoke Zarathustra”), BSB ML, Orff.ms. 43 and 44
First movement: “Nachtlied” (December 1911)
Baritone solo with winds and percussion: 2 Obs., Ob. d’am., Eng. Hn., Clar. in B-flat, Bsn., Cbsn., 4 Hns., 3 Tbn.s., Tam-tam

Second movement: “Mitternacht” (17 January 1912)

Third movement: “Vor Sonnenaufgang” (9 May 1912)

The texts of the first movements are also found in Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik (1905 edition), 39 and 265, respectively (also in 1904 edition; in 1902 edition, 36 and 235–236, respectively). The Avenarius source numbers the twelve strokes of midnight before and after each line; Orff included these in his score in the form of twelve explosive tam-tam strokes.

Opus 15: “Des Herzen Slüzzelin” (“The heart’s little key”), BSB ML, Orff.ms. 37 and 38
Ms. dated 6 March 1912 (a date is found in only one of the two extant manuscripts); textual source: anonymous author, Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik, 123 (1904/1905), 109 (1902); in 1902 edition, the twelfth-century poet Wernher, here called Wernher von Tegernsee, is named as the author
Published by München und Leipzig: Ernst Germann Verlag, Plate 666, June 1912

7 Date of publication as in Münster et al, Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk, 50; July 1912 is given as the date in Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 243.

8 Instrumentation based on study of the manuscript; there are discrepancies in various other sources (Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 243; Münster et al, Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk, 51; Liess, trans. Parkers, Carl Orff, 13–14, in original German, Liess, Carl Orff, 12). A list of corrections to Dokumentation Vol. 1 corrected the number of trombones from three to four (the error is found on 243, whereas the correct number is given on 90–91).

8 Instrumentation based on study of the manuscript; there are discrepancies in various other sources (Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 243; Münster et al, Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk, 51; Liess, trans. Parkers, Carl Orff, 13–14, in original German, Liess, Carl Orff, 12). A list of corrections to Dokumentation Vol. 1 corrected the number of trombones from three to four (the error is found on 243, whereas the correct number is given on 90–91). The manuscript specifies “several pianos” (mehrere Klaviere); in Dokumentation one finds both three and six specified (Vol. 1, 92 and 243, respectively)
Opus 16: Tonbild nach Andersen, Bilderbuch ohne Bilder, 27. Abend (“Tone picture after Andersen, Picturebook without Pictures, Twenty-Seventh Evening”)

BSB ML, Orff.ms. 39; 1912


Opus 17, BSB ML Orff.ms. 40, both June 1912

No. 1: “Liebessorgen” (“Love worries”), text by Martin Greif (born Friedrich Hermann Frey, 1839–1911)


Opus 17 published by München und Leipzig: Ernst Germann Verlag, Plate 671 (No. 1) and Plate 672 (No. 2); all songs bound together, June 1912

Opus 18: Four Songs on texts by Börries, Freiherr von Münchhausen, versions for piano and orchestra (2 Fls.; 2 Obs.; 3 Clars. (B-flat); 2 Bsns. and Cbsn.; 4 Horns; 2 Tpts.; 2 Tbn.; 5 Percussionists: Timp., Triangle, Cymbals, Tenor Drum, Bass Drum; full Strings), both extant

BSB ML, Orff.ms. 41 and 42


No. 1: “Der Tod und die Liebe” (“Death and Love”)

No. 2: “Lebensbüßer” (“Penitent life”)

No. 3: “Dein Amt” (“Your office”)

No. 4: “Lebensweg” (“Journal”)

Opus 18 No. 1 published by München und Leipzig: Ernst Germann Verlag, Plate 673, 1912

Orff also intended to compose a melodrama with orchestra on Münchhausen’s “Die Glocke zu Hadamar” (“The Bell of Hadamar”), textual source ibid., 7–10

Opus 19: Two songs with texts by Walter von der Vogelweide (ca. 1170–ca. 1230) BSB ML, Orff.ms. 38

No. 1: Ein Kuß vom roten Munde” (“A kiss from a red mouth”)


No. 2: Unter der Linde” (“Under the linden tree”)


Opus 20: Gisei: Das Opfer (see Chapter 1 regarding textual sources)

Orchestral forces: 3 Fls. (3rd = picc.), 3 Obs., Eng. Hn., 3 Clars., Bass Clar., 3 Sax. (Alto, Tenor, and Bass), 3 Bsns., Cbsn., 4 Horns, 3 Tpts., 3 Tbn., 2 Tubas, 5 Percussionists (Timpani, Glockenspiel, Triangle, Cymbals, Bass Drum, Tam-tam, Gong, Large Gong, Wind Machine, Thunder Sheet), 2 Harps, Piano, Glass Harmonica, full Strings (several instruments also used off-stage)

Off-stage chorus

---

10 Date according to Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 243; no date is given in the manuscript or in Münster et al, Carl Orff: Das Bühnenwerk, 51.
11 For an English translation of Andersen’s work, see Hans Christian Andersen, trans. not credited, A Picture Book without Pictures and other Stories (Hans Andersen’s Library), New York: John B. Alden, [1883], 113–114 (this edition is rather at odds with the title in having illustrations).
12 Mentioned in Thomas, Dokumentation, Vol. 1, 96.
Opus 21: Tanzende Faune: Ein Orchesterspiel (“Dancing Fauns: An Orchestral Play”),
Orchestra: 4 Fls. (4th behind the scene), 2 Obs., Eng. Hn., 3 Clars., 3 Bsns., 4 Horns, 2 Tpts., 4
Percussionists (Timpani, Cymbals, Triangle, Tam-tam), 2 Harps, Celesta, Piano (four-hands), 32 Violins,
8–16 Violas, 8–14 Celli, 4 Contrabasses

Opus 22: String Quartet (one movement) in B minor, 1914

Note: there is a further extant String Quartet movement by Carl Orff from 1921, an anomalous
work with respect to both musical language and the fact that it is absolute music.

“Ave Maria,” ca. 1912–1914

Textual Sources for Orff’s works from the Weimar Republic

2 songs for high voice, 1919
Nikolas Lenau: “Bitte” (2 September 1919), Hausbuch Deutscher Lyrik, 131 (1905/1904), 116 (1902)
Friedrich Nietzsche: “Mein Herz ist wie ein See so weit” (7 August 1919), Friedrich Nietzsche, Gedichte
und Sprüche. Leipzig: C. G. Naumann, 1901, 23 (this poem was written in 1862)

Texts by Klabund (Alfred Henschke, 1890–1928), 1919
Der Leierkastenmann, Berlin: Erich Reiß, 1917, 39 (“Zwiesgespräch”)
Irene oder Die Gesinnung: Ein Gesang von Klabund, Berlin: Erich Reiss Verlag, 1918, 6–7 (II, “Blond ist
mein Haar”) and 25–26 (XXI, “Herr, ich liebte”). Der Leierkastenmann is described on the title page (and
in a shortened form on the cover) as “Folksongs of the present from the mouth of the folk collected and
here for the first time published by Klabund” (Volkslieder der Gegenwart aus dem Munde des Volkes
gesammelt und hier zum erstenmal veröffentlicht von Klabund). According to a preliminary page of Irene,
this volume was written between November and December 1916.

Texts Richard Dehmel (1863–1920), 1919
3 songs for tenor and orchestra (2 Fls., 2 Obs., 2 Clars., 2 Bsns., 4 Horns, 3 Tpts., 3 Tbn., Tuba, Timpani,
Glockenspiel, Cymbals, Bass Drum, Tenor Drum, Triangle, Tambourine, Harp, 16 Violins, 6 Violas, 6
Cellos, 4 Contrabasses)
Textual sources: Richard Dehmel, Hundert ausgewählte Gedichte, Berlin: S. Fischer, 1918, 43 (“Leises
Lied”) and 208 “Wienegienlied”; Richard Dehmel, Erlösungen: Gedichte und Sprüche, Berlin: Schuster &
Loeffler, 1898, 115 (“Entelied”)
Projected fourth setting: “Mein Trinklied” (100 ausgewählte Gedichte, 181)

Georg Büchner (1813–1837): incidental music for Leonce und Lena (Frankfurt am Main : Athenäum
Verlag, ca. 1987; Büchner-Studien, Bd. 3); in English translation: The Plays of Georg Büchner, trans.
Unfortunately the score does not survive, although portions of the piano reduction do. Orchestra: 2 Fls. (2nd
= picc.), 2 Obs., 2 Clars., 2 Bsns., 2 Horns, Trpt., Tbn., Timpani, Glockenspiel, Xylophone, Percussion [?],
Harp, Celesta, Piano, small section of Strings

Texts set (or projected to be set) by Franz Werfel (1890–1945):

For 1920 Lieder:
“Als mich dein Wandel an den Tod verzückte” and “Rache” Wir sind: Neue Gedichte (Leipzig: Kurt
Wolff Verlag, 1914, 19 and 59 (respectively)
“Ein Liebeslied,” “Mondlied eines Mächchens,” “Der gute Mensch,” “Lächeln, Atmen, Schreiten,” “Litanei
eines Kranken,” “Nacht,” “Fremde sind wir auf der Erde Alle,” and “Veni creator spiritus” from Einander:
Oden Lieder Gestalten (Leipzig: Kurt Wolff Verglag, 1915, 22, 74–75, 14, 7–8, 37–39, 67, 60, and 29–30,
respectively).
Des Turmes Auferstehung (1920–1921): Wir sind: Neue Gedichte, 78–79
Originally for two soloists, then rescored for double men’s chorus with large orchestra (5 Fls., 3rd and 4th = Piccs.; Alto Fl.; 4 Obs.; Eng. Hn.; Heckelphone; 5 Bsn., 5th = 2nd Cbsn.; Cbsn.; 8 Tpts. ad lib.; 4 Tbn.s.; Timpani, 2 players; Bass Drum; Tam-tam; Crash Cymbals; Antique Cymbals; Bells; 6 Harps; 6 Pianos; Organ; Full Strings with additional Cellos and Contrabasses)

Further projected works:
“Jesus und der Äserweg” from Einander: Oden Lieder Gestalten (Leipzig: Kurt Wolff Verlag, 1915, 91–93)
“Der Gerichtsherr,” “Trinklied,” and “Verwundeter Storch” from Der Gerichtstag (poems written primarily 1916–1917, Leipzig: Kurt Wolff Verlag, [1919], 41–43, 36–37, and 74–75, respectively)
“Ich habe eine gute Tat getan” from Der Weltfreund (Berlin: Axel Juncker Verlag, [1918], 105–107)

The 1930 cantatas use eight of the above poems, in addition to “Revolutions Aufruf” (in Orff’s work called “Aufruf”) from Einander (51):
Veni Creator Spiritus: “Litanei eines Kranken,” “Nacht,” “Veni creator spiritus”
Der gute Mensch: “Lächeln, Atmen, Schreiten,” “Ein Liebeslied,” “Der gute Mensch”
Fremde sind wir: “Fremde sind wir auf der Erde Alle,” “Aufruf,” and “Hymnus”

Texts set (or projected to set) by Bertolt Brecht (1898–1956):


Note: “Siebenhundert Intellektuelle beten einen Öltank an” is from Aus einem Lesebuch für Städtebewohner (From a reader for city-dwellers); “Über das Frühjahr” is grouped with these poems in the English translation here given.

Das Funfte Rad (projected): Bertolt Brecht, from Aus einem Lesebuch für Städtebewohner (From a reader for city-dwellers), reprinted in Die Gedichte, 160–162 and 165–166 (Nos. 2 and 6, respectively); in English translation, Bertolt Brecht Poems, 132–133 and 137 (Nos. 2 and 6, respectively).
Appendix 2a. Documents pertaining to the Third Reich.

Address by Joseph Goebbels in Berlin, 28 May 1938

Source: *Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer*, 5. Jahr, Nummer 11, 1 June 1938 (Berlin), S. 1

**Zehn Grundsätze deutscher Musikschaffens**

1. Nicht das Programm und nicht die Theorie, nicht Experiment und nicht Konstruktion machen das Wesen der Musik. Ihr Wesen ist die Melodie. Die Melodie als solche erhebt die Herzen und erquickt die Gemüter; sie ist nicht deshalb kitschig oder verwerflich, weil sie ihrer Einprägsamkeit wegen vom Volke gesungen wird.


4. Die Musik ist die sinnlichste aller Künste. Sie spricht deshalb mehr das Herz und das Gefühl als den Verstand an. Wo aber schlüge das Herz eines

---

**Ten Principles of German Musical Creation**

1. Not the program and not the theory, not experimentation and not construction make the nature of music. Its nature is the melody. The melody as such raises hearts and refreshes souls; therefore it is neither kitschy nor objectionable, because it is sung by the Volk on account of its memorability.

2. Not every [kind of] music fits everyone. Therefore that kind of popular music, which finds its way into the broad masses, also has its right to exist, especially in an epoch in which it must be the task of the government, besides the difficult worries that the time entails, also to bring relaxation, entertainment, and refreshment to the Volk.

3. Like every other art, so does music rise from secret and deep powers that are rooted in folklore. Therefore, it also can be shaped and managed only by the children of folklore in accordance with the necessity and unbridled musical drive of a Volk. Jewishness and German music are opposites that, according to their nature, stand in starkest conflict to each other. The fight against Jewishness in German music—which Richard Wagner once took on, lonely and only on his own—is therefore still today our great problem of the time, never to be relinquished, which now, however, is no longer operated by a knowing and brilliant outsider alone, but carried out by an entire Volk.

4. Music is the most sensual of all arts. It speaks therefore more to the heart and to feeling than to understanding. But where would the heart of a
Volkes heißer als in seinen breiten Massen, in denen das Herz einer Nation seine eigentliche Heimstätte gefunden hat. Es ist deshalb einer unabweisbare Pflicht unserer Musikführung, das ganze Volk an den Schätzen der deutschen Musik teilnehmen zu lassen.

5. Unmusikalisch sein, das ist für den musikalischen Menschen so viel wie blind oder taub sein. Danken wir Gott, daß er uns die Gnade gab, Musik zu hören, sie zu empfinden und leidenschaftlich zu lieben.

6. Die Musik ist jene Kunst, die das Gemüt der Menschen am tiefsten bewegt; sie besitzt die Kraft, den Schmerz zu lindern und das Glück zu verklären.

7. Wenn die Melodie der Ursprung der Musik ist, so folgt daraus, daß die Musik für das Volk sich nicht im Pastoralen oder Choralen erschöpfen darf. Sie muß immer wieder zur bewegten Melodie als der Wurzel ihres Wesens zurückkehren.

8. Nirgendwo liegen die Schätze der Vergangenheit so reich und unerschöpflich ausgebreitet wie auf dem Gebiete der Musik. Sie zu heben und an das Volk heranzutragen, ist unsere wichtigste und lohnendste Aufgabe.


10. Als Kinder unseres Volkes sind sie damit auch die eigentlichen Majestäten unseres Volksstums, in Wahrheit von Gottes Gnaden und dazu bestimmt, den Ruhm und die Ehre unserer Nation zu erhalten und zu mehren.

Entwurf des Schreibens an Orff ist beigefügt.
Sehr geehrter Herr Orff!


Ich freue mich ganz besonders, dass Ihr Werk seine Uraufführung in Frankfurt a.M. erleben konnte und hoffe, dass die so glücklich angeknüpfte Verbindung zwischen Ihnen und der Frankfurter Oper sich auch in Zukunft bewahren und festigen möge.


Gestatten Sie mir, Ihnen auch für die Zukunft für Ihr persönliches Wohlergehen und für die glückhafte Weiterentwicklung Ihres Werkes meine besten Wünsche auszusprechen.

Heil Hitler!

[Signature]

I. Herrn
Carl Orff
München
Mauringstraße 16

II. In Abschrift
ab dem Kulturamt
auf dem Ber.v.15.6.37/
1) d. Abh.-Anhörs-Führung
zur Kenntnis, zu b) und Überweisung
des Betrages von 500.-- in an Herrn
Orff unter Verrechnung auf 1. 1a. 43.
An den  
Oberbürgermeister der Stadt Frankfurt/Main  
Herrn Staatsrat Dr. Fritz K e b s  
F r a n k f u r t/Main  
================================  
Rathaus  

Sehr geehrter Herr Oberbürgermeister!

Mit grosser Freude empfing ich Ihren Brief vom 24. ds. Mts.,  
in dem Sie mir die Ueberweisung einer Ehrenbote der Stadt  
Frankfurt ankündigten. Ich bin von dieser Nachricht ebenso  
überrascht wie erfreut und danke Ihnen sehr herzlich für  
die Anerkennung meines Werkes, die Sie dadurch zum Aus-  
druck bringen.

Dass die Burana nicht nur Ihre Anerkennung gefunden hat,  
sondern Ihnen auch, wie ich dem Brief entnehmen darf, per-  
sönlich Freude gemacht hat, ist mir besonders wertvoll.

Bei der Durchsicht der täglich einlaufenden Pressestimmen  
über die Uraufführung der Burana sehe ich, welch ungemeines  
Aufsehen und welch allgemein begeisterte Aufnahme die be-  
wunderungswerte Leistung der Frankfurter Oper gefunden hat.

Ich möchte Sie, sehr verehrter Herr Oberbürgermeister, ganz  
besonders beglückwünschen zu dieser hervorragenden Opernbühne  
und bin zugleich stolz mit meinem Werk ein Kleines zum alten  
Rahme dieser Oper und der Stadt Frankfurt beigetragen zu haben.

Mit nochmaligem Dank und bester Empfehlung

Heil Hitler!

Ihr ergebener

Carl Orff
Abschrift!

Carl Orff
München, Mailingerstr 16, II

München, den 10.8.1938

Herrn
Staatsrat Oberbürgermeister Dr. Krebs
Frankfurt/Main
Rathaus

Sehr verehrter Herr Staatsrat!

Ich empfing heute mit grosser Freude die Auftragserteilung zu einer Musik zu Shakespeare's Sommernachtstraum durch Herrn Generalintendanten Meissner, und ich danke Ihnen ausserordentlich für das wiederum bewiesene Vertrauen.

Ich freue mich sehr, die handschriftliche Partitur nach Fertigstellung der Arbeit der Stadt Frankfurt/Main übergeben zu können, denn ich verdanke der Stadt und damit Ihnen, sehr verehrter Herr Oberbürgermeister, eine entscheidende künstlerische Förderung und bin glücklich, dass ein weiteres Werk von mir in Ihrem Theater zur Aufführung kommen soll.

Mit ergebenen Grüßen
Heil Hitler!
gez.: Carl Orff

---

I. Gelben

II. Vermerk zum Vorgang in den Akten 6112, Bd. 2

III. U.
über das Kulturamt
dem Herrn Generalintendanten
zum Weiteren gemäss Vfg. vom 4.5.38.

DER OBERBÜRGERMEISTER
In Vertretung
gez.: Kremmer
Herrn
Oberbürgermeister
Staatsrat Dr. Krebs,
F r a n k f u r t / M e i n
Rathaus

Sehr verehrter Herr Staatsrat!
Von Frankfurt/M. zurückkommend möchte ich Ihnen noch einmal meinen Dank zum Ausdruck bringen für das warme Interesse, das Sie immer erneut für meine Arbeiten und Pläne zeigen. Ich freue mich außerordentlich, dass Letztere nun der Verwirklichung zustreben und hoffe nur, dass meine "Intuitionen" in Zukunft für Frankfurt/M. genau so lebhaft spriessen, wie heute meine Arbeitstätigkeit für unsere Pläne!
Man kann und soll ja in künstlerischer Beziehung nie "Zukunftsmusik" machen, aber ich hoffe, verehrter Herr Staatsrat, dass Sie wissen, dass alles das, was in meiner persönlichen Macht liegt, von mir aus getan wird, um Ihren Werksauftrag an mich einem guten Ziel zuzusteuern. Ich möchte mich in meinen Worten an Sie, verehrter Herr Staatsrat, nicht immer wiederholen - darum würden es mich freuen, wenn ich bald in das Stadium der "Tat" eintreten könnte!
In diesem Sinne begrüsse ich Sie dankbar ergebenst mit

Heil Hitler!

O h r
C a r l O r f f
Nr. 58: Letter from Hans Meissner to Friedrich Krebs, 15 June 1937

Following up on the consultation I made with you, allow me to renew the proposal to give to Herr Carl Orff a one-time honorary gift of the city in the amount of 500 RM on the occasion of the world premiere and great success of his work *Carmina Burana*. The amount not only would be a recognition of the especially high quality artistic accomplishment Orff demonstrates, but also a balancing for the deprivation, which has lasted for years, that has been imposed on the composer. Even still today the poet lives definitely not in especially favorable economic conditions and a special grant, at least on the economic side, certainly would make his artistic work easier for him.

A draft of the letter to Orff is enclosed.

Nr. 60: Letter from Friedrich Krebs to Carl Orff, 24 June 1937

Dear Herr Orff:

The world premiere of your work *Carmina Burana* has made a great, indelible impression on me. This impression yet deepened with a second hearing. The richness of vocal ideas, the clear and pure command of musical lines, as also the catchy melodies of your work certainly will win the hearts of many listeners far beyond Frankfurt.

I am especially pleased that your work could experience its world premiere in Frankfurt am Main and hope that so happy a tied-together bond between you and the Frankfurt Opera may prove itself and strengthen also in the future.

In recognition of the work that you yourself also did in the last weeks before the world premiere in Frankfurt am Main and that you dedicated to preparing the piece, I allow an honorary prize of 500 RM to be transferred to you.

Permit me also to express for you my best wishes for the future, for your personal wellbeing, and for the serendipitous further development of your work.

Heil Hitler!

Nr. 61: Letter from Carl Orff to Friedrich Krebs, 25 June 1937

Dear Mr. Mayor!

I received your letter from the 24th of this month, in which you announce a transfer of an honorary prize, with great joy.

I am as surprised as I am pleased by this message and thank you very heartily for the recognition of my work, which you thereby express.

That the *Burana* not only has found your recognition, but also made you personally happy, as I may gather from the letter, is especially valuable to me.

With the examination of the reviews, coming in daily, over the world premiere of the *Burana*, I see what a tremendous success and what a generally enthusiastic reception the admirable performance of the Frankfurt Opera has found.

I would like to congratulate you quite especially, very dear Mr. Mayor, on this outstanding operatic stage and at the same time am proud to have contributed with my work a little bit to the old glory of this opera and the city of Frankfurt.

With further thanks and best regards

Heil Hitler!

Your devoted Carl Orff
Nr. 124a: Letter from Carl Orff to Friedrich Krebs, 10 June 1938

Most honored state counselor!

Today I received the commission for music for Shakespeare’s Ein Sommernachtstraum with great joy through Herr Generalintendant Meissner, and I thank you extraordinarily for the trust [you have] proved again.

It would make me very happy to be able to give the handwritten score to the city of Frankfurt-am-Main after the work is completed, for I have the city—and with it, you, most honored Herr Mayor—to thank for crucial artistic support and am happy that a further work from me should come to have a production in your theater.

With devoted greetings
Heil Hitler!
Carl Orff

Nr. 328: Letter from Carl Orff to Friedrich Krebs, 26 April 1940

Note: this letter was written around the time of Orff’s two-year contract with Frankfurt to receive 500 RM monthly, which included supplying festival music (presumably the new version of his Entrata, premiere 28 February 1941), the new version of Der Mond (which did not come to fruition), and the world premiere of Die Kluge on 20 February 1943 (see Nr. 329–330; see also page 178 of this dissertation). Note also that Orff’s insistent promise to do everything in his power to please the Lord Mayor came after he had not been able to produce the music for Ein Sommernachtstraum within the desired timeframe the preceding year (resulting the reduction of his commission from 5,000 RM to 3,000 RM).

Most honored state counselor!

Returning from Frankfurt-am-Main, I would like to express my thanks to you once more for the warm interest that you always repeatedly show for my work and plans. I am extraordinarily happy that the latter now head toward realization and only hope that my “intuitions” in the future for Frankfurt-am-Main grow exactly as vivaciously as does my desire today to work for our plans!

One certainly can and should never make “future music” in an artistic relationship, but I hope, honored state counselor, that you know that I do everything that lies in my personal power to steer myself to a good endpoint for your work order.

I would like not always to repeat myself in my words to you, honored state counselor—that is why it would make me happy if I could soon enter into the stage of the “deed”!

In this sense I greet you thankfully and most devotedly with

Heil Hitler!
Your Carl Orff
Memo from the Gauhauptstellenleiter, 27 May 1942. Berlin Bundesarchiv (BA), N 0029, 0046. The Bundesarchiv has a copy of the same document dated 10 July 1942 (BA N 0029, 0052).

Translation: I request an assessment, as exhaustive as possible, of the composer Carl Orff. In the present case it simply serves us [to have] as detailed a statement as possible about Orff with regard to politics, worldview, and character. He is identified as a composer in ever strengthening crowds and celebrated directly by those circles that even today are yet regarded as opponents in their worldview. In our office there are concerns with respect to worldview regarding the “Music Schulwerk” edited by him, and we distance ourselves also from his musical creations. We ask that the survey be carried out confidentially. It is especially important to ascertain as to whether Orff is a Party member, as the case may be whether he belongs to the structure of the NSDAP, and whether he generally ever has functioned in the sense of the NSDAP. As there is a current reason for our request, we are bound for a quick answer.
Memo from the Gauhauptstellenleiter, 30 May 1942. Berlin BA, N 0029, 0046. The Bundesarchiv has a copy of the same document dated 10 July 1942 (BA N 0029, 0052). (Note: words difficult to read on printout penciled in by author at the archive.)

Translation: “Assessment desired on the following grounds: Enquiry of the Gauschulungsamtes.
I request from you exact information as to whether there are concerns against the political reliability of the abovementioned person [and], if applicable, on what fact they are grounded. In view of the urgency of the matter, I request the compliance of the date identified.” The boxed text in the upper right hand corner translates to “Immediately filed: strictly confidential!”
Memo from the Gauhauptstellenleiter to the Gauschulungsamt, 27 June 1942. Berlin BA, N 0029, 0066 (a later copy of this document dated 17 August 1942 is also present in the Berlin BA, N 0029, 0050)

Translation: “Orff, according to the documents available here, is neither a member of the NSDAP nor of one of its organizations or connected associations. He appears to be engaged in no way with respect to politics. Facts that are indicative of opposition have not become known.”

Note the following two discrepant questionnaires on Orff, one of which reports that he was member of the Reichskulturkammer and one of which erroneously reports that he was not (presumably this memo is based on the latter).
Memo to the Gauleitung, München-Oberbayern, 27 June 1942. Berlin BA, N 0029, 0060
Translation: “About both of the composers living in the Gräfelfing Ortsgruppe, Werner Egk and Karl Orff, I request that their political pasts and early artistic works be clarified in detail.”

Translation:

"About both of the composers living in the Gräfelfing Ortsgruppe, Werner Egk and Karl Orff, I request that their political pasts and early artistic works be clarified in detail.”
Memo from the Hoheitsträger (Munich), 30 June 1942. Berlin BA, N 0029, 0048
Translation: “There are no doubts against his political reliability. Orff is very often travelling¹ and wholly dedicates himself to art.” Text at bottom of page: “This assessment should not be sufficient, so I request a further page be enclosed!”

¹ Literally “always very much on the road.”
Memo from Obergemeinschaftsleiter der NSDAP, 10 July 1942. Berlin BA, N 0029, 0064.
Translation: "In the enclosure I send you two questionnaires, which I as usual request you fill out most carefully and return in the near future. I request that you expand the assessment as much as possible on the following points: 1. Character, 2. political past, 3. early artistic works.

An die
Ogr. Gräfelfing d.NSDAP
z. Hd. Fg. Martin Eich e le
Gräfelfing b. München.
Würmstr. 3

Gaupersonalamt/Hpt. St. Fig. Beurteilung
K/Scha. - SE 837 / 00 342

Betrifft: Werner EGK, Komponist, wh. Gräfelfing und
Karl ORFF, Komponist, wh. Gräfelfing.

In der Anlage übermittle ich Ihnen 2 Fragebogen, die ich wie üblich sorgfältigst ausgefüllt in Nähe zurück erbitte.
Ich erweise Sie nach aller Möglichkeit die politische Beurteilung auf folgende Punkte zu erweitern:
1. Charakter, 2. politisches Vorleben, 3. künstlerisches Jugend-
schaffen.

Heil Hitler!

Anlagen!

Obergemeinschaftsleiter der NSDAP.
Memo from Ortsgruppenleiter (Gräfelfing), 30 July 1942, Berlin BA, N 0029, 0054

“Orff lives here very secluded. He lives in the house of his mother-in-law Willert, who is described as wealthy. The named person spends much time in Munich and should also have yet another apartment there. At [these] locations he primarily conducts musical studies. (composition). Nothing is apparent about his politics. Nothing adverse is known about him.” Translation of text at bottom: “This assessment should not be sufficient, so I request a further page be enclosed!”

Ausführliches Gesamiturteil:

Orf lebt hier sehr zurückgezogen. Er bewohnt das Haus seiner Schwiegermutter Willert, die als vermögend bezeichnet wird. 
Genannter hält sich viel in München auf und soll auch dort noch eine andere Wohnung haben.
Am Orte betreibt er hauptsächlich musikalisches Studium. (komponieren)
Politisch tritt er nicht in Erscheinung. Nachteiliges über ihm ist nichts bekannt.

Kenntnis genommen.

[Signature]

Der Kreisleiter,
I.A.

Gräfelfing, den 30. Juli 1942

Der Ortsgruppenleiter

Der Hoheitsträger

Sollte der Beurteilungsbogen nicht ausreichen, so bitte ich, ein weiteres Blatt beizulegen!
Questionnaires regarding Carl Orff's political background, Berlin BA, 0047 and 0053. Note the discrepant answers with regard to II b; the first document (stating that Orff was a member of the Reichskulturkammer) is correct. Translations follow.

I. Frühere Zugehörigkeit zu anderen politischen Parteien oder Wehr-verbänden sowie Logen?

von:                       bis

nein

II. a) Mitglied der NSDAP seit:     Mitgliedsnummer:

nein

b) Zugehörigkeit zu Gliederungen, angeschlossenen Verbänden der Partei usw.?

seit: Reichskulturkammer

Bekleidet derselbe ein Amt innerhalb der Partei, Gliederungen oder angeschlossenen Verbände?

nein

c) Ist Frau in Frauenschaft?

nein

d) Sind Kinder in HJ, BDM, JV?

nein

III. Soziales Verhalten:  ist gut uns einwandfrei
Federaler Zollverwaltungsverband, Bundesamt für Verwaltung, 1940.

II. a) Mitglied der NSDAP seit: / Mitgliedsnummer: /
nein

b) Zugehörigkeit zu Gliederungen, angeschlossenen Verbänden der Partei usw.?
seit: nein
Bekleidet derselbe ein Amt innerhalb der Partei, Gliederungen oder angeschlossenen Verbände?
nein

c) Ist Frau in Frauentuch?
nein

d) Sind Kinder in HJ, BDM, JV?

III. Soziales Verhalten:

s. Beurteilung
I. Earlier membership to other political parties, paramilitary organizations, or lodges?

from: unknown to: unknown

II. a) Member of the NSDAP: Membership number:

no

b) Membership in organizations, affiliated associations of the Party, etc.?

since: Reichskulturkammer (i.e. Reich Cultural Chamber)

Holds rank in the same office within the party, organizations, affiliated associations?

no

c) Is wife in the Frauenenschaft [women’s branch of the NSDAP]? no

d) Are children in the Hitler Youth, League of German Girls [branch of the Hitler Youth for girls], Young Volk [branch of Hitler Youth for boys aged 10 to 14]? no

III. Social behavior: is good, flawless for us

Note: HJ = Hitlerjugend; BDM = Bund Deutscher Mädel; JV = Jung Volk