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Nietzsche’s break with Wagner, this last event of the German spirit over which greatness broods...

Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*

“zerging’ in Dunst
das heil’ge Römische Reich,
uns bleibe gleich
die heil’ge deutsche Kunst!”

Richard Wagner, *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*

On the genesis of art - That making perfect, seeing as perfect, which characterizes the cerebral system bursting with sexual energy (evening with the beloved, the smallest chance occurrences as transfixed, life a succession of sublime things, ‘the misfortune of the unfortunate lover worth more than anything else’): on the other hand, everything perfect and beautiful works as an unconscious reminder of that enamored condition and its way of seeing - every perfection, all the beauty of things, revives through contiguity this aphrodisian bliss (die aphrodisische Seligkeit).

Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power*

Among the more effective predictions of Friedrich Nietzsche was his stated confidence that future generations would forever entwine his name with that of composer Richard Wagner. Nietzsche had been one of the most enthusiastic younger supporters of Wagner’s cause of promulgating a new music drama and theatrical-cultural site for its reception -- the so-called ‘Idea of Bayreuth’ -- that would regain for the German spirit the standards and pathos of classical Hellenic tragic drama. The momentous break between Nietzsche and Wagner - momentous, at least, for the younger Nietzsche at that time if not for the elder and established Wagner – proved a crucial element in the matured Nietzsche’s formulations of an ‘aesthetic morals’ (cf. Chytry, 1989: 317) that would supersede Wagner, Wagernianism, and the gathering of Wagnerian acolytes in Bayreuth.

himself the very embodiment of the Gesamt-kunstwerk, 'total artwork', no less than Gemeinsam-Kunstwerk, 'collective artwork'. (for further references see Chytry, 1989: 274-317)

How is such a phenomenon to be classified: The coming to fruition of the most flamboyant wing of European Romanticism? Breakthrough to a world promised by the total revolutions of 1848? Quantum leap onto the 'aesthetic utopia' availed on a century of German Hellenism and nostalgia for the Hellenic polis? Manifestation of the décadence of triumphal 'theatrocracy'?

Perhaps most simply: the first sustained venture in an 'artful firm' – that is, the first exemplar of the 'art firm', 'aesthetic firm', 'artful making', terms that have come into increasing prominence and currency among a contemporary generation of post-Schumpeterian management, organization, and business theorists eager to converge aesthetics, management, and community. Without denying the more aesthetic-political-spiritual readings of The idea of Bayreuth, this paper considers such an option. In the first part it traces the important two phases in Wagner's own career as the context for applying such a reading. The second part then calls upon the help of Nietzsche's closing revaluation of Wagner and Wagnerianism in terms of Nietzsche's own project of a 'physiological' aesthetics. Finally, the third and fourth parts look at the phenomenon of Bayreuth itself as an entrepreneurial enterprise located within the standards of the radical Wagner’s and later Nietzsche’s aesthetics.

ONE
What was Richard Wagner getting at with what eventually became known as the Idea of Bayreuth? The answer is woven into Wagner’s career and its division into two phases, separated by his encounter with the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer around 1854-56. This division is itself deeply marked by Wagner’s relation to the politics of his time and to his search for a distinctly German renewal of the arts and of what he came to call the ‘purely human’ (das reine Menschliche).

The first phase finds Wagner as the total revolutionary, increasingly imbibing radical ideas from anarchist and socialist circles regarding the need for a complete transformation of society through political revolution. By his own confessions Wagner began as a child of the Revolution of 1830 – ‘with one blow I became a revolutionary’ -- convinced that every striving person should become ‘exclusively occupied with politics’; (Wagner, 1967: 98) and by the time of the Revolutions of 1848, Dresden Kapellmeister Wagner had become a full-fledged ally of such unquestioned radicals as the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin in the Dresden revolution of 1849. After the failure of the latter, Wagner was lucky to escape to Switzerland and became the most famous outlaw of music for European political conservatism over the next decade, producing a steady stream of radical-revolutionary works -- both programmatic and musico-dramatic -- that famously brought together the themes of art and total revolution.

In the second phase, chastened by Napoleon's coup of 1851 in France, Wagner was redirected to take an interest in Schopenhauer, which after 1854-6 grew into a lifelong, if idiosyncratic, devotion to Schopenhauerian world renunciation. Subsequently, personally saved from his immense debts by the timely intervention of that ‘perfect Wagnerite’ King Ludwig ii of Bavaria, in 1864, Wagner embarked on the pragmatic realization of his hopes for a theatre and cultural space specifically capable of producing and understanding his grandest musico-dramatic projects – from the Ring cycle to the body of works that culminate in the one musico-dramatic work, Parsifal, shaped and staged with his concrete Theatron of Bayreuth in mind.

An understandable, but incorrect, reading of this evolution would claim, as does Bryan Magee in his recent study of Wagner and philosophy, that the first-phase Wagner was politically inclined, whereas the second-phase Wagner had freed himself from such adolescent expectations in favor of a more matured and profound reconciliation with the limits of politics as such. In truth however, the second-phase Wagner was even more driven toward ensuring political change after his Schopenhauerian ‘conversion’. What had changed was quite simply that whereas the original plan foresaw the cooperative alliance of radical political movements and theatrical revolution, the later strategies, having given up on the equality between the political and the theatrical, aimed rather at effecting political change directly through the impact of the musico-dramatic works themselves while subordinating any remaining political fellow-travelers to this one overriding objective. It is in the transition between these two approaches that something like the ‘artful-firm’ reading of the Idea of Bayreuth then becomes salient.

Let us accordingly reconsider the central features of the first phase. Like his Leipzig University peers, the Young Wagner of 1830 was bowled over by the revolutionary tide. That August in Brussels the most striking conjunction of opera and revolution took place when a crowd attending the French composer Daniel Auber’s opera La Muette de Portici was so overwhelmed by the patriotic duet ‘Amour sacré de la patrie’ sung by the renowned tenor Adolphe Nourrit that it poured out into the streets shouting out patriotic slogans against the ruling Netherlands government, seized the hotel de ville and other governmental buildings, thus launching a revolution that ultimately founded the Kingdom of Belgium and the establishment of a Belgian constitution in 1831.

This is as transparent a connection between ‘opera’ and ‘revolution’ as one might ask, and not surprisingly, in his later reminiscences of Auber in 1871 Wagner was lavish in his praise of La Muette de Portici as an explosive event for German audiences in 1830 – and of course himself -- in terms of the future possibilities for genuine music drama. This opera, he averred, ‘became recognized as the manifest theatrical predecessor of the July Revolution and seldom has an artistic manifestation had such an exact relation to a world event’ (Wagner, 1914, vii: 141). Not surprisingly, Auber’s presentation of the crowd scenes in revolutionary conditions formed the model for Wagner's early opera Das Liebesverbot (1836) that similarly exploited revolutionary possibilities based on a theme culled from Neapolitan history. Similarly, Rienzi, der Letzte der Tribuner (1837), Wagner’s first extensive foray into ‘grand opera’ in the contemporaneous Parisian tradition, was based on the historical figure of Cola di Rienzi whose temporary fame in 1347
as the Tribune of the Roman populus refounding the Roman Republic had long received the approbation of such canonical European authors as Petrarch. This same opera, performed with dazzling effect in Dresden in 1842, actually launched Wagner's career beyond a local German context onto the wider European stage, whence emerged Wagner's explicit embarkation, starting with his Die fliegende Holländer (1843), toward the ideal of a superior 'music drama' to supplant mere entertainment opera and work hand-in-hand with political-revolutionary transformation of the German and European landscapes.

Critical to this ambition was Wagner's absorption during precisely this 1847-9 revolutionary period of the image of ancient Athenian democracy and its commitment to dramatic tragedy as a political, spiritual, and religious celebration that Wagner drew from his readings of the German classicist Johann Gustav Droysen. Droysen's main claim that the tragic poet was the ultimate educator for bringing together the first genuine democracy by a 'Volk' proved the catalyst for Wagner's project. From now on -- unlike his German Romantic peers -- the meaning for Wagner of the standard of 'Volk' was inseparable from this model of the Athenian polis, allowing Wagner to evoke for the first time 'the great total art-work (Gesammtkunstwerk) of (Aeschylean) tragedy' for his ideal of the music drama as the union of all the arts in service to the creation of a people's self-understanding (Chytry, 1989: 278 esp. note 15). Accordingly, in terms of the revolutionary movement, this model of the Athenian polis meant for Wagner that the music dramatist's task during the revolutionary stage proper must be to cultivate this same standard in conjunction with explicit political revolutionary change, since such a dramatic standard would arouse an 'authentic' sense in the audience of how a people should live and identify themselves, thus undermining the deleterious effects of industrial civilization on modern individuals (more particularly, it would also undercut the continued dominance of French cultural standards over German self-identification). After the success of the revolution, this same model of the Athenian polis would then help suggest the kind of role that music drama should play in a society like the Athenian, for which commercial considerations had been excised in favor of the religio-spiritual event of the festival and public participation in drama and music.

Turning to the implications of the second phase in Wagner's evolution, what had markedly changed around 1854-56 was Wagner's loss of confidence in explicit political revolution for effecting a total transformation in society. Moreover, Wagner's Schopenhauerian turn provided the first (and final) clear philosophical legitimation of what Wagner thought that he was doing dramaturgically. Together however, these changes, far from removing Wagner from the political arena, reinforced his single-minded commitment solely to himself and the Wagnerian Gesammtkunstwerk for his prime agent of change. Thus Wagner began the long, and fascinating, turn in his dramaturgy which, while continuing to rely on the priority of the total artwork of all the arts, placed music front and center in a manner that undermined his earlier theory of the balance of (poetic) word and music for drama. It was still to be the artwork of all the arts -- but music was the mistress, since Wagner now understood from Schopenhauer that music was the single artform that directly manifested the universal/noumenal Will. Put in non-Schopenhauerian terms, music revealed the underlying nature of all being, and as a result, transformation through the music drama became all the more pivotal for transforming human beings directly. Accordingly, the deliciously naive musings of the revolutionary Wagner during his Zurich exile of a special temporary theatre to house the four events that would freely perform the Ring cycle before that theatre was consigned to the 'flames' gradually evolved during the 1850s into the more sober recognition that he would somehow have to build his special temple for the kind of performances that his works metaphysically demanded.

With Ludwig's miraculous entry into this process in 1864, Wagner immediately began rhapsodizing with his royal admirer that they should transform Bavaria's capital city of Munich into an 'Athens of the Isar' crowned 'with a monument to all the Muses, the temple of the Gesammtkunstwerk'. (Chytry, 1989: 297 esp. note 82). More practically, Wagner hastened to bring a mixed bag of old radicals, barricadeurs, and young experimental musicians -- August Röckel, Julius Froebel, Gottfried Semper, and Heinrich Laube among others -- to Munich in service to the common cause. Nor did he himself hesitate to 'instruct' his young ward of the political theories -- Ludwig Feuerbach, Constantin Frantz, and Ferdinand Lasalle -- that he regarded as trenchant to their project. In fact, the first genuine productions of Wagnerian music drama, from Tristan und Isolde in 1865 to the first parts of the Ring cycle in 1869 and 1870, did confirm that Ludwig would stop at nothing to ensure appropriate performances in his capital, including the construction of the ideal Wagnerian theatre. Yet, partly because of the reaction by Catholic Bavaria to Wagner's new liaison with Franz Liszt's illegitimate daughter Cosima -- the cause of Wagner and Cosima leaving Munich during 1865-6 -- Wagner recast his gaze upon an entirely independent site of pilgrimage for his temple of the arts, finally discovering in 1870 a Brockhaus encyclopaedia account of the north Bavarian (and Protestant) city Bayreuth that seemed perfect for his purposes. As it turned out, the original baroque theatre in Bayreuth that Wagner had planned to update proved completely useless; but once the die was cast, Wagner's single-mindedness succeeded, as of 22 May 1872, in transforming the idea of Bayreuth into the inauguration event of setting the foundation stone for the literal building of his own specified Gesammtkunstwerk theatre. From this point on, it is fair to say that the idea of Bayreuth had become a permanent aesthetic-political fact of modern German life.

But what exactly did the idea of Bayreuth suggest to Wagner himself at this later stage of his career? Perhaps the most appropriate terminology would be: 'religion of art' (Kunstreligion), a term originally coined by the German philosopher G. W. F. Hegel to refer to the epoch of classical Greek society, politics and spirituality in which 'art' served as the focal point for the highest manifestations of spirit (Geist). This term Kunstreligion is useful to corral Wagner through its conjunction of 'religion' and 'art'. Wagner, it seems clear, sought out a musica-dramatic experience that required an 'island' or refuge from daily demands, its center a veritable 'temple' to the experience of an ultimate or grounding reality that was only accessible to music and that then needed its incarnations into dramatico-figural shapes to access an audience or acolyte. Thus contemporary descriptions of attending Bayreuth as a 'pilgrimage' or even a 'hajj' are not necessarily mistaken, or for that matter automatically
blashphemous. Something comparable to the experience of a kind of religiosity does reward the undeterred Bayreuth pilgrim. Indeed, Wagner finally resorted to the term ‘Bühnenweihfestspiel’ – a ‘stage dedication play’ – to further distinguish Parsifal – the one work specifically composed with the Bayreuth Festspielhaus in mind – from the common run of operatic works and traditions.

The trouble, of course, with such formulations is that it threatens to remake Wagner himself into a quasi-divine figure, a ‘messenger’ as he saw himself, or prophet for modernity, which would then drag in his more prosaic fulminations covering such insalubrious subject-matter as his inveterate anti-Semitism. Still, it is worth noting that Bayreuth has had only a century for deepening, or chastening some of, its effects. Comparable times marked for such long-lasting religions as institutional Christianity and Islam indicate similar teething pains toward something that would in time grow into pragmatic substantiality. Even so, far more relevant is the question of exactly what this ‘religion’ entails. The hasty answer: ‘art’, only begins the process of unraveling how the domains of the aesthetic and artistic creation have increasingly preempted zones of traditional religiosity historically since the early nineteenth century. It may be argued that behind such a religiosity there dwells no ‘God’ (but then neither is Buddhism dependent on one) nor ‘Artist-God’ (as the later Nietzsche put it teasingly), but rather the originating reality of Poieisis proper: the deeply poetic origination to all things that certain past cultures have articulated by drawing on the aesthetic language of primordial vibration, of the ontological ‘non-sound’ (anahata/shabda) that first ‘non-sound’ (anahata/shabda) that first makes possible proper Sound itself – and consequently mousiké, or ‘music’. 

Granted that this slant on Wagner’s goals is helpful, how then did the later Wagner plan to make practicable the siting of his distinctive religion of art? Here we enter into the ‘commercial’ Wagner, a feature of the composer’s prodigious energy that is often overlooked or misread. To plan out the Temple, to line up support for it, to ensure appropriately exemplary performances of the music dramas, is surely not the least of Wagner’s lifetime accomplishments. Since he had managed to gain autonomy over the whole ‘festival’ project of Bayreuth, Wagner’s original financing strategy depended on privately raised funds through a large number of small donors. Wagner first tried patrons’ certificates, purchasers thus securing seats at forthcoming performances, and he supported the founding of Wagner societies which might secure patrons through fund-raising. These fiscal sources would hopefully allow Wagner to retain his ideal of a festival without charge for genuine devotees. However, the schemes failed and ultimately Wagner had to resort to ticket sales and to turn the enterprise into a joint stock company (following Spotts, 1994: 45). Even then, Ludwig himself was called upon for a timely loan, and the first Ring festival in 1876 proved a financial failure; it took two decades before Bayreuth worked as a commercial enterprise, and not till 1913 did Cosima and the Wagner family manage to pay off all outstanding debts.

For all that, Wagner did succeed in establishing the first modern musical festival. The Shakespeare festivals at Stratford were founded in 1879, the Mozart Salzburg festivals in 1920, while the first such family enterprise, Glyndebourne, came much later in 1934. Indeed, it could be argued that Bayreuth is the first truly ‘classical’ theatre since the Roman odeions; parallels between its Festspielhaus and the ancient Hellenic theatre at Epidaurus have been noted. Above all, the tradition of serious opera (or music-drama) attendance begins with Wagner and his admirably stubborn commitment to exalted standards of performance and audience. For all the subsequent permutations of the Bayreuth enterprise, it can be argued that Wagner’s ‘festival’ today remains perhaps the most impressive exemplar of artistic commitment to the performance of music drama on the part of performers and audience alike.

TWO

Enter the Young Nietzsche. The tale of Nietzsche’s early infatuation with Wagner, and the Wagners, at the Tribschen ‘Asyle’ has become a commonplace of intellectual history. Unexpectedly meeting up with Wagner in Leipzig in 1868, the philological student shortly thereafter had the good fortune to receive a teaching post in Basel within commuting distance of Tribschen. In a short period of time he had become a favored member of the Wagner household and was engaged in extensive discussions with Wagner on their special topics of Schopenhauer and Greek tragedy. Tribschen gave Nietzsche a unique first contact with Wagner’s many friends in politics and the arts and his first concrete image of what the Athens of Aeschylus and Sophocles might well have been like. Indeed Nietzsche was among the first to be told of the Bayreuth enterprise, and his early participation in what he called the ‘Temple’ (or ‘Gralsburg der Kunst’) included a manifesto to the Germans on behalf of Wagner’s fund-raising schemes. Above all, Nietzsche gave new respectability to the Wagnerian enterprise by his unalloyed praise of Wagner’s cultural mission as the modern equivalent of the Dionysian ethos informing classical Athenian tragedy according to the theory in Nietzsche’s maiden work The Birth of Tragedy (1872). Not only the dedication to Wagner, but also the last ten sections of the entire book were devoted to a rather shameless Wagnerophelia.

It is however no less true that as early as January 1874 Nietzsche was privy to raise serious misgivings about Wagner as musician and cultural phenomenon. Attending the Bayreuth rehearsals of 1875 and planning to attend the 1876 inaugural cycle, Nietzsche found himself burdened by serious second thoughts about what he subsequently dubbed Wagnerian ‘theatrocracy’, the Bayreuth gathering of Wagnerian acolytes who represented less a new spirit than the ‘cultural-philistinism’ (as Nietzsche coined it) of the new post-1871 German Reich. Nietzsche’s Richard Wagner in Bayreuth (1875) is both a final praise and subtle critique of Wagner as artistic tyrant, and it was not long before the very different flavors of Wagner’s libretto for Parsifal and Nietzsche’s first post-Wagnerian work Human, All Too Human (1878) hastened the closure of their friendship.

During his prolific writing decade of the 1880s, Nietzsche commonly settled on Wagner as embodiment of a variety of illnesses that Nietzsche attributed to modern society. These writings, often characterized as the ‘positivist’ phase of Nietzschean thinking before it arrived at the set of revaluations rhapsodized in his most singular work Thus Spoke Zarathustra, have proven a subsequent boon to postmodern readings of
Nietzsche which valorize his ironic, decentering, aphoristic moves that sit somewhat uneasily beside his subsequent prophecies of the superman, will to power, and eternal recurrence of the same.\textsuperscript{26} Above all, such 'positivist' writings unfold an unremitting critique of conventional veneration and valorization of art, the artist, the aesthetic, and the poetic and musical genius – critiques that more often than not are launched with the target of Bayreuth and the later composer of Parsifal in mind but also contain far wider implications regarding such veneration of art. To the degree that this suspicion of the stratagems and ideology of the cult of art and artist can be traced even to the final Nietzschean oeuvre, let alone his voluminous Nachlass, perceptive readers of this feature in the Nietzschean project of revaluation are right to wonder whether any room is left for a favorable Nietzschean view of the role of art – certainly of ‘art as work of art’.\textsuperscript{21}

Yet even such comprehensive doubts about the extent of Nietzsche’s devotion to art and the aesthetic dimension are willing to grant his continued sponsorship of something vaguely labeled ‘artistic activity’ (Künstlertum) and of art ‘as meaning a notion of activity, creativity, or organization in the most basic sense’, of ‘an ambiguous kind of art, an art of deeds’.\textsuperscript{22} In the final analysis, Nietzsche may well have felt that the most consummate genre of art, tragic drama, still fell short of its originating dynamics in the Dionysian mysteries, the spectacle, and the festival.\textsuperscript{23} Nonetheless, his final efforts during his final year of sanity of 1888 to sum up Wagner and Wagnerianism did include what he considered an effective antidote, one which might well help launch an alternative and post-decadence mode of creativeness. Accordingly, not only did Nietzsche bring out two small works that dealt solely with Wagner – The Case of Wagner and Nietzsche contra Wagner – but Nietzsche assured a correspondent that a third work, Ecce Homo, was completely concerned with the theme of Wagner.\textsuperscript{24}

Thus, at the same time that Nietzsche was headed toward his own final cannonades which were to include his philosophical summation under such portentous titles as The Will to Power and Revaluation of All Values, he was no less concerned with Richard Wagner: as artist, man, and cultural phenomenon. Upon originally hearing of Wagner’s death in 1883 Nietzsche had declared himself heir to the ‘authentic Wagner’, (Nietzsche, 1975-2004, 3:1: 334). for central even to Nietzsche’s final accounting is less a savaging of Wagner than a clarification of his earlier cooperation with the composer in service to a philosophical revaluation of modernity that he thought the latter shared. This meant a return to the area of philosophical aesthetics which had been Nietzsche’s prime concern during his early years with Wagner. Indeed ‘aesthetics’ is the one area in which the early Nietzsche might regard himself as a formal philosopher, and The Birth of Tragedy was seen above all as a work belonging to ‘aesthetics’. Prior to making his stylistic and substantive turn toward the ‘positivist’ Nietzsche of 1876-8, Nietzsche had been preoccupied with formally working out a genuine ‘tragic’ philosophy corresponding to his account of tragic Greek culture. Nietzsche’s famous claim in The Birth of Tragedy (and strongly reaffirmed in his later 1886 edition of the book) that ‘only as an aesthetic phenomenon is the universe eternally justified’ was in fact legitimized by his argument, in a fragmentary work called Philosophy in the Tragic Age of the Greeks, of the Heraclitean vision of ‘the artistic play of the cosmos’ as basically correct: the universe as indeed a continually dynamic play, the play of the artist and child, the play that the Aion (Zeus) plays with itself.\textsuperscript{25}

It is worth recalling that Nietzsche originally thought that this important conclusion – basically what Nietzsche would henceforth call a ‘Dionysian’ vision of the universe and with which he challenged both Wagner and Schopenhauer – was the philosophical fulfillment of the vision that he had earlier shared with the Tribesmen Wagner – and, incidentally, one which in due course also undermined the young Nietzsche’s commitment to the final truths of Schopenhauerian metaphysics. Thus when Nietzsche finally returned to the project of an appropriately formal philosophical aesthetics in his last year, it was this philosophical alternative that he had in mind when undercutting Wagner, Wagnerianism, and the metaphysics behind the entire Idea of Bayreuth.

Starting with Toward a Genealogy of Morals (1887), Nietzsche announced the prospect of a forthcoming ‘physiology of aesthetics’ – a subject, he claimed, ‘which is practically untouched and unexplored so far’.\textsuperscript{26} Although such a project was never completed, bits and pieces of it float through the production of that final year.\textsuperscript{27} By ‘physiology’ Nietzsche showed his primary concern with the state of plenitude which art either fosters or reinforces. Beauty as the master category of aesthetics should therefore not be read in Kantian-Schopenhauerian terms as a matter of ‘disinterest’ but, on the contrary, as a matter of greatest ‘interest’. This alternative view was underscored by Nietzsche’s resort to the French writer Stendhal’s definition of beauty as ‘a promise of happiness’: ‘une promesse de bonheur’.\textsuperscript{28} Far from constituting the beginnings of a turn away from the world – and the unmoral metaphysical will of Schopenhauerian vintage – beauty for Nietzsche was to mean ‘the highest sign of power, namely power over opposites; moreover, without tension’. Thus beauty – and here Nietzsche launched his aesthetic punch line – was really the ‘aphrodisian bliss’ (die aphrodisische Seligkeit) that rewarded the state of intoxication (Rausch) which had reached a sense of self-perfection. Idealism was therefore not opposed to sensuality; rather, it was the heightening, magnification, transfiguration of the intoxication called ‘love’ – an immense sexual, ‘aphrodisiac’ surge – into the perfected replications made possible through the formalities and technicalities of the varied arts.

Accordingly, Nietzsche’s objection to the Idea of Bayreuth carried a critique of the evolution of Wagner and Wagnerianism in terms of the two phases that we have already described and that Nietzsche himself was perhaps the first to explicitly clarify. Wagner succumbed to Schopenhauer, Nietzsche asserted, because Schopenhauer gave him a metaphysical justification for the priority of music; but that priority was itself based on Schopenhauerian metaphysics that unlike all the other arts – which for Schopenhauer were quasi-Platonic Ideas of the will – music was the direct expression of the will. True, such a position elevated the ontological status of the musician, but it still tied the priority of music to a thoroughly renunciatory metaphysics. If music directly expressed the will – itself the unmoral, striving essence of being – then an entire Festival
ideal for culture committed to such music (the later Wagnerian music, particularly the renunciatory ethics of \textit{Parsifal}, as well as the turn taken by the \textit{Ring} theme in Wagner's final version) could not but be nihilistically directed in the straightforward sense that its purpose was to preach 'redemption' from the world and reality.\textsuperscript{29} Since Nietzsche did not really believe that Wagner meant to instill such an uncompromisingly renunciatory ethics, he could only conclude that, like Baudelaire, Wagner had become the summation of the décadence of a modernity that was capable at its best of lingering over niceties and miniature experiences -- Wagner 'as our greatest \textit{Miniaturist} of music' (Nietzsche, 1966, ii: 918, emphasis in original) -- but incapable of forming values that might supersede the implicit nihilism of his own time. Wagner in effect was the 'playactor' (Schauspieler) par excellence, a tyrant of the theatrical experience who enjoyed the pseudo-Christianizing, pseudo-Buddhist posturings of a \textit{Parsifal} without actually embracing the values of either religion. Nonetheless, the consequences for his theatrical experience and his 'theatrocracy' were nefarious, producing neither a sublime experience of the 'true' nature of reality -- the priority of the cosmos as play, as a 'Dionysian' reality -- nor the equivalent of past religio-theatrical modes of solace as sustained over time by formal institutional practices. Only a theatre freed from the tyranny of Wagnerianism could hope to renew the liberatory experiences that Greek tragic theatre had once offered and that the more radical Wagner himself had once presumably sought to regain.\textsuperscript{30}

\section*{THREE}

It is no part of this article to consider a reading of Wagner that would take seriously the latter's Buddhism and show its differences with Schopenhauerian renunciation.\textsuperscript{31} Such a reading would need to distinguish characteristic accounts of Buddhism as a 'pessimistic' world-view and religion, a position that Nietzsche in his limited understanding of Buddhism maintained, and show how Wagner, at least for this one work, achieved the kind of contemporary tragic experience to which Nietzsche, even in his last polemics against Wagner, seems to have deferred.\textsuperscript{32}

In this third and the following fourth section the aim is rather to indicate how Nietzsche's more 'aesthetic' metaphysics of the universe as play and his reading of beauty as 'aphrodisian bliss' supplements our understanding of the meaning of the Idea of Bayreuth as it has unfolded since its inception by Wagner and how a reading of the Bayreuth project as an 'art firm' aids in this endeavor.

As a family operation, Bayreuth has remained under firm -- if less direct -- control of the Wagner family. Thanks both to an excessively literalist reading of the works and festival idea by Wagner's wife Cosima and son Siegfried, and to Siegfried's wife Winifred Wagner's embrace of, and apparently even love for, Adolf Hitler,\textsuperscript{33} Bayreuth became almost fatally identified with the Third Reich during the 1930s and 1940s.\textsuperscript{34} Indeed, Hitler very probably saved Bayreuth itself by becoming its greatest patron,\textsuperscript{35} and it has been argued that, in turn, the Bayreuth reception of Hitler from 1923-1924 on by Houston Smith Chamberlain and the Wagner clan led by Winifred transformed Hitler himself into the \textit{Führer}-type of the future.\textsuperscript{36} While it is true that the henchmen of National Socialism were not in the least interested in four-plus hours of serious Wagnerian fare, it is no less true that the lynchpin of the system, Adolf Hitler himself, remained a genuine and informed Wagnerite, proposed a new plan for an expanded Festspielhaus, and even forced his lieutenants to attend the festivals until their beer-guzzling propensities in preference to worship of the \textit{Meister} finally discouraged even the \textit{Führer}.\textsuperscript{37} German defeat in World War II meant the disgrace of the Wagner family and temporary control of the Festspielhaus by the U.S. Army. In 1950 however, thanks to the ebbing of de-nazification programs, the Festival's assets were turned over to Siegfried's sons Wieland and Wolfgang, and in 1949 the Society of the Friends of Bayreuth began the old Wagnerian ploy of selling memberships in exchange for donations (Hamann, 2002: 498-567).

The immediate results of this turnabout were that Bayreuth and the Wagnerianism of National Socialism escaped serious accountability -- nor has it occurred since.\textsuperscript{38} Still, as a result of these Nazi associations, foreigners avoided Bayreuth, and since this included the all-important potential legions of foreign performers, conductors, theatrical experts, and audience, such avoidance could have permanently sunk Bayreuth. What in effect saved Bayreuth for the highly successful commercial enterprise that it has since become were two factors. First, the concept of the 'Temple' of Bayreuth had to be changed into that of 'Workshop' or \textit{Werkstatt}. That is, instead of being a temple to the worship at the altar of ' \textit{ce dieu Richard Wagner}', as even the structuralist anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss once celebrated (Levi-Strauss, 1964: 23), it should become the scene for countless artistic and artisanal experiments in theatre that could maintain variety and outside interest in a format and venue that after all were rather limited (to the seven main Wagner music dramas).\textsuperscript{39} Second, starting in 1951, Wieland Wagner embarked on a wholly new way of reading the Wagnerian experience, instituting what became known as New Bayreuth.\textsuperscript{40} Even if the 'post-New Bayreuth' of his brother Wolfgang after Wieland's death in 1966 (Hamann, 2002: 595-611) has been somewhat less successful in establishing historic readings of the Wagnerian oeuvre, Wieland entirely turned around the general view of what to expect from Bayreuth and achieved the modern connection with ancient Greek tragedy that his grandfather -- and the latter's erstwhile young friend Friedrich Nietzsche -- had once hoped for.\textsuperscript{41}

Technically, the Festival was turned over by 1973 to the German government with the Wagner estate becoming the 'Richard-Wagner-Stiftung Bayreuth', to be run by a board of directors of eight members representing the federal government, the government of Bavaria, members of the four lines of the Wagner family, and other elements. This board was entrusted with the responsibility of choosing the director of the Festival, whose autonomy would be 'guaranteed'. Not surprisingly, the board chose Wolfgang. Thus, although by 1973 the Festival was no longer strictly a private dynastic institution, it remained under the direction of Wagner's grandson.\textsuperscript{42}

This, in effect, is the institution that Pierre Guillet de Monthoux (2004: 110-121) in his pioneering work in aesthetic management theory has tried to appropriate for his concept of the 'art firm'. For Guillet de Monthoux, Wagner was an absolute original in conceiving of an art firm or 'art enterprise' as a project working within commercial boundaries while still committing itself to the
kind of aesthetic experience of the ancient Greeks that escaped modern dangers of commodity cooptation and banality. Guillet de Monthoux's account of Wagner is rich in demonstrating Wagner's pragmatic commercial understanding of the obstacles the serious music dramatist had to face in a capitalist reality and the steps he took to mitigate some of those obstacles in order to awaken what Guillet de Monthoux labels – following the aesthetic writings of Friedrich Schiller -- the ‘swing’ or ‘oscillation’ (Schwung) essential to aesthetic experience as such.

Guillet de Monthoux's original reading itself forms part of an important new branch in contemporary organization and business theory concerned with art and the aesthetic dimension in the practices of the firm. We propose to call this branch ‘the artful firm’ in recognition of Guillet de Monthoux’s concept of the ‘art firm’ and of the Harvard business school theorist Rob Austin’s and theatre practitioner Lee Devin’s equally important concept of ‘artful making’ for the primarily knowledge-creating firm’s exploitation of theatrical metaphors of rehearsal, release, collaboration, ensemble and play (cf. Austin & Devin, 2003: 15-16). Similarly relevant areas of work include Antonio Strati’s concept of ‘organizational aesthetics’ as a discipline in which organizations are studied for the role of aesthetic judgments in their daily operations and John Dobson’s historical account of the evolution of the modern firm from the ‘technical firm’ through the ‘moral firm’ to the ‘aesthetic firm’ concerned with Aristotelian excellence as a goal rather than as simply a prudential feature for facilitating profits (Strati, 1999; Strati in Linstead & Höpfl, 2000; Dobson, 1999; Pine & Gilmore, 1999).

Behind such theorizing stands the acknowledgment that modern organizational and entrepreneurial developments, particularly in the areas known as knowledge-creation primarily connected with fast-moving digital technologies, have raised important competitive issues that are increasingly related to aesthetic considerations, from simple design to the running of the (successfully competitive) firm as a quasi-theatrical operation. Indeed one student of the contemporary commercial landscape argues that we have entered an ‘aesthetic age’, an ‘aesthetic universe’ – evident in such highly successful commercial chains as IKEA and Starbucks – which more traditional managers ignore at their peril.43 Wagner’s originality is to have anticipated such contemporary developments by his many-sided invocation of theatre, entrepreneurship, and the Event that crystallizes the ‘experience economy’.44

FOUR

It would be premature to grant speculative legitimacy to this body of works before it reaches further theoretical sophistication. Nonetheless, at least as a symptom, theorizing about the ‘artful firm’ provides a useful perspective with which to read the idea of Bayreuth and its Festival. If the latter cannot serve – and should not, if it wishes to avoid unnecessary controversy -- as a ‘spiritual’ equivalent to the ceremonies and liturgies of established formalized religious institutions, Bayreuth should also not be dismissed as a mere commercial enterprise tied up with the successful sale of tickets to a theatre-going public. One hundred years of survival and prosperity have shown Bayreuth to be what Wagner hoped in his less ‘redemptive’ days that it might become: a serious occasion for the experience and reflection of the aesthetic dimension for the lives of individuals otherwise restricted to the everydayness of advanced industrial society. The category of ‘art firm’ provided by Guillet de Monthoux saves the Idea of Bayreuth from methodologies limited to interpretations of capitalistic cooptations of ‘art’, and the growing body of empirical and theoretical work that we call the ‘artful firm’ shows a variety of ways in which this ‘art firm’ can even be regarded as an aid to the practical functions of the modern business firm according to metaphorics of theatre and design.

Indeed, as these connections are further explored, it may even prove possible to relate such management literature in the ‘artful firm’ to corresponding academic work in the ‘aesthetic-political’ as such (see Chytry, 2005: 263, note 496). If the original impetus behind the ‘aesthetic-political’ is less the de-masking of a fascist ‘aestheticization of politics’ (die Ästhetisierung der Politik)46 and more a modern attempt to regain some of the constructive elements of the ancient Greek polis without succumbing to historical nostalgia, then clarification of Bayreuth as an ‘art firm’ and its relation to management literature on the ‘artful firm’ and ‘organizational aesthetics’ will inevitably have to face its further connections with the political dimension as such. In this endeavor the ‘aesthetic age’ of the management theorist and the ‘aesthetic-political’ of the academic theorist may fertilize one another – perhaps eventually to the extent of taking more seriously the radical Wagner’s own commitment to the polis.46

Any such moves will remain thankful to Nietzsche’s rereadings of the proper function of music drama in favor of a philosophy preferring ‘aphrodisian bliss’ to Wagnerian ‘redemption’. In the final analysis Bayreuth is about providing a space for the particular virtues of the music drama, vaguely based on the revival of the communal experiences of ancient Greek tragedy. Accordingly it will be about the liberatory elements contained in the communal-spectatorial experience made available by ‘music’. Although nothing can be done about changing Wagner’s ‘music’ as such, a great deal can be done about the manner of interpreting and dramatizing it. If, according to Wagner, the music that legitimates music drama is the very core of the universe, then Nietzsche’s reading of that core in terms of the universe as a continual, dynamic play would seem far more ‘musical’ than Wagner’s own Schopenhauerian stance. Indeed, Nietzsche himself conceived of such music as ideally ‘la gaya scienza; light feet; wit, fire, grace, the great logic; the dance of the stars, wanton spiritedness; the light-shudder of the South; the glossy sea – perfection ...’ (Nietzsche, 1966, ii: 925)

Still, notwithstanding Nietzsche’s theoretical calls for a ‘mediterraneanization of music’, it is after all Wagner who provides us with the actual practice of music and the musico-dramatic Festival. In the hands of a master interpreter such as his grandson Wieland Wagner, this music and the drama it entails were successfully transferred to the domain of secular concerns that highlighted the archetypal truths contained in them.47 Accordingly Wieland Wagner first gifted Wagnerian music drama with that ‘Greek tragic’ quality which its original author had used as his guide and which his immediate heirs had largely wasted with their redemptive cult of Wagnerian (partly reinforced by the later Wagner).48

Significantly enough, Wieland Wagner
claimed that he was inspired by his readings of the radical Wagner's prose works and aims to undertake this vital 'Greek' turn in the stagings of his New Bayreuth.49 As Wagnerian music drama has become genuinely universal for the first time thanks to such stagings40 it has thus fulfilled the radical Wagner's, as well as the young Nietzsche's, highest aspirations: to produce profound experiences within a modern contextualization of the human condition that music drama – post-Renaissance successor to Greek tragedy – seems uniquely equipped to convey.

Notes
1. The original version of this paper was presented as part of a panel on the 'Aesthetic-Political' at the Southern Political Science Association Meetings in Atlanta, Georgia, on 6 January 2006. I am grateful for the comments of the other panelists, especially of Robert Pirro, in helping me to formulate the present version as well as the suggestions of an anonymous reviewer for Aesthetics. My thanks, finally, to the California College of the Arts for their financial support.
3. ‘Were the Holy Roman Empire to vanish into mist, there still would remain to us the Holy German Art’.
5. For the non-economist it may be worth noting that Joseph Schumpeter is regarded as the father of contemporary institutional and evolutionary economics. Schumpeter was a key economist of the twentieth century particularly for the emphasis he gave ‘innovation’ and ‘creative destruction’ in his analyses of the factors promoting growth in modern technological and capitalist societies. Cf., e.g., Schumpeter (1976) and (1997). Also, more generally cf. Freeman & Louçã (2001).
6. Ironically perhaps, Wagner was directed to Schopenhauer by his political revolutionary allies such as Georg Herwegh.
7. Wagner spent many occasions conversing with Auber in Paris cafes during his Paris years.
9. Cf. the important conclusions of ‘Polis-Verständnis’, in Bemmbach (1994), 146-167. As Bemmbach stresses, not German myths but ‘die griechische Polis’ was for Wagner the ‘Modell, in dem das ‘Volk’ als der eigentliche soveräne Akteur selbst bestimmt auftritt, als creator communis, beratend und entscheidend zugleich’ (146).
11. In his letter to a banker, Wagner stressed that he wanted a small town with no competing theatre or fashionable spa attracting an unsuitable public; it should be in the center of Germany and in Bavaria (in order to enjoy the protection of Ludwig). Cited in Spotts (1994), 40.
12. Frederic Spotts refers to Wagner’s ‘desire to transform theatre into an essentially eschatological experience.’ Spotts (1994), 51. Spott’s general account provides the outsider to Bayreuth with the best introduction to the ‘experience’ of the Bayreuth pilgrimage, one which this author can confirm from his own attendance of the 1968 performances.
13. The groundplan of the Festspielhaus of 1876, along with the 1882 addition of the royal annex, is reproduced in Spotts (1994), 49 and back cover.
15. It should be noted that the original Munich project had not only included the sanctuary of a Wagner theatre proper, but also a supportive journal, societies of patrons, and a musical school developing training in naturalness of voice and gesture presumably akin to classical Greek tragedy. Cf. Newman (1976), ii, 318; ‘Bericht über eine in München zu errichtende deutsche Oper’, in Wagner (1865), in Wagner (1914), viii, 125-176.
17. Cf. Nietzsche: Aesthetic Morals’, in Chytry (1989), 319-358. In light of more recent Nietzsche scholarship that explores in further detail – and in some cases opposes – the positive significance of art and the aesthetic dimension in Nietzsche’s thought, it may be worthwhile stating here the commitment of this article to the aesthetic or ‘artful’ Nietzsche, that is, the Nietzsche who, emerging from the critical attitude toward art and the artist of his ‘positivist’ writings, produced a final body of works – as well as relevant Nachlass – that promulgated a ‘revaluation of all values’ geared toward the primacy of the paradigm of artistic creativeness.
18. ‘Mahnruf an die Deutschen’, associating Bayreuth with ‘der Wohlfahrt und die Ehre des deutschen Geistes und des deutschen Namens’ (3030), in Nietzsche (1966), ii, 303-307. However Wagner did not use the manifesto, preferring a softer sales pitch.
19. Nietzsche’s own contribution to cultural renewal was to form something like a ‘monastic-artistic cooperative’ (klösterisch-künstlerische Genossenschaft) with his friends somewhere in the Alps as part of Wagner’s regeneration of the German spirit. Cf. his letters to his friend Erwin Rohde in Nietzsche (1975-2004), 2:1 (15 December 1870), 166, and 2:3 (22 March 1873), 135-137.
20. The idea of a ‘new Nietzsche’ was announced as early as an 1977 collection of essays. Cf. Allison (1977) and, more recently, Allison (2001), along with the bibliography in Pothen (2002).
21. ‘Die Kunst der Kunstwerke’, Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, ii (174), in Nietzsche (1966), i, 804-805. This passage is cited and exploited by the most effective proponent of such a reading of Nietzsche’s aesthetics and philosophy of art. Pothen (2002), 38, 190.
22. Even if such a venture would appear ‘as undefined and elusive as possible’, Pothen (2002), 6, 195, 200.
25. A more detailed presentation is found in 'Cosmos as Lila Nietzsche's Diorysian Cosmology and the Problematic of the Postmodern', in Chytry (2005), 32-35.

26. Zur Genealogie der Moral, ii (8). 'Aesthetics is nothing else than applied physiology' (Nietzsche contra Wagner). Also a 'psychology of the artist', so long as this is understood as based on the 'physiological preconditition of intoxication' (Rausch). Twilight of the Idols, 'Expeditions of an Untimely Man' (8). Cf. Nietzsche's formal plan for a section entitled "Toward the Physiology of Art", in CM VII, 3, 328, containing 18 parts. This plan (minus the 18th part) receives an extensive commentary from Martin Heidegger in the latter's analysis of 'Nietzsche's aesthetics-art physiology', Heidegger (1991), 93-95.

27. These would include relevant sections in Twilight of the Idols; the 'small aesthetic work' The Case of Wagner (plus Nietzsche contra Wagner); and the section of The Will to Power notes called 'The Will to Power as Art'. Cf. also his letters in Nietzsche (1975-2004), 3-5, to Jacob Burckhardt (13 September 1888), 420-421, and to Paul Deussen (14 September 1888), 425-427.

28. Zur Genealogie der Moral, ii (6-8); The Will to Power (802-810).

29. This point should be considered quite apart from the additional fact that Nietzsche saw Wagner's and Schopenhauer's very concept of 'redemption' (Erleissung) as incoherent. When Nietzsche called Wagner's operas 'die Oper der Erleissung', he was in effect blaming Schopenhauer, particularly the account of redemption in Book IV of Schopenhauer's The World as Will and Representation. Nietzsche (1966), ii, 908, 911.

30. It should be noted that if Nietzsche was deeply disappointed by the original Bayreuth Festival in 1876, so was Wagner. Indeed, on reading Thucydides, Wagner compared the 1876 Festival to the fall of Periclean Athens. Cf. Westernhagen, Wagner, 513.

31. Particularly with regard to what Wagner called his 'metaphysics of sexual love' and which he may have expressed in his most Nietzschean work, Tristan und Isolde. Cf. the reading of this music drama in Chytry (1989), 290-296.

32. It is true that the term 'pessimism' came into vogue precisely in the 1850s at a time when Schopenhauer and Buddhism also grew in popularity. Indeed it was the French orientalist Eugène Burnouf who apparently coined the word 'nihilism' as a translation of the Buddhist concept of 'nirvana'. Cited in Poggioli (1968), 61. More sophisticated contemporary understanding of Buddhism has had to contend with this automatic equation of Buddhism with pessimism that its original European vogue established. Cf. Govinda (1991) for a cogent critique of this identification from the perspective of a contemporary 'Western Buddhist' thinker.

33. Cf. 'Hitler in Bayreuth (1923-1924)', in Hamann (2002), 73-100. Brian Magee claims that Winifred Wagner personally informed him that she had fallen in love with the Young Hitler during the early 1920s and wanted to marry Hitler after her husband's death in 1930. Magee (2000), 367. At the time foreign minister Gustav Stresemann found himself asking how 'the old democrat Wagner' could end up being taken for a 'modern Hakenkreuzler', Cited in Hamann (2002), 142.

34. Cf. especially The Perfect Wagnerite in Spotts (2002), 221-263, supplemented by Hamann (2002). In fairness to Wagner, it should be noted that he left absolutely no statement that he expected Cosima to continue his mission; rather, he hoped for Siegfried to become his successor.

35. Hitler guaranteed 'the Festival's finances for the first time in its history'. Ironically, thanks to Hitler's patronage, the Bayreuth Festival (the Bayreuth Republic) was the only cultural institution in the Third Reich independent of Nazi control. Spotts (2002), 258.

36. Wagner's home Wahnfried became in effect the 'home' that Hitler 'had not known since childhood'. Spotts (2002), 250. 'Bayreuth believed in him as he believed in Wagner'. Köhler (2000), 197; also 191-208. Still, it is worth heeding Ian Kershaw's warning not to reduce the Third Reich to the relation of Hitler to Wagner as Köhler does. As Kershaw's own prodigious two-volume study of Hitler shows, a great deal more is involved in the political reality and aims of the Third Reich than Wagnerianism. Kershaw (1998), 617 (note 121).

37. For the details, cf. Spotts (1994), 159-204, including a reproduction of Hitler's own proposed new Festspielhaus designed by Rudolf Emil Mewes (197). Similarly Hitler failed to interest his henchmen to performances of Die Meistersinger to precede the Nuremberg Rallies of the 1930s. In fact, 'Hitler's passion for Wagner aroused great anguish inside the party'. Spotts (2002), 256. It should be noted – a point however that Brian Magee in his defense of Wagner overstresses – that in general Third Reich ideologists were unhappy with the actual messages of Wagner's works, particularly Parsifal. For them, there was an intrinsic difference between their ideology and the Wagnerian 'religion of art'. Die Meistersinger was criticized in 1943 by the Frankfurter Zeitung: 'Der darin mitschwingenden romantischen Prinzip der Politik kann der Deutsche unserer Zeit nicht mehr mitvollziehen'. Cf. Barth (ed.) (1957), 117.

38. Winfried Wagner's continued anti-Semitic faith in her Führer to the end of her life is narrated in Hamann (2002), 635-639.

39. This would also include opportunities for renowned scenographers such as the Czech Josef Svoboda. Cf. Burian (1983). 40. Cf. Wieland Wagner (1962). Some interpreters regard Wieland Wagner as the founder of a specifically operatic or lyrical scenography and regret how quickly his innovations have been forgotten: after his death in 1966 Bayreuth meurt pour la second foi'. Lust (1969), 26-30.


43. Cf. 'The Aesthetic Imperative', in Postrel (2003), 1-33. Another index is the rapid growth of industrial design programs in burgeoning art colleges.

44. On the 'experience economy' and its relation to event and theatrics, cf. Pine & Gilmore (1999). Interestingly enough, Pine & Gilmore foresee a further stage in which such an 'experience economy' – confirmed by such enterprises as Disneyland and Disneyworld – will be supplanted by one in which spiritual-religious factors become more explicit. Cf. also the more recent work of Philip Hancock regarding an 'aesthetic economy' that gives more emphasis to the conceptual importance of a Hegelian-Marxian dialectic approach for the 'inter-subjective process of becoming' a subject in organizations. Hancock & Tyler (2001), 211.

45. As some misguided interpreters of the canonical passage in Walter Benjamin's classic study 'The Artwork in the Age of its Technical Reproducibility' have held. Cf. Benjamin (1963), 51.

46. In such early essays as 'The Greek State', Nietzsche himself began as a proponent of the Hellenic polis, but in his
final writings seems to have shifted to advocacy of imperial Rome – at least as a tactical move on behalf of his campaign against Christian morals and its undermining of the 'noble' morals underlying the construction of the Imperium in the 'grand style'. For the modern reading of the polis, the important philosophical contributors are Martin Heidegger, Hannah Arendt, Herbert Marcuse, Karl Löwith, and Jan Patocka. 47. Cf. Wieland Wagner's brief account of the process of meaning Bayreuth from the Cosima cult of piety to newer scenographic standards represented by Adolphe Appia in order to produce 'Wagner's archetypal musical theatre' for contemporary audiences. 'Denkmalschutz für Wagner', in Wieland Wagner (1926), 233-235.
48. According to K. H. Ruppel, Wagner sought not simply an artistic effect but 'auch sittlich erhebende, reiniende Wirkung (wie bei der antiken Tragödie)'. 'Bayreuth – Alte Idee in Neuer Form', in Wieland Wagner (1962), 207. 208
49. For Wieland Wagner pivotal influences included Mozart, the Greek dramatists (especially Aeschylus, Wagner's own hero), and Homer (Wieland called himself 'a Homer fan, if you like'). The discovery of the Greek dramatists, Wieland was delighted to find, took place for him at the same age as it had for his grandfather. Spotts (1994), 209.
50. The defining characteristics of the stagings of the New Bayreuth were (paraphrasing Spotts): a circular acting area, use of light to link music to movement and color, the simplification of costumes without suggesting a specific time or place, the transformation of characters from pseudo-human beings into symbols, and the stripping away of sets and gestures insensetial to the conceptual core of the work. Apparently Wieland was inspired by his discovery in Cosima's diary of Wagner's statement that besides having created the 'invisible orchestra', he wished he could invent 'the invisible theatre'. Spotts (1994), 216.
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