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1 In Whose Camp Were the Austrians? Historical Tradition and the Austro-Swedish Interrelationship of the Early 1600s
PETER THALER

This article examines Austrian Protestants who actively resisted the Habsburg Counterreformation in the early seventeenth century. Since the climax of their activism coincided with the Swedish intervention in the Thirty Years' War, the analysis includes contemporary Swedish policy and the resulting Austro-Swedish relationship. The essay not only explores the historical conflict itself, however, but also uses it as a case study on societal recollection. Austrian nation-building was anchored in a conservative ideological tradition with strong sympathies for the Habsburg legacy. This ideological perspective also influenced the assessment of the confessional period. The modern representation of early modern conflicts reveals the selectivity of historical memory.

35 A Language of One's Own: On the Linguistic Plight of Stefan Zweig's Later Writings (1934–42)
CAIO YURGEL

By focusing on Stefan Zweig's later writings (1934–1942), this article seeks to pinpoint instances of the author's linguistic plight, of his slow but irreversible descent into a plurilingualism, which over time started to erode his confidence and belief not only in himself but also in the cosmopolitan ideals that defined him as a writer and human being. Rather than searching an explanation for Zweig's plight in the realms of theory, this article seeks to show concrete instances of the author's growing crisis of faith and self-doubt — of a writer who had once been discussed in the same breath as James Joyce — on his own craft.
Transparent, Fluent, Readable: Ingeborg Bachmann’s Prose in English
EWA SIWAK

This article examines the English translations of Ingeborg Bachmann’s prose from the early 1980s through the early 2000s. It clarifies the process by which translations adapt the culture and ideology of source texts and shows how these adaptations reflect agendas of the target culture. It draws on Bachmann scholarship, translation studies, and personal interviews with American translators of Bachmann and looks at the prose works published in Bachmann’s lifetime. The analysis identifies parallels between the rewriting Bachmann’s prose has undergone in translation and the shifts in US views on Austrian and feminist literature since the 1980s. It shows that US translators view Bachmann’s Austrianness and her feminist proposition as mutually exclusive and that the translators struggle with Bachmann’s ideologically charged intertextual irony because it is incompatible with their notion of Bachmann as a modernist poet.

“Der gelernte Österreicher”: Arthur Schnitzler’s Ambivalent Posture of Detachment During World War I
MARIE KOLKENBROCK

While Arthur Schnitzler has been rightly credited for not joining the enthusiasm at the beginning of World War I, this essay focuses on the extreme ambivalence he expressed toward both the nationalist pro-war discourse and the European pacifist movement. The article argues that Schnitzler maintained an ambivalent “posture” of detachment that not only seems to anticipate the self-regulating codes of cool conduct of the interwar years but also informs his poetics and his understanding of the societal function of his literature. This posture of detachment is expressed in Schnitzler’s scarce public statements, private correspondence, and anthropological analysis of the war. Besides published materials, the article also takes into account some unpublished sources from the Cambridge University Library and the Deutsche Literaturarchiv Marbach as well as some previously unconsidered publications during the war years.
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In Whose Camp Were the Austrians?

Historical Tradition and the Austro-Swedish Interrelationship of the Early 1600s

Peter Thaler

Introduction

“In your camp is Austria,” Franz Grillparzer extolled Field Marshal Joseph Radetzky after his defeat of Italian revolutionaries in 1848.1 The illustrious author posited Radetzky as the defender of “our” country against rebellious Italians. Reality was more complicated. The conflict also pitted liberal reformers of many nationalities against a transnational monarchic elite, and the Austro-German revolutionaries who elected delegates to the German parliament in Frankfurt were indifferent to the future of Venetia and Lombardy. Austria as a state may have been represented by Radetzky’s soldiers. The Austro-German population, in contrast, was deeply split.

In this light, it may seem surprising how comprehensively modern Austrians have adopted the historical perspective of their erstwhile rulers. In spite of the territorial, cultural, and constitutional chasm that separated the Habsburg Monarchy from all its successor states, the Austrian republic largely assumed its legacy.2 This tendency displayed ideological nuances and intensified over time. Although most Catholic-Conservatives already emphasized the affinities in the interwar First Republic, Social Democrats and some National-Liberals still distinguished between the Habsburg polity and its inhabitants.3 In the symbolic representation of the postwar Second Republic, however, the Alpine populace was the rightful successor of the deposed dynasty and its multicultural empire.4 Diverse historic expressions of Austrianness merged into the genealogy of a new state.5
This retroactive identification also surfaced in portrayals of the confessional era. In popular historical imagery, the Habsburg perspective represented the country’s natural point of reference. From this angle, resistance to the dynasty appeared suspect and latently anti-Austrian (see Eichmeyer 167). The political confrontations of the early modern period cannot be described with a terminology developed for democratic nation-states, however. Religion and social standing competed with political affiliation. In dynastic conglomerates such as the Habsburg Monarchy, this conflict of loyalties was exacerbated by the clash between the estatist tradition of individual territories and the nascent absolutism of Habsburg rulers. Whereas the dynasty tried to impose a more homogeneous and centralized form of government, the estates strove for regional autonomy and aristocratic co-dominion. When the preexisting rivalry between monarchy and territorial aristocracy was reinforced by confessional differences, open conflict seemed unavoidable.

This article examines Austrian Protestants who actively resisted the Habsburg Counterreformation in the early seventeenth century. Since the climax of their activism coincided with the Swedish intervention in the Thirty Years’ War, the analysis includes contemporary Swedish policy and the resulting Austro-Swedish interrelationship. The essay not only explores the historical conflict itself, however, but also uses it as a case study on societal recollection. Austrian nation-building, which tenuously commenced in the interwar era but was fully implemented after the restoration of Austrian statehood in 1945, was anchored in a conservative ideological tradition with strong sympathies for the Habsburg legacy. This ideological perspective also influenced the assessment of the confessional period. The modern representation of early modern conflicts reveals the selectivity of historical memory.

Historical Tradition in Republican Austria

The public imagery of contemporary Austria remains tied to a dynastic legacy even at historical junctures in which that dynasty stood in opposition to large sectors of the populace. At first sight, it may seem difficult to explain the divergence between historical experience and historical representation. Theorists have long pointed to the disparity between event and remembrance, however, and the relationship between history, memory, and myth has become an important topic of theoretical debate.6

In Austria, the collapse of the Third Reich in 1945 offered a Catholic con-
servatism with deep roots in Habsburg dynasticism a unique chance at re-establishing itself in public discourse. This ideological tradition continued older self-representations of Habsburg rulers as integrative figures in a world of national strife, deeply intertwined with the Catholic Church and its universalist legacy. As such, it had already been employed by the dynasty both in the contest for public opinion in the German lands during the mid-1800s and in its attempt to assuage the growing demands for national autonomy in the final decades of the Danube Monarchy. Not until the late 1920s did small circles of Habsburg legitimists adapt this historical imagery to the altered political environment of Alpine Austria. In the postwar decades, however, its major conceptions spread to initially resistant sectors of society and established themselves as the preeminent expression of Austrian historical identity.

This emerging Austrian national ideology emphasized the country’s long historical roots (see Bundesministerium 171; Fischer). Many authors traced Austrian separateness back to the *privilegium minus* in 1156; others chose the early modern consolidation of the Alpine hereditary lands or the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. Austrian identity was formed by the Counterreformation and the Baroque and represented a Catholic antipode to Protestant Germany. History had even given rise to a distinct human type, *homo austriacus*, which was described as a supranational mediator between nationalities, as well as polylingual, adaptable, art-loving, and deeply immersed in the traditions of the Habsburg empire (Schmitz; Lhotsky 308–31). And perhaps most importantly at the historic juncture when this imagery established itself in public discourse, the Austrians had been incorporated into Germany against their will in 1938; they had resisted to their best ability but been abandoned by the international community.

In regard to its core tenets, this historical interpretation has come under increasing scrutiny in recent decades. The millennial underpinnings of postwar Austrian nationalism formed one centerpiece of investigation (see Thaler, *The Ambivalence of Identity*; Bruckmüller). The Austrian recollection of World War II constituted another. Tied to the debate about the wartime past of Kurt Waldheim, who had risen to both secretary general of the United Nations and president of Austria, the international challenge to this state historiography reflected a rare cooperation among scholars, journalists, and politicians that altered entrenched historical interpretations. Starting in the 1980s, the focus on Austrian victimization was gradually replaced with an acceptance of co-responsibility for National Socialist crimes (Uhl, “From
Victim Myth to Co-Responsibility Thesis”). This politically induced revisionism was in itself an intriguing demonstration of the interplay of politics, memory, and history.

For historical processes that were less incendiary for contemporary politics, the conservative paradigm largely held sway. An important element of this paradigm, with deep roots in Habsburg tradition, anchored Austria’s very identity in its Catholic legacy. The interwar president Wilhelm Miklas explained that “Catholic faith in the hearts and souls of the Viennese is inseparably intertwined with true Austrianess; with a love for the fatherland that cannot be separated from Catholic belief and truly Catholic convictions.”

The Christian-Social politician and historian Ernst Karl Winter wrote of an Austria Sancta, which, as the representation of Austria’s Catholic saints, should guide the country and its people (95). Oscar Schmitz argued that in “almost every Austrian, something of the binding powers of the Catholic Church, of the baroque urge to sensualize the sublime and to sublime the sensual, of the harmony of Haydn, Mozart, and Schubert, became flesh and blood, whereas in almost every German there is something of Luther’s negation of form” (8). And in his Österreichische Staats- und Kulturgeschichte, Ludwig Reiter concluded simply that “the Austrians formed their national culture in resistance to Luther’s reformation” (122).

If Catholicism forms an intrinsic attribute of Austria’s historical identity, its onetime opponents are placed firmly outside the country’s collective legacy. In an increasingly secular and diverse society, it would not be possible to maintain such an explicit equation of national and confessional identity, and political declarations of this nature have become the exception. Nonetheless, the residual identification with the dynastic interpretation of historical domestic conflicts owes some of its endurance to postwar nation-building. The political and confessional confrontations of the early seventeenth century are remembered through the filter of national ideology. The present provides the measure of the past.

Austrian Protestants and the Counterreformation

The final decades of the sixteenth century have been designated as the onset of a counterreformation. In its broader meaning, the term denotes Catholic efforts to revitalize the church and reverse the progress of Protestantism. As such, it was coined in the late 1700s and introduced into the historical debate
during the subsequent century to characterize the period that followed the initial advance of reformist thought. Its semantic connotation as a mere reaction to external challenges as well as its widespread association with the suppression of dissent induced a number of Catholic scholars to take exception to the wholesale subsumption of a historical era under this term. They considered it more appropriate to divide the phenomenon into two complementary aspects. There existed an external and political effort, which was typically executed in cooperation with local governments. For this aspect, the term Counterreformation has also been accepted by decidedly Catholic interpreters, even if some of them originally preferred the wording Catholic restoration. In their eyes, however, the internal process of Catholic reform was more important for understanding the eventual consolidation of the church.15

After the Habsburgs had failed in their initial attempts to bar Protestant inroads into their territories, Lutheranism expanded in a relatively quiet and inconspicuous manner.16 Since they faced the opposition of the dynasty, which after 1555 could invoke the Peace of Augsburg, Protestants had to tread lightly. They had to forego many public manifestations of their creed and wrest individual concessions from successive rulers. These concessions were frequently secured through large financial contributions; at the same time, they provoked a backlash among the Catholic hierarchy both in and outside of Austria. In fact, the 1578 Pacification of Bruck marked a turning point in denominational relations.17 On the one hand, it represented the hitherto most comprehensive affirmation of Protestant religious rights in Inner Austria by granting at least preliminary freedom of conscience to a large part of the populace.18 On the other, it triggered the secret Munich Conference of the following year, in which Charles II of Inner Austria, Ferdinand II of Tyrol, and William V of Bavaria agreed on a program for the recatholization of Inner Austria.19 Even though Charles began to implement its principles, it remained up to his successor, the later emperor Ferdinand II, to execute it fully. Ferdinand, educated by Jesuit teachers in Bavarian Ingolstadt, considered it a moral duty to restore Catholic hegemony in his domains.20

The Inner Austrian Counterreformation climaxed in the campaigns of reformation commissions between 1598 and 1604. Accompanied by a military detachment, these commissions assembled the local inhabitants of towns and villages, appealed to them through sermons, and ordered them to return to Catholicism. In the course of a two-month campaign through Carinthia in the fall of 1600, four churches and their cemeteries were destroyed, twenty-
seven pastors and teachers expelled, fifteen hundred heretic books burned, and thousands of Protestants outwardly converted (Loesche 249; Leeb et al. 261–62). The burghers in the regional centers of Villach and Klagenfurt lost their heterodox ecclesial institutions as well. Four years later, however, the commission had to reexamine Klagenfurt, and in remote mountain districts of Styria and especially Carinthia, Protestantism was merely driven underground.

Whereas the nobles of Inner Austria largely refrained from open resistance and responded to the increasing religious pressure with petitions to the sovereign and appeals for intercessions from friendly princes, their Lower Austrian peers chose a more confrontational approach (Bibl; Strohmeyer). To be sure, they, too, watched fairly passively as the Habsburgs reestablished Catholic supremacy in the ducal towns and cities. In the early 1600s, however, the noble estates used conflicts within the dynasty to regain lost positions. This stiffer resistance culminated in the support of many Austrian aristocrats for the Bohemian uprising against the Habsburgs in 1618.

At the same time, however, a number of prominent nobles converted to Catholicism. From the 1590s onward, Catholics regained a foothold in the diets, based upon the induction of new members as well as the conversion of established families. There can be little doubt that many conversions were influenced by economic considerations.21 In an early phase, they could express a desire for a career at court, which had become difficult for Protestants. In the end, they reflected a straightforward choice between conversion and emigration. Yet at the same time these conversions also signaled the renewed vigor and attraction of tridentine Catholicism. Czech historian Karel Stloukal diagnosed a rationalist vitalism among Bohemian converts such as Albrecht von Wallenstein, who sensed the outcome of the political and spiritual struggle in the monarchy early on and embraced the prospective victor for both the opportunities it offered and the superior strength it exuded.22 Nonetheless, three quarters of the Lower Austrian nobility were still Protestant in 1620; the corresponding percentage in Upper Austria was even higher.23

The designation of Ferdinand of Inner Austria as the new leader of the Habsburg dynasty brought the long-simmering conflict to a boil.24 Disturbed by Ferdinand’s record in his established domains, many nobles in Upper and Lower Austria withheld formal recognition of the monarch and demanded explicit confirmation of their religious liberties. This brought them into contact with the Bohemian estates, who had replaced Ferdinand
with a Protestant king. The Catholic victory at the Battle of White Mountain subsequently provided Ferdinand with the opportunity to purge both the Austrian and the Bohemian nobilities of his adversaries.

Ultimately, the personal conduct of Austrian nobles had only limited influence on their fate. On April 22, 1627, the Upper Austrian nobles were given the choice between converting to Catholicism and emigrating within three months. Most of them had been considered disloyal by Ferdinand. On August 1, 1628, however, the nobles of Inner Austria followed suit, even though the emperor had to acknowledge their exemplary record of loyalty (Loserth, Akten und Korrespondenzen . . . unter Ferdinand II. 2:814–21). Only in Lower Austria, Ferdinand had been forced to make concessions during the turbulent period following his coronation in order to win over segments of the Protestant aristocracy. Thereafter, those select nobles were the only indigenous Austrians who could legally be Protestants.25

**Austrian Protestants and the Kingdom of Sweden**

In the decades leading up to the Thirty Years’ War, the religious future of Austria was still open. Although Protestantism was commonplace in both the general population and the nobility, the Counterreformation had made visible progress. Increasingly pressured by their Habsburg rulers, the Protestant estates appealed for external support. Initially, they primarily mobilized princes of the empire.26 The impact of their intercessions was limited, however. Even the most Protestant princes felt allegiance to the emperor. They also feared the consequences of antagonizing him. Not least of all, they subscribed to the constitutional foundation of Habsburg religious regimentation, the Peace of Augsburg. The Habsburgs regularly reminded them that emperors could not have fewer prerogatives in their own patrimony than minor potentates.

Due to these limitations, Austrian Protestants began to look beyond the Holy Roman Empire. Sweden was only beginning to become a relevant political factor. Under the leadership of Gustav Vasa, the country had left the Danish-dominated Union of Calmar in 1523. The new king had not only fought for political independence but also promoted the Lutheran reformation, which he had pushed through at the 1527 diet at Västerås.27

The dynasty profited from the seizure of church property and the eventual confirmation of hereditary succession. Before long, however, it began to undermine itself. Gustav’s oldest son, Erik XIV, was deposed by his half-
brothers John and Charles in 1568. The former subsequently ruled the country as John III until his death in 1592, whereupon he was succeeded by his son Sigismund. As the nephew of the last Jagiellonian king, Sigismund had already been elected to the throne of Poland in 1587.\(^{28}\) To prepare him for this opportunity, he had been familiarized with Catholicism from childhood, resulting in his open embrace of his mother’s church as a teenager.\(^{29}\)

Sweden was thrown into a serious crisis. The very dynasty that had fought for independence and religious reform now linked the country to a powerful Catholic neighbor. Since the Polish magnates refused to be ruled from Stockholm, Sigismund had to control his Swedish patrimony from afar. His uncle Charles was installed as regent in 1594 and cast himself as the guardian of specifically Swedish and Protestant interests.\(^{30}\) Sigismund’s influence waned so rapidly that he chose to invade his own kingdom. Defeated on the battlefield, he withdrew to Poland in 1598 and was deposed the year after. The victor assumed the throne as Charles IX in 1607, but his embittered nephew never truly surrendered his dream of return.

When Charles’s eldest son with Christina of Holstein-Gottorp succeeded his father in 1611, he thus inherited a dynastic mission together with a series of international conflicts.\(^{31}\) By mastering these conflicts, Gustavus II Adolphus transformed Sweden into a Protestant regional power. In this role, the country also took a greater interest in neighboring Central Europe. Habsburg support to Poland and the advance of the Counterreformation to northern Germany were seen as threats to realm and dynasty.\(^{32}\)

German Protestants, divided into Lutherans and Calvinists and seldom in agreement on imperial politics, were perennially in need of assistance. When the newly founded Evangelical Union looked for international allies in 1608, however, Sweden was not yet highest on its list. Due to his superior resources and his role as a prince of the empire, the king of Denmark was more coveted.\(^{33}\) There were hopes for a broader Protestant coalition, to be sure, but it proved impossible to reconcile the interests of Denmark and Sweden, as well as those of England and the Netherlands.\(^{34}\) Instead, Sweden entered into a defensive alliance with The Hague in 1614. Stockholm also tried to impress on the Dutch that Danish intransigence was preventing the Swedish army from bringing its struggle against Poland and thus the Counterreformation to a successful conclusion (Thyresson 45).

The onset of the Thirty Years’ War prompted renewed attempts to intensify cooperation between the Union and the Scandinavian kingdoms.\(^{35}\)
The assembled alliance members at Heilbronn and Ulm sent urgent calls to Stockholm (Hammarstrand 152). The Union was so ridden by crisis, however, that it inspired no trust among potential allies. Gustavus Adolphus listed his drawn-out conflict with Poland as sufficient contribution to the strengthening of international Protestantism (188).

By that time, Habsburg Protestants had begun to pay attention to Sweden as well. Representatives of the Bohemian estates and their Palatine allies stressed the parallels between their own resistance to the dynasty’s religious pressure and the opposition of Gustavus’s father to a Catholic ruler (Thyresson 205–6). By deposing a king who had endangered their religious freedom, the Bohemians argued, they had merely emulated the Swedish example. With the defeat at White Mountain, the calls for support became more urgent, and the appeals by the Protestant estates of Lower Austria in August 1620 betrayed their growing desperation.36

The internal disunity of German Protestantism, which had again been revealed in the Bohemian conflict, continued to deter Gustavus Adolphus from a more active intervention. The war with Poland remained a priority, although its spread to Prussia moved it closer to the German battlegrounds. The rivalry between the two Scandinavian kingdoms, in turn, also extended to their role as potential patrons of German Protestantism. When England and the Netherlands proffered an alliance against the Catholic advance in 1624, Gustavus demanded so many prerogatives and guarantees that the maritime powers reached an agreement with Christian IV of Denmark instead (Tham 137–43). Following its resounding victory at Lutter in August 1626, however, the imperial army advanced so far north that Swedish intervention again became a possibility.

Austrians in Swedish Service in the Early 1600s

The changing domestic and international situation also attracted individual Austrians to the rising Protestant power in the north. As early as 1603 the Carinthian Jakob Zenegg surfaced as ensign of a Swedish mercenary regiment.37 For this purpose he had recruited six horsemen, including his cousin Augustin Paul as well as two additional countrymen, Bartholomäus Amlacher and Gabriel Langenmantel. Zenegg advanced to captain but subsequently returned to Carinthia, where he administered Khevenhüller estates in Wernberg and Paternion until the increased religious pressure in the
late 1620s forced him to emigrate to Regensburg (Pauli 76; Dedic, “Kärntner Exulanten” (1960) 314–15).

For Zenegg’s relatives in Malborghet, the Scandinavian kingdom gained more lasting significance. The protoindustrialist Paul family belonged to the patriciate of this southern Carinthian market town. The financial upswing of the early 1500s provided them with the means to acquire the estate of Nagerschigg near Villach, whereupon they began to call themselves Paul von Nagerschigg. In 1598 Emperor Rudolf II ennobled parts of the family. This social ascendancy was soon endangered, however. Lutheran family members were uprooted by the Counterreformation and sought a new future in Swedish services. Michael Paul made a name for himself as a cavalry officer under General Åke Tott (Droysen 358; AOSB 2:9, 718; Pauli 283). Matthias rose to commander of Mannheim in 1632 (AOSB 1:7, 348–49, 358–59, 440–41). Four brothers even decided to relocate to the Swedish realm, where two of them, Andreas and Zacharias, became the founding fathers of the aristocratic family of Pauli.

Following his arrival in Sweden, Andreas Pauli joined the cavalry. He served in the wars with Poland and Russia and led his Finnish horsemen against the emperor after 1630. For his services, he received land grants in southern Finland, but his descendants spent their prime years on the faraway battlefields of Europe and already died out as early as 1671. Thus, all the modern-day members of the Swedish Pauli family stem from the youngest brother, Zacharias. He, too, served in the Swedish cavalry for most of his adult life. In 1615, he received land grants in central Sweden and combined them into the estate of Vingslöör. During the same year, he also married Brita Hård af Segerstad, the daughter of a prominent Swedish nobleman. Zacharias was subsequently inducted into the House of Knights and thus joined the core of the Swedish aristocracy in 1625.

Not by coincidence, these early examples of Austrians in Swedish services were common or recently ennobled Carinthians. In his hereditary domain of Inner Austria, the later emperor Ferdinand II had been able to implement his confessional policies earlier than in the remainder of Austria. It was only consistent, therefore, that the next wave of Austrian émigrés originated from the archduchy. Ferdinand’s accession to power in the Danubian and Bohemian provinces and his subsequent defeat of the Protestant opposition drove many into exile. Among them was Melchior Wurmbrand, baron of Steyersberg and Stuppach, born in Lower Austria in 1586. Wurmbrand hailed from old
noble stock; his father Hieronymus had served in the executive committee of the territorial estates. Melchior was well educated and well traveled; in a different era he might have embarked on a successful career in his native country. Any such prospects ended in 1620, however, when Wurmbrand was outlawed for joining the Protestant resistance and failing to pay homage to Ferdinand II; he lost his estates and took refuge abroad (Hüb 125). In 1621/22 he served Protestant warlord Ernst von Mansfeld (Krüssmann 272). Johan Skytte, royal tutor and member of Sweden's council of the realm, established contact with Wurmbrand in Germany and recommended him to Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna (Granberg 67). In 1625 Wurmbrand entered Swedish services as colonel and commander of Seaton’s new infantry regiment, which was stationed in Riga and engaged in the war against Poland (Barkman and Lundkvist 446; Nordisk familjebok 32:1220).

Wurmbrand was not just another foreign officer in Swedish uniform, however. He came to Gustavus Adolphus’s attention when he offered to construct a so-called leather gun. This light cannon was designed to increase the mobility and thus enhance the battlefield use of artillery. Its exact construction varied, but typically consisted of a sheet-thin copper barrel that was reinforced with iron rails and rings, wound with rope, and encased in leather. The king showed great interest in the invention, and Wurmbrand was ready to share his technical knowhow. He agreed to both manufacture such cannons and train Swedish experts in building them independently. As a reward as well as a means to launch production, the Austrian baron obtained the royal estate of Julita in the Swedish province of Södermanland. This imposing manor dates back to the Middle Ages, where it had also functioned as a monastery, and was closely linked with the king’s immediate family. His half-brother Karl Karlsson Gyllenhielm grew up on Julita, which subsequently also served as the dower residence of Gustavus’s mother Christina.

Wurmbrand’s leather cannons were employed in the Polish war and during the earliest phase of the Swedish intervention in Germany (Meyerson 25–34). Their mobility emerged most impressively in 1628 near Weichselmünde, where they were transported through swampy marshland to surprise and cripple a Polish naval unit (see also Abelin 1140). Overall, however, the price for this mobility proved too high. The guns could only deliver a small charge and developed a disturbing tendency toward overheating. After the Battle of Breitenfeld they were taken out of use again.

In spite of their brief service, Wurmbrand’s cannons inspired a
modernization of Swedish artillery. Also their creator learned from the drawbacks of the leather guns and shifted production to more traditional iron pieces. When industrialist Louis de Geer complained about illegal competition in 1630, the council of the realm emphasized Wurmbrand’s crucial refinement of artillery production (Granberg 78). Wurmbrand himself departed from Sweden soon thereafter to participate directly in the war in Germany. In 1632 he served as Swedish governor of Donauwörth and Lauingen (Generalstaben 180). Subsequently, he fought under Duke Bernhard of Weimar in Alsace, where he was taken prisoner by imperial Croats in June 1636. The exact details of his further fate are unknown, but he did not survive beyond 1638. On June 16 of that year Queen Christina noted that Julita had reverted to the crown upon the death of Colonel Wurmbrand.

Whereas Melchior Wurmbrand entered the Swedish history books as military inventor, one of his countrymen excelled as military commander. Maximilian Teufel, baron of Guntersdorf, was born in Lower Austria in the late 1500s. His family was renowned for its military tradition—Georg Teufel even served as president of the court council of war from 1566 to 1578—and its avid Protestantism. Maximilian upheld this legacy on both counts. Following his education, which also included studies at the universities of Padua and Siena, he initially served the emperor (Matschinegg 280). The advances of the Counterreformation increasingly strained relations between the Protestant nobles and their Catholic sovereign, however. In 1608 Teufel supported the Protestant Federation of Horn, and in the early phases of the Thirty Years’ War he was again to be found among the aristocratic opposition to the Habsburgs (Boehm 324). Whereas many of his peers subsequently made their peace with the emperor, Maximilian Teufel chose emigration.

In 1624 Teufel joined the regiment Hans Georg von Arnim was recruiting for Gustavus Adolphus. The following year he was promoted to regimental commander and well on his way to becoming one of the most visible officers in Swedish services (see Nordisk familjebok 28:1013–14). In October 1627 he was put in charge of the court regiment, also known by the color of its uniform as the yellow regiment (Mankell 3–6). In this post he succeeded a fellow Protestant émigré, the Bohemian count Franz Bernhard von Thurn, who had been promoted to commander of the infantry and subsequently major general under Field Marshal Hermann von Wrangel. Franz Bernhard’s father was Heinrich Matthias von Thurn, one of the central leaders of the Protestant opposition to Habsburg rule in Bohemia. Following the defeat
of the Bohemians at White Mountain, Heinrich Matthias continued to resist the Habsburgs in the service of ever-changing adversaries. In 1627 he joined his son in Sweden and concluded his life as a Livonian nobleman in 1640. Franz Bernhard von Thurn had already died during the Polish war in 1628, whereupon Teufel also succeeded him as sergeant major general of the army. Under Teufel’s leadership, the yellow regiment gained its stature as Swedish elite unit and royal guard (Mankell 7).

Teufel participated in all the Swedish military engagements of the period. He fought in Livonia, leading a regiment in the critical Battle of Wallhof in 1626. Thereafter he joined the offensive against Poland in royal Prussia. Defeated by Hetman Stanisław Koniecpolski at Hammerstein, Teufel fell into enemy hands in April 1627 (AOSB 1:3, 528–31; Micraelius 177–78). Following his release in a prisoner exchange, Teufel contributed significantly to the Swedish victory at Gorzno in February 1629 (Mankell 4; Ridderstad 7). His regiment was indispensable for the Swedish intervention in the Thirty Years’ War. It was shipped from Elbing to Usedom at the beginning of July 1630, whereupon Teufel was quickly ordered to the king’s side at Stettin (AOSB 2:9, 550).

During the following months Teufel traversed northeastern Germany at Gustavus Adolphus’s side. The yellow regiment blocked imperial relief to the beleaguered fortress of Kolberg. It also spearheaded the storming of Greifenhagen on Christmas Day of 1630. Following a raid into Mecklenburg, Teufel returned to Pomerania and confronted the vanguard of General Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly. On reconnaissance with the king during the siege of Frankfurt on the Oder, the colonel was hit by a bullet. He recovered quickly, however, and rejoined the storming of the city. The capture of Frankfurt put the Oder River under Swedish control and provided direct access to Habsburg Silesia.

The king had planned to raise an army in eastern Pomerania, which Teufel would lead as field marshal, but the war took a different turn (AOSB 2:1, 649). Tilly’s attack on Magdeburg shifted the conflict toward the center of Germany. Teufel provided crucial support for the king at Werben, where Tilly unsuccessfully attempted to dislodge the Swedish encampment (Nordisk familjebok 28:1013). Yet the real measure of the two armies followed in September 1631 near the Saxon village of Breitenfeld. Gustavus Adolphus spent the eve of the battle sleeping in an open wagon alongside his most trusted officers, the generals Gustaf Horn and Johan Banér and Colonel
Teufel. The next day Teufel commanded the first division of the Swedish center. The battle commenced unevenly. Whereas the Swedish left flank came under severe pressure, the right, where also the king had taken position, successfully beat back all attacks by Gottfried Heinrich zu Pappenheim’s imperial cavalry. Trying to restore communication between disconnected units, Teufel was fatally wounded by a musket shot (Watts 23). He did not live to see the Swedish victory, which marked a turning point in the war. Having inflicted the first significant defeat on the Catholic armies, Gustavus Adolphus established himself as a tactical innovator and as a serious military and political challenger to the emperor. At the same time, his success in central Germany opened gateways to the southern bastions of imperial Catholicism.

Maximilian Teufel had established himself as one of the king’s most capable military leaders. He was especially renowned for courage and speed: referring to the complementary temperaments of two of his foremost officers, Gustavus Adolphus is quoted as calling Teufel his hammer and Knyphausen his anvil, while pitying the unlucky adversary who ends up between them. In spite of their elation over the victory, king and chancellor did not overlook the price paid for it and expressly deplored the loss of their skillful commander (see AOSB 2:1, 742, and 1:6, 495).

These individual affiliations with Sweden were complemented by more ambitious proposals for an integration of embattled Protestants from the Holy Roman Empire. In the mid-1620s Gustavus Adolphus offered refuge in the recently conquered province of Ingria (see Raupach 435–37). Austrian magnate Hans Ludwig von Kueffstein was intrigued enough to contact the king and discuss the idea with close friends. In the end, the allure of the remote northern Baltic was still limited and the uncertainty of the project too daunting. It took the arrival of Swedish troops in Germany to familiarize more Austrians with the opportunities in the Swedish Empire.

Austrian Exiles After the Swedish Intervention in the Thirty Years’ War

The third and biggest wave of Austrians joining Swedish services followed the large-scale emigration of the Protestant nobility in 1628/29 and the subsequent advance of Gustavus Adolphus’s army into southern Germany. In the free imperial cities of this region, where many Austrians had taken re-
fuge, they had to reevaluate their situation and establish new lives. There
they also encountered the emissaries of the Swedish king, who urged them
to join his campaign to save the embattled Protestant religion and German
liberty.\textsuperscript{54} But could these assurances be trusted? The discussion about the
underlying motives of the Swedish intervention in Germany has been as in-
tense as it has been enduring. In 1992 Swedish historian Sverker Oredsson
published a metastudy of 166 pertinent works in seven languages, which stret-
ched from Bogislaff Chemnitz’s contemporary assessment from 1648 all the
way to Konrad Repgen’s edited volume \textit{Krieg und Politik 1618–1648} from 1988
(Oredsson, \textit{Gustav Adolf, Sverige och Trettioåriga kriget}). Oredsson estab-
lished eleven interpretative categories. According to the respective accounts,
Gustavus Adolphus went to war for the narrowly subscribed reasons of the
war manifesto, in defense of German Protestantism, in support of freedom
of conscience and religion, as an instrument of God or history, in defense of
German liberty, to restore the international balance of power, in defense of
the king and his lineage, to protect Sweden from hostile imperial designs, for
lust of conquest, to improve Sweden’s economic position, or in the interest of
the Swedish feudal lords.\textsuperscript{55}

If one disregards the infrequent economic explanations, most of which
originated during the heydays of historical materialism, the remaining
interpretations can be subsumed under two encompassing headings:
religion and politics. Their respective preeminence has provoked passionate
disagreements, but a straightforward juxtaposition is misleading. The
recurrent debate of military options in the council of the realm shows an
amalgamation of political and religious aspects.\textsuperscript{56} Since council meetings
also served a propagandistic purpose, they should be supplemented with
the king’s personal communications. In a letter sent to Axel Oxenstierna
on October 8, 1630, Gustavus Adolphus made the case for intervention:
“We are certain that you agree with us that the House of Austria intends to
subjugate all of Germany and change its status. Furthermore, that the House
of Austria wishes to completely uproot the Protestant religion in Germany
and implant the erroneous popish creed instead. And I am well aware that
you have carefully considered the dangers this entails for us, our country, and
the whole region” (\textit{AOSB}, 2:1, 654). Therefore, the king was skeptical toward
peace offers that essentially surrendered Germany to the emperor. Gustavus
argued that no peace should be contemplated “unless the whole of Germany
is religiously pacified and all of our neighbors are restored to their previous status so that we, through their security, would be secure in our own country” (AOSB, 2:1, 654).

In Gustavus’s confessionalized worldview, the emperor’s attempt at Catholic restoration in Germany represented both a religious and a political challenge. The two aspects were intertwined further by the Vasas’ intradynastic conflict. Supported by a reinvigorated Catholic monarchy in the empire, the Polish branch could regain control of Sweden and supplant both Gustavus Adolphus and the Lutheran creed. Religion and politics were two sides of the same coin.

With the continuing advance of Habsburg and Leaguist forces, calls for a confessional counterweight and security zone in the Holy Roman Empire began to resonate among German Protestants. To be sure, a number of later allies from Pomerania to Brandenburg and Saxony hesitated to support the Swedish intervention. In view of the uncertainty about Sweden’s political designs and military capabilities, this caution was well founded. Support for Sweden was more pronounced among the most imperiled elements of imperial Protestantism. No one had more reason to feel imperiled than the Austrian refugees.

The number of Austrians who joined Swedish service is too large to be fully reconstructed. Most commoners disappeared namelessly in the era’s mercenary armies. Yet in the enlistment rolls of the Swedish Khevenhüller regiment, to take one example, one encounters numerous non-aristocratic Carinthians, among them Hans Altenhauser, Kaspar Altziebler, and Michael Stegger, all from Paternion, and Melchior Haibacher from Villach. Additional names can be found in the publications of Protestant church historian Paul Dedic. Few were as fortunate as Georg Derfflinger, whose service in the Swedish cavalry catalyzed his ascent from Austrian farm boy to Brandenburg general and nobleman.

More visible were noble officers. They included members of the country’s leading families, such as Jörgers, Herbersteins, Stubenbergs, and Starhembergs. Andre von Bernardin was lieutenant general in the Schlammersdorf regiment. Friedrich von Egg served as captain in the Solms regiment; Gottfried von Egg ended his career as colonel. Maximillian Gienger von Grünbühel held the rank of major in the white regiment. Christoph Amann von Ammansegg and his brother Georg Sigmund fell as Swedish
officers, as did Paul and Adam von Hallegg, Melchior Leopold von Hohberg, Hans Hermann von Hohenwart, Hans Christoph von Kronegg, Hans Georg Prunner von Vasoldsberg, Georg Ehrenreich von Rottal, Franz Ludwig von Teuffenbach, and numerous others (see Schnabel 303–5).

Support for Sweden was not restricted to military contributions. Bartholomäus von Dietrichstein held the coveted title of hereditary cup bearer of Carinthia, where he was also one of the leading landowners. By the time of his emigration to Nuremberg he had passed fifty. Unlike several of his sons and sons-in-law, he no longer saw his place on the battlefield. Instead, he focused on politics and introduced Upper Austrian insurgents to the Swedish leadership in 1632 (see Kurz 55, 59; Dedic, “Kärntner Exulanten” (1948) 130–31; AOSB 1:7, 559–61). Ferdinand accused Dietrichstein of treason and summoned him to Vienna (Kurz 380–82). The unreconstructed exile relocated to more secure Hanau, where he died in 1635.

A particularly visible example of émigré activism followed during the Swedish occupation of Regensburg. Duke Bernhard of Weimar put the Styrian exile Johann Friedrich von Teuffenbach in charge of the city and adjacent Bavarian possessions in 1633. Encouraged by Swedish plans to advance into the Habsburg heartland, Austrian refugees played an important role in Teuffenbach’s administration. In the eyes of concerned natives, the Swedish faction in the city even seemed to be dominated by exiles. As a consequence, many of them left Regensburg together with the Swedish forces in 1634. Teuffenbach himself continued his support for Sweden and struggle for restitution until his death in 1647.

Among those who decided to throw their lot behind Gustavus Adolphus were also the brothers Khevenhüller, who belonged to the cream of the Carinthian aristocracy. In 1631 they loaned seventy thousand taler to the king; in the following spring they raised a mounted regiment for the Swedish army. The leading officers of the unit—Colonel Paul von Khevenhüller; his brother, Lieutenant Colonel Hans von Khevenhüller; and their brother-in-law, Major Rudolf von Dietrichstein—were all Carinthian refugees, as were many of their subordinates. Among the officers, one finds Dietrichstein’s brother Cornet Christian von Dietrichstein, Cornet Klement von Welz, Lieutenant Hans Ulrich von Ernau, Wolf Friedrich von Metnitz, as well as Bartholomäus and Carl Putz. Yet also among the common soldiers, there were many Carinthians, especially from the Khevenhüllers’ core domains.
around Villach and Paternion. Finally, the military chaplain Johann Schwäger was the son of a Protestant refugee from Villach as well (Dedic, “Der Kärntner Protestantismus” 71).

The regiment crisscrossed southern Germany in 1632. Following the battlefield deaths of his brother Hans in August and the Swedish king in November, however, Paul Khevenhüller withdrew from military life. In 1636, he headed for Stockholm to expedite the repayment of his loan. Two years later, he received the estate of Julita in central Sweden as security for interest owed. When Queen Christina invested him with the estate in 1645, Khevenhüller had become a major Swedish landholder. He was introduced into the House of Knights and joined the inner circle of the Swedish aristocracy (Svenska Riksrådets Protokoll, 12:75).

This elevated position aided the family’s attempts at regaining its confiscated Austrian properties. During the negotiations for peace with the emperor, the Swedish emissaries at Osnabrück insisted on full restitution for the Khevenhüllers, which the Habsburgs were forced to concede (Müller 22). Since any return would have required conversion to Catholicism, this restitution could only have taken the form of financial compensation. Yet in spite of tireless attempts by several generations of Khevenhüllers, no compensation was ever paid (Czerwenka 508–16, 528–33, 550–57).

During the final years of his life, Paul Khevenhüller served as chief steward of the queen dowager Maria Eleonora and member of the Swedish council of the realm. On December 9, 1655, he died in Stockholm Castle while attending the baptism of the later king Charles XI (Elgenstierna 123). Thus, his life ended very symbolically at the political center of the country that had provided him with a new start.

His children, too, put themselves at the disposal of their host society. No fewer than five sons served in the armed forces. They paid a heavy price. Georg Christoph fell in 1645 in Bohemia, Andreas in 1648 at Bremervörde, and Paul Junior in 1658 during the siege of Copenhagen (Elgenstierna 123). When Paul’s last remaining son Bartholomäus passed on in 1662, the Swedish baronial family of Khevenhüller was extinguished after only fifteen years. Yet although some of Paul’s daughters died childless as well, his progeny did not disappear completely from Swedish history. Paul’s eldest daughter, Anna Regina, married the Pomeranian-born nobleman Mathias Palbitzki, who served Queen Christina as diplomat and art expert. For two centuries, their descendants kept possession of Julita. The last male Palbitzki died in 1851;
upon the death of his widow, the estate was sold to a wealthy merchant. In 1944 Julita was donated to the Nordic Museum and opened to the public.

As a member of the council of the realm and leading landowner, Paul Khevenhüller had entered the inner circle of Sweden’s social and political elite. Due to the premature death of his sons, however, the Swedish Khevenhüllers remained a brief episode. The experience of other Austrian newcomers to the Swedish aristocracy may have been less spectacular, but proved to be more enduring. Over the centuries, the Pauli family gave its new homeland an abundance of military and cultural leaders. The Styrian noble Hans Christoph Fröhlich served as colonel in Gustavus Adolphus’s army. His descendants largely followed in his military footsteps; they were naturalized in 1682 and subsequently elevated to barons and counts. As a commoner, the Lutheran furrier Matthias Vult already left his Styrian homeland in the early phases of recatholization. He found refuge in Silesia, but his son Elias considered it safer to move on to Sweden. Grandson Johannes Vultejus studied theology and became court chaplain in Stockholm. Great-grandson Johan Julius crowned a long public career with the position of auditor-general of public finances, having been ennobled under the name of Vult von Steijern along the way. All of these families continue to flourish today. In Austria, their experiences are largely forgotten.

Conclusion

Over the centuries, Austrian history became synonymous with Habsburg history. An important ideological tradition defined the Protestant estates as dangerous detractors from the country’s innate mission. As a true representative of this historical perspective, Ernst Tomek did not hesitate to declare that the Battle of White Mountain had saved Austria (520). Not the Catholic Church in Central Europe or the Habsburg dynasty, but nothing less than the country itself. The accomplished ecclesiastical historian was fully aware of the Protestantization of Austrian society. He knew that crucial segments of the population had supported the Bohemian cause. To many conservatives, however, Austria was simply unimaginable without Catholicism and the Habsburg legacy. Austria was saved from itself at White Mountain. The identification of country, church, and dynasty was complete.

A selective recollection of the past is not unusual; Ernest Renan famously observed that nations are held together not only by what they have
in common, but also by what they have collectively forgotten.71 Yet the wholehearted embrace of a dynastic historical perspective in republican Austria is intriguing. Protestantism had taken deep roots in early modern Austria, and the restoration of Catholic homogeneity had required a concerted effort of church and monarchy. Moreover, the religious conflict of the epoch was interwoven with the struggle between the estates’ insistence on divided governance and the dynasty’s claim to unilateral authority. When Archduke Ferdinand of Inner Austria linked the Protestant estates to Dutch and Swiss republicanism, he hardly undermined their modern reputation (see Wolf 24). And held up to the desperate hopes that Upper Austrian peasants placed on the Swedish king in 1632, a purely governmental perspective will fall short (see AOSB 1:7, 559–63).

The Thirty Years’ War was not only a German or imperial civil war. In its initial phases, at least, it also constituted a civil war within the nascent Habsburg Monarchy. In the Austrian and Bohemian lands, central societal forces took different sides. As a consequence, this Habsburgian civil war was not resolved domestically. The Habsburgs proved unable to subjugate the Protestant nobles of Bohemia and Austria until they received external support, especially from Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. The Swedish intervention reenergized Habsburg exiles but failed to restore prewar liberties. The future of the Austro-Bohemian lands was determined by international politics. The Catholic monarchy kept the upper hand, but its domestic opponents were no less representative of contemporary Austrian society and no less legitimate a part of Austrian historical tradition.

Why has Austrian public memory rarely reflected this fundamental truism? As long as the Austrian political system was defined along dynastic lines, it was difficult to reevaluate popular uprisings against previous representatives of the ruling family. If the dynasty constituted the polity, any opposition to it had to be illegitimate. More surprising than its historical dominance was the substantial retention of this dynastic perspective in republican Austria. Whereas Czech and Hungarian historians subjected Habsburg historiography to comprehensive revision, their Austrian colleagues have been more hesitant to do so.72 The history of the small Germanophone republic merged with that of its imperial predecessor, whereas the contemporaneous histories of Bohemia, Slovenia, or Hungary depicted the interrelationship of local populations and that empire. The implicit premise transformed Habsburg sovereignty into the rule of Styrian farmers and Tyrolean mineworkers over Bohemian counts and
Hungarian magnates. Only by assigning a distinctly German mission to the Habsburgs, however, can one distinguish between their rule over Carinthia and Moravia, not to mention over those crown lands' individual nationalities. Heinrich von Srbič may have been among the last leading scholars to interpret the history of the dynasty from this perspective.73

Yet other than in a symbolic sense, the Habsburg Monarchy was never the realm of modern-day Austrians. The peripheral status of the Alpine and Danubian provinces changed when they became the hereditary domains of an imperial dynasty. Located at the intersection between the European core and its more volatile eastern margins, their rise to prominence was not altogether coincidental. The Habsburg Monarchy was not simply the result of Austrian political and military prowess, however. Its rulers relied on the resources of the Holy Roman Empire and the security interests of their exposed neighbors to the east. The emerging realm was rooted in a dynasty and not a people. The Habsburg Monarchy was not ruled by its Alpine Germanophones, but by a supranational monarchic elite. During much of its history, German functioned as the lingua franca of the empire, and one should not overlook the practical and emotional advantages this provided to native speakers. Yet Germans held no monopoly of power in this conglomerate state, and at crucial historical junctions such as the Thirty Years’ War, significant sectors of the Austro-German population could be found among the opponents of the dynasty.

For an aristocratic and bureaucratic elite, the transition from the Habsburg Monarchy to the Republic of Austria may indeed have resembled a mere change in size and governance. They were the truly vanquished who were left behind without a fatherland in 1919, as Joseph Roth has described so grippingly in his literary masterpieces.74 For Austrian society in general, however, the transition was reminiscent of rather than distinct from that of other successor states. As pivotal a figure as the first state chancellor even recommended burying the historical name together with the dismantled empire.75

It can be argued that the persistence of dynastic perspectives reflected historical realities. Habsburg absolutism and the Catholic Church prevailed and shaped Alpine Austria for centuries. The Protestant estates faded from historical consciousness because they did not tie in with the society that succeeded them. This argument only sounds plausible within a purely Austrian context, however. The victory of the Habsburgs was equally decisive in Bohemia. Yet as soon as modern Czech historiography took root, it integrated the
estatist opposition to the Habsburgs into its own image of Czech tradition. For many historians, the Battle of White Mountain initiated the decline of their society into centuries of temno, darkness, and those who disagreed only sought to reconcile the legacy of Protestant estatism with that of its dynastic conqueror. Modern Czechs do not judge their seventeenth-century history based on who had proven more influential for their subsequent development, and even devout Catholics do not automatically assume the Habsburg legacy.

It would be misleading, however, to interpret the early Thirty Years’ War as a conflict between Austrians and Bohemians. In reality, both were divided in their loyalties, although their politically active segments predominantly flocked to the Habsburgs’ adversaries. At White Mountain, Austrians contributed five companies of infantry and eight—albeit incomplete—companies of cavalry to the Bohemian army. They encountered a highly international imperial and leaguist force, in which native Austrians only formed a small minority. Both sides were convinced of fighting for a just cause. The outcome of the battle, in turn, changed Bohemia as well as Austria.

Like their Bohemian counterparts, the Protestant nobles of the Alpine lands conceived of themselves as deeply patriotic, but their vision of patriotism did not correspond to the dynasty’s. Whereas the latter developed the ultimately prevailing image of Austria as the Catholic, absolutist Habsburg Empire, in other words, as a political entity rooted in a princely family, the Protestant nobles anchored their patriotism in the individual territories and their customary laws and privileges. The seceding Protestant estates in Horn turned to their Catholic peers in 1620 and implored them, as good patriots, to collaborate on the securing of estatist rights (Bibl 297). This corresponded to the understanding of Bohemian Heinrich Mathias von Thurn, who even in Swedish exile continued to define himself as a patriot, who had only served his native land.

The Upper Austrian resistance leader Georg Erasmus von Tschernembl developed this alternative sense of identity most explicitly. At the center of his loyalty stood the territory, the land, which was personified by the estates. It was the duty of the estates to uphold the interests of the land, also against the monarch. In particular, this responsibility included the obligation to preserve customary law and practice. Estates that failed to ensure the preservation of territorial liberties and privileges, such as the Styrians who swore allegiance to Archduke Ferdinand without having secured unassailable constitutional guarantees, neglected their duty and did irreparable damage.
to their territory. Territorial representatives may entrust a dynasty with a hereditary claim to the throne. In doing so, however, they do not transfer their loyalty from the commonwealth to the ruler. The selection of hereditary princes occurs exclusively for the benefit of the territory, providing it with increased status and security. If the dynasty neglects the common good in favor of its own, it forfeits its claim to the throne.

In this manner, Tschernembl constructed a polity around the land and its people rather than a ruling family. It was a vision that differed fundamentally from the reality of Habsburgian Austria for centuries to come. Yet in many ways, its foundation in popular representation and the local tradition of Alpine territories might be expected to hold a stronger appeal for the democratic Austrian republic than the multinational absolutism of the Habsburg Monarchy. It is therefore intriguing from the viewpoint of historical imagery and elite continuity that the Habsburgian tradition has retained and even expanded its hold on republican self-representation. Postwar Austria identified with the legacy of a dynastic conglomerate state even at those historical junctures at which many Austrians, be they peasants, townsmen or nobles, had fought this legacy. It shows the power of historical tradition-making that the Austrian populace has largely internalized this sense-of-self.
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**Notes**

1. Grillparzer 318–19. Grillparzer’s poem, first published in the *Constitutionelle Donau-Zeitung* on June 8, 1848, begins with the following verse: “Glück auf, mein Feldherr, führe den Streich! Nicht bloß um des Ruhmes Schimmer, In deinem Lager ist Österreich, Wir andern sind einzelne Trümmer.” The central line of the poem, “In deinem Lager ist Österreich,” was also inscribed on Radetzky’s monument in Vienna.
2. In this article, the designation “Republic of Austria” refers to both the interwar First Republic and the postwar Second Republic.

3. Still paradigmatic for the origins of the Austrian party system is Wandruszka.

4. For the postwar era, see Reiterer.

5. This conflation of different notions of Austrianness also surfaces in such popular expressions as “when Bohemia still was a part of Austria,” which are widely (but of course anachronistically) understood as expressing a historical subjugation of Bohemia to the territory of the modern Republic of Austria.

6. Among the most influential works have been Halbwachs and Nora.

7. For an early expression of this ideological innovation, see Knoll.

8. See Görlich, advancing the privilegium minus, and Kreissler, with emphasis on 1806.

9. Almost all conservative Austrianists supported this proposition, among them Reiter.

10. This view was official public policy from the very beginning of the Second Republic; it had a prominent place in the country’s Declaration of Independence of April 27, 1945. It was presented in detailed scholarly form in Stadler and in Kreissler.

11. For discussions of the victim theory, see Uhl, Zwischen Versöhnung und Verstörung; Utgaard.

12. For an introduction to the Waldheim debate in an Austrian context, see Mitten.

13. For a skillful analysis of the relationship between religious practice and Habsburg political culture, see Coreth.


15. For an introduction to the Counterreformation, one may consult Lutz; Hsia; and Bireley, The Refashioning of Catholicism 1999. For the terminological development, see also Elkan; Jedin; O’Malley.

16. For a modern overview of the confessional era in Austria, see Leeb et al. 145–279. For an introduction to the extensive literature by Austrian Protestant scholars on their own community, see Leeb. For a broader context, see also Evans, The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy.

17. For a closer examination of the Pacification of Bruck and its prehistory, see Loserth, “Die steirische Religionspazifikation.”

18. During parts of the 1500s and 1600s, the Habsburgs’ hereditary lands were divided among different branches of the family. The archduchy of Austria comprised modern-day Lower and Upper Austria. Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola belonged to an entity called Inner Austria. The westernmost provinces were known as Tyrol and the Vorlande, or Austria Anterior.

19. See Loserth, Acten und Correspondenzen … unter Erzherzog Karl II. 31–40. For a newer analysis of the Counterreformation in Inner Austria, see Pörntner. Archduke Ferdinand II of Tyrol is not the same person as the later Emperor Ferdinand II.

20. In a 1621 codicil to his testament he defined it as his heir’s foremost task in life to “maintain his lands and his people in the genuine Apostolic Roman and only true Catholic faith, and to seriously keep out and eradicate all sects and seductive teachings, as well as everything that might cause and promote their spread” (Turba 352).

21. For a typology of conversions, see Winkelbauer 85–158.
22. See Stloukal-Zlinský. For a recent English-language biography of Wallenstein, see Mortimer.
23. For the numbers in Lower Austria, see MacHardy 147, 144, 146; Reingrabner 11–20.
24. For a sophisticated analysis of Ferdinand and his religious policies, see Bireley, Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counterreformation. For a newer general biography of the monarch, see also Bireley, Ferdinand II.
25. The Treaty of Osnabrück subsequently stipulated that the Lutheran nobles still residing in Lower Austria would not be forced to emigrate and enjoyed the right to attend Lutheran services beyond the border. See Müller 127.
26. See the mission by Wolfgang von Hofkirchen in 1603 described in Loserth, Akten und Korrespondenzen . . . unter Ferdinand II. 2:318–23.
27. For an introduction to Gustav Vasa and the early history of his dynasty, see Roberts, The Early Vasas; Svalenius; Larsson Gustav Vasa–landsfader eller tyrann? and Arvet efter Gustav Vasa. For an English-language introduction to the history of the Protestant reformation in Sweden and the remainder of Scandinavia, see Grell.
28. On Sigismund, see Wisner; Östergren.
29. For interpretations of this step, see Larsson, Arvet efter Gustav Vasa 250–53; Östergren 24–26.
30. For a recent biography of Charles IX, see Petersson.
31. There are far too many works on Gustavus II Adolphus to list them here; a useful metahistory of this literature is Oredsson, Gustav Adolf, Sverige och Trettioåriga kriget. As a concise and well-informed introduction in English one can still use Roberts, Gustavus Adolphus. A more critical newer perspective was presented in Oredsson, Gustav II Adolf.
32. Even the Spanish branch of the Habsburgs developed concrete plans for an anti-Swedish alliance with Poland, as has been documented in Skowron.
33. For the close involvement of the Danish composite monarchy in the politics of the empire, see Lockhart. For the role of Schleswig and Holstein as links between Denmark and Germany, see also Thaler, Of Mind and Matter.
34. For the English approach to these efforts, see Adams.
35. For a recent English-language synthesis of the war, see Wilson.
38. Malborgeth is now Malborghetto in Italy.
39. For the biography of Wurmbrand, see Buttlar-Elberberg; Biografiskt lexicon 213–15.
40. For the history of the Wurmbrand family, see Hormann and Mednyanszky 7–24; Wurzbach 289–314.
41. For his studies at Italian universities, see Luschin 262.
42. See Hamilton 246–47. For general discussions of the era’s leather cannons by Wurmbrand and others, see also Meyerson; Gessler; Stevenson; and Caldwell.
43. See the king’s letters from March and April 1627, cited in Meyerson 13–14.
44. For the history of the estate, see Lagerquist; Söderberg 323–31.
45. Whereas some authors described a relatively quick execution of Wurmbrand at the hand of his Croat captors, others have uncovered correspondence by him dating as late as 1637. Compare Brunemayr 400–401; Nordisk familjebok 32:1220; and Hübel 125 on the one hand with Buttlar-Elberberg 17–18 on the other.
46. See “Pantebref,” June 26, 1638, Julita Gårdsarkiv, F1:1 Handlingar rörande familjen Khevenhüller 1631–1747.
47. On Maximilian Teufel, see Nordisk familjebok 28:1013–14; Schmertosch 146.
48. The court council of war in essence constituted an early ministry of defense. On the Teufel family, see Glatzl; Wissgrill; Widter; and Schrauf. For the opportunities opened up by conversion, see the career of a different Georg Teufel in Kielmansegg 242–46.
49. On Heinrich Matthias von Thurn and his family, see Pojar.
50. Royal Prussia was the contemporary designation for the section of the former territory of the Teutonic Knights that had been assigned to Poland by the Second Peace of Thorn in 1466. It largely corresponded to the later German province of West Prussia and the region of Warmia in East Prussia.
51. His movements during this period, which are treated in the following paragraphs, can be traced in his correspondence with Chancellor Oxenstierna, printed in AOSB 2:9, 551–70.
52. For the Battle of Breitenfeld, see Opitz and the contemporary description in Gründlicher.
53. See Frydell 172. The East Frisian nobleman Dodo von Knyphausen rose to the rank of Swedish field marshal.
54. This is how Gustavus Adolphus defined his mission in “Schuldurkunde Gustav Adolfs König der Schweden für die Brüder Johann und Paul Khevenhüller . . . ,” December 23, 1631, Kärntner Landesarchiv, Khevenhüller-Archiv, box 6/109.
55. Oredsson, Gustav Adolf, Sverige och Trettioåriga kriget 12–13. In a newer study, Erik Ringmar tied the Swedish intervention to not only national security but also national identity.
56. These debates from the prelude and the early stages of the war can be followed in Svenska Riksrådets Protokoll, vols. 1 and 2; see also Ahnlund.
57. See Rullor 1632:26, Bl. 152, 153a, 157, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ D1, Svarnummer KO1556. Ennobled men could be found among common cavallerymen as well, as can be seen in the case of Mathias Nitsch in Rullor 1632:26, Bl. 154b, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ D1, Svarnummer KO1556.
58. See, for example, Dedic, “Kärntner Exulanten” (1950) 802.
59. For a modern-day introduction to Derfflinger, see Herrmann.
60. On Dietrichstein, see Dedic, “Kärntner Exulanten” (1948) 130–31 and Benedikt 160–61.
61. For the following, see Schnabel 309–17, 622–23.
62. On the family, see Czerwenka.
63. On Dietrichstein, see Rullor -1723, Register, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ R; on Welz, see Rullor 1632:26, Bl. 150, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ D1, Svarnummer KO1556; on Ernau, see Rullor 1632:26, Bl. 152, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ D1, Svarnummer KO1556; on Metnitz (misspelled Mecknitz), see Soden 514; on Carl and Bartholomäus Putz, see Rullor 1632:26, Bl. 150, Kungliga Krigsarkivet Stockholm, Referenskod SE/SVAR/KrA-141010003/ D1, Svarnummer KO1556.

64. For contemporary sources on the battlefield death of Hans Khevenhüller, see “Beschreibung Ihr Gnaden Herrn Hans Khevenhüllers Geschlecht, Herkommen, Geburth, Leben, Wandel und seligen Abschieds,” 1632, Kärntner Landesarchiv, Khevenhüller-Archiv, box 2/12; as well as Brockington 275.


66. On Paul’s children, see also Schwennicke, table 41.

67. On Anna Regina Khevenhüller, see Lindblom; on Mathias Palbitzki, see Nisser.

68. For the later generations of Palbitzkis, see Wallin and the family’s entry in Riddarhusdirektionen.

69. On the Frölichs, see their entry in Riddarhusdirektionen, as well as Nordisk familjebok 9:63–65. For additional details, especially about Hans Christoph’s daughter Eva Margaretha, who developed into a religious visionary and unsuccessfully tried to convince King Karl XI of his mission as biblically ordained savior of Christendom, see Kirschfeld; Andersson.

70. His brother Gabriel chose a military career and was ennobled in 1689 under the name Lilliesvård. For more information on the descendants of the Vult family, see the entries on Vult von Steijern and Lilliesvård in Riddarhusdirektionen, as well as Nordisk familjebok 32:1209–10.

71. This is expressed most clearly in Renan.

72. For an introduction to pertinent Czech historiography, see Mamatey; Petráň; Petráň and Petráňova; Heymann; and also Kavka. For an introduction to Hungarian equivalents, see Romsics; Pálffy 1–6.

73. See especially Deutsche Einheit.

74. See especially Radetzkymarsch.

75. Karl Renner suggested Southeast-Germany as a possible alternative; see Wodak 51.

76. For alternative nineteenth- and early twentieth-century interpretations of Czech history in general and the impact of the Thirty Years’ War in particular, see Palacky; Masaryk; Krofta; and Pečař. For the treatment of the topic in fictional literature, see also Hýsek.

77. The multifaceted relationship between the three core components of the Habsburg Monarchy, that is, the Austrian, the Bohemian and the Hungarian lands, is treated magisterially in Evans, The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, and Evans, Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs. For differing historiographical traditions, see also Evans, “Historians and the State in the Habsburg Lands.”


80. See Thurn 22. For the self-image of Upper Austrian rebel Erasmus von Starhemberg, see also Heilingssetzer.

81. For the following, see Tschernembl, especially recommendations 8, 25, and 33. For an in-depth analysis of Tschernembl's ideology, see Thaler, “Conservative Revolutionary.”

82. The estatist variety of representative government differed substantially from its modern democratic expression, of course. Yet this is equally true in England, without diminishing historical identification.
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The great necessity of entering—and remaining as long as possible within—the momentum of writing is perhaps what kept Stefan Zweig alive in his final years. As the memory of his home and of his mother tongue started to fade from his memory, Zweig resorted to pen and paper as a means to force them back to life and, through them, also force himself back to life. The strategy worked for as long as it could, for as long as Zweig could withstand having lost what had made him a writer in the first place: his books, his confidence, his home, his language.

What Zweig lost in 1934, following Hitler’s rise to power in Germany, was first and foremost his sense of self, a sense of self that had been, over the years, carefully nurtured by—and entangled with—his Viennese upbringing. In a touching text written in 1940, called Das Wien von Gestern, Zweig speaks at length of Vienna as a historical and cultural crossroads, a Weltstadt that teaches its inhabitants from an early age the secrets and pleasures of foreign customs and languages—this is why, claims Zweig, one never succumbed in Vienna to the feeling of being confined in one’s own language, race, or nationality; even the German spoken in the city was softer, more musical and open than its northern counterpart, more welcoming of other intonations and inflections. It was easy for a Viennese to learn new languages, and it was not at all uncommon to spend a day in French or Italian, soaking oneself in the melody of these foreign, yet familiar, sounds (“Das Wien von Gestern” 395–97).¹
Therein lies Vienna’s task, argues Zweig: in breathing Weltluft, in fostering an inclusive cosmopolitanism and thus fomenting “eine überlegene Kultur” capable of hindering all advances of barbarism (412). It comes as no surprise that Zweig valued himself—much as his beloved Vienna—as a Weltbürger, comfortable in many different milieux, conversant in many languages, capable of sitting down with James Joyce and discussing possible translations of his Portrait of an Artist into English, French, German, and Italian—as he proudly retells in his autobiography (366–67). The same Zweig who then lost his Heimat and lost his language, whose books were burned in Germany and whose mother tongue was banned during the war in Brazil. If an exiled Zweig wanted his letters to reach their destinations, he had to start writing them in English or French, even if these letters were trying to convey his innermost thoughts and feelings, thoughts and feelings he was no doubt having in German.

In his last years, Zweig was living in a permanent state of translation. Foreign languages were both his salvation and his demise. It is this weary feeling of both belonging to the world at large—of being a born and raised Weltbürger—and no longer belonging to any specific, familiar place that this article seeks to investigate, by way of Zweig’s existentially charged encounter with languages in his years of exile (1934–42). By focusing on Zweig’s later writings, this article seeks to pinpoint instances of the author’s linguistic plight, of his slow but irreversible descent into a multilingualism that, over time, started to erode his confidence and belief not only in himself but also—and most gravely—in the cosmopolitan ideals that he once identified with Vienna. Rather than searching an explanation for Zweig’s plight in the abstruse worlds of theory, this article seeks to show concrete instances of the author’s growing crisis of faith and self-doubt, as the same Zweig who had could once hold his own with James Joyce in four different languages began to cast doubt on his control over the English language and, ultimately, on his own craft.

The ghost of Entfremdung haunts Zweig’s autobiography from the very first page, as in exile he grieves over Vienna’s demotion from a “supernational metropolis” to a “German provincial city,” as he commits to paper the revulsion felt upon having his books burned to ashes “in the same land where [they] made friends of millions of readers.” And so, already two pages in, Zweig sets
the tone for the retelling of his life story: “And so I belong nowhere, and everywhere I am a stranger, a guest at best” (Die Welt von Gestern 10). The autobiography’s title, Die Welt von Gestern, seems to refer not to a world already gone but to a world the author no longer felt a part of. Although it was not for lack of trying.

Despite Thomas Mann’s harsh reaction to the tragic suicide—Mann accused Zweig of cowardice—Zweig did, in his own non-belligerent way, try to intervene, to be of some use in that troubled century. Sometime during 1935 or 1936, as Zweig was already in exile between London and New York, he was engaged in conceiving a monthly literary publication that would feature articles in various languages as a means of counterattacking the vicious German propaganda with the ethical values backed by a European community of world citizens much like himself. The project, unfortunately, never came to be, a painful realization to a man who in many ways was the very embodiment of his own project: “The more European a life a man had lived in Europe, the harder he was punished by the fist that battered Europe. [. . .] It was useless that I had been training my heart for almost half a century to beat as that of a citoyen du monde” (Die Welt von Gestern 369, 543).

The failure of the project was also the failure of what Zweig had become as a human being, was yet another sign of the exhaustion and disillusion that would eventually consume him. It tore apart the lesson he had learned during his days as a young writer in Paris, “the city of eternal youth,” as he calls it in his autobiography. It tore apart whatever was left of his youth, the one lesson Paris had taught this citoyen du monde:

I used my time in translating foreign languages, and even now I hold this to be the best way for a young poet to understand more deeply and more creatively the spirit of his own language. [. . .] for in this humble activity of transmitting the highest treasures of art I experienced for the first time the assurance of doing something truly useful, a justification of my existence. (Die Welt von Gestern 167)

Zweig found solace, even a childlike happiness at times, in languages, as, for instance, when he received from his German publishing house, for his fiftieth birthday, a collection of his own books published in a wide array of languages—upon which he joyously wrote: “no language was absent, not Bulgarian or Finnish, not Portuguese or Armenian, not Chinese or Marathi. In
Braille, in shorthand, in all exotic alphabets and idioms, thoughts and words of mine had gone out to people; I had expanded my existence immeasurably beyond the space of my being . . . What evil could possible happen? There were my books: could they be destroyed?” (Die Welt von Gestern 469).

But they were being destroyed; by that time Zweig had already left his home in Salzburg, had left behind every translation of his books aligned on shelves he would never again lay eyes upon. From candid bliss Zweig had been thrust into despair: “when my own works disappeared from the German language, I could more clearly grasp [the] lament at being able to produce the created word only in translation, in a diluted, altered medium” (Die Welt von Gestern 538). Zweig had lost his mother tongue, and all translations in the world seemed only to pale in comparison. But it was only due to these translations, due to his diluted existence in other languages, that he was able to flee Austria via London and in 1935 board a ship bound for New York, from where he wrote to Hermann Hesse: “my house in Salzburg [. . . ] is no longer a home to me; for emigration I have no talent” (Briefe an Freunde 264). Zweig had been deprived of his Austrian passport, he was a citoyen du monde who was no longer a citoyen, all that he had left was a truncated version of the monde.

And so he accepted the invitation in 1936 to go to Buenos Aires, Argentina, to take part in the PEN Congress, an activity he generally disliked. But he did so out of a commitment to the world, despite his failed project, despite his dwindling forces. He writes in his autobiography: “Never had it seemed more important to me than then to support the idea of intellectual solidarity over and beyond national boundaries and languages” (Die Welt von Gestern 522). This is, of course, the grandiose statement of a man writing his own life story. In reality, things were much more convoluted, as he reported to his good friend Raoul Auernheimer in a letter sent from Buenos Aires a few days later:

I do not know if the others feel the predicament of our situation the same way as I do—to speak German there means to be understood by nobody; to speak French there, where German is the official language of the congress, means to recognize that one no longer has a Heimat in German literature. Moreover, I did not wish to impose on the few Jews who were present, so I kept to myself and held no lectures. (Zweig, The Correspondence of Stefan Zweig 116)

Torn between languages and their implicit ideologies, shaken by the
possibility of renewed failure, Zweig chose silence. One could interpret his silence as the surfacing of his passive political stance, the same passivity that would be posthumously criticized by Thomas Mann. But it would be much more compelling to hear his silence as a bittersweet respect for language, this random, fallible set of conventions that turns every human interaction into a small miracle, the acknowledgment that a language can destroy as much as it can create. It was at this fragile, almost defeatist point in Zweig’s life that Brazil entered the stage, and for a little while it gave the Austrian author a second wind, it breathed in Zweig’s life a Luft that, if not properly cosmopolitan like that of his native Vienna, then was at least fresh enough and soft enough to restitute his voice. The couple of weeks he spent in Brazil after the PEN Congress of 1936 marked a new beginning in his life—but they also contained its end.18

Four years later, in 1940, Zweig returned to South America. In the meantime something had shifted within him, maybe something that Brazil had set in motion, and despite his usual languid, melancholy demeanor, there was a newfound vitality in his writing, the stubborn strength of a dying horse. It is said in South America that a horse gives all it’s got until the moment it dies; it never falters, never fails. Zweig had found his way around language once again. He wrote his ex-wife, Friderike Zweig, one letter after the other relishing his success: “Yesterday I spoke French here, in Buenos Aires (and in the other places) I held two lectures in Spanish, one in English, one in German, and dozens of people wait for me . . . ,”19 he wrote in September 1940, and then in October: “Yesterday, the first lecture in Spanish took place under dire conditions—although of a most flattering kind. The room for 1,500 people was so packed that the police had to intervene after 3,000 people tried to squeeze their way in. [. . .] It is nothing short of a sensation, here, that an author should speak Spanish and, wonder of wonders, I have spoken well” (Zweig and F. Zweig, Unrast der Liebe, 262).20

One can easily read between the lines the weary triumph of a citoyen du monde reconnected to—if not the world at large—then at least a world. The brief reprieve of once again partaking in the ethical, worldly solidarity of the intellectual community he so wished to be part of. His relieved words reached Friderike in November of the same year: “I have secured a permanent visa in Brazil, so that at least I can have a land where I don’t need to beg for a visa” (Unrast der Liebe, 265).21

Brazil had not only restituted his voice and provided him with a
permanent visa—Brazil also gave Zweig something that the “world of yesterday” did not, and that was the feeling of living “im Werdenden, Kommenden, Zukünftigen”—a phrase bringing to mind the passage from Deleuze and Guattari’s *Kafka: Pour une littérature mineure* (33–34): “To write like a dog in its hole, a rat digging its burrow. And thus to find one’s own point of under-development, one’s own dialect, one’s own Third World.” Zweig found these three things in Brazil, provided one understands this “Third World” not in terms of numbers and figures but as an invitation to another world, not this one or that one but a third one, a world in which things are still being created, rather than destroyed.

*Brasilien: Ein Land der Zukunft*, published in 1941, is a beautiful, caring book, a book that suffers from its excessive love. The book downplays the country’s shortcomings, while simultaneously exaggerating its paradisiacal qualities and affable people. Instead of mass production or administrative acumen, Zweig praises the country’s “Wille zur Verständigung und Verträglichkeit” (22), as he discovers his affection for a country that, despite its diverse population, managed to bypass and ignore the European racial obsession. It becomes clear that Zweig is using Brazil as the humanist model against which Germany, or fascist Europe, should be compared. It is in this sense that Brazil is a land of the future, as opposed to the European world of yesterday. The two books should be read back to back: not only do they complement one another, but they also reveal the extent to which Zweig was torn, a man without a present, lost between past and future, between his books in Europe and his freedom in Brazil, one foot on each side of the Atlantic. In October 1941 he wrote to Friderike: “I feel inhibited in my work in every sense. My books will hardly ever be published again in the original, and my entire mindset and worldview is bound to a European—and even Latin—mentality” (*Unrast der Liebe* 280).

Such constant reminders of having lost his existence “in the original” and only surviving through translation surfaces in interesting, if not unexpected ways throughout *Brasilien: Ein Land der Zukunft*. For instance, as Zweig retells the country’s colonization process, he muses, referring to the day that the French attempted to conquer Rio de Janeiro, “whether in the future this town is to be known as Rio de Janeiro or Henriville, and if the language of Brazil is to be Portuguese or French”—as if fearing that the imperialism of the French language would somehow endanger the pacific nature of Brazil (*Brasilien*, 58–59). But he later concludes that it is not the Portuguese spoken
in Brazil that sets the country apart from Portugal and, thus, from Europe—it is actually the warm human contact, most often expressed in the form of a hug: “the hug [accolade] is simply a custom taken for granted among Brazilians, and the result of their innate friendliness. Courtesy is here the basis of human relationship, taking forms which we in Europe have long forgotten” (Brasilien, 154–55).26

Zweig is, of course, exaggerating this perceived cordiality, but it is nevertheless touching how he in his Brazilian letters equates language to human contact, as if the secret to this humanist stance were somehow hidden within the depths of the local dialect. By 1941 Zweig and Lotte, his former secretary and by then his second wife, had moved to Petrópolis, up on the mountains outside Rio, where they hired a local cook. Zweig would spend hours musing over the happiness of this barefoot woman, eventually writing to his friend Berthold Viertel: “But nonetheless she is touchingly tender of behavior, happy, grateful—ah, if only I could learn this language” (Briefe an Freunde 337).27

The letter was sent three months before his suicide. By then, the burden of existing with one foot on each side of the Atlantic had grown too heavy, the continental vastness of Brazil made him feel stranded, an old man in a country for young people: “we are too old to once again get used to foreign languages and lands,”28 he confessed in one of the last letters sent to Friderike, a letter originally written in English (Unrast der Liebe, 288).29

But it would not do Zweig any justice to finish this essay on a suicidal moment. Instead, it would be best to go back to 1937, to a text he wrote as a recollection of his first years as an exile, as a guest in a foreign land. The text is called “Das Haus der Tausend Schicksale,” and at a certain point Zweig writes about being aboard a ship in the middle of the Atlantic, surrounded by homeless, landless people much like himself. And he admonishes you, you who have a home, you who know how this travel is going to end, to “approach them, speak to them. It is enough to cheer them if you merely go up to them, speak to them, but if you could speak to them in their own language they unconsciously draw a breath of the homeland which they have left, and their eyes light up eloquently” (“Das Haus der Tausend Schicksale” 360).30

Zweig resorts to the same image once again while introducing his book on the Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan, published in 1938. Zweig finds himself impatient, even bored, aboard a ship bound to Brazil, despite all of the amenities and comforts that are provided. And he thinks of Magellan, lost in the infinite seas exploring the unknown, and he thinks of himself aboard that
ship and repeats very similar words to himself: “You know your destination; to the hour, almost to the minute, you know when you will get there; and your coming is eagerly awaited” (Magellan 10). Zweig was, at that very time, the adrift homeless person and the valiant explorer; he was constantly trying to negotiate this asymmetry, trying to find an answer to the question of how to live in several languages under the crushing weight of nationalism.

The image could not be more fitting to wrap up this brief linguistic inquiry: Zweig is literally writing a book in the middle of the ocean, adrift in the expanses of this “no-man's land,” this place of transit, as if to say that if one has no other place of belonging, no other place to live, one must live in one’s words, one must live through language. One must go through many languages before finding a language of one’s own. Even if that language turns out to be silence.
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**Notes**

1. “Darum hatte man in Wien ständig das Gefühl, Weltluft zu atmen und nicht eingesperrt zu sein in einer Sprache, einer Rasse, einer Nation, einer Idee. [. . .] Kein Ausländer, der nicht deutsch verstand, war hier verloren. [. . .] Unser Deutsch wurde dadurch nicht so hart, nicht so akzentuiert, nicht so eckig und präzis wie das der Norddeutschen, es war weicher, nachlässiger, musikalischer, und so wurde es uns auch leichter, fremde Sprachen zu lernen. Wir hatten keine Feindseligkeit zu überwinden, keinen Widerstand, es war in den besseren Kreisen üblich, Französisch, Italienisch sich auszudrücken, und auch von diesen Sprachen nahm man die Musik in die unsere hinein.” For an original take on the choice and function of setting in Zweig’s work and particularly of “the Vienna of his upbringing,” see Turner.

2. “Die Aufgabe, eine überlegene Kultur zu verteidigen gegen jeden Einbruch der Barbarei, diese Aufgabe, die die Römer uns in die Mauern unserer Stadt eingemeißelt, wir haben sie bis zur letzten Stunde erfüllt. Wir haben sie erfüllt in dem Wien von gestern und wir wollen, wir werden sie weiter erfüllen auch in der Fremde und überall.” The interesting relationship between facts and fiction in Zweig’s autobiography, between Zweig’s Vienna
and the Vienna described by historians, between the “signs” and the “designata,” is explored at length in Galdós.

3. “Je mehr ich ihn kennenlernte, desto mehr setzte er mich durch seine phantastische Sprachkenntnis in Erstaunen; hinter dieser runden, fest gehämmerten Stirn, die im elektrischen Licht wie Porzellan glatt glänzte, waren alle Vokabeln aller Idiome eingestanzt, und er spielte sie in brillanter Weise durcheinander. Einmal als er mich fragte, wie ich einen schwierigen Satz in ›Portrait of an artist‹ deutsch wiedergeben würde, versuchten wir die Formung zusammen in Italienisch und Französisch; er hatte für jedes Wort vier oder fünf in jedem Idiom parat, selbst die dialektischen, und wußte ihren Valeur, ihr Gewicht bis in die kleinste Nuance.”

4. “Mit einem Federstrich hatte der Sinn eines ganzen Lebens sich in Widersinn verwandelt; ich schrieb, ich dachte noch immer in deutscher Sprache, aber jeder Gedanke, den ich dachte, jeder Wunsch, den ich fühlte, gehörte den Ländern, die in Waffen standen für die Freiheit der Welt.” (Die Welt von Gestern 572) Darién Davies makes note of the symbolic (and perverse) loss of language experienced by Zweig and how it reflected on the author’s correspondence: “Both Zweigs had to face the fact that owing to the war the market for German writing had dwindled, and furthermore, they had to write letters to their family in English to avoid the wartime censorship.” Davies 185. On Zweig’s own perception of the broader act of writing and sending letters as a hopeful device to preserve one’s sense of moral integrity, see Bohnen.

5. On Zweig’s “lack of self-confidence” in an earlier period of his life, see Steiman.


7. “Mein Unglück in diesen Zeiten besteht in dem, was früher meine Stärke war: klar und sehr weit voraus zu sehen, nicht mich selbst zu belügen und mich und andere durch Illusionen und Phrasen zu betrügen.” Briefe an Freunde, 345.

8. “Ich bin aufgewachsen in Wien, der zweitausendjährigen übernationalen Metropole, und habe sie wie ein Verbrecher verlassen müssen, ehe sie degradiert wurde zu einer deutschen Provinzstadt. Mein literarisches Werk ist in der Sprache, in der ich es geschrieben, zu Asche gebrannt worden, in eben demselben Lande, wo meine Bücher Millionen Leser sich zu Freunden gemacht. So gehöre ich nirgends mehr hin, überall Fremder und bestenfalls Gast . . .” The English translation provided has been checked against Harry Zohn’s 1944 edition of Zweig’s autobiography and adapted whenever necessary. All other translations are my own.

9. For an informative overview of Zweig’s activities as a mediator in European literature (his translations, adaptations, critical essays, introductions), see Zohn.

10. “Je europäischer ein Mensch in Europa gelebt, um so härter wurde er von der Faust gezüchtigt, die Europa zerschlug. ( . . . ) Es hat mir nicht geholfen, daß ich fast durch ein halbes Jahrhundert mein Herz erzogen, weltbürgerlich als das eines ›citoyen du monde‹ zu schlagen.”
11. “... nützte ich meine Zeit, um aus fremden Sprachen zu übersetzen, was ich noch heute für die beste Möglichkeit für einen jungen Dichter halte, den Geist der eigenen Sprache tiefer und schöpferischer zu begreifen. [ . . . ] denn an dieser bescheidenen Tätigkeit der Vermittlung erlauchten Kunstguts empfand ich zum erstenmal die Sicherheit, etwas wirklich Sinnvolles zu tun, eine Rechtfertigung meiner Existenz.” See also Steiman’s observation that “[Richard] Dehmel advised Zweig to redirect his energies from his own work to that of translating foreign authors, and thus set him to the task which would preoccupy him for the next dozen years, a task which nurtured his growing internationalism and a task in which he continued to see his most important function, that of mediating between cultures and bringing peoples together through their literatures.” Steiman 104.


14. On Zweig’s complicated relationship with England—which was nevertheless the country that “he thought first when it became clear to him in 1933 that the time was approaching when he must leave Austria”—and, to a lesser extent, with the English language, see Prater.

15. “... mein Haus in Salzburg ( . . . ) ist mir nicht recht Heimat mehr, zum Emigranten habe ich kein Talent.”


20. “Gestern war der erste Vortrag in Spanisch unter reichlichen Schwierigkeiten—freilich solchen höchst schmeichelafter Art. Der Saal mit 1500 Personen war so gestürmt, daß erstens sich 3000 Personen hineinquetschten und Polizei einschreiten mußte. [ . . . ] Es
ist eben eine Sensation hier, daß ein Autor Spanisch spricht und, Wunder über Wunder, ich habe gut gesprochen.”


22. “Écrire comme un chien qui fait son trou, un rat qui fait son terrier. Et, pour cela, trouver son propre point de sous-développement, son propre patois, son tiers-monde à soi . . .”

23. It should be noted that Zweig “was conscious of the social dislocation and the disintegration of traditional values wrought by industrialization” but that he ultimately “did not question these changes” beyond what he optimistically perceived as the artist’s task, which was to find “in the new forms of the city . . . a new beauty, in her noises a new rhythm, in her confusion an order, . . . in her stammering a language.” See Steiman 105.

24. “Ich fühle mich gehemmt in meinem Wirken in jedem Sinne, in dem Original werden die Bücher vermutlich kaum mehr erscheinen und mein ganzes Denken und Betrachten ist an europäische, ja sogar lateinische Mentalität gebunden. . . .”


26. “die accolade zwischen Brasilianern eine durchaus selbstverständliche Sitt e ist, ein Ausstrom natürlicher Herzlichkeit. Höflichkeit wiederum ist hier die selbstverständliche Grundform menschlicher Beziehung, und sie nimmt Formen an, die wir in Europa längst vergessen haben.”


28. “aber wir sind alle zu alt, um uns noch ganz an fremde Sprachen und Länder zu gewöhnen.” This letter echoes—with even more negative undertones—a previous letter Zweig had written to Paul Zech from New York in June of 1941: “Wir sind falsch gestellt in jedem Sinne; man müsste heute entweder zwanzig sein oder achtzig, das Leben schon hinter sich haben oder noch ganz vor sich. Aber eines ist uns noch geblieben, und selbst ohne ihre Wirkung hat sie ihre ablenkende Kraft bewahrt.” Zweig and Zech, Briefe 158.

29. Davies brilliantly locates in translation, in the act of constantly “code-switching, interpreting, and re-interpreting,” the instability and the feeling of in-between-ness (which he calls “liminality”) that burdened the Zweigs in South America: “Translation can be regarded as a liminal art of profession, independent of whether one believes the translator is a technician or a co-creator.” Davies ultimately concludes that “[l]iminality, as a transitory journey and as a phase or a state of being, can, oddly enough, be its own resolution”—a statement that captures quite well, from a theoretical point of view, the atmosphere surrounding Zweig’s last days in Brazil. Davies 185, 187.

30. “. . . tritt zu ihnen, sprich zu ihnen, denn schon dies ist Tröstung, daß Du zu ihnen trittst, und indem Du sie ansprichst in ihrer Sprache, trinken sie unbewußt einen Atemzug der Heimat, die sie verlassen haben, und ihre Augen werden hell und beredt.”
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“Translation is . . . not only necessary but unavoidable. And yet, as the text guards its secret, it is impossible.”
—Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Translation as Culture”

Introduction

The following study of translations of Ingeborg Bachmann in the US considers reception and cultural transfer and the precision with which translations mirror the historical and cultural mores of their eras. Translations are not just “vicarious objects standing in for originals as best they can, but [. . . ] significant counters in the symbolic economy and carriers of ideas, attitudes and values” (Hermans 81). If we accept that meaning-making is never external to discourse and ideology but is instead generated from the various interpretive frameworks present in a culture, then a translation analysis opens up an opportunity to see in action how a particular culture will adapt a foreign source text over time. A chronological comparison of adaptations can illuminate the evolution of changing and at times competing discourses in the receiving culture. Since translation and cross-linguistic reception play such a vital role in presenting foreign cultures, an investigation such as this one allows us to reconstruct the cultural positions that condition the rewriting of an author across a linguistic border. This article considers Bachmann’s prose vis-à-vis its US translations across four decades, with focus on works published during Bachmann’s life.¹

What specifically can a translation tell us about the process of cultural transfer? Plenty, as literary translation constitutes a final, marketable instance
of a writer's presence in a foreign culture. Since the 1990s, translation research has applied and substantiated an argument then central to postcolonial studies: Cultural identity will reveal itself most radically when confronted with another national tradition (Venuti, The Translator's Invisibility 100). If we extend this framework to Bachmann, translation analysis holds up a light to the source text, isolating two key aspects of prose: gender and culture. How do translations engage with Bachmann's textual practice to convey its particular historical and cultural context of postwar Austria, as well as with the elements of her prose that carry the author's feminist proposition? A reverse focus on the receiving culture reveals intriguing information. Given the general ethnocentric impulse of cultures to habitually deform foreign texts, captured by Antoine Berman (4), as well as the geographic and cultural distance between Austria and the US, how do US cultural institutions such as publishing houses, editors, and translators frame Bachmann's Austrianness? And, for a readership accustomed to a strong tradition of feminist writing, is Bachmann's pioneering feminism at all perceptible on American ground?

**Bachmann in the US: Overview**

In contrast to the German-speaking countries, where Bachmann first achieved prominence as a lyrical poet and where her prose encountered much resistance, she entered the mainstream English-language literary market with delay and as a prose writer (for a full list of translations prior to 2000, see Siwak 93–94). Michael Bullock's 1964 translation of the short story collection titled *The Thirtieth Year* failed to interest a broader audience, and Holmes and Meier reprinted it only in 1989, to include Bachmann's prose in its *Modern German Voices* series. Holmes and Meier published a translation by Mary Fran Gilbert of *Simultan* under the English title *Three Paths to the Lake* in 1989 and, a year later, *Malina*, translated by Philip Boehm. At first glance, the steady frequency with which new translations appeared in the later 1990s and early 2000s may seem to have strengthened Bachmann's presence in the American literary market. However, in contrast with adequate attention of popular critics in previous decades, only Peter Filkins's 1999 rendition of Bachmann's posthumously edited and published prose cycle *Todesarten* (*The Book of Franza* and *Requiem for Fanny Goldmann*) elicited any mainstream response. 2 Bachmann's *Letters to Felician* (2004) from her private archive, translated by Damion Searls, was followed in 2005 by a tiny anthology of selected
stories and poems in Lilian Friedberg’s translation under the title Last Living Words: The Ingeborg Bachmann Reader. Finally, 2007 gave us an expanded edition of Bachmann’s collected poems translated by Filkins; this was the bilingual collection Darkness Spoken that includes poems never published in German. First announced in the 1990s, the translation of Bachmann’s critical writings with emphasis on the Frankfurt lectures, by Karen Achberger and Karl Solibakke, is still in the works.

In the conclusion of her review of the American translation of Franza and Fanny, Gabriele Annan remarks that Bachmann, so “fiendishly difficult” to render in another language, is one of those authors “whom every generation will feel the need to retranslate” (Annan). Indeed, American translators have been reaching back for Bachmann since the 1960s—from Bullock to Anderson to Boehm, Filkins, and Friedberg, several sub-generations have attempted to lay claim to Bachmann’s poetry and prose. Friedberg’s work is particularly unconventional, for it combines feminist ideology, a multidisciplinary perspective of an academic and performer, and a strong personal commitment to breathe new life into Bachmann. Neither Filkins’s nor Friedberg’s labors of love have sparked a Bachmann revival in the US. The first decade of our new millennium has seen, and quickly forgotten, their coincidentally concurrent (albeit programmatically different) translations of Bachmann’s poetry. Aside from receiving prestigious distinctions (the Kayden Translation Award for Friedberg and the Distinguished Translation Award of the Austrian Cultural Ministry for Filkins) and a handful of non-academic reviews, their work galvanized little interest in Bachmann.

These renewed attempts to position Bachmann in the US literary market mirror the evolution of Bachmann studies, especially their North American branch. In the 2006 Bachmann monograph Cemetery of the Murdered Daughters, Sara Lennox outlines her own rethinking of Bachmann over the past four decades against the backdrop of Bachmann scholarship. Lennox traces the changes in her approach to the Austrian writer as various academic frameworks of the past forty years flash by. She makes a compelling argument that most academic and popular criticism never could tap into the carefully crafted historical positionality of Bachmann’s protagonists, interpreting them at face value instead (15–17). Consequently, the writer was accused of confessionality, and her reception defaulted toward the autobiographical. In addition, Bachmann’s own identity as an author at the crossroads of postwar Europe, existentialism, Austrianness, and proto-feminism was destined
to have difficulty crossing even the Austrian border, and her quick rise to literary prominence in neighboring Germany abstracted her unique amalgam of influences. Similar to their effect on academic and popular reception, the fragmentation of cultural discourse and changes in intellectual access to the Austrian tradition have over time affected the translations of Bachmann as well. Those fluctuations are telling, since the translations of her prose tip toward a focus either on gender or on aesthetics, but never both. Two such extremes are Boehm and Friedberg: Boehm, attentive to Bachmann’s lyricism, neatly diffuses the anti-patriarchy that drives her prose, while Friedberg in her feminist fierceness bulldozes over Bachmann’s lyrical language. But how, and why?

Translation in Western Cultures

Bachmann’s relative absence from the US market reflects the institutional constraints that translators in the US face. German-language literature has to contend with small print runs and a niche audience. While translations of poetry, including Bachmann’s, can usually count on a modest but refined and open-minded readership in the US, foreign prose must conform to more popular expectations, which often makes any resonance of the source culture difficult. In order to increase the potential pool of readers, translators feel obligated to adhere to standards that prevail in US (and generally Western) practice and reflect a visceral ambivalence toward literary translation. Lawrence Venuti centered his discussion of the notorious ethnocentricity of translation practice in the US around fidelity, invisibility, and fluency, which he has identified as the three commandments that guide translation (The Translator’s Invisibility). Such practice frequently generates English-language versions that flatten or dilute the foreignness of a literary text. In fact, reviewers and readers measure the quality of a translation by its linguistic and discursive transparency. Thus the transformations that Bachmann’s texts undergo in English presumably still reflect a mix of the translators’ reading practices and literary sensibility as well as their internalized notions of what is culturally acceptable. The resulting target-language texts can allow us to reconstruct the habitus of a culture. When Michaela Wolf applies Bourdieu’s concept to translation analysis, she welcomes translation’s potential to inform said habitus: “translatorial habitus not only results from social practice but can also create values and produce knowledge” (Wolf 13). Her approach ref-
rains from value judgments and presupposes trust in the pluralities of cross-cultural processes. How times have changed. In the nascent days of the cultural and sociological turn in translation studies, scholars such as Lefevere and Bassnett equated translation with active manipulation that occurs in response to historical and political pressures of cultural systems (Lefevere 1992).

However, our focus on cultural transfer should not ignore the translator’s double allegiance: she bears a responsibility to the target reader but above all must fulfill her obligation to the source text. Venuti examined this twofold obligation, showing how it positions translators in a space between the two cultures and determines their role as “social agents in conflict” (The Translator’s Invisibility 202). Whether unwittingly or actively steeped in ideology and culture, translators face a prime challenge: how to uncover and transmit the mode in which a literary text constructs meaning while still providing the audience with a narcissistic experience of recognizing their own universe of discourse in a foreign text (Lefevere 87–98). Consequently, the translator’s mission is bound to collide with literary works that are far from fluent, whose literariness results from their divergence from the existing canon.

Meaning construction is an especially complex process in modernist writing such as Bachmann’s, who drew on the various discourses of post-1945 Western Europe as well as on the Austrian intellectual and literary tradition, combining existentialism with language philosophy, typically modernist features with surrealism. To express the post-1945 existential alienation of an individual and the position of a woman in a patriarchal society, Bachmann relies on the modernist narrative strategies of both linguistic and psychological displacement. Her use of metonymy as a mode of expression further highlights the alienation from language, culture, and history that her characters experience. An intricate framework made up of intertextuality, overt references, and displaced connotations stitches together the cultural meaning of her texts. The vast number of allusions to literary, philosophical, and musical works has posed a challenge to critics and academics alike. Characteristically for Bachmann, connections between an allusion and the original work exist only on the surface; she was prone to placing titles or quotes on the page in order to convey her characters’ composite makeup and their often subconscious allegiance to a multilayered intellectual heritage. The language of Bachmann’s novels and stories retains a distinct affinity to her poetry. Her prose is lyrical, saturated with the surrealistic images so emblematic of her poems, and her associative narration relies heavily on
linguistic displacement as well. This metonymical language movement drives Bachmann’s feminist discourse. Clearly, a standard fluent and transparent translation that shies away from linguistic repetitions and ruptures is bound to derail Bachmann’s aesthetics.

The following translation analysis discusses examples of alterations that occur in the three plains outlined by Lefevere: universe of discourse, ideology, and poetics. Naturally, the kinds of rewritings that result from the translation process engender subtler and more isolated shifts than those arising from criticism or historiography, but symptomatic patterns emerge nevertheless. An analysis of samples from the translations by Bullock, Boehm, and Gilbert is followed by a comparison of two versions of the same story, “Undine geht,” in Bullock’s traditional rendering and Lilian Friedberg’s much later feminist “liberal translation” (the label is Friedberg’s) of the same piece. I examine deviations that alter the interpretive frame, approaching translation from the hermeneutic perspective as a concretization of a literary text that channels an initially open source text into a more specific rewriting. The English versions typically soften or erase manifestations of an obsession with language and of linguistic crises in Bachmann’s narratives. While Bachmann frequently relies on repetitions, these tend to vanish in the process of translation, broken up by translators’ reflex to diffuse them with synonyms instead. It follows that some elements of Bachmann’s cultural specificity and her particular aesthetics remain opaque to the English-language readers, and perhaps to the American translators as well. There is also ample evidence that Bachmann’s texts shift in English to fit the particular horizon of American culture and its static view of the Austrian heritage. Again, the impulse to categorize and freeze a cultural other is a standard behavior in cross-linguistic transfer. But, as Venuti pointed out, it ignores the inherent processes of heterogeneity and change, instead conjuring imaginary coherence and homogeneity (“Translation and the Formation of Cultural Identities” 3).

In Germany and Austria, Bachmann’s gender diverted the reception of her prose toward a simplified and more autobiographical approach. A similar perspective informed her English-language translations. Bullock, one of the best and most prolific translators of twentieth-century German-language literature, renders Bachmann’s stories in an accessible and fluent English prose, and that transparency, coupled with Bullock’s inattentive reading, leads to losses. In *Understanding Ingeborg Bachmann*, Karen Achberger spotted uncoordinated translations of Geschöpf as “creature” in one place and “victim”
in another, and Bullock’s familiarity with Vienna comes into question when Bachmann’s “Riesenrad” emerges as “giant wheel” (Achberger 92, 95). I will take up the more significant translation casualties when discussing gender and poetics to trace how Bullock fails to interpret and render both intertextuality and intertextual irony.

One of the most exhausting features of Bachmann’s discourse is the presence of compulsive intertextual references and allusions to literary and philosophical texts, often sourced from a patriarchal tradition. Rather than quoting them, Bachmann rewrites these references, thus offering an alternative to such artifacts of patriarchy. Bachmann scholars have uncovered numerous sources and have gleaned the purpose of intertextuality in Bachmann’s writing. Heidi Schlipphacke’s 2010 study Nostalgia after Nazism develops a perspective particularly productive for translation research. Schlipphacke argues that nostalgia in Austrian literature never figures as the single-layered affect. Instead, out of awareness of Austria’s historical complicity, nostalgia blends with irony or at least an ironic distance, because “in contemporary German and Austrian art . . . only this form of nostalgia could guard against the regression leading to the erasure of history” (18). Thus citation and intertextuality serve to dislocate the space for affect, for the expression of nostalgic longing (23). In Bachmann’s case, displaced nostalgia also provides a (claustrophobic) gap away from the total entrapment of her characters by gender oppression, fascism, and colonialism. That tiny space disappears in Bullock’s English translations entirely, as he reinstates the female-identified and female-oriented text into the patriarchal paradigm against which Bachmann is writing. Bullock’s translations also tend to efface Bachmann’s “Austrian mind”—her attention to and preoccupation with language, her indebtedness to Wittgenstein and Kraus (Siwak 94). His perspective on Bachmann, insensitive to her deep Austrian roots, may be a residue of his extensive translation work on Max Frisch and Siegfried Lenz and certainly reflects the prevailing midcentury attitude that modern Austrian literature is essentially a branch of the German literary market.

In the 1950s Bachmann vaulted to celebrity status in the Germany literary world, which heralded her as a cultural icon. When in the early 1960s she turned from writing poetry to prose, critics rejected her short stories, and especially the 1974 novel Malina, as overly lyrical, lacking social engagement, and (therefore) anachronistic. Issues of the canon likely added to this negative reception: As a lyrical novel in the tradition of Rilke and Jacobsen, Malina
represents a late nineteenth-century genre no longer canonical in Germany. Much like other authors of lyrical novels, such as Hesse, Woolf, or Rilke, Bachmann transforms the traditional novel into an organized exploration of consciousness (Freedman 187). The narrative premise of _Malina_ reflects the solipsistic attitude of existentialism and of modernist literature: a modernist subject cannot transcend isolation and subjectivity, since the world reveals itself to us only in rare moments of subjective awareness. To further complicate matters for the translator, the lyrical novel never became part of the literary canon in the US, and the only frame of reference it is likely to conjure is the early twentieth-century women’s modernist writing of Virginia Woolf and Djuna Barnes.

**Culture**

From Bachmann’s dissertation on Heidegger to her intense engagement with Wittgenstein, language philosophy permanently framed Bachmann’s intellectual outlook. Wittgenstein’s view of language as a constitutive force has its sources in the Viennese intellectual milieu, whose prominent representative Karl Kraus stated that every linguistic statement has an unspoken moral dimension. It is this moral and real dimension of language that Bachmann’s poetry and prose take up and develop. Bachmann’s writing is deeply indebted to the Austrian tradition and to a quintessentially Austrian preoccupation with language. In contrast with European readers, as Peter Filkins remarked in our interview, the relationship of English-speaking audiences to language is far less complicated. This difference keeps the layers of linguistic anguish that Bachmann’s characters voice out of her English readers’ reach.

The following passage from Bachmann’s 1961 short story “Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha” foregrounds language in a way typical for Bachmann’s writings:


It is not accidental that Charlotte’s interior monologue plays out on the
grammatical plane. The noun Satz reappears thrice, in connection with the verbs übersetzen and bilden. Charlotte is reacting to a linguistic change that occurred earlier in the story, when Mara began to address her with Du. This shift is binding, and it threatens Charlotte because it imposes a degree of intimacy, a closer and initially unwelcome relationship. Thus, in “Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha” linguistic layers drive external reality, which is quickly slipping out of Charlotte's grip. Soon it will be too late for moot gestures of distance between the two women.

In English, though, this passage undergoes a significant transformation. Because English lacks the distinction between the formal and the informal “you,” the shift that occurs in the English version is partially obligatory: the translator, Michael Bullock, has little choice but to resort to using a first name.

When they were out on the street she couldn’t find the sentence that had saved her once already. Earlier the sentence had been possible: I'll call a taxi for you . . . But now she would have to add “Mara” to the sentence. She couldn't do that. They walked slowly back. Charlotte put her hands in her coat pockets. At least Mara shouldn’t have her hand any more. (Bullock, “A Step towards Gomorrah” 111)

However, the remaining changes are entirely voluntary. Bullock decides against repeating the word "sentence" and drops the two verbs that carry a linguistic connotation. These seemingly innocent variations have significant interpretive consequences. The source text depicts a female character entangled in linguistic structures, whose relationship to reality is deferred and mediated through language. By erasing this interpretive frame, Bullock sidesteps Bachmann's preoccupation with language. The notion of language as a process that constitutes rather than reflects reality does not even enter the English text. The cultural discourses that speak through Bachmann’s narrative remain invisible. Finally, Bullock’s decision to replace repetition with synonyms indicates a desire to produce a fluent translation, one that is linear and not circular, one that may read more like an original. But of course, this original is not fluent at all.

Drawing on a 1955 interview with Bachmann, Gisela Brinker-Gabler suggested that for the author herself as well as for some of her literary figures, their mother tongue, Austrian-German, is already an “other” tongue by linking one to another culture, nation, and location: Germany (187). However, I would argue that if we account for Bachmann's Todesarten cycle as well as
Bachmann’s essays, we can identify reasons beyond Bachmann’s sentimental allegiance to the microcosm of Austria that fuel her characters’ unease toward language. Bachmann explained in Frankfurter Vorlesungen that today’s speaking subject, the contemporary “Ich,” no longer expresses history and embodies it instead (230). This poetological principle is reflected in her characters’ lack of specific identity; they operate somewhat like vessels for various intellectual and historical discourses. Many of Bachmann’s protagonists speak for those Austrians of the Stunde Null generation who continued to bear witness to the war. Thus it is first and foremost German fascism from which the singsongy Austrian wants to keep its distance. But Bachmann is never naive about Austrian complicity. Take her story “Unter Mör dern und Irren,” published in 1955, the year of the Austrian State Treaty, which effectively absolved Austria of its war guilt. If Bachmann’s subsequent protagonists cannot feel at home in German, their linguistic displacement gives voice not just to a Habsburg nostalgia but also to the insight that in Austria fascism did not vanish with the strokes of five pens. Hidden fascism persists in societal relations. This unwelcome affiliation with Germany and the recognition of Austria’s complicity contribute to her character’s difficulty with German.

Another moral dimension in the vein of Karl Kraus often prompts Bachmann’s protagonists to yearn to recover their footing in language, as they find themselves confined to the “schlechte Sprache,” a store of superficial phrases and banalities. Far from enabling communication, this language generates conversational noise. Bachmann’s 1972 short story volume Simultan again takes up the subliminal connection between language and the psyche, but the spotlight shifts to the loss of linguistic grounding. The title story, “Simultan,” brands its protagonist Nadja as a geographic and linguistic expatriate. Nadja hopes that through Mr. Frankel, an Austrian she has met at a conference, she can access this lost language, but she quickly realizes that her expectations were misplaced:

Sie wußte bloß nicht, was sie des wegen einander zu sagen hatten, nur weil sie beide aus dieser Stadt kamen und eine ähnliche Art zu sprechen und beiseite zu sprechen hatten, vielleicht hatte sie auch nur, nach einem dritten Whisky auf der Dachterasse im Hilton geglaubt, er bringe ihr etwas zurück, einen vermißten Geschmack, einen fehlenden Tonfall, ein geisterhaftes Gefühl von einem Daheim, das nirgends mehr für sie war. (Bachmann, “Simultan” 285)
Gilbert’s English version simplifies the subtleties of Nadja’s perception. The Austrian language, a source of her lost cultural identity, becomes reduced to an accent, an intonation, the famous Austrian melody:

She wondered all the same how much they really had to say to one another, given that they had only this city in common and a similar way of talking, the same intonation, perhaps she’d just wanted to believe after that third whiskey on the roof garden at the Hilton that he would give her back something she’d lost, a missing taste, an intonation gone flat, that ghostly feeling of home, though she was no longer at home anywhere. (Gilbert, “Word for Word” 2)

When in the source text Nadja’s reflections touch on the limits of language and the sayable (“zu sprechen und beiseite zu sprechen”), the translation takes language very literally. The context of communication, miscommunication, and conversational games has vanished, flattened into “talking” and “intonation.”

A similarly reductive shift occurs in Gilbert’s translation of “Drei Wege zum See,” where Elizabeth reflects on her geographically detached mastery of English:

weil sie nie versucht hatte, ein bestimmtes Englisch zu sprechen, sondern sich in einem neutralen aufhielt, ohne die Besonderheiten von englischen und amerikanischen Freunden zu kopieren, und Trotta hatte sie einmal geklagt, daß sie nie so gut französisch sprechen werde wie er, aber er hatte gemeint, das wünsche er ihr nicht, es sei besser, sie geriete nie wie er in diesen Zustand von Auflösung, denn es hatten ihn auch die Sprachen aufgelöst. (Bachmann, “Drei Wege” 453)

Here again, the translation restricts “language” to “accent,” and reduces the differences between British and American English to the level of idiom. Moreover, it entirely omits the German sich aufhalten (“sich [. . .] aufhielt”), a verb that connotes a territorial embeddedness in language:

Elisabeth [. . . ] never attempted to speak a certain kind of English: her accent was neutral and she didn’t copy the idioms of her English and American friends, Trotta had once complained that she would never speak French as well as he did but had added that he didn’t wish it upon her, it would be better if she didn’t end up in the state of disins-
integration, for languages had also made him go to pieces. (Gilbert, “Three Paths” 178)

This deviation from the original causes a visible rupture in the English text. The source-language passage establishes an association between identity and language and explains Trotta’s state in those terms. Trotta warns Elisabeth of the potential danger of her ease with languages, attributing his own psychological disintegration to multilingualism, a residue of his country’s imperial and multinational past. The latent intertextual reference to Heidegger’s assertion that “Die Sprache ist das Haus des Seins” is lost in translation, so Elisabeth’s and Trotta’s remarks seem misaligned. Gilbert’s noticeable translation error (“und Trotta hatte sie einmal geklagt” as “Trotta once complained”) further upends the logic of Elisabeth’s grievance.

Gender/Ideology

In keeping with the standards of her culture, Bachmann handled female sexuality discreetly, or perhaps evasively. To be sure, sexual connotations are frequently present in her prose, but Bachmann hardly goes beyond linguistic allusions to sex. This quality of her discourse did not stop the translator of “Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha” to concretize the sexual connotations in the story, framing them in explicit ways. As the plot unfolds, Mara’s interest in Charlotte acquires an erotic aura. When Mara asks about Charlotte’s marriage, her increasingly demanding questions reveal her jealousy: “Glaubst du, ich werde zulassen, daß du auf die Bahn gehst und mit ihm zurückkommst! Umarmt er dich gut? Gut? Wie?” (“Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha” 197).

But Bullock’s translation spells out and fortifies the sexual element: “Do you think I shall let you go to the station and come back with him! Is he a good lover? Well, is he?” (“A Step towards Gomorrah” 115). Later Charlotte decides that she will take on Mara as her “Geschöpf” and treat the girl as condescendingly as her own lovers had always dealt with her. “Sie fuhr Mara noch einmal zaghaft durchs Haar, hatte ihr gern etwas versprochen. Etwas Süßes, Blumen, eine Nacht oder eine Kette” (199). Again, Bullock opts to foreground the sexual aspect: “She timidly ran her hand through Mara’s hair again, would have liked to promise her something. Something sweet, flowers, a night of love or a necklace” (“A Step towards Gomorrah” 118). These transformations reveal the translator’s urge to pin down the indeterminate sexuality of the ori-
In the 1970s, feminist Germanists hailed “Ein Schritt nach Gomorrha” and “Undine geht” as perhaps the earliest manifestations of Bachmann’s critique of patriarchy, which the author then went on to develop in the Todesarten cycle. Feminist scholars, most notably Karen Achberger (1982), often refer to “Gomorrha” as the female story of creation. As such, this story is necessarily iconoclastic; it rests on the possibility that the religion of patriarchy might be abolished and eradicated. Confronted with the novel possibility of a same-sex relationship, the protagonist attempts to visualize alternative ways to love and relate:


This quote exemplifies a classic case of linguistic and interpretive indeterminacy: The German word Geschlecht can refer to mankind, species, sex, and gender. Jakobson discusses instances of indeterminacy and the challenge they can pose for translators (144–51); indeterminacies occur where the source-language expression is less fixed and can be rendered in the target language only in a more particular way. Thus an indeterminacy in the source text will create a free zone for the translator to perform an interpretation—inscribing personal, cultural, and ideological factors into the target text.

As the following translation of the passage makes evident, a single such shift can substantially affect the intended conceptual relationships. In effect, the translation hijacks a source text that belongs to the domain of discourse by women. The narrative strategy of intertextual irony—to playfully weave in a patriarchal intertext, only to expose and to question it—disappears:

If only mankind could once more reach for a fruit, once more arouse wrath, once more decide in favour of its earth! Experience another awakening, another shame! Mankind was never tied down. There
were possibilities. The fruit was never consumed, had still not been consumed, not yet. The scent of all fruits, which were of equal value, hung in the air. There might be other knowledge to be grasped. She was free. (Bachmann, “A Step towards Gomorrah” 123)

Conversely, a feminist reading of the story would prompt a translation of “dieses Geschlecht” not as “mankind,” or even “species,” but rather as “this sex,” “festgelegt” as “determined” rather than “tied down.” This case demonstrates the decisive role gender markers can play in the translation process. In the original, Bachmann openly draws on diction and phraseology of patriarchal texts, in particular the Bible and the works of Nietzsche. Simultaneously, the story provides the reader with enough context to realize that “Gomorrha” does not quote these sources but rather desymbolizes them. Bachmann’s prose and poetry alike make heavy use of this gesture to proclaim the author’s identification with the “feminine” in writing. But the gender shift in English sabotages the feminist practice. Let Bachmann write against patriarchy; Bullock will plunge her female-identified and female-oriented text into the patriarchal paradigm.

If Charlotte in “Gomorrha” could still defy patriarchal oppression, such a possibility disappears in Bachmann’s later prose. In Malina, the “I” finds herself utterly defenseless in the face of patriarchal violence. Her fear and premonition of death gradually reveal themselves, to drive the novel’s plot. Initially triggered just by dreams of the father, the terror begins to creep in from other directions. Slowly, the narrative exposes her lover Ivan as yet another perpetrator, whose insults and threats she will internalize:

Ivan greift wieder an.

Oft kann ich es in deinem Gesicht sehen
Damals hast du alt ausgesehen
Manchmal siehst du richtig alt aus
Heute siehst du zwanzig Jahre jünger aus
Lach mehr, lies weniger, schlaf mehr, denk weniger
Das macht dich doch alt, was du machst
Graue und braune Kleider machen dich alt
Verschenk deine Trauerkleider ans Rote Kreuz
Wer hat dir diese Grabkleider erlaubt?
Surprisingly, the translation smooths out Ivan’s menacing tone: “You’ll look younger right away, I’ll drive old age away from you!” (Boehm, *Malina* 64). If in German Ivan sadistically offers to “knock it out” of her, much like an abusive parent would, in English he is almost making a friendly promise. In this passage, Boehm’s translation shift destabilizes a parallel between violence and gender relations that Bachmann drew early in her career (*Wir müssen wahre Sätze finden* 144) and remained committed to exposing.

The equation of patriarchy and violence makes up the key ideological proposition of the *Todesarten* cycle. In a 1984 essay on Bachmann, “Der Krieg mit anderen Mitteln,” Elfriede Jelinek celebrated Bachmann’s conflation of fascism with gender relation as her most significant contribution to German-language literature (312). In the 1970s, Bachmann’s writing helped to create and canonize feminist discourse in German-language literature. Bachmann shows that socially condoned violence is always directed against women, who die at the hands of both random killers and lovers. In *Malina*, the female narrator gradually recognizes that an unspoken conspiracy lies behind all these seemingly coincidental deaths. Men murder women:


But not in English, as the translator decides against imposing gender markers:

> The news is often filled with such ghastly reports. In Pötzleinsdorf, at the Prater, in the Vienna Woods, on every periphery a woman is murdered, strangled—it almost happened to me, too, but not on the periphery—strangled by some brutal individual, and then I always think to myself: that could be you, that will be you. *Strangers murdered by strangers*. (Boehm, *Malina* 183)
His choice has the effect of obfuscating the horrifying truth of these murders. These daily occurrences of gender violence in the German text shift instead to an account of random acts, committed by anybody against anybody. By effacing gender identities of the victims (women), and their perpetrators (men), the English text sidesteps an endemic connection between violence and patriarchy that Bachmann’s narratives consistently foreground.

The parallels between violence, patriarchy, and fascism culminate in Bachmann’s leitmotif of the “verschwiegene Erinnerung.” A single memory of a trauma of violence and the knowledge of the murderer’s identity serve as the impetus behind the narrative. Briefly introduced early in the novel, this leitmotif resurfaces in moments of panic and mental crisis, but until the novel’s end, the memory remains unspeakable, and for a good reason: It would force her to identify her father as a Nazi murderer. As the novel progresses, the narrator begins to recognize that the “verschwiegene Erinnerung”—the silenced memory—must be uncovered, and yet the price for this revelation will be her own death. Her “crime”? She was, if not an accomplice, then at least a bystander, and the character Malina eventually puts the blame on her: “Gewußt hast du das vielleicht nicht, aber du warst einverstanden” (Bachmann, Malina 232). The father-daughter and other intimate relationships in Malina are steeped in the same terror that swept Austria in 1938 and has never quite subsided.

In Malina the notion of “Erinnerung” functions on two levels: it denotes a particular memory and the faculty of remembering—memory and remembrance. Gradually, the “verschwiegene Erinnerung” becomes a more and more dominant lexical motif, signaling the real drive behind the interior monologue of “I.” Although the “I” appears to narrate incessantly only to avoid this recognition, at times she realizes that eventually she will have to reveal the unspeakable: “Ich muß erzählen. Ich werde erzählen. Es gibt nichts mehr, was mich in meiner Erinnerung stört. [. . . ] Wenn meine Erinnerung aber nur die gewöhnlichen Erinnerungen meinte, Zurückliegendes, Abgelebtes, Verlassenes, dann bin ich noch weit, sehr weit von der verschwiegenen Erinnerung, in der mich nichts mehr stören läßt” (Bachmann, Malina 20). In opting for various synonyms, the translation breaks up this crucial theme: “I must talk. I will talk. There’s nothing more to disturb my reminiscing. . . . However, if my memory only entails the usual recollections, remote, decrepit, abandoned, then I’m still far away, very far away from the silent reminiscence where nothing more can upset me” (Boehm, Malina 9). Boehm’s synonymizing reflex, his insisten-
ce on stylistic variation, diffuses this most acute motif of Bachmann’s novel. But the effects of Boehm’s textual intervention do not end here. By translating “verschwiegene Erinnerung” as “silent reminiscence,” Boehm erases two important connotations, which in the original indict societal structures: repression and fear. Although the parallels between patriarchy, fascism, and war permeate Malina’s narrative, the translation directs the narrative voice away from social critique back into the privacy of female suffering.

Poetics

What makes a novel, in readers’ eyes? A cursory search for definitions brings up commonalities such as “a sequence of events,” “a plot,” and “characters,” but no references to poetics. As popular notions place plot at their center, novels are far more likely than poetry or plays to undergo significant changes in the process of translation. The root causes of such transformations are readers and critics themselves: readers (translators not excepted) tend to separate a novel’s “content” and “poetics.” They view novels as easily paraphrasable material and regard the aesthetics as a nonessential component (Bassnett 126). For their part, critics commonly praise translations that “read like an original” and dismiss styles that call attention to language as “translationese” (Venuti, The Translator’s Invisibility 5).

In Malina, displacement, desymbolization, and textual repetitions and ruptures serve as key aesthetic devices in accounting for the position of woman in a patriarchal society. Bachmann’s feminist proposition is intrinsically bound up with her poetics, where the psychoanalytic and linguistic displacements and repetitions coincide. Thus by default most shifts affecting the novel’s aesthetics will simultaneously alter its ideological frame. To what degree will fluent and transparent translation sabotage Bachmann’s écriture féminine?

Increasing instances of violence in Malina feed into the first-person narrator’s fear of impeding death. Her horror is not directly thematized; rather it comes through in the narrator’s linguistic behavior. For instance when the “ich,” Malina’s narrator, says: “Ich könnte auf Malina warten, aber ich gehe lieber ins Bett, ich bin todmüde, furchtbar müde, zu Tod erschöpft” (Bachmann, Malina 77), the repetition and variation give this sentence a structure (typical of the circular movement of Bachmann’s many narratives) whose sound pattern could be represented as: ~ m / ~ m / t ~. Boehm’s translation disrupts
this circularity: “I could wait for Malina, but I better go to bed, I’m extremely
tired, utterly fatigued, exhausted to death” (t—,—,-d) (Boehm, Malina 46). Where Bachmann, constructing the narrative much like a musical piece, relies on repetition and transformation, the translator, concerned with “good style,” sacrifices Malina’s musical structure. But Bachmann’s novel is built on a tightly woven net of repetitions, ruptures, and displacements that surround the motifs of exhaustion and death. As Kirsten Belgum has argued, an ending of death actually drives this narrative, which rests on the narrator’s anticipation of its coming. The narrating woman remains in control of this discourse on death. Her knowledge and awareness of the impending murder are an empowering force at the same time that they frame her victimhood. By not honoring one of Malina’s crucial compositional principles, Boehm appears occasionally impervious to manifestations of Bachmann’s écriture feminine. Ultimately, the source text Malina experienced two consequential reinterpretations in close sequence: both the 1990 English translation and the 1991 Schroeter/Jelinek film adaptation render the parallels Bachmann drew between violence, patriarchy, and the Holocaust less coherent. Perhaps in response to that decade’s rising fascination with depression and mental illness in Western cultures, they shift their focus toward psychology and pay the price of destabilizing Malina’s ideological foundation.

Overall, Boehm’s Malina presents a smoother, more readable text and a less faithful rendering of the original. At times Boehm is inconsistent in dealing with Bachmann’s strategy of switching registers. Generally, he makes a conscious effort to efface these ruptures, possibly to make the narrative adhere to the notion of uniform style, but also because he still sees Bachmann as more of a lyrical poet than a novelist. In his apparent effort to highlight only the lyrical, he occasionally removes the narrative irony. Paradoxically, there are times when the translation effaces some of Bachmann’s lyrical diction, the musical structure of her novel, and Bachmann’s reliance on repetition and transformation, in spots diluting some key elements of Bachmann’s feminist aesthetics: metonymy and displacement. His translation softens the novel’s feminist proposition and muffles Bachmann’s persistent critique of patriarchy.

It should be noted that the current discussion sets out to identify and spotlight consequential shifts and refractions, which occur in all translations. Philip Boehm’s rendering of Malina in particular is a truly expert undertaking and rightly garnered praise when it first appeared. Where Bullock and
Gilbert tends to accept translation losses as par for the course, Boehm proves quite attuned to the overall interpretive project and skillfully compensates for most linguistic debits. As Aehberger observed, his work “shows a great deal of thought and care, as well as a sensitivity to her [Bachmann’s] principle of strict composition,” yet “the highly allusive language of a writer like Ingeborg Bachmann must inevitably lose in the translation” (“Malina” 506).

In Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame Lefevere argues that “faithful” translations, far from being objective, are often inspired by a conservative ideology in service of the target culture (51). The changes that occur are largely unintended; they result from reading rather than writing practices. Could the opposite be true if the translator were to apply her female signature intentionally and flaunt it openly?

Much different from the standard translations of Bachmann’s prose by Bullock, Gilbert, and Boehm is Lilian Friedberg’s “liberal translation” of “Undine geht.” Friedberg’s project proves valuable for contrasting such opposite translation practices and weighing their effects. Her initial version of “Undine geht” first appeared in Trivia in 1995 as “Undine’s Valediction” and was later included in her 2006 volume of translations of Bachmann’s poetry and prose, Last Living Words, under the title “Undine Quits.” The English rendering, as well as the accompanying essay, proposes to offer insights into alternative, openly political translation practices. Additionally, if unwittingly, it sheds light onto the American handling and appropriation of Bachmann’s feminism.

In the Trivia essay, Friedberg accounts for her radical method and takes issue with traditional translation practices (“A Liberal Translation” 112–19). She readily admits to having taken significant liberties with Bachmann’s piece, in pursuit of a rendering that is expressive of Bachmann’s ideological agenda rather than linguistically accurate. Although she claims to have no knowledge of feminist translation practice or any translation theory at all, her approach to Bachmann frequently illustrates several tenets of feminist translation. Luise von Flotow and Sherry Simon propose several practices of feminist handling of the source text that go beyond the traditional notions of translation, to allow target-language readers to fully experience the political and aesthetic message of the original. Von Flotow argues for such strategies as supplementing, prefacing, footnoting, and outright hijacking. The latter term refers to the appropriation of a text whose intentions are not expressly feminist, using every strategy to make the feminine visible in language. Re-
gendering the English language is another strategy that lets the translator “show in what ways gender differences serve as the unquestioned foundations of our cultural life” (Simon 18).

To explain her provocative and deliberately controversial method, Friedberg speaks out against what she calls “literal translation” (her label for the standard translation practice). Her own project, she explains, approaches the text as a whole and seeks to capture the “mind,” or spirit, of the piece. That entails an attempt to “reproduce not only the ‘alphabetical meanings,’ but also to unleash the same spirit that comes to life in German by giving careful consideration to what can best be described as ‘linguistic overtones’—subtle resonances which reverberate on a frequency ‘above’ and ‘beyond’ the actual words themselves” (113–14). No need to limit such echoes to allusions likely intended by the author; on the contrary, argues Friedberg, it is perfectly acceptable for a translator to follow her own perceptions of the symbolic meanings latent in the original.

The original story “Undine geht” belongs to a 1961 volume of Bachmann’s short fiction. Framed as a monologue of a water creature named Undine, the text juxtaposes her free existence outside the boundaries of the human world with the confined world of the humans—specifically, men. Undine’s monologue conveys an accusation against men, for whom she has merely been a fleeting escape from their prescribed and measured lives. In the 1980s and 1990s, “Undine” was often the subject of ideological controversies among Bachmann scholars. Feminist scholar Rita Felski appropriated “Undine geht” as one of the earliest manifestations of Bachmann’s critique of patriarchy. Conservative scholarship did just the opposite: those scholars aligned their interpretation with Bachmann’s own comment that Undine’s character was conceptualized not as a gendered figure but rather as a metaphor for art. A translation of an ambiguous original typically shifts the source text in a more specific direction. In the case of “Undine,” these two alternative interpretations, one focused on art and the other on gender, are latent in the story. Once expressly featured by the translator, they can take the target text in opposite directions.

Friedberg’s 1995 English version of “Undine geht” postdates the 1964 publication of The Thirtieth Year in Michael Bullock’s translation, but Friedberg was not familiar with her predecessor’s work. Bullock’s “Undine Goes” meticulously attends to the source text on a sentence level. In contrast, Friedberg is most interested in recreating the overall effect of Bachmann’s piece as she sees it. Where Bullock retains the name “Hans” for Undine’s
adversary, Friedberg replaces it with “John.” Her explanation for the renaming illuminates not only her translation strategy but the combative political stance of her project as well:

Speakers of English language have no inkling of the subtle derision connoted by the German “Hans.” “Hans,” in the German cultural context, is more than just a name: “Hans” may also imply “idiot” or “clod” [. . .] In an attempt to retain this nuance, I have employed here the English name “John” which resonates on a similar pejorative frequency: so, for example, a prostitute’s client might be called a “John,” as would be the pot he pisses in but cannot clean. (114)

According to Friedberg, “the purpose of Bachmann’s piece is to express, through the character of Undine, EveryWOMAN’s perception of the spirit of everyman, personified by Hans/John” (116). This angle prompted Friedberg to include the words of other women artists with whom Bachmann may or may not have been familiar, such as Sylvia Plath, Margaret Atwood, Emily Dickinson, Tillie Olsen, and a vocal group made up of three sisters, the Roches. By doing so Friedberg attempts to draw on what might be termed women’s collective memory as it reveals itself in women’s artistic creation. In her view, it “strengthens the spirit of everywoman in the piece, but does not pervert Bachmann’s meaning in any way.”

In light of her translation, we should examine more closely what Friedberg has in mind when she asserts that her “liberal” interpretation of “Undine geht” stays true to the meaning of the original story. Bachmann writes,


and Bullock renders it as:

Yes, I have learnt this piece of logic, that a man has to be called Hans,
that you are all called Hans, one like the other, and yet only one. Always there is only one who bears this name that I can never forget, even if I forget you all, completely forget how I loved you utterly. And long after your kisses and your seed have been washed off and carried away by the great waters—rains, rivers, sea—the name is still there, propagating itself under water, because I cannot stop crying out, Hans, Hans . . . (“Undine Goes” 171)

In Friedberg’s hands, Bachmann’s diction takes a sharp turn:

> It has been a great lesson in logic: your name will always be John because each of you—each and everyone—bears the same name and that name is John. And yet, there is never more than one. Just one J.O.H.N. is ever written in my memory in indelible ink." (“Undine Quits” 266, all emphases in original)

Next, the translator strikes more boldly:

> Even if I were to forget you all; if I were to erase your memory from my mind as completely and as wholly as I have loved it; even after the weight of the earth’s great waters—the torrents of rains, rivers and oceans—have long since washed away your kisses and your cum, the name would linger, reverberating beneath the waves because I cannot cease the calling: John, John. (266)

This brief shift of register succeeds in shaking the reader. It empowers the passage, giving it an unexpected force and signaling the overall tone of Friedberg’s “Undine Quits”: female disillusionment. By contrast, Bullock’s rendering remains closer to the original softer tone of a “Wehklage.”

In the short story volume Das dreißigste Jahr, which includes “Undine geht,” Bachmann’s diction remains close to the style of her poetry: spare, concentrated, frequently not contemporary at all, often compulsively clinging to particular words and images. Undine reminds a Hans in her monologue, “Hast du nicht gesagt: So soll es immer sein, und das andere soll nicht sein, ist ohne Gültigkeit!” (“Undine geht” 142); Friedberg translates it as, “And didn’t you say this was the way it should be, forever and always? That anything else was sheer insanity?” (“Undine Quits” 270), Friedberg turns Bachmann’s neutral register into a colloquial and contemporary one. Further, when repetitions intensify the monologue (“Ich habe euch nie verstanden, während ihr
euch von jedem Dritten verstanden wußtet. Ich habe gesagt: Ich verstehe dich nicht, verstehe nicht, kann nicht verstehen.” (“Undine geht” 143)), Friedberg consistently disrupts these loops to achieve a smoothly flowing and more colloquial text: “I have never understood you, nor why you thought the rest of the world somehow did. I said, ‘I don’t understand. I just don’t get it. It is beyond me.’” (“Undine Quits” 273). Her desire to render “Undine geht” as a contemporary, relevant piece is evident in her lexical choices and her insistence on current colloquialisms. This different kind of “fluent translation” alters Bachmann’s diction in a manner akin to code switching. No wonder a critic otherwise impressed with aspects of Friedberg’s translation work nevertheless took note of the “pedestrian English” into which Friedberg forces Bachmann’s poetry (Shannon).

Friedberg’s translation consistently redresses Bachmann’s text as an angry renouncement of men. Such womanhandling, to use Barbara Godard’s term, of Bachmann’s text occurs in less obtrusive ways, too, when Friedberg reinserts the English text into gendered discourse. While the German reads, “Nie hat jemand so von der Erde gesprochen, von ihrer Gestalt, ihren Zeitaltern” (“Undine geht” 147) and Bullock’s translation renders “die Erde” as gender-neutral (“Never has anyone spoken like that about the earth, about its shape, its ages.” (“Undine Goes” 180)), Friedberg, reimposes grammatical gender on “the earth,” to bring out the feminist potential of Bachmann’s text: “Never has anyone before said such things of the Earth, her matter, her ages, her depths” (“Undine Quits” 282). This shift is founded on a fidelity to the German die Erde but also alludes to the feminists’ identification with nature and “Mother Earth.”

“Undine Quits” openly appropriates Bachmann’s text for ideological purposes. A comparison with Bullock’s traditional translation points to interesting conflicts inherent in translatorial fidelity. Friedberg sees her obligation not in following the letter of the original but rather in remaining faithful to her critical project—a feminist transposition of the story. In contrast, Bullock’s rendering appears to proceed in a bottom-up manner, with no fidelity to the story’s purpose or affect. Without a doubt, the impetus of Friedberg’s free-flowing translation erases a key quality of “Undine’s” diction—its austere, yet poetic language. When Friedberg proceeds to smooth out Bachmann’s repetitions, she distorts the delicate, if persistent, connection between psychology and language. Finally, Friedberg hijacks Undine’s character and imposes on her a vengeful monologue, full of sarcasm,
hardly equivalent to the original softer lamentation. Yet it could be argued that Friedberg’s translation “lives,” in the sense that Benjamin talks about translation as rejuvenating afterlife.

One clear drawback of fixing the gender war at the core of “Undine Quits” is that it erases the potential for a multifaceted interpretation. Friedberg claims that it is vital for a translator to understand the writer’s position and suggests that her “own perceptions and experience of male-female relations in patriarchy” provide her with the key to Bachmann’s writing (113–14). Her argument, impossible to refute, nevertheless simplifies the sources of Bachmann’s authorship. Bachmann was not only a woman living in patriarchy but also an artist working from a certain literary tradition. Worse yet, Friedberg’s position suggests that she may conflate the author with the narrator and that her reading of Bachmann draws too heavily on a single, if potentially beneficial, aspect—the identification of the translator with the author. The inspiration for how Friedberg handles Bachmann’s diction stems from her conviction that “a language has a mind before it has an alphabet and, when one has understood the mind of any given author, one can—and should—take liberties with language itself” (118–19). Ironically, Bachmann, who throughout her oeuvre critically questioned the power of our deformed and deforming “schlechte Sprache,” would be the first to disagree.

What remains then of the two key elements of Bachmann’s prose: her feminist voice and the centrality of Austrian cultural tradition? It appears that in an “activist” translation like Friedberg’s they prove mutually exclusive. Friedberg’s “Undine Quits” effectively Americanizes Bachmann’s discourse, partly by forging extensive connections with American women’s writing. Friedberg insists on reading Bachmann on American terms and chooses to highlight gender conflict in “Undine” as the sole impetus of the story.

The other translators make choices that appear to be less clear-cut, less programmatic, but in the end they too partly obscure the diverse cultural roots of Bachmann’s prose. Gilbert’s and Boehm’s work loosens the connection between psychological trauma and the experience and memory of violence and thus dilutes Bachmann’s recurrent thematization of Fascism and the Holocaust. Boehm’s Malina shows great sensitivity to the cultural surface of the text, especially its Viennese flavor and speech cadence and its multinational aura. But Malina is above all Austrian in its composite-like cultural and intellectual identities of its characters and its tropes. Although a number of cultural discourses from various historical periods saturate the novel’s narrative,
Boehm's translation at times shortchanges these more deeply located manifestations of cultural identity. Alterations in interpretive frame occur predictably in instances when historical and cultural issues are implied, rather than overtly expressed. Thus Boehm, in general vigilantly alert to intertextuality, occasionally neglects the intertext but goes on to highlight Bachmann's cultural and historical specificity where it is less vital for a deeper understanding of her texts. The English version includes a map of Vienna, and, as other translators have, uses the convention of retaining German forms of address. Such strategies package the Austrian flavor in an appealing manner, but they do so at a price, scaling down Malina's foreign origin to its geographical remoteness and softening its often unpalatable otherness.

Translation, while ostensibly enriching the target culture with literary artifacts from other languages, has an ulterior motive—to mold source cultures into mirror images of the target universe of discourse. The source retains a few linguistic or geographic dissimilarities but perhaps only to reward the target readers' cosmopolitan ambitions. Paradoxically, while taking care to retain a foreign aura of her texts, the translations invariably efface some of the more significant cultural and ideological differences. In Bachmann's case, her English translators diffuse the specific ways in which the author handles both gender and the burden of Austrian historical conscience. In English, her texts shift toward cultural and historical transparency.

Over the last decades, entry points for Bachmann's translators have shrunk considerably, as American readership increasingly loses familiarity with the Austrian literary tradition. Explicating all the possible sources and references would not necessarily facilitate the reading process. This consideration brings us back to Friedberg's critical translation of Bachmann. Her handling of the source text raises flags about the fidelity of translation and the translator's obligation to her audience. If, as Benjamin points out, translations are supposed to assure a text's afterlife, they need to conform to a changing cultural horizon of the target culture (256). However, traditional translation practice has privileged the source text, making an effort to preserve it in its no-longer-existing state. If a translation is updated in ways that appeal to a contemporary readership, could it enable readers to access new contexts with which Bachmann's texts resonate? Might this be an effective step toward freeing Bachmann's writing for new generations of readers? The fate of Friedberg's 2006 volume Last Living Words suggests otherwise: The book elicited almost no critical reaction and reached only a
small audience. Is conservative readership to blame? Not likely, as readers and
many translators (but not translation scholars) will confirm. We enjoy the
illusory promise that a translation will leave behind the source text, which we
assume to be invariant, open to interpretations, and we balk when confronted
with a narrowly channeled rewriting. When a translator sets out to pre-read
the text for her audience, we are inclined to reject a rendition that veers too
sharply off course. Mark Anderson, himself a translator of Bachmann’s poetry,
obseved that “when you are doing a translation of *Malina*, you know it is
not going to be retranslated until in another twenty or forty years, if at all.
You have got to make it last, . . . if you go too far in one direction, it becomes
dated extremely quickly, and it appeals to a small portion of the readership.”
Venuti has proposed a more ethical approach, the foreignizing translation,
which sets out to interrogate the dominant hierarchies of the target culture
(*Translation Changes Everything*) Although it runs counter to readers’
expectations, they may well appreciate the interpretive opportunities such
inquisitive translations promise to open up.

In the US literature in translation simply does not enjoy much popularity, and
translations from German remain an especially marginal market. A glance at
the *New York Times* bestseller list or even the book review section suffices to
substantiate this claim. If a foreign title makes it to this list at all, it tends to
be a novel that first gained an audience here as a film adaptation. Bachmann’s
Austrian roots put her prose at an additional disadvantage. The American
approach to language—unquestioned, *en face*—makes it difficult for the
US audience to appreciate or even perceive Bachmann’s opaque discourse;
in particular, the loss of linguistic grounding, Bachmann’s frequent theme,
connects to a topos far more easily accessible to an audience familiar with
Austrian *fin de siècle*. Because the Austrian tradition has grown more and more
culturally obscure in the US, earlier introductions to English translations of
Bachmann ultimately resort to framing Bachmann as primarily a European
modernist.

Bachmann’s feminism proves to be the most effective way for her to enter
the US literary market. It was her gendered discourse rather than her ties to
the Austrian literary tradition or her rank within German-language literature
that gained her a foothold here. However, her *écriture féminine* differs signifi-
cantly from the English-language tradition of feminist writing. Bachmann’s
critique of patriarchy extends to recent history, fascism, race, and a critique
of language—themes that make her feminist vision too culturally specific and, perhaps, also too intellectualized. A definite weak point, especially in the American context, is that from a later perspective, Bachmann’s proto-feminist vision appears naive, split, hesitant; as well, the men-women relations she portrays in both Malina and Simultan appear easily exploitable.

German-language scholarship on Bachmann, in particular the recent publication of her letters to and from Hans Werner Henze and Paul Celan, reinvigorated non-academic interest in Bachmann’s early work and fueled enough enthusiasm to engender a critically acclaimed 2016 film, Die Geträumten by Ruth Beckermann. Regrettably, in the US, the three titles that appeared in the new millennium—Darkness Spoken, Letters to Felician, and Last Living Words—have come and gone largely unnoticed. Perhaps a translation of Bachmann’s Frankfurt lectures might help move her historical and philosophical reflections about writing and literature toward the spotlight.

Interview with the American Translators of Bachmann, Binghamton, NY, October 1996.

Mark Anderson, Philip Boehm, and Peter Filkins

Ewa Siwak: By way of starting this interview I wanted to explain to you just how important it is to me to be able to talk to you now. One of the characteristics of writing a dissertation in literature is that you usually deal with a dead author. This is, of course, the case with Bachmann and my project. But in my case, writing on translations of her work, here I have a chance to talk to the actual translators. That certainly makes the work a lot less removed from reality than it could otherwise be.

My first question for you is very introductory. Could you please state briefly what brought you to Bachmann and what brought Bachmann to you, as readers and as translators?

Mark Anderson: I simply found myself in Germany in a small town, very isolated and frustrated that I hadn’t been able to find on the streets or in the homes or bookstores anything of the Germany that I thought I had been studying when I was learning the language. I came across a young German who loved poetry and I asked him what he was reading, and he was reading Bachmann. So I started reading Bachmann with him, and translating her, using him as a sounding board, and discovering that there was somebody wri-
ting in Germany. This was shortly after she had died, but this was a contemporary voice, very much a part of that tradition that I had studied, of Musil, Schönberg, Freud, the turn-of-the-century Vienna. That is where my interest started and it has maintained itself, in that area of the Austrian tradition.

**Peter Filkins:** In answering I wanted to take issue with your first point: the reason I came to Bachmann was because she was not a dead author. My first experience was from *Die Anrufung des großen Bären*. Reading the first line, “Großer Bär, komm herab, zottige Nacht,” and hearing a live author there. I think my whole effort as a translator is to try to convey the liveness of this author, the livingness of this writer, in her voice. For me she is alive, and my job as a translator is to try to make her live to my readers, in English, in the best way that I can. For me it’s in voice, a poetic voice, in trying to find a construction of that voice that works poetically.

**Philip Boehm:** I first read Bachmann by chance, I picked up a collection of her poems in a bookstore in Germany in 1977 or 1978. And then I reacquainted myself with Bachmann about ten years later, when I was in Poland. Mark [Anderson] mentioned that *Holmes & Meier* was collecting samples of translations for *Malina* and he suggested that I submit something and I did, and they chose my translation. That’s how I got this translation job. I am not in Germanistik per se, and at that time I was living in Poland. There is a string of chances that led me back to Bachmann’s work.

**ES:** Do you by any chance know who the other people were who had also submitted translations?

**MA:** It was a blind sample. I was involved because I was the editor, but they sent me three or four samples, it was anonymous.

**ES:** Could you please describe your preparation for your translation projects? There are many ways to go about preparation: some people study academic criticism, some people read all the existing translations, some programmatically do not touch anything at all. How do you approach it?

**MA:** I don’t have a philosophy. This was my first major translation project. There were no existing translations of Bachmann’s poetry except a few poems scattered in anthologies, which I did look at. She was completely unknown; I certainly wasn’t reading criticism.

**PB:** Did you look at other language translations, French or Italian?
MA: I think that I looked at the Italian at one point, since I knew Italian, but the Italian is just so far away. English is much closer to German; it was easier for me to stay close to the rhythms, even to the rhyme schemes, because English and German often match.

And I certainly wasn’t reading criticism; at the time, very few critics in America were writing on Bachmann. A lot of the interest has come late. As you know the feminists were very much against Bachmann, she wasn’t political enough, and you find this kind of criticism still today. Feminists say that her poetry is not political, it is aesthetic, that only when she started writing novels did she acquire a feminist voice.

PF: It is partially the same for me. I began my translation in 1981, so even Mark’s book did not exist at that time. I did the bulk of it between 1981 and 1985.

Again the same problem with criticism, there was not much criticism in English. I translated my way into the language; I knew some German, but I certainly learned a lot more German in the process. I spent two years in Vienna, part of the research was to read three newspapers a day; part of the research was trying to find as many different kinds of rhetoric and conversations that I could to expand that fluency. It was not a matter of being able to speak the language, but of being able to hear the language. Later on, towards the end, when the book was coming out, I thought it important in order to write the introduction to look at criticism, her initial reception, her more recent reception; to try to get the historical context for her life and her writing.

PB: In my case I too had studied Austrian literature and history in some detail.

MA: Philip is Austrian.

PB: I had worked in that area as a student. My studies as an undergraduate were intellectual history as well as Germanistik, so I had some philosophical training. To me Bachmann is a philosopher and a poet, from a grand tradition of philosopher-poets. In order to understand, just understand on the surface, a book like Malina. there is a great deal of detective work, research; tracking down “what is this a reference to?” I remember asking Mark, since he knew Italian, about the Italian phrases in the book, I remember conversations with people in Poland, with people at the Instituto d’Italiana Cultura, as if they knew all about this, and they would say “Ah, I think it’s Petrarca.” Slowly,
but I hope somewhat surely, I think I was able to decode a lot of the surface. As far as looking at other translations I looked at the Polish translation, as more of a decoding device than anything else, because Polish is so far away from English. But it was often interesting to see. And oftentimes it’s easier for me to translate into Polish from German because there is an overlap of concept there; you can find the root that you translate, and the Poles cling to the root of the word in the same way that Germans do. That would sometimes spark an idea in English. But I determined that since the Polish translation had come out so soon after the original, it was this typically Polish phenomenon of a very live interest in European literature. But that is why, even though the translator did an admirable job, I had disagreements over passages that I thought were actually mistranslated, a little too free-flowing, some of the coarse grain of her sandpaper wasn’t quite there.

ES: Since you have mentioned having to do your detective’s work, could you explain what you do when you find a reference to Petrarch?

PB: Let’s take an example, the *Pierrot Lunaire*. I could have translated that myself, “alter Duft aus Märchenzeit,” but there were existing recordings of this, and some of them more interesting than others. But I liked that by Cleo Laine. In my research I found this recording that I really liked, because she was obviously talking about a performance, of those notes coming to her when she walked around; there was that specific specificity that I too was after. But in some cases I just couldn’t do it. There was a card game that the children were playing, and so I used old maid, an American game that children play, to get specific, and the more specific I can get the better. Now, where I can’t be specific of course is the topography of Vienna and the environs. Nobody has the faintest idea where Kagran is, they don’t even know where the Danube is. That’s when I said “we need a map.” The readers are still not going to understand fully, but if they want to they have some tools there. Bachmann lived in the polyglot continent and in a polyglot culture, exploring the boundaries between the languages, she is able to include French, and her readership is going to understand that French. Her readership is not going to understand Hungarian, Slovenian, or other languages that pop up, but even so it will be recognized as Hungarian. But for our audience it is different. They are just not going to understand. Why should they understand? So I have to make them understand her references. So there is a glossary, there is a translation of the Hungarian. One of the editors had suggested that everyone could
decode the French anyway. But why that bias towards French, why shouldn’t they decode the Hungarian? Not to weigh people down with the critical apparatus, because who wants that. To me it was this challenge. I think it was a very different process than translating the poems.

**PF:** In her poetry, because you have so many references to classical poems, that is where criticism and scholarship is useful, especially for a non-Germanist. In other words, it is helpful in translating, though not that helpful in the actual translation, giving a rendering of a rendering. She has done something with Goethe, Schubert, that is where footnotes come in. Not to burden it with critical apparatus, but simply to provide that information.

**PB:** And as my friend Egon Schwarz says, sometimes we have to know the proper mispronunciation.

**MA:** One other thing that of course was a consideration when we did *Malina*: both Peter and I included introductions to poems, which is pretty standard in introducing a poet, but—when translating novels, there often is nothing, the idea is that a novel will stand on its own. If it’s a good read, that’s all you need. It is unusual to put an afterword. But with *Malina* we thought it really needed it, similarly when we did a novel by Thomas Bernhard, *The Loser*. He has been translated before, but without introductions, and I was so appalled by the low level of reviewing. Because novels, unlike poetry or critical/academic books get sent out all over the country. And so you have the reviewer in *The Milwaukee Journal* or the *LA Times*—you might get fifty or sixty reviews of the novel, but often the level of culture and awareness about Austria is appallingly low. So writing the introduction I had the experience of watching my work get reprocessed, it became the substance of all these reviews. A lot of times there is no acknowledgment, they pass this information on as their own ideas. It is something that I learned when I did that, but in the end result you are able to educate the audience to a certain extent, and at least a small circle of people will be able to see that there is something behind this strange Hungarian term. They will be able to make sense of what Hungary has to do with Austria.

**PB:** In the case of *Malina*, Holmes & Meier does not have the best distribution system. That fact is significant; they wouldn’t send lots of copies out to be reviewed.
PF: That does not matter, even if you do . . . Marsilio was really great that way, but . . .

MA: But poetry is different. For instance, Knopf did Thomas Bernhard, extremely well respected and major publishing house. But they still can't get people to read Thomas Bernhard, they sold five hundred copies, in the English speaking world! That is a huge market!

ES: What about libraries?

MA: Libraries have cut back, and the academic work is often more important for the university. Contemporary literature is not a major focus of a research library. Like you have mentioned, most of us are working on dead authors, so university libraries are mostly interested in critical literature. I found in the experience Holmes & Meier versus Knopf, both doing a novel, that in fact the novel was reviewed all the way across the country with Knopf. It still did not sell that many copies, but you had a small group of people who are literate, interested, who read their local newspaper and they see it.

PF: There is not enough of a culture in this country among writers and academics who are broad in their interests. Newspapers are doing not as many reviews, but there are also not as many reviewers. What I mean is that there is not enough of a culture of literary reviews, of writer to writer. Yesterday Andrea Stoll was asking if there is some place where anybody could do a journalistic article on Bachmann in this country. I said, no there isn't a place, but even more, there is no journalist, there is nobody who has the sense of a feuilleton.

MA: But the New York Review of Books did do a big piece on Bachmann, about a year after Malina came out. The author's name was Gabriele Annan.

PB: But that wasn’t a very good piece.

MA: The trouble is that the New York Review of Books is not read, there is no national forum. In Germany too you have a little bit of the same problem. You see, of course in France you have Le Monde, and it has a central function. In Germany you still have this Süddeutsche versus Frankfurter Rundschat— all of it regional.

ES: But you have Die Zeit.

MA: You are right, Die Zeit is really a national forum.
**PF:** But there is no national commitment either, even if there is a forum, there is no commitment by the people who could do these things, writers.

**MA:** We’ve seen attempts to do it, but these people can’t sustain it financially.

**PB:** We do not value this as a culture. It is historically explicable, but generally speaking people just don’t care about this, and those who are in the position to perhaps foster a little more caring are often thwarted by all these circumstances that we are talking about. But there is just very little interest. Friends are always teasing me when I start thinking about a new translation: “Oh, that’s right, well, another one of those East Berlin novels.”

**ES:** Philip, could you comment on your remark from yesterday that you were considering translating the Viennese dialect into Texan? Was that a joke?

**PB:** That was partly a joke, but, on the other hand, for instance, the scene at the Altenwyls, there is a scene in an aristocratic setting. There is a problem: in American English we do not have those aristocratic layers, we are an anti-aristocratic country.

**ES:** What about Boston?

**PB:** What you could do is you could make it Boston, but that’s not Ingeborg Bachmann, you can’t do it. That is going too specific. I hint at it, that is all I can do. There is a fine line between trying to make it specific and going overboard. There are other translations where I have no qualms about doing it otherwise. I translated a poem by Walter von der Vogelweide into Texan at one point, it was a poem about horses.

**MA:** And there is a difference when the publication has a kind of form that is supposed to last. Architecture is by nature conservative; you don’t change a building like you change a shirt. If Philip is doing a production of a play, he can take tremendous liberties, and five years later you do it differently. But when you are doing a translation of Malina you know it is not going to be re-translated until in another twenty or forty years, if at all. You have got to make it last, precisely that kind of experimentation, if you go too far in one direction, it becomes dated extremely quickly, and it appeals to a small portion of the readership.

**PB:** I also feel personally obliged to find a middle ground. If there is any doubt, for an opening night, staging Sam Shepard in Poland, and if he has never been shown there, I am going to be a lot more in line with the productions
that Sam Shepard did because I feel obliged to introduce Sam Shepard in the way he introduced himself.

ES: Who do you envision as an ideal reader of Bachmann in the US? What kind of cultural capital do you think an American reader can gain from reading Bachmann?

PF: It might sound like I am skirting the question, but the ideal reader is someone who is sensitive and attentive to language, and the whole problem of language. As a writer I don’t think of a cultural reader. Writers don’t think of readers, they think perhaps of the two or three voices, living or dead, who they are speaking to. And that’s the same for me as a translator. Cultural capital? That I won’t doubt. One of the reasons Bachmann has not succeeded in this country is that the US does not have a complicated relationship with language. Language comes en face, we just don’t think about it, the paradoxical nature of it all. That is one of the biggest problems in the reception of Bachmann, because her language is so simple on surface. No one sees the complexity going on beneath it. So an ideal reader is someone who has an ironic stance towards the language, because there is great cultural capital in that.

PB: As far as ideal readers, ideal readers would be editors of influential journals and newspapers.

MA: You meant an ideal reader who is best placed to understand Bachmann?

PF: This country is too divided and complex; I don’t know the readers in this country.

PB: But I don’t think people are reading Bachmann in Poland anyway.

ES: But that is not true—there is a new translation of Bachmann, of Das dreißigste Jahr. It came out in 1995. The problem in Poland of course now is that there used to be a very effective apparatus of reviewing and publishing. You would find twenty reviews of Malina in a country as small as Poland, with thirty thousand copies sold, when it was first published there in 1975.

PB: They were sought after; you would find them later on the black market.

ES: But now, with the new translation that came out two years ago, there is not a single review a year later, and the number of copies printed was perhaps five or six thousand. The only sign of any interest is that someone did an interview with the translator for a major Cracow paper.
PB: The difference is that now the market is flooded with pulp, and before, it was not a market, it was a setup.

MA: And she could be considered slightly subversive in Poland?

PB: Yes, she had a cache, she was a Westerner.

ES: If anything gets translated in Poland now, it is American literature.

MA: When I was in Poland, I was surprised to see how many people, young, spoke really quite fluent German. I was surprised to see that traces of the old Polish-German animosity seem to be gone.

ES: That’s true, if there is still any conflict, it is mostly economic. It is kind of the Mexico-America issue.

MA: Is there an interest now in German culture?

ES: Now mostly American culture; although in the 1970s, Günter Grass became extremely popular, he was quite a figure on the Polish literary market. It had mostly to do with Die Blechtrommel and its references to the Russians. The book was banned, although Grass is certainly far from being revisionist about the “former German territories.” Anyhow, the issues of Germans living in the now-Polish territories and descriptions of the Russian army looting, raping, and killing were just too politically sensitive. This of course contributed to Grass’s popularity in Poland. But then the movie started being shown at universities, the translation appeared in samizdat, and eventually the ban was lifted. Other than that, Latin American literature really made it in the seventies. There was a huge Cortazar boom in Poland. But when it comes to German literature, it was more a need for whatever would be subversive, whatever would appear to speak against the current ideology.

MA: Maybe we should get our evangelical preachers to propose a ban on a book, that way people would read more?

ES: The unfortunate thing about literature in Poland now is that we have had this long history of literature on the barricades. After 1989 books have lost this subversive function, and nobody is interested in it anymore. But the new standard has not crystallized yet. But in the case of Bachmann, when one speaks of her as a political author, that will never speak to the Polish audience. There is just one way of being a political author in Poland, and that is if you have gone to jail. And besides, people just do not want to read any more engaged literature.
**PB:** But she was political, of course in a different way. Her reception in Poland is very tied to her visit to Auschwitz. To come back to the current Polish-German relations I think that there are other layers of that Polish German problem. True, I too think that the major motivation for young people learning German now is entirely economic. There is a big sense of readership among the literati and among the readers, the aging audience, the aging literati, people who knew of her when her books first came out. Young people, however, are not going to pick it up at all.

**ES:** To get closer to the heart of my dissertation: How do you envision your role as a translator? One of my theses is that translation is a rewriting, transposition, that, in fact, translators rewrite the source text. But you, Peter, spoke of hearing the voice and trying to render it in one’s own language. Do you see any kind of space for rewriting in your translations of Bachmann, just because the public here would be so different from the one in Austria?

**PF:** As a translator you want to be as accurate as you possibly can. It is a translator’s nightmare when you hear: “You are wrong, this is incorrect.” But then the question becomes: What do you mean by accuracy, accuracy of what? Sure, you are trying to make accommodations all the time to what you understand as your audience who might hear it. I have no shape or name for my audience, just a sensible listener. In my case there are often accommodations to try and convey the formal structures and arguments that are going on there. And that becomes very tricky because you do not want to do that just for the sake of doing it, because the whole point is translating. You have to find new inventions. If there is a formal kind of arrangement, you might have to come up with a different one, which is actually a different arrangement, but one that at least shows that there is an arrangement going on. What is nice is that quite often we have a dual-language edition, which is what any translation would want.

**PB:** I don’t think about this theoretically at all. As I said before, I own my hearing and I put my ear onto the book and try to hear how it sounds, and I smell it, feel it, and I taste it if I can. I just find that you have to uncover something, discover something, and then recover something. And then I have to start singing. Read the music, heard the song, and now I have to start singing. That is how I direct plays, too.

**PF:** It is an awareness. To go back to that first line, “Großer Bär, komm herab, zottige Nacht.” There is no problem translating the clarity of that line, but I chose “Great Bear, shaggy night, come down,” because “down” is acoustical-
ly closer to “Nacht.” If you are going to make accommodations, you have to know why. You make different accommodations each time.

**PB:** For me the novel has to be in American English; that is what I know, that is what I write, a very specific American English, I have to hear that.

**MA:** There is often a problem with British and American translations, editors won’t differentiate, and so there is often a very stiff quality to texts translated by Brits for an American audience. But with poetry, I think most translators probably vocalize. You really have to hear how it sounds when you read it out loud. It might work on the page, but then you find out that what you thought might work, actually doesn’t.

**PF:** One example that comes to mind of choices you have to make is Bachmann’s poem “Schatten, großer Schatten.” Later in the poem’s text, you have no way of telling whether she uses “Schatten” in singular or plural—there is no way to tell. There is a case where you simply have to make a choice.

**ES:** Now we are on to feminism. By now it is generally acknowledged that Bachmann, slowly but surely, drifted towards more voiced feminism, or a kind of *I’écriture féminine*. What role do you attribute to the feminist perspective, the female voice in her writing? Do you consider it marginal? What role did it play in your translations? Did you consciously try to render the interplay of genders, certainly in her prose, but also in her poems? Since German is such a gendered language, in Bachmann’s poetry, but also prose, the noun genders often connote gendered identities. That sometimes creates problems with translations into English.

**MA:** From the beginning, if you read the introductions I wrote, I render her as a woman writer, very consciously. Gender is a part of the language and you want to give it. If you remember, in the early poem “Die gestundete Zeit” there is a line about a lover sinking in sand. The gender of lover [in the German text “Geliebte”] is unclear in English, but in the next line you render that as a “she.” You can gender that “lover.” Any good translator will do that. Yesterday there was this kind of silly claim whether you have to be a man or a woman to translate Bachmann. I really think that there is a logical error there. There is a confusion about what is experienced in the act of reading and what is actually possible when you take words in German and words in English. It is obvious that we all come to a book with different experiences. The experience of reading a passage about rape will differ, based on whether you have actually been raped, whether you are a woman, and many other things. But the words that you will have in English to translate that experience are not going to change...
whether you are a man or a woman. It is not true that there is suddenly going to be a different word that the man will not have access to, that a woman could find. It is really a question of sensitivity to language.

**PB:** And since you have asked about ideal readers: As translators, do we choose one agenda if there are different agendas? Do we target one agenda versus another? Who do we write for? This sensitivity is certainly a female sensitivity. In translating I am very aware of the ramifications of this gendered German, and *Malina* is in particular set up as a triangle.

**PF:** It is a very important part of Bachmann's aesthetic and thinking, but it is a part. There is also her Austrian background, the philosophical tradition. It is yet another opportunity that you want to be aware of, and look for all the way through. But sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't. In a large collection or a large novel you may not be able to solve a problem in one place, but you may be able to creatively solve it in another place. You compensate.

**PB:** Because you have mentioned the movement from poetry to prose: We don't know what she might have written had she lived. I have big problems with schematizing her writings. I know a lot of artists who work in this medium now and then switch to another one. Who knows, maybe she would have returned to poetry.

**MA:** Bachmann was obviously tremendously gifted; this woman could philosophize. If you have that kind of ability, you want to try out different means. Mozart doesn't just write operas, he tries this kind of music, that kind of music, that is what we recognize in a really creative figure. She is interested in music, so she works with Henze. She wrote two fantastic collections of poetry, she is famous in her country, maybe it is time to do something else. In fact, she was writing prose from the very beginning, her early stories as a young woman, it is not something that she switches to towards the end of her life.

**PB:** To oversimplify her writing as oeuvre, and to speak of this consciousness at this moment, is doing her great disservice.

**PF:** She was interested in crossing borders. She was supposed to write a theatrical piece.

**ES:** One of the last questions: in your translations, did you encounter issues of cultural acceptability, intranslatability, issues of aesthetic norm, poetic norm, where it is really difficult to find an English or an American equivalent? What do you do with *Malina*'s genre—the lyrical novel?
MA: But we do have the lyrical novel, when you look at Djuna Barnes’s *Nightwood*. It is not a drugstore novel, not Stephen King. Yes, I do have an example—this poem “Harlem.” You translated it, Peter, because you translated all of them. I knew I had to, but it is not in my collection. I remember that I considered including it, and I decided against it. Sara Lennox had brought it up, because she is teaching race and is very interested in that question. Her feeling also is that it is German folklore, a white German woman comes to America and empathizes, of course, with the blacks. So she does a little poem about the blacks rolling their eyes, Harlem rolling its eyes. This is intolerable for American audience. It would still work in Germany, I do not think that a German reader would be very upset. But in English. . .

PF: Also the poem “Der dunkle Erdteil,” I did include it. I decided I am committed, I am going to do them all, but it was very difficult.

PB: Intranslatability? Lack of equivalents? I’m sure that there are references that I missed, that I did not do justice to some of the voices. A thousand and one voices.

MA: But if you translate closely, you may do justice without being conscious of the connotation, and even if you had not picked up on the reference, your reader might.

ES: One of the issues that has come up today is Brits translating for the American literary market. Bullock, the translator of *The Thirtieth Year*, is British, lives in Canada now. What is the situation now? Does England have their own translators of Bachmann?

PB: No, the rights are English-speaking rights, they do not have separate translators.

MA: It is probably usually more of the problem the other way around. The Americans are doing the bulk of the English-language translations, so people in South Africa, Australia, England are putting up with American translations of Umberto Eco in William Weaver’s translation throughout the world.

ES: I would be curious to hear any anecdotes about having disagreements with the editor.

PB: Editors did not intervene much, but interestingly one place where they did was with a recipe, it was about cooking something Hungarian, and it was in Hungarian. I know Hungarian, so I translated it. The editor thought,
no one is really going to know it, why don’t we translate it with something understandable. And he came up with this very pedestrian idea, I do not quite remember anymore what it was, but it was equivalent to translating *Palatschinken* as “pancakes.” I said, “I don’t think so, why do that?” There was also a formal contract that I had to sign, saying that this book does not contain any recipe that’s harmful. But really, I was surprised how little intervention there was. In fact, one or two references could have been caught by a more close reading, because there is always going to be something you will miss.

**MA:** It is very rare in America to have an editor that knows anything about German literature. Maybe they have had a couple of courses in college, but most editors in this country can’t work at a sophisticated level in German. And that means that unlike French, the translator is on his or her own. They are explaining to the editor what is going on. The editor makes a pragmatic decision, based on other work, on what the policy is.

**PF:** Mine was a strange case because my editors were Heinz Bachmann and his wife Sheila, which is an odd dynamic, but they were extremely helpful. Nevertheless, we had interpretive disagreements. But they supplied answers where I might not have been able to do that myself, and I had an answer that in some ways they couldn’t get to because of being native speakers, being too close, having very firm convictions of what it should mean.

**PB:** I found them very helpful too.

**MA:** They are very good. I had the same experience with Heinz and Sheila Bachmann. I sent them a manuscript and got it back six months later. They had read and thought about literally every line. I learned from Heinz Bachmann that even though I thought that Bachmann was totally unknown, he had been receiving on average a request every month, for years, to translate Bachmann. He had been turning them down, for English-language translations. His wife is actually English, and he works for a multinational corporation, so he speaks English very well. They were extremely good, but also extremely protective. Much more critical with English than with other languages. There is a very close relationship, very protective relationship of his sister. Heinz Bachmann is responsible for this *Sperrfrist* on the letters and personal documents, for fifty years. Bachmann herself, I am sure, would have approved of that.

**ES:** The question of edition sizes and sales figures—we don’t know that?

**MA:** You have to contact the editors.
PB: Have you ever seen Malina in a bookstore near you? I haven’t.

ES: My last question is for Peter, and it has to do with your project in progress, Der Fall Franza. In what stage of the translation are you? And why have you decided to try translating prose? You yourself are a poet.

PF: I am at the early stages. I don’t know how I feel about translating prose. I have done some short stories of other writers, but Bachmann is again a very complicated writer. This is not to be facetious, I will know when I get there. Find my way through the woods and see where I came out. To me Bachmann’s prose is very poetic, so at least there is that shared concern. It is not simply translating the novel or simply translating prose.

PB: It will be interesting to see what will happen, now that Peter will translate Franza with its overlap with Malina. There is no need to go in and evaluate how the two translations compare, that is not what I mean, but it could create an interesting tension between the two texts.

Ewa Siwak holds an MA in German from Warsaw University in Poland and a PhD in German literature and translation studies from the University of Texas at Austin. She has taught German, Swedish, and Polish. In 2011 she joined the German faculty at Texas State University as a lecturer. Her ongoing research focuses on postwar Austrian literature and its transmission into other cultures via translation and reference works. Parallel to German-language Austrian literature she is fascinated by Galicia. In her current project she is analyzing the 1890–1910 Viennese print media for coverage of Ukrainian intellectual production to identify instances of reverse cultural resonance between the imperial center and its periphery.

Notes

1. Thus not discussed are poetry translations, which necessitate a separate approach and have already received some attention in the American academe. Neither is Peter Filkins’s massive translation/reconstruction project that brought the posthumously published Todesarten cycle to the American market.

2. That Filkins translated such unfinished, fragmentary work is a testament to his determination that Bachmann become more widely read and known in English. Unfortunately, the twenty-first century has little patience for translations of unfinished prose by lyrical poets from post-imperial Europe. Even a Bachmann enthusiast such as Gabriele Annan concludes that the project would have been better off left alone—Bachmann scholars can dissect it.
in the original; as “for anyone else, the fragments are really to fragmentary to be enjoyable” (Annan).


4. A legendary debate on this topic between Albrecht Holschuh and Susanne Baackmann took place in The German Quarterly in 1995 and has become a permanent reference point in reception studies.
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In the early weeks of the First World War, Olga Schnitzler diagnosed her husband Arthur with an “unzeitgemässe Selbstbewahrung” and criticized him for his “reservirte kühle Haltung” (Tagebuch: 1913–1916 140, 30 September 1914) with regard to the war. In her opinion, he should have used his symbolic capital in the literary field and published his thoughts on the recent outbreak of the war. Olga was not the only one who expected a public statement from Arthur Schnitzler, whose tendency to remain silent in political matters during the war years became, for his contemporaries, a point of particular irritation.

This essay will consider Schnitzler’s “cool detachment” as his posture through which he negotiated his position in the intellectual field during the war. Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the literary field, the Swiss literary scholar Jerôme Meizôz has introduced the term posture (the term is mentioned only causally by Bourdieu himself). Meizôz uses posture as a concept to analyze how literary writers navigate their individual paths through this field of struggle: analyzing a writer’s posture, according to Meizôz, means describing

die singuläre Weise, eine objektive Position innerhalb eines Feldes zu besetzen, die selbst wieder durch soziologische Parameter einge- grenzt wird. Es handelt sich also um eine persönliche Art, eine Rolle oder einen Status anzunehmen oder innezuhaben: ein Autor erspielt oder erstreitet seine Position im literarischen Feld über verschiedene Modi der Darstellung seiner selbst und seiner postures. (176)
Here, I will argue that Schnitzler maintained what I call an ambivalent posture of detachment throughout the war.

Detachment, of course, takes different forms. In her book *The Power of Distance: Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment* (2001), Amanda Anderson shows that detachment as a cultivated social practice is a by-product of modernity, which emerges more forcefully in the late nineteenth century. Critical distance, deriving from the project of the Enlightenment, is seen as a prerequisite of scientific objectivity, one that informed many intellectual projects, such as—an example significant in our context—cosmopolitanism. At the same time, detachment is also a phenomenon linked to specific fears arising from modernity (see Anderson 4). Detachment can stand for individualism and a lack of opportunism but also for indifference and a lack of interpersonal connectedness or empathy, for alienation and rootlessness. Finally, detachment can function as a defense mechanism against shame and embarrassment in the interaction with others or even in the face of discrimination and marginalization. Already part of the bourgeois habitus in the late nineteenth century, cultivated detachment becomes the main element of what Helmut Lethen has termed “cool conduct.” In the increasingly antagonistic society of the interwar years, Lethen argues, avoiding vulnerability through the detachment from one’s personal emotions becomes a mode of survival. I hope to show in this article that Schnitzler’s posture is informed by all of these complex facets of detachment and in some ways even anticipates the self-regulating codes of cool conduct of the interwar years. This posture of detachment is expressed not only in Schnitzler’s scarce public statements and in his private writings but also in his anthropological analysis of the war. Finally, I will show that Schnitzler’s posture of detachment also informs his poetics and his understanding of the societal function of his literature.

**A Private Pacifist? Schnitzler’s Posture of Detachment**

The outbreak of the war fundamentally changed the dynamics of the literary field in Germany and Austria: The *Burgfrieden* proclaimed by the German emperor in 1914—“Ich kenne keine Parteien mehr, ich kenne nur noch Deutsche!”—was a call for a collective passion, which was supposed to erase all individual nuances for the sake of one homogeneous national identity standing united against the enemy. This not only applied to German party politics but also weakened the autonomy of the fields of cultural production...
in both Germany and Austria; art and literature were suddenly expected to be political, and writers like Schnitzler were urged to publish essayistic statements about the war. The expectations of what literary writers were supposed to deliver in this political state of exception had changed: on the one hand, many writers (Georg Trakl, Fritz von Unruh, and Robert Musil, and many others) left their desks to actually fight in the war. Moreover, the war was framed in Germany and Austria as a German Kulturkrieg against Western “civilization,” so it became the new task of literary writers to serve the “Kriegsdienst an der Feder,” to provide ideological support of the war and German nationalism through literary and essayistic writings. The Aufruf an die Kulturwelt, a manifesto defending the German attack on Belgium signed by ninety-three German intellectuals (among them Gerhart Hauptmann) and Thomas Mann’s Gedanken im Kriege are the most notorious examples. On the other hand, European pacifists like Romain Rolland and Heinrich Mann seemed to follow Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s adage “The pen is mightier than the sword”: they used their literary writings and their symbolic capital in the literary field programmatically for pacifist activism (see Kurzke 135). At the age of fifty-two, Schnitzler was too old to be considered for actual service at the front. And the main postures on the literary stage wielding the pen as a political weapon either for or against the war did not hold any appeal to him. Instead he chose a mostly silent posture of detachment.

While Schnitzler’s literary career had just reached a considerable climax with the nomination for the Nobel Prize in 1914, the war provided a platform for his critics: with regard to the lack of heroic characters, Schnitzler’s writings were deemed backward and antimodern. His refusal to express his commitment to the war deepened the rift between Schnitzler and many of his contemporaries. In retrospect, Schnitzler has rightly been credited for being one of the few German-language intellectuals who did not join the nationalist enthusiasm in the early stages of World War I (see Miklin; Roberts; Müller-Seidel; Fliedl; Le Rider; García). His critical stance toward the practice of dueling, expressed in many of his narrative and dramatic texts, is well known. His most notorious work in this respect is Leutnant Gustl (1900), the portrait of a military officer whose interior monologue reveals less-than-heroic qualities. That the publication of this piece cost Schnitzler his status as reserve officer may already testify to his anti-militarist bona fides (see Fliedl 39). Moreover, between 1914 and 1919, Schnitzler wrote a collection of essayistic aphorisms, titled Und einmal wird der Friede wiederkommen, which remained
unpublished until his death (CUL A1/CUL 230). Here he developed, privately, a critical commentary on the war that reveals his distanced attitude toward the “Kriegsdienst an der Feder.”

Schnitzler’s rather detached position with regard to the war in a period of pro-war ecstasy and heated patriotism has been convincingly explained by his difficult relationship to his home country Austria, which, in turn, has been linked to his alienating experiences of anti-Semitism (see Miklin 208; Müller-Seidel 28; Fliedl 38). At the same time, it has not been overlooked that Schnitzler was nevertheless loyal to Austria and its ally Germany and fiercely contested the sole responsibility of these two countries for the outbreak of the war (Miklin 200; Müller-Seidel 29; Fliedl 41). Moreover, this patriotic loyalty is in itself complex and multi-layered: Schnitzler repeatedly felt the need to defend the reputation of his native Austria against Germany, where stereotypes of the Austrian Schlendrian were constantly used to present Austria as the weaker and less reliable ally (Fliedl 39).

Here, one can recognize Schnitzler’s tendency to display a “negative” solidarity, as it were, which emerged in particular in the face of unfair criticism and discriminatory stereotyping. As Bettina Riedmann (422) has pointed out, his tripartite sense of identity—Jewish, Austrian, and German—is linked to the feeling of being misunderstood and falsely judged with regard to each of these three identities. Nevertheless, scholars have tended to describe this complex form of solidarity as some kind of “patriotic fit” in the very early days of the war, which soon gave way to a more critical and distanced position. I do not want to relativize Schnitzler’s critical stance toward the war or, on the other hand, to deny his patriotic tendencies altogether. However, I suggest that a focus on his extreme ambivalence with regard to both the patriotic and the pacifist discourses of his time will prove productive when further analyzing Schnitzler’s position during the war. This ambivalence is already palpable at the very beginning of the war, and he maintained it for the rest of his life.

Cosmopolitanism as a Posture of Detachment

For many German and Austrian Jews, the war initially led to a hopeful and passionate identification with the fatherland: they understood the Burgfriedensrede of Wilhelm II as an immediate gesture of inclusion into the national community (see Sieg 10). Schnitzler was more cautious. As Richard
Miklin (207–8) has shown, many passages in Schnitzler’s literary and non-literary writings suggest a critical distance to the concept of Vaterland. The sense of belonging to his Heimat does not seem to have relied on the idea of the nation-state.9 This critical detachment from his home country also emerges in his war notes. For Miklin, however, those distancing passages do little to mitigate the “kampfesfreudige Töne” in Schnitzler’s early war notes (199). And certainly, Schnitzler does express support for and loyalty to the German and Austrian troops (“Ja, feuern wir selbst, die Daheimgebliebenen, sie [the German and Austrian military forces] durch Rufe der Bewunderung und der Liebe an,” Und einmal 190). Miklin reads the passages of 1914, together with a few positive comments about Austrian and German successes at the front in his journals, as evidence that even Schnitzler was not immune to the patriotic atmosphere at the beginning of the war. While this may well be true, it also may be possible that we are seeing here an attempt at responding to the repeated requests to write a publishable essay during the war. The passage from 1914 is one of the few longer, more coherent passages in the folder Unausweichlich, aber vergessen wir darüber nicht in der Tiefe unserer Seele, daß auch die Feinde, gegen die sie [the German and Austrian soldiers] kämpfen, Väter, Mütter, Geschwister und Gattinnen und Kinder,
Schnitzler seems to regard the loyalty to one’s own nation as an unquestionable fact, but he also relativizes it by granting this loyalty equally to members of the adversary nations. This perspective demonstrates “a reflective distance from one’s own cultural affiliations,” which Anderson describes as a necessary condition of cosmopolitanism (267). In 1915, Schnitzler’s contemporary Sigmund Freud described the loss of the prewar “Kulturweltbürger” who could “aus allen Vorzügen und Reizen der Kulturländer ein neues, größeres Vaterland zusammensetzen” (327). The cultural impoverishment caused by the loss of Europe as a cosmopolitan homeland must have been particularly bitter for Jewish intellectuals like Freud and Schnitzler. As Jews, their legitimate place in the German and Austrian society was constantly challenged and drawn into question. A cosmopolitan detachment from the nation-state therefore offered an attractive form of resistance against these exclusionary tendencies. In the passage quoted above, Schnitzler urges his compatriots to take up the reflective distance of the cosmopolitan perspective.

Like Freud in the passage quoted earlier, Schnitzler expresses his astonishment about the level of barbarity among the “Kulturvölker” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 189) but insists that the rift between the nations should not lead to depreciation of the cultural works of other nations:

Aber lassen wir uns durch die gerechte Verbitterung über ihre [intellectuals of the Allied Powers] Irrtümer und Bosheiten, zu denen ihre Vaterlandsliebe sie verleitet, die Freude an ihren Talenten und an den Erzeugnissen ihrer Talente nicht vergären. (194)

We recognize here the same concern for the loss of Europe as a cosmopolitan cultural center expressed by Freud. Moreover, Schnitzler’s comment that the “Vaterlandsliebe” is to blame for the alleged mistakes and maliciousness of British and French intellectuals problematizes the status of patriotism in general. Finally, Schnitzler even turns rather abruptly from his own compatriots to his intellectual “brothers” in the adversary French territories: “Auch wollen wir euch, meine Lieben, die Versicherung schenken, daß ihr Goethe verehrt. Wir verehren Rousseau, Voltaire, Flaubert, Stendhal und...
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noch viele andere” ( Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 195). This unusually affectionate address demonstrates how much Schnitzler was pained by the polarizing nationalist discourses of the time. When he criticized French and British intellectuals for their anti-German utterances and their apparent inability or “innere Widerstand, Fremdes zu begreifen” (194), he was also implicitly criticizing his fellow German writers like Thomas Mann, Gerhart Hauptmann and the contributors to the Manifest der 93.10

It is therefore hardly surprising that Schnitzler could not remain inactive, when he was informed in the autumn of 1914 that an aspersive article in a Russian newspaper had accused him of having defamed the leading poets of France, Belgium, England, and Russia. Schnitzler countered the slanderous attack with a protestation, which he published with the help of the French pacifist writer Romain Rolland in the Journal de Genève, the Zürcher Zeitung, and later also in the pacifist magazine Das Forum.11 This collaborative act with Rolland corresponds to the cosmopolitan ideal that the cultural elites should stand above the battle, as the title of Rolland’s 1915 essay compilation Au-dessus de la Mêlée suggests. The quoted passages from Schnitzler’s wartime notes and the publication of his protest together with Rolland demonstrate a similar ideal. His protest in Das Forum certainly ends on this note:

Doch später einmal, wenn der Friede wieder da ist, wollen wir uns mit schmerzlichem Staunen erinnern, daß es eine Zeit gab, in der wir genötigt waren, über die Grenzen hinüber einander die Versicherung zuzurufen, daß wir trotzdem Gerechtigkeit, Urteil und Dankbarkeit niemals verlernt; daß wir, um es kurz zu sagen, auch in dieser ungeheuren Epoche der Verwirrung niemals gänzlich den Verstand verloren hatten. (491)12

With the publication of this text, Schnitzler openly adopted a cosmopolitan posture of detachment with regard to the war.13

At the same time, Schnitzler’s loyalty to Austria (and Germany) was not subject to change. Rather, it was precisely this ambivalent tension between detachment and belonging throughout the war and beyond that made it impossible for Schnitzler to commit either to the posture of cosmopolitan pacifists like Rolland or that of the Kulturkrieger like Thomas Mann. We do not know whether he responded when the pacifist organization Bund Neues Vaterland approached him in reaction to his publication in Das Forum. In its letter of February 24, 1915, the Bund praised Schnitzler “dass Sie sich mit
It informed him further that they had started to organize “eine analoge Organisation wie den Anti Oorlog Raad [the pacifist organization in the Netherlands] in Deutschland” and wished to ask him for his support. As there is no mention of the letter in Schnitzler’s journal and no other record of any involvement with the Bund, it seems safe to assume that Schnitzler, true to his posture of detachment, chose to decline.

“Der gelernte Österreicher”: A Posture of Detachment and Belonging

Schnitzler’s ambivalence with regard to his home country was aptly pointed out by the psychoanalyst Fritz Wittels, another doctor-writer with whom Schnitzler had a vivid correspondence during the war years:


This anecdote describes neatly Schnitzler’s predicament: while in times of peace his identification with Austria may have felt independent of the nation-state, the idea of his hometown becoming Russian territory was clearly a terrifying idea for Schnitzler. The high influx of Eastern Jewish migrants seeking refuge in the Habsburg monarchy from Russian pogroms in the late nineteenth century may have influenced Schnitzler’s perspective on this topic (see Aschheim 37). This also emerges in his review of Rolland’s essay compilation Au-dessus de la Mêlée.14 Schnitzler criticizes Rolland not only for the lack of a balanced, objective view on the war and its parties but also for his apparent ignorance of the specific situation of the European Jews: “Mit unbegreiflicher Zartheit geht Rolland über die Pogroms hinweg, die er
gewiss ebenso verurteilt wie wir alle” (CUL A1). Rolland’s plan to let the little states currently under the German and Austrian regimes choose through referenda whether they want to belong to Russia or the Central Powers was also, for Schnitzler, a palpably unnerving prospect: “Es gibt keine jüdischen Provinzen. In Polen leben Russen, Ruthenen, Deutsche, deutsche Juden, russische Juden durcheinander. Eine Wahl, die getroffen werden würde, käme einem Zwang zur Auswanderung gleich” (CUL A1). Rolland’s disregard for the threat of homelessness for Jewish citizens may well be one of the reasons for Schnitzler’s refusal to commit completely to the detached position of a pacifist cosmopolitan by giving up his—albeit extremely ambivalent—attachment to the multiethnic state of Austria-Hungary.

Rolland’s pacifist essays left Schnitzler feeling generally disappointed:

Nach dem Ruf, der diesen Aufsätzen voranging, erwartete ich in ihnen Gerechtigkeit und Objektivität zu finden, so weit sie Menschen überhaupt möglich ist. Nicht etwa ein wirkliches Begreifen von Deutschlands Wesen [. . . ], aber doch wenigstens den Versuch, die Verteilung der Schuld an dem Krieg bei sämtlichen beteiligten Völkern und Regierungen gegeneinander abzuwägen. (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 214)

Thus, on the one hand, Schnitzler missed in Rolland’s texts the objective viewpoint of the detached, objective observer. On the other hand, however, Rolland’s request for German intellectuals to speak up against the German government was for Schnitzler an impossible demand, which would deny the individual attachment one has to one’s homeland or said homeland’s allies. He stresses that no one would ever ask of Rolland or other French intellectuals to distance themselves from their country’s allies:

Nehmen wir der Einfachheit halber an, in allen diesen Fällen wäre von deutscher Seite Unrecht geschehen,—hat je ein Deutscher von den französischen Intellektuellen verlangt, dass sie gegen Englands Völkerrechtsverletzungen, dass gegen den Treubruch Italiens u.s.w. Proteste erheben sollen? (CUL A1)

Here, Schnitzler’s viewpoint seems to correspond to that of George Bernard Shaw, who had a similar discussion with Rolland in 1919. Michael W. Pharand has shown that while Shaw was passionately against the war and its atrocities, he did not share Rolland’s charge that the intellectuals should have put them-
selves above the battle and detached themselves completely from their national identities (176). Rather than blaming the intellectuals for their lack of cosmopolitan detachment from their home countries, he stressed that the war made precisely such a detachment impossible. For him, it was only possible to prevent war by promoting such a detachment in times of peace, but during the war, everyone was inevitably thrown back to unconditional loyalty with one’s fatherland. Schnitzler, too, would never have joined those, who, as he scornfully wrote in one of his unpublished drafts, “ihr eigenes Nest zu bespucken lieben, Subjekte, die nichts können, Renegaten von Beruf” (CUL A20).

It is this attachment to his home country that has him abandon his general posture of detachment in a few individual instances during the war. The last lines of his play Der Schleier der Beatrice (1900) not only become a concluding staple in his public readings during the war (see Fliedl 40–41); they also form his contribution to the volume Österreichs Geist und Schwert (1915), edited by Clara Körber. In both cases, the Renaissance aesthetic of the play now became a patriotic call to arms:

Das Zeichen tönt, und macht’ge Neubegier
Wie nie zuvor beflügelt meinen Schritt,
Ich freue mich des guten Kampfs der kommt;
Die frischen Morgenlüfte atm’ ich durstig
Und preise dieses Leuchten aus den Höhn.
Als wür’ es mir so reich geschenkt.
Das Leben ist die Fülle, nicht die Zeit.
Und noch der nächste Augenblick ist weit! (DW I, 678–79/ Körber 11)

Körber’s book assembled, aside from Schnitzler, a mix of lesser-known names and well-known authors like Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, Peter Altenberg, Richard Schaukal, and Stefan Zweig. The contributions varied in their degree of explicit patriotism, but in her Geleitwort Körber unequivocally outlined the intention behind the compilation: “Den österreichischen Geist in seiner Vielfältigkeit zu sammeln, das österreichisch-ungarische und deutsche Schwert unserer Helden zu besingen, ist Zweck und Ziel dieses Buches” (3). Moreover, she expressed the hope that the contributions by the “bedeutenden Vertreter der Wissenschaft, Kunst und anderer Stände der Monarchie [. . .] dienen dem besseren Verständnis ihres Vaterlandes” (3).

This last point must have been of particular significance for Schnitzler.
Recall that he criticized French and British intellectuals for their “innere Widerstand, Fremdes zu verstehen.” The experience of not being seen or understood was certainly a central aspect in his loyalty to Austria and Germany (see Müller-Seidel 28):


Schnitzler’s contribution to Körber’s book is thus an expression of his passionate ethical appeal to at least make the effort to understand the “other” in times of war and peace.16 His decision to participate in Körber’s compilation “zur Aufklärung Deutschlands über Oesterreich” (Tagebuch: 1913–1916 181, March 17, 1915), as she introduced the project to him, was thus tightly linked to the existence of widespread anti-Austrian sentiment in Germany. In his journal, he commented after the report of Körber’s request: “(Ja-Schulter an Schulter sind wir [Germans and Austrians] wohl, aber selten Geist an Geist, Herz an Herz!—).” Schnitzler’s contribution to the volume can, then, be seen as a paradigmatic expression of “negative solidarity” mentioned earlier.

A year later, in 1916, he submitted an even more ambiguous parable to Das Land Goethes: Ein vaterländisches Gedenkbuch, a volume that was edited by the Berliner Goethebund. The editorial presented the volume as a compilation of representatives of the “sittlichen und geistigen Führerschaft des gegenwärtigen Deutschlands [ . . . ], das bis auf den heutigen Tag das Land Goethes geblieben ist und in dem ihm aufgezwungenen Daseinskampfe nicht zuletzt die Ideale verteidigt, für die sein größter Genius ihm Vorbild und Sinnbild geworden ist” ([5]). While this conformed to the conventional nationalist narrative of the German Kulturkrieg, the contributions in the volume varied greatly in their degree of explicit prowar nationalism. From the rather unequivocal and simple “Vorwärts” (62) by Generalfeldmarschall Hindenburg to Auguste Hauschner’s cautious hope that art, presently serving the war, would create a “Meister [ . . . ], der das Weihefestspiel des Jahrhunderts schreibt, die Trilogie der Liebe, des Völkerfriedens und der Menschlichkeit” (53), the book in its entirety presented quite different shades of patriotism.
Not all of the voices assembled here seemed to support the war unequivocally, and Schnitzler’s rather enigmatic parable certainly belonged to the less straightforward examples:

Keiner wird sich entrüsteter gebärden als Einer, den Du zu Unrecht beschuldigst, daß er in deinem Haus einen silbernen Löffel hat mitgehen lassen und der beim Nachbarn ein Dutzend gestohlen hat, ohne daß er erwischt worden ist. (106)

Whether Schnitzler was referring here to Johann Peter Hebel’s short narrative Der silberne Löffel (1811) or just to the idiomatic expression “silberne Löffel stehlen,” both cases seemed to project the image of a person who is guilty of a misdemeanor that would ruin their reputation in the event that it was revealed. In the context of the volume, the parable may be read as addressing the question as to which party should be held responsible for the outbreak of the war. The passage can therefore be understood as a defense of Germany and Austria as the main aggressors of the war. After all, in his early notes from 1914, he wrote:


Again, it cannot be established whether this passage is an authentic representation of Schnitzler’s initial militarization in the early days of the war or whether he had initially planned to publish this particular piece and therefore wrote it with a censor in mind. At any rate, Schnitzler’s rejection of Germany’s and Austria’s main responsibility during the war remained intact: “Nicht der Krieg Erklärende führt den Angriffskrieg” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 197), he wrote in January 1915. Against this backdrop, one may understand his contribution as an allegory: while the Allied Powers may not have been the party to declare the war, they were, according to Schnitzler, nevertheless responsible for preparing it in a way that forced Germany into declaring war. However, this interpretation was by no means unequivocal, of course, representing another indication of Schnitzler’s reserved attitude. Nevertheless, that he did contribute to the volume at all
has to be seen as a gesture of solidarity with Germany. The trifold sensation of being misunderstood—as a Jew by Austrians and Germans, as an Austrian by Germans, and as a German by the European adversaries—must have led to this ambivalent posture of belonging. His perspective on the *Schuldfrage* remained the same throughout and beyond the war. On the 12 October 1918, when the public enthusiasm for the war has given way for the hunt for scapegoats, he writes in bemusement to Elisabeth Steinrück:


This patriotism, such as it was, never took on any chauvinistic qualities, however. It was unwavering, but it was expressed through an extremely ambivalent posture of detachment and belonging.

**Self-Preservation and Self-Defense: A Posture of Detachment**

Schnitzler’s acceptance of the invitations to contribute to the volumes edited by Körber and the Berliner Goethebund may also have stemmed from personal reasons of a more strategic nature: they allowed him to position himself as a respected representative of the German-language cultural elite. This countered the constant attempts of anti-Semitic critics to deny him this very status in the literary field by degrading his writings as a degenerate Viennese “Geschmäcklerkunst” (CUL A20). Schnitzler’s posture of detachment was not only received as a lack of patriotism, it was also used to attack him as a literary writer. That he did not explicitly participate in the “Kriegsdienst an der Feder” and never endorsed the war itself made him a particularly vulnerable target for the nationalist press and its prowar propaganda (see Müller-Seidel 27). In the anti-Semitic German press Schnitzler’s general posture of detachment during the war was seen as further evidence for the incapability of Austrian and Jewish writers to adequately represent the German *Geist* (see *Tagebuch: 1913–1916* 329, January 15, 1916). The verdict of backwardness that would haunt Schnitzler until his death became most prominent in the face of the polarizing forces during the war.

Cautious “Selbstbewahrung” had been one of Schnitzler’s main strategic maxims for quite a while, as the following private note, dated 15 May 1911 (his
forty-ninth birthday) and kept in an unpublished folder with the title “In eigener Sache” (CUL A20), shows:

Hier werden also Nachlässigkeiten, Irrtümer, bewusste Fälschungen und Mischformen verzeichnet stehen, sowohl allgemeiner als auch spezieller Natur. Der Sinn dieser Worte soll vorläufig kein anderer sein als durch rasche Abreaktion die Seele für reinere und wertvolle Regungen wieder frei zu machen. (CUL A20)

While the notes in this folder were not meant for the eyes of his contemporaries, they nevertheless have a function for the present moment. What follows is a collection of comments on passages from the press, in which Schnitzler saw himself misrepresented or misunderstood. In other words, this private collection of unfair criticism and Schnitzler’s responses had above all a psychological function: by keeping his anger under control, it helped to protect his posture of detachment. This masking of emotions is reminiscent of the anthropology of distance, which Helmut Plessner developed in his 1924 study Grenzen der Gemeinschaft: Eine Kritik des sozialen Radikalismus, the text that serves Helmut Lethen as a key example for his seminal study Cool Conduct. Schnitzler’s posture of detachment, his “reservierte kühle Haltung” during the war, apparently already anticipated the struggle for dignity, which can only be guaranteed through the practice of armoring of emotion described by Lethen (see 60).

How much Schnitzler’s cool conduct avant la lettre was due to his constantly contested position as a Jewish writer becomes clear when one takes a further look at Schnitzler’s folder In eigener Sache (CUL A20). The frequently aggravating anti-Semitic criticisms made Schnitzler’s concern for his position in the literary canon particularly urgent during the war, as a draft letter to the Berlin-based newspaper Neue Rundschau from 4 December 1915 demonstrates. Here, he complains about the way contemporary critics distort his profile as a literary writer:

Die systematische halb oberflächliche, halb böswillige Verfälschung meiner literarischen Physiognomie [. . .] schleicht sich natürlich auch schon in die Literaturgeschichten ein [. . .], die ja zum grössten Teil von verschämten oder unverschämten Klerikalen und Antisemiten geschrieben werden. (CUL A20)

Schnitzler’s use of the phrase “literarischen Physiognomie” in this passa-
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ge describes the way the perception of an author and his or her work can lead to the construction of a form of literary “portrait.” While “portrait” has rather positive connotations, “physiognomy” seems to refer to less laudatory forms of representation, particularly to the invocation of anti-Semitic stereotypes.17

In the letter to the Neue Rundschau, Schnitzler defended himself and his writing against the simplifications and categorizations assigned to him as an Austrian, Viennese, and Jewish author and provides a telling example of how, particularly during the war years, the German press reduced his work to these three attributes.

Auch dass man mit einer tückischen Absichtlichkeit die Fehler und Mängel, die einer gewissen minderen Kategorie meiner Landsleute eignet, gerade mir ankreidet, und die in meinen Werken zu finden trachtet, habe ich oft genug erlebt, um endlich stumpf dagegen zu werden. (CUL A20)

As clichés of Viennese decadence and degeneration were tightly correlated with implicit and explicit associations of anti-Semitic stereotypes, anti-Austrian criticism in the German press was hardly distinguishable from anti-Semitic tendencies. Schnitzler’s claim that the frequency of the rhetorical assaults against him and his work had made him somewhat numb (“stumpf”) underlines how much his posture of detachment should be understood as a form of self-defense against the anti-Semitic humiliation he had to face on a daily basis.

In a well-known autobiographical note, apparently from 1912, Schnitzler had already described how hard it was to maintain this detachment in an increasingly anti-Semitic society. Here, he highlighted that it was impossible for any Jewish person to remain unaffected by the contemporary discussions of the so-called Jewish question:

Man hatte die Wahl für unempfindlich, zudringlich, frech oder für empfindlich, schüchtern, verfolgungswahnsinnig zu gelten. Und auch wenn man seine innere und äußere Haltung so weit bewahrte, daß man weder das eine noch das andere zeigte, ganz unberührt bleiben war so unmöglich, als etwa ein Mensch gleichgültig bleiben könnte, der sich zwar die Haut anaesthesieren ließ, aber mit wachen Augen zusehen muß, wie unreine Messer sie ritzen, [. . .] bis das Blut kommt. (Jugend in Wien 322, emphasis added)
This powerful image seems to contain in a nutshell the origin of Schnitzler’s “fühlte Haltung” and “Selbstbewahrung”: as a strategy of detachment, it can be seen as an attempt to fend off the constant stream of anti-Semitic stereotyping.

In his private notes, Schnitzler turned Olga’s criticism of his “unzeitgemäße Selbstbewahrung” around: “Was heißt es, für seine Zeit reif sein?,” he asked in 1914—and gave the answer: “Ihr nichts schuldig bleiben und sich doch selbst in ihr bewahren” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 196). This credo mirrors accurately his programmatic political abstinence as well as his artistic strategy during the war years. The fact that he wrote about the war in private and did not share his thoughts with his contemporaries is an important aspect of his posture: while he remained detached from the literary field of his own time, he made sure to provide posterity with material that would counterbalance the distortions of his “physiognomy” in contemporary criticism. In 1915 he wrote about his fear that his journals might become lost: “als könnt ich mich von der quälenden inneren Einsamkeit befreien, wenn ich—jenseits meines Grabs Freunde wüßte” (Tagebuch: 1917–1919 173, 22 August 1918). Schnitzler’s posture of detachment during the war years has thus to be understood as a focus not only on inwardness but also, and maybe more importantly, as the attempt at completing a literary and personal profile for his artistic afterlife.

Schnitzler’s Anthropological Poetics of Detachment

While Schnitzler therefore felt that he did not owe his contemporary compatriots a commentary on the war, he nevertheless felt the responsibility to provide them with continuing literary production. Writing in the same way as he always had was the only form of nationalism he could accept: to serve the national interest by continuing to do what one was best at. For Schnitzler, his own refusal to adjust his literary practice to the current affairs of the war (in the form of war poetry or essayistic writings, for example) was therefore a form of “Selbstbewahrung” but also his duty to his country. Many of his contemporaries did not recognize this idiosyncratic form of patriotism. His correspondent Wittels was an exception. In 1915, Wittels complimented Schnitzler for his recently published Komödie der Worte: “Sie sind [...] ein [österrei- chischer] Meister des Todes der Ehe. Nach dem Kriege werden wir die österreichischen Aktivposten zusammenrechnen. Da gehören Sie auch dazu”
While Schnitzler appreciated the acknowledgment of his artistic productivity during the war, he rejected Wittels’s slogan in which he recognized the common claim that his writings were exclusively concerned with romance. Schnitzler finally concluded with the ironic and slightly coquettish suggestion of a different label: “Meisterdilettant den von [sic] Wechselfällen menschlicher Beziehungen” (DLA A:Schnitzler 590). In this way, Schnitzler emphasized the anthropological dimension of his work. His unchanged literary practice of depicting nonheroic characters can then actually be read as an indirect comment on the war: the war would not engender heroes; it would leave humans just as deficient as they had always been.

Using both his aesthetic talent and his anthropological insight into human relationships, Schnitzler therefore positioned himself as a writer of the human condition. How he defined the latter, in turn, is of utmost significance for his analysis of the war. Detachment, in the sense of emotional indifference to the pain of others, played a central role in his anthropology and consequently in his understanding of the war: “Der Mensch,” wrote Schnitzler in 1916, “ist das mitleidloseste Lebewesen der ganzen Natur” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 208). This diagnosis can certainly be recognized in the way Schnitzler characterized the protagonists in his literary writings. Abigail Gillmann speaks of Schnitzler’s “aesthetics of detachment” only casually in order to sketch out the personality of Georg, the protagonist in Schnitzler’s novel Der Weg ins Freie (1908), but it is a description that may well be applicable for the largest part of his work. Schnitzler’s literature therefore conveys aesthetically the anthropology of detachment that emerges from his wartime notes. Significantly, Schnitzler did not have any hope that people can be changed for the better (see Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 212). With this rather bleak assumption, he not only criticized the prowar discourse of his time and its assumption that war could bring about a “Läuterung” of the masses, but he also appeared to contradict the pacifist hope that love, connectedness, or solidarity could overcome the human tendency toward hate, aggression, and war. The reason for this skepticism lay in Schnitzler’s understanding of detachment as an anthropological fact.

It becomes clear that detachment itself was an ambivalent subject for Schnitzler: while it may have been an important aspect of his own posture in the intellectual field, in its extreme form, as indifference, it became a problematic element of the human condition that endangered the stability of peace. For Schnitzler, it was indifference and not primarily cruelty...
or aggression that jeopardized the hope for lasting peace (see *Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 212): wars are made possible by the detached acceptance of other people’s suffering. Significantly, Schnitzler explained this indifference as a result of the struggle for existence, quoting Darwin’s phrase directly: “Diese Gleichgültigkeit hat sich wahrscheinlich im Kampf ums Dasein entwickelt, da nur durch sie das Leben, das Weiterleben überhaupt möglich wurde” (*Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 212). This reference to the struggle for existence resonated with Schnitzler’s own efforts to retain his posture of detachment in the face of anti-Semitic discrimination. While Schnitzler was referring here to indifference to the suffering of others, it is nevertheless plausible that detachment as a form of protective armor has an anesthetizing effect not only on how one feels about one’s own injuries but also on the way one feels about the suffering of others.

The understanding of detachment as part of the human condition had consequences for both Schnitzler’s understanding of the function of his literature and his understanding of war and peace. Of course, he rejected any form of literature that idealizes the war: “Notwendig ist auch der Kampf gegen die Literatur, die den Krieg verherrlicht” (*Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 210), he wrote. Another aphorism in the war notes suggests that for Schnitzler, art could be seen as a kind of antidote to politics: “Der alte Kunstgriff der Politik vom Einzelnen abzusehen, mit Massen zu rechnen, im Gegensatz zum Künstler, der die Masse in die Einzelnen auflöst” (203). If politics gloss over the individual tragedies of war by reducing it to abstract terms like *Heldentod* and *Vaterland*, art might be able to produce images that make palpable what war really means for the individual. Art could therefore stimulate sympathy and fight human indifference. However, it becomes clear that a form of literature that aims at shattering this kind of detachment was not what Schnitzler has in mind. Looking at Schnitzler’s own work, it would be hard to find anything that would qualify as such a form of *Betroffensheitsliteratur*. Indeed, he dismissed this kind of literary participation in current affairs almost as much as war-positive essayistic statements or “Heldenliteratur”: “Kriegsliteratur. Friedensschriften. Dass Wunden schmerzen, dass ein früher Tod beklagenswert ist, dass Witwen und Waisen weinen, wissen wir. Und es wird nicht einmal von den Verehrern des Kriegs geleugnet” (CUL A1). Even though, years later, he would find himself deeply moved after reading Erich Maria Remarque’s soon-to-be-classic antiwar novel *Im Westen nichts Neues* (see *Tagebuch: 1927–1930* 226, 10 February 1929), he did not seem to believe
that this experience of temporary sympathy engendered by literature could change humankind in any fundamental way.

Rather than denying detachment as a part of the human condition, Schnitzler seemed to suggest that one should accept it and work with it: “Nicht die Menschen sind zu bessern,” Schnitzler wrote, “sondern die Organisationen” (*Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 215). These organizations, in turn, should not rely on sentiments of solidarity or love between the people but on a cool rationalization of what is beneficial for the individual:

> Bei diesen Organisationen kommt es auch keineswegs auf Solidarität oder Verbrüderung an, [. . .] sondern auf das Ersichtlichmachen desjenigen, was für den einzelnen praktisch oder gar vorteilhaft ist. Von hier ist eine eventuelle Bewegung einzuleiten. (*Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 215)

Therefore, Schnitzler took his own anthropological analysis seriously. If people genuinely lack a capability for real sympathy and are unchangeably indifferent to the suffering of others, one has to appeal to their own selfish interests in order to achieve a stable opposition against the war. Schnitzler did not rely on overcoming hatred through solidarity, but he focused on persuading individuals that they themselves would benefit from lasting peace. Instead of denying detached indifference, Schnitzler thus urged his readers to take it into consideration and to use it for the organization of individuals and nation-states: not a community based on mutual love but a cultivated detachment for the benefit of all is the goal.

Schnitzler articulated this in an aphorism from 1927, where he wrote:

> Es ist immer noch besser, wenn sich zwei Menschen über den Abgrund ewiger Fremdheit hin kühl die Hände reichen, als wenn sie einander über den trügerischen Wirbeln des Verstehens gerührt in die Arme sinken. (*Aphorismen und Betrachtungen* 63)

Recall that Schnitzler lamented the lack of mutual understanding among the nations at war as well as the German misconceptions of Austria and the German and Austrian ignorance with regard to their Jewish citizens. Here, he seems to have given up on the hope that real understanding could be possible. This is reminiscent of his review of Rolland’s book where he did not even expect from the latter “ein wirkliches Begreifen von Deutschlands Wesen” but at least an honest attempt at an objective evaluation of all parties in the war.
If a real mutual understanding was impossible, cultivated detachment would become the only solution for Schnitzler to avoid conflict and war. With this appeal to a reorganization of human coexistence based on detachment rather than attachment, Schnitzler’s anthropology appeared to resonate once more with Plessner’s approach from 1924. Plessner proposed a social order based on the cultivation of distance, which is supposed to prevent what he called the radicalism of the ideologies of community. He suggested that establishing distance between individuals smoothed over by conventionally created codes of conduct would be the key for a well-functioning society in which people are protected from shame and embarrassment, “ohne sich durch Gleichgültigkeit zu verletzen” (80).

Conclusion

Schnitzler’s posture of detachment during the war took different forms: as a refusal to participate in the nationalist enthusiasm at the beginning of the war and as a cultivated distance from his home country, which informed his efforts to maintain objectivity and fair judgment in his evaluation of the war. Schnitzler’s tendencies of cosmopolitan detachment from his home country, however, did not make him a member of the pacifist movement. Rather, he also maintained his posture of detachment on this topic as well. There were certainly involuntary elements in Schnitzler’s consistent posture. Paradoxically, the experience of anti-Semitism fostered his distanced position with regard to his home country but also reinforced his attachment to it: the experience of being marginalized as a Jew in his own country elicited a certain negative solidarity with the latter and its ally Germany when these countries became increasingly isolated in Europe as the aggressors of war. It has become clear how much of his effort to outwardly maintain his detached and therefore invulnerable attitude is rooted in the confrontation with anti-Semitic insults. In both his literary writings and his anthropological analysis of the war, then, Schnitzler problematized detachment as an anthropological fact, which, if unregulated, enables the outbreak of war. However, rather than hoping to establish a lasting connectedness and mutual understanding between people, Schnitzler proposed to accept detachment as part of the human condition. An organization of human coexistence based on regulated and cultivated forms of detachment appeared as a practicable ideal.

The image of Schnitzler’s aphorism from 1927, a detached handshake
over the abyss, had already appeared in his play *Professor Bernhardi* (1912). The doctor and his adversary, the priest, enact precisely this scenario at the end of the play (see also Vortisch 90). When the priest offers Bernhardi his hand, the latter smiles: “Über—den Abgrund, Hochwürden?” (*Professor Bernhardi* 131). Of course, the ephemeral quality of this moment of cultivated distance is even made explicit in the priest’s response: “Lassen Sie uns—nicht hinabschauen—für einen Augenblick!” Nevertheless, Bernhardi’s handshake over the abyss appears to provide an admittedly ambivalent image for the ideal of cultivated distance. In this way, Schnitzler introduces his own posture of detachment as the most realistic and honest way of peaceful coexistence.
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Notes

1. The term *posture* overlaps in part with what is generally referred to as “authorial self-fashioning.” However, posture includes but also goes beyond the intentional forms of self-fashioning and conscious strategies of authorial positioning. Speaking of an author’s posture means, then, to combine the analysis of the specific form and style of literary texts and that of the performative position-taking of the author: *posture* thus refers to both textual or discursive forms of authorial positioning (through literary texts, but also interviews, letters, public statements, and so on) and nonverbal practices (hexis, habitus, looks). For a more extensive discussion of posture as an analytical category, see Peck and Wolf. The nonverbal dimension of Schnitzler’s posture will be neglected in this essay due to limitations of space.

2. See, for instance, Schnitzler’s diary for 22 November 1914 (*Tagbuch: 1913–1916* 152).

3. Historians have been arguing over the last two decades that the prowar euphoria in Austria and Germany was in fact not quite as widespread as previously assumed. While there were certainly assemblies of celebratory patriotic demonstrations in the large cities, the individual reactions to the prospect of war were much more nuanced. The legend of a collective prowar enthusiasm was part of the strategic war propaganda, which was

© 2018 Austrian Studies Association
promoted by the media, but is no longer seen as a historically accurate representation of how the German and Austrian people felt about the war (see Bendikowski 8; Ullrich 631; Verhey). In the literary field, however, the voices celebrating the war were undoubtedly the most dominant. By the end of 1914 more than two hundred German-language volumes of war poetry had been published. Among these contributions one could find prestigious names such as Gerhart Hauptmann, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Hugo von Hofmannsthal (see Hüppauf 636). Of course, these publications cannot necessarily be understood as authentic expressions of how their creators felt about the war either, but are part of their authorial postures.

4. Large parts of this folder have been published posthumously: a selection was published in the magazine Neue Rundschau as early as 1932 under the title “Aufzeichnungen aus der Kriegszeit.” In 1939 the author’s son Heinrich Schnitzler published a selection in book form under the title Über Krieg und Frieden. The most extensive selection was included in the 1967 volume Aphorismen und Betrachtungen, edited by Robert O. Weiss. A small part remains unpublished to this day, although it is available in the Cambridge University Library. In the following, when I quote from Schnitzler’s wartime notes, I refer to the Aphorismen volume; for unpublished passages, I will refer to folder A1 in the archive of the Cambridge University Library (CUL). Folder A1 appears to contain Schnitzler’s own typescripts, while folder 230 appears to consist of typewritten copies, probably completed after Schnitzler’s death. For a more detailed comparison of the published versions with the Nachlass materials, see the master’s thesis “Arthur Schnitzlers Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ersten Weltkrieg im Nachlass” by Anna Carpanese. While not referring to folder A1, Carpanese focuses on an analysis of Und einmal wird der Friede wiederkommen . . . as found in folder 230, which she has accessed through the Arthur-Schnitzler-Archiv in Freiburg (which holds copies of the Cambridge manuscripts). I thank the Syndics of Cambridge University Library for the kind permission to cite from their archival materials (cited as “CUL”). I also would like to thank the Deutsches Literatur Archiv Marbach to cite from their archival sources (cited as “DLA”).

5. See for example the correspondence between Schnitzler and his publisher Samuel Fischer, where Fischer insinuates that the Austrians relied too much on the strength of their German allies (Fischer and Fischer 104) and Schnitzler rages in his response against this “höchst ungerechte Verallgemeinerung” (Briefe 105–6).


7. Miklin describes Schnitzler’s position during the war as a development, beginning with an initially strong, emotional patriotic response, which turned into a more severe criticism in the course of the war (200–202). Fliedl speaks of a “patriotischen Anfall” at the beginning of the war and highlights the contrast between the few public concessions Schnitzler made to the patriotic discourse of his time and his war-critical private notes (39–41).

8. Of course, this hope did not materialize. Anti-Semitism rose immensely during the war, and particularly after the defeat of the central powers (see Sieg 12).

9. Miklin cites, for example, a section from Schnitzler’s play Der Gang zum Weiher (1926), in which the poet Sylvester Thorn expresses an understanding of “Heimat” inde-
pendent from the nation state: “Der Erdenfl eck, der mir gehört, so wie/Ich ihm, wer immer
ihn als Fürst beherrische” (DWz 771). Miklin argues convincingly that this appears to cor-
respond to Schnitzler’s own perspective, particularly in the later years of the war and after
its end.

10. In a letter to Schnitzler of 14 December 1914, Elisabeth Steinrück explicitly draws the
parallel between British and French anti-German war propaganda and the undifferentiated
nationalism of the German cultural elite: “Wir werden lange ganz aufeinander angewiesen
sein, wir deutschen Menschen; die anderen wollen und können nichts von uns verstehen,
ich lese täglich französische Blätter u. empfinde es schmerzlich. Sie wissen nichts von uns.—
Ist der Rundschau-Artikel [Gedanken im Kriege] von Thomas M. nicht aehnlich?” (DLA A:
Schnitzler 862).

11. The incident and Schnitzler’s reaction have been covered elsewhere in the scholars-
ship, which is why I mention it only briefly here. For an extensive overview of the incident in
the Russian newspaper, see Heresch. For a more detailed discussion of Schnitzler’s protest,
see also Müller-Seidel 26–27. For the new onslaught of anti-Semitic and nationalist criticism
in the German press in response to Schnitzler’s protest, see Carpanese 51.

12. The same lines can also be found in a letter Schnitzler wrote to Stefan Zweig (Briefe
857–58).

13. The idea of cosmopolitan distance as a “remedy” for patriotism emerges as early as
1891 in one of Schnitzler’s sketches for a narrative text: “‘O du mein liebes Wien. . . .’ Er hat es
jung und frisch und dumm gedichtet, geht in fremdes Land, uwerwindet den Patriotismus,
kehrt zurück, hoert in einem Lokal sein Lied, hat einen Ekel davor, lacht, wird hinausge-
worfen” (DLA A:Schnitzler 09.87, “Prosapläne”).

14. Schnitzler’s review of Rolland’s book has found no attention in the scholarship,
which may be due to Robert O. Weiss’s decision not to include more than the first paragraph
in his section “Und einmal wird der Friede wiederkommen,” with the justification that the
following is “nicht mehr zum eigentlichen Thema gehörig” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen
507). As the following analysis seeks to show, this claim can be contested.

15. The parallels between Shaw’s position on the war and that of Schnitzler could be
worth further investigation.

16. See also the passage in his wartime notes, which begins with the words: “Im
Verstehen gehe ich so weit wie möglich” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 194).

17. See the chapter on physiognomy in Schnitzler’s novel Der Weg ins Freie (1908) in my

18. See the note “National” from 1904: “Man ist national, indem man innerhalb seiner
Fähigkeiten das denkbar höchste zu leisten bestrebt ist; so fördert man zugleich sich selbst
und die Nation, der man angehört” (Aphorismen und Betrachtungen 187).

19. See Carpanese, who argues convincingly that the plot of Schnitzler’s draft “Kriegs-
geschichte” suggests that the war does not have any purifying effect on people and that they
thus remain as flawed as ever (61).

20. Georg Friedrich Nicolai’s study Die Biologie des Krieges (1917) is a paradigmatic ex-
ample of this pacifist position. Nicolai argues that all humans share a “Keimplasma” that
will make it possible for people to live in a community of brotherhood together (371). Even
though Schnitzler credits Nicolai’s book in 1920 for not being “das übliche pacifistische Ge-
schwefel” (Tagebuch: 1920–1922 96, 11 October 1920), his own anthropological analysis of the
war differs distinctly from that of Nicolai.
21. Schnitzler rejects both terms time and again in his wartime notes.
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Marc Lacheny has provided scholars of Germanophone theater in the eighteenth and long nineteenth centuries with the book that has long been needed: an extended, eloquently written, and well-documented study of the relationships between the theater cultures of Vienna and the mythical “Germany” of early nationalist fantasy. This volume provides a critical overview of the existing scholarship and a clear vision of the work that needs to be done to counter the stereotypes enshrined in many existing literary histories of Germanophone theater authors. The result sets a new standard for work on the theater landscapes of Germanophone Europe: anyone working on “German” theater in the tradition of Gottsched, Lessing, and Weimar Classicism and anyone working on the “Austrian” Volkstheater or state theaters in the long nineteenth century will run the risk of total irrelevance if Lacheny’s incisive, important map is not accounted for. Littérature “d’en haut”, littérature “d’en bas”? is written from an admirable transnational, thoroughly engaging perspective, using international scholarship on theater both “high” and “low” as well as comparative approaches to redraw our map in an important area of theater studies.

In starting from the relationship between “high” and “popular/low” literature in the day, Lacheny refutes the strict lines often drawn between “German” and “Austrian” theaters, the commonplaces in theater histories that set Weimar and the Viennese Volkstheater far apart from each other. Scholars have tended to isolate these different theater cultures on the basis...
of nationalism and nationalist cultural politics, overestimating both Austria-Hungary’s purported cultural decadence and the cultural coherency of Prussia-turned-German-Empire. But Lacheny’s project is conceived in ways that, in research and argumentation both, squarely attack the isolation of the privileged place in literary history accorded to figures like Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller by looking at more than theater texts: this is the cultural history of theater in the German-speaking world, not the history of the poetics of plays in German.

Lacheny sets these theater cultures onto a dynamic map of European theater to recreate transnational dynamics and moments of cultural contact, thus reclaiming how the Viennese theater functioned within this extended theatrical space. Here, Lessing’s and Schiller’s genius did not necessarily point the way to “real” theater (continued through figures like Hebbel), nor was Vienna known simply for “low comedy” (Nestroy) or drama derivative of the Weimar dioscurs (Grillparzer). Instead, Lacheny shows how Vienna’s dramatic theater and the Viennese popular theater, including its love for satire, were central to European theater conceived more broadly—the charges of “coarseness” that have echoed across theater history all too often arose from aesthetic nationalism rather than judgments of quality.

To make this case, the text falls into three parts. The first aims at the myth of Weimar classicism, showing how Lessing and Goethe in particular in fact engaged with the popular theater of the sort that played in Vienna. It reconstructs both the critical debates familiar to Germanists and the dynamics between dramatic and comic theater writing that are usually familiar only to Austrianists. In so doing, he presents a notable aspect of cultural and theatrical life long ignored in scholarship but is now increasingly well documented (notably by Johann Sonnleitner and Matthias Mansky).

The second section tracks how German Classicism’s plays were received and reused in Vienna, including accounts of straight dramatic productions and parodies/satires alike. Lacheny follows Karl Kraus as defining what was original in this reception by reference to Nestroy’s theater (Nestroy had even acted Schiller roles until 1830). The third section takes up Grillparzer’s dramas and comedies as revealing specific interactions between traditions, a narrative starting from the fact that the playwright’s uncle published the first collected edition of the works of Philipp Hafner, one of the founders of the Volkstheater. Raimund also comes into this picture as a conduit for Schiller reception, as does Grillparzer’s critique of Schiller and Goethe as writing texts that were
abstract and insufficiently theatrical (203). We also are provided with documentation that Grillparzer was also deeply aware of comic traditions in world theater, having even visited theaters in Paris and London.

In following this course, Lacheny has written an eloquent, accessible work—made even more accessible by an extended German-language summary/appendix of almost fifty pages. This addendum is specially tailored for that German audience: he even changes his subtitle, moving from the term dramaturgie canonique allemande to Klassik, showing sensitivity to national scholarly programs. This monograph is also incredibly learned in its command of well over a century’s worth of theater writing and important for its broad engagement with European theater history and criticism—any Germanist or Austrianist taking up theatrical texts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries would be well advised to use Lacheny’s work as an entry point, both in content and methodology.

Lacheny sets the bar at a new height, as he demonstrates scholars’ need to consider theatrical texts within their various functions and networks (transnational performances, commerce, audience expectations). In this magisterial volume, Lacheny has opened up a door to a new generation of scholarship; we would all do well to follow him through it.

Katherine Arens
The University of Texas at Austin


This handsomely illustrated 2016 edition of the Hofmannsthals Jahrbuch is divided into five treasure-trove divisions. The first 120 pages center on the interviewer and littérateur Hermann Menkes (1869–1931) and include eight of his Neues Wiener Journal interviews and two of his Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung interviews with Hofmannsthal and other leading Viennese imaginative writers and performing artists conducted mostly at their homes. The second portion is a readable twenty-first-century German translation by Rudolf Brandmeyer of Paul Bourget’s iconic “dilettantisme” essay (1882) in what is, remarkably, the first German translation since 1903. This piece is followed in the Menkes vein by a brief but informative essay
on the history behind Hofmannsthal’s eighteenth-century “Schlösschen”—the playwright’s own residential “Turm” in Rodaun by Katja Kaluga and Katharina J. Schneider. It, in turn, serves as an introduction to the tome’s fourth and longest section covering over two hundred pages and containing seven essays on Hofmannsthal’s Der Turm based on papers presented at the eighteenth conference of the Hofmannsthal Gesellschaft held in Basel in 2014. Two rich non-Hofmannsthal-specific essays conclude the volume: one, heavily researched and footnoted, on the literary historical significance of the Süddeutsche Monatshfte (covering its publication from 1904 to 1914) by Michael Pilz and the other, lavishly illustrated, on Egon Schiele’s self-portrait figures by Dalia Klippenstein—fittingly titled “Pantomime auf einem Blatt Papier.”

Of the Menkes interviews, three are devoted to Hofmannsthal. Menkes is a gifted and personable interviewer, and Hofmannsthal speaks freely with him throughout. In the 1907 piece, Menkes first describes the physical beauty of Rodaun before he actually interviews the writer at home. At the end, Hofmannsthal unabashedly praises Richard Strauss’s innate sense of stage drama in his operatic setting of Hofmannsthal’s Elektra: “Er komponiert den Text wie er ist und wo was zu streichen ist, findet er es selbst mit grossem Geschmack und grosser Sicherheit” (48). This unconditional approbation looks ahead to the librettist’s and composer’s five future operatic projects. The interview from 1910 is full of Hofmannsthal’s thoughts on Der Rosenkavalier, including his praise of Reinhardt’s recent Dresden world premiere production, the future Viennese cast, and the Viennese comic operatic tradition running from Mozart’s Marriage of Figaro to Rosenkavalier. In addition, Hofmannsthal reminisces on how he had first made the acquaintance of Strauss a decade before. The 1913 interview focuses both on Hofmannsthal’s remarks on the genesis of his Jedermann drama and his contrasting the previous Berlin Reinhardt production with the pending Viennese performances. The Hofmannsthal selections conclude with Menkes’s celebratory piece in honor of Hofmannsthal’s fiftieth birthday in the Neues Wiener Journal, in which he evokes the writer’s choice of Rodaun as his home, with its late Baroque architectural style, as a veritable physical reflection of Hofmannsthal’s art: “Ein Virtuose der Anempfindung hat sein Heim im idyllischen Rodaun auf diesen Stil und Ton gestimmt” (117). Other interviews included in the Jahrbuch are with such operatic interpreters of the Strauss/Hofmannsthal canon as Marie Gutheil-Schoder and Alma Bahr-Mildenburg, and other house visits include...
those to Arthur Schnitzler and Hermann Bahr. Ursula Renner, the scrupulous editor of this first section, bookends it with her biographical essay of Menkes and a bibliography of his journalistic writings, which for the first time includes citations of Menkes’s earliest work.

The essays dealing with Der Turm begin with Sabine Schneider’s “Einführung,” in which she raises the key question as to why Hofmannsthal was unable to amalgamate his three different printed versions of the play into a single final version—the earlier version being more mythic and fairy tale-like and the later versions emphasizing political disorder and the social chaos of the 1920s. Hans-Thies Lehmann’s “Tragödie auf dem Theater” effectively analyzes the criticism of the first version by the likes of Walter Benjamin, Martin Buber, and Max Reinhardt but nevertheless offers the suggestion that the earlier printed version of the play is most effective as theater. Complementing Lehmann’s piece, Nicola Gess argues in her “Choreographie der Intrigue” that through Hofmannsthal’s 1925 and 1926 readings in Benjamin’s Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels, the playwright was inspired to intensify Julian’s role as a more pointedly dramatic character for the final printed version of the play.

In the middle of Alexander Honold’s “Der Turm und der Krieg” analysis, the critic’s masterful character examination of Olivier as Hofmannsthal’s ruthless human embodiment of the brutality of the war mentality is most helpful. This examination is followed by Roland Borgards’s essay on animal imagery, “Wo ist dem Tier sein End?’ Das Politische, das Poetische und die Tiere in Hofmannsthals Turm.” Here, Olivier’s brutal use of devastating metaphorical animal imagery is contrasted with Sigismund’s direct characterization of the actual animals around him. Borgards points out that in the play’s second version there are 170 references to animals.

The two final essays in this section are comparative in nature. Roland Innerhofer’s comparison of Der Turm with a variety of other Austrian historical interwar plays by Hofmannsthal’s contemporaries, such as Hans Kaltneker, Friedrich Schreyvogl, Karl Schönherr, and Franz Werfel underscores the more complex questions posed by Hofmannsthal in his final drama. Stefan Breuer, a social thinker, analyzes vital points of congruence between Max Weber’s political and social theories and Hofmannsthal’s socio-political views.

The editors of this generous volume are to be congratulated for including a most helpful index and for the overall care and dedication with which the
bibliographical references throughout are provided. Introductory overview remarks might have been included at the beginning of the volume—but their absence cannot be a source of complaint as regards this invaluable addition to Hofmannsthal secondary criticism.

Steven R. Cerf
Bowdoin College


Süreyya İlkılıç’s study presents an intentionally nonargumentative overview of Kafka’s reception in Turkey and the influence that his work has had on Turkish authors, intellectuals, and scholars since the mid-twentieth century. According to İlkılıç, Turkish readers were first introduced to Kafka in 1951 with the translation of his short story “A Message from the Emperor” (1919). A year later his novella The Metamorphosis came out, followed by In the Penal Colony in 1954, whereas Kafka’s 1925 novel The Trial was published in 1960, premiering for the stage in Ankara three years later. While the first Turkish translations were produced via the English or French translations, from the 1960s onward a steady stream of new translations were completed and published, all based on the original German texts. It is striking that Kafka’s The Metamorphosis, first translated into Turkish in 1955 by Vedat Günyol, went through a significant period of retranslations. The newest version was published in 1986 by Ahmet Cemal. İlkılıç reveals that the work of earlier translations were essential for the reception of Kafka in Turkey but also had an influence on a new style of modern Turkish literature. She highlights the subtle differences in the work of the various translators such as Kâmuran Şipal, Ahmet Cemal, and Evrim Tevfik Güney to shed light on the ways in which their translations have shaped, rearranged, expanded, and at times limited Turkish readers’ understanding of Kafka’s literary work. Despite the criticism by a newer group of Turkish Kafka scholars and translators, the first generation of translators, such as Necip Aslan, Vedat Günyol, and Adalet Çimcoz, were instrumental in introducing Kafka to the Turkish-speaking world.
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The volume is divided into nine parts. In the first half of the book, İlkılıç sketches out the traditional Kafka scholarship that established itself in Turkey, drawing attention to the main interpretative approaches to Kafka’s texts, the search for an ultimate meaning behind his writings, and also the challenges in transcribing the author’s puzzling figurative and metaphorical meanings into the Turkish language. In this respect, her volume presents a brief history of translation studies and its evolution in Turkey, referring to some methods used in classical Ottoman literature and the modern era. Simultaneously, İlkılıç discusses the idiosyncrasies of the Turkish language, referring to linguistic features such as phonology, morphology, and syntax. Her structural analysis then draws attention to the history of Turkish literary production and to what extent Kafka’s oeuvre has influenced the writings of renowned Turkish authors, such as Sait Faik, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Bilge Karasu, Ferit Edgü, Yusuf Atılgan, and Hasan Ali Toptaş. The book lays before us a few dates and facts about Turkish literature as well as the socio-cultural and ideological changes since the foundation of the republic in 1923. Additionally, it offers comparative readings of how Kafka is approached from various points of view by Turkish critics.

The second half of the book deals with Kafka’s characteristic narrative techniques. The following chapter presents excerpts of Kafka’s Metamorphosis in Turkish and the various perspectives of Turkish translators. İlkılıç’s analysis has been tempered by an understanding of linguistics and grammar; it is further enhanced her grasp of the significant number of loanwords from Arabic, Persian, Ottoman as well as colloquial Turkish have found their way into Kafka’s stories. The book includes also a pilot study on Kafka that the author conducted with seventeen Turkish authors and scholars. While some answers are short, many participants responded in detail to İlkılıç’s questionnaire and spoke about their fascination with Kafka. One will find in this section information on why Kafka’s works are relevant to the problems of the younger generation today or why his texts were banned by the Turkish government during the 1980s.

İlkılıç has written this book primarily for German-speakers, pointing out the rich array of interpretative approaches into Kafka’s texts in Turkey. Yet her study gives the impression that the difficulty of understanding Kafka’s texts can be attributed to the incompatibility between the two cultures. The assumption is the Orientalist view that understanding Kafka’s writing is more challenging to Turkish readers due to the Sprachbarrieren between
the Turkish and German language (13, 124, 156, 192, 228), as both stem from distinctive language families (Indo-European versus Ural-Altaic). The book is for the most part eloquent in its praise of Kafka scholarship in the West but also in its discussion of the differences in the intellectual and philosophical fashions in each culture. This reduction to a Turkish-German binarism, however, is misleading. As the sheer number and range of interpretations of Kafka’s work suggest, readers, both inside and outside of academia, are confronted with the same difficulties of understanding Kafka’s allegorical texts. There is no master code, as exemplified in Theodor Adorno’s image of the “stolen key” (“Aufzeichnungen zu Kafka,” 1953) that would allow us to unlock the parabolic system of Kafka’s writings. In that context, İlkılıç opts not to show how hundreds of translators such as Edwin and Willa Muir, Vladimir Nabokov, or Jorge Luis Borges have dealt with the same obstacles when translating Kafka’s writings into their native languages. No word fits adequately enough in all the contexts that Kafka’s texts present. Instead of using a literal translation, translators have often stated that being unfaithful to the original is at times inevitable. In dissecting Kafka’s Metamorphosis and offering a range of translations regarding this text, İlkılıç’s approach uncovers the magic of Kafka’s fictional world and how this dimension has mesmerized audiences globally. Though some of the material presented in this volume is not entirely new, it is impressive in its style, its documentation, and its bibliographies. It is a valuable general study.

Mine Eren
Randolph-Macon College


If every generation requires a new history of literature, then, too, new studies on the life and work of noted authors are always in order. Max Haberich provides a study on Schnitzler and his times under the subtitle Anatom des Fin de Siècle, which integrates biographical and interpretative parts into a commentary on the critical debates of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries pertaining to the author at hand. Recent research and scholarship on Jewish literary and social studies facilitate Haberich’s contextualization of Schnitzler and his oeuvre in historically specific terms.
and position the author within the current discourse on the intellectual culture of Austro-Hungary. This includes the coffeehouses, cabarets, and other public venues that were part of the public sphere open to Schnitzler and his fellow writers and intellectuals. Haberich examines Schnitzler’s background and personal life in a more realistic and less deferential manner than was the case with earlier critics. The result is a rather contemporary Schnitzler construct emerging from a fresh look at the author’s literary and autobiographical writings.

Haberich’s study transcends the fin-de-siècle framework while remaining mindful of the fin-de-siècle as Schnitzler’s focal theme that also colored the author’s attitude toward the post–World War I republic. Leaving the war virtually unaddressed, as Haberich notes, and becoming increasingly the target of anti-Semitic hostilities in the 1920s, Schnitzler examined the new Austrian republic through a fin-de-siècle lens and with a latent nostalgia of a time and setting that he criticized while they lasted. Schnitzler infused his view of the “modern” Austrian republic with sexual, sentimental, and Jewish content that harkened back to the prewar era. Indeed, some of his works written before the war, such as Reigen, fueled public scandals in the interwar years. In conjunction with his professional difficulties, Haberich traces the mounting difficulties in Schnitzler’s personal life such as his divorce from Olga Gussmann after eighteen years of marriage and the suicide of his daughter Lili, who had married an Italian fascist. Reflections of these events, Haberich shows, appear in the later oeuvre.

Haberich’s critical narrative establishes convincing connections between Schnitzler’s life situations, his literary production, and his fascination and engagement with innovations, for example, with film as the medium of the future. Haberich discusses the intersection of personal and literary development issues that the existence of Schnitzler’s extensive correspondences, diaries, and notes makes especially compelling. Not all of those documents have become accessible to date, which leaves mysterious informational gaps, for example the exact circumstances that precipitated Lily Schnitzler’s suicide. Issues with which the author contended, including the demise of the Habsburg monarchy, his concerns about Lily’s vulnerability, and his critical stance toward the continued honor code of the military, correspond with Schnitzler’s personal convictions and formed sources of inspiration for works such as Fräulein Else, Traumnovelle, and Spiel im Morgengrauen. Likewise, the fascination with the occult and secret societies
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in Schnitzler’s generation, coupled with concerns about the disintegrating family and gender structures inform the later works. Haberich observes both continuities and attitudinal changes between Schnitzler’s pre- and post–World War I works, which illustrate Schnitzler’s responses to the changing climate but also attest to his versatility at a time when many critics considered him a man of the past.

Over the decades Schnitzler has drawn attention from prominent scholars as the innumerable studies on his life, work, and times document, including Heinrich Schnitzler, Christian Brandstätter; and Reinhard Urbach’s *Arthur Schnitzler: sein Leben, sein Werk, seine Zeit* (1981); Peter Gay’s *Schnitzler and His Century: The Making of the Middle Class* (2002); the general studies by Hartmut Scheible (1976), Michaela Perlman (1987), Renate Wagner (2006), and Richard Specht (2014); and explorations of Schnitzler’s family and relationships in context, such as Friedrich Rothe’s *Arthur Schnitzler and Adele Sandrock* (1998) and Jutta Jacobi’s *Die Schnitzler’s: Eine Familiengeschichte* (2016). The posthumous publications of Schnitzler texts such as the autobiography *Jugend in Wien* (1968) and the drama *Zug der Schatten* (1970) prompted a steady flow of Schnitzler scholarship in Europe and overseas. The latter aspect poses a problem in the book, which lists only a rather limited number selection of scholarly literature on Schnitzler in languages other than German. Likewise, the index, considering the scope of the discussions and themes, seems skimpy.

Compared to previous Schnitzler critics, Haberich’s sober, matter-of-fact, sentimentalism-free approach to his subject is refreshing, and the connections he makes between important new studies on Jewish Vienna and the East-West relationships of Jewish intellectuals provides new access to Schnitzler’s work, who as an author and a physician interacted with different segments of Vienna’s multicultural society, which at the time of World War I seemed to be on the verge of integration. Overall, Haberich’s study represents a significant, innovative contribution to Schnitzler scholarship.

Dagmar C. G. Lorenz

*University of Illinois at Chicago*


Der Titel des Bandes *Aktualität und Beliebtheit* trifft den Punkt, dokumentiert der Band doch eindringlich, dass Zweigs Oeuvre auch in Teilen Asiens höchst populär ist. Die Essaysammlung unterscheidet sich jedoch grundlegend von anderen Tagungsbänden, die sich mit Zweigs Werken befassen. Bei vielen Aufsätzen handelt es sich nämlich um textimmanente Interpretationen, die

führt Wagner aus, dass Dr. Condor Max Schelers zweigeteilte Mitleidsethik evoziert.


Gregor Thuswaldner
North Park University


Wie wirkt eine Masse, wodurch, was macht die Masse zu ihr: zur Masse? So akkurat Elias Canetti sie beschreibt, und auch unter diesem Aspekt, der einer der Medialität ist, etwa, wo er als konstitutiv den Rhythmus der Füße beschreibt, der diese rhythmische oder zuckende Masse konstituiert, die sich in der Medialität—durch die Intensität des Stampfens—über ihre Größe betrügen kann, wie es in Masse und Macht heißt, eine eigene Medientheorie ist darin nicht entfaltet. Diese Lücke schließt rekonstruktiv wie produktiv Shinichi Furuya mit Masse, Macht und Medium, einem Buch, das Canetti mit Marshall McLuhan lesend Germanistik und Soziologie zugleich ist, wenn man so will.

Die Bochumer Dissertation liest Canetti mit McLuhan. Also dort, wo dessen Masse nicht mehr dies ist, sondern durch sich anderes—oder doch Masse, aber nicht durch sich, sondern eben durch die Medien, worin “die Masse [ . . . ] körperlos, verstreut und unsichtbar” (7) sei. Dabei beginnt Furuya mit den Realien. Wiewohl sich “Canetti fast gewohnheitsmäßig von den zeitgenössischen Denkern distanzierte” (9), muss er McLuhan zur Kenntnis genommen haben—immerhin lässt sich am Nachlass nachweisen, dass er fünf Bücher des Medientheoretikers besaß. (9) Kennengelernt könnte Canetti ihn über George Steiner haben, wiewohl er, und das ist auch zu betonen, diesen in seinen (veröffentlichten) Schriften “gar nicht erwähnt”. (9) Es sind also eher Parallelen und Plausibilitäten, worin sich dies erschöpft.

Im Forschungsüberblick geht hernach der Verfasser der Frage nach, inwiefern Medialität nicht nur bei Canetti, sondern auch in der Sekundärliteratur zu ihm ein Thema ist. Dass dabei Eric McLuhan—Marshall McLuhans

Auch ein Problem: Dass auch eher unendifferenzierte oder provokante Positionen wie Sloterdijks Lob für Canetti—das “härteste [...] gesellschafts- und menschenkundliche Buch in diesem Jahrhundert” (104)—wie seriöse Befunde genommen werden. Was aber sagte Härte da überhaupt aus? Und: Viele es ist dann eben doch schon gesagt, vielleicht nicht mit Nennung Canettis, doch wenn Benjamin zur “Physiognomie” (110) dessen, was im Film Masse sei, zitiert wird, dann wäre diese Verbindung erstens zu konkretisieren, jedenfalls, wenn man dieses Buch schriebe, und zweitens fruchtbar zu machen. Er wird aber wesentlich referiert (110). Ähnlich wird der Umschlag von Menschenmasse zu Massenmensch mit Ortega (115) und Anders (116) sowie die Simultaneität Vereinzelter bei Flusser (117) bloß nacherzählt, nicht falsch, aber doch auch weder originell noch kritisch, alles passt irgendwie zusammen, fertig.

Interessanter sind die Randbemerkungen, etwa zu der Medialität von Ämtern, wenn der König zwei Körper habe, deren immaterieller, so Kantorowicz in *The King’s Two Bodies*, “kontinuierlich weiterleben” (166) könne: als des Königs politischer Körper. Das griff Agamben in *Homo Sacer* bekanntlich auf, um u.a. Hitler zu verstehen (169). Allerdings passt es nur bedingt zu Canetti, wo der Befehl von außen kommt, imaginär oder real, also genau dieses Moment der Expansion schon auch dekonstruiert wird, was Furuya aber wieder nicht beachtet, womit die Randbemerkung dies bleibt.

Dann ist man, das *name-dropping* wurde ja schon erwähnt, bei Foucaults *Bio-Politik*, Statistiken zu den Massenmenschmassen, quasi. Und danach unversehens und recht unrund bei einem Fazit, dass man Canetti “auch im Kon-
text eines Diskurses der Wahrnehmungstheorie” (213) lesen könne, was etwas dünn ist und eher lose mit dem Thema zu tun hat, soweit es sich bis dahin überhaupt entfaltete.

Martin A. Hainz
Universität Wien


Am Hügel Sainte-Geneviève im Quartier Latin began Celans Arbeitsplatz und zeitweise seine Wohnung in der École Normale Supérieure (ENS).


Bianca Rosenthal

_Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo_


What was known about Hans Weigel before his personal papers became available some twenty years ago was primarily threefold: he was a cultural critic and author of lesser renown, he was an ardent and often strident Cold Warrior who helped organize the Brecht boycott on Viennese stages in the 1950s, and he saw himself as the “discoverer” of young writers, such as Ingeborg Bachmann, Ilse Aichinger, and many others. There has never been a dearth of publications that mention Weigel, if only because he was something of an institution in postwar Austrian culture. More recently, however, there has been a mini-boom in studies of Weigel and his work that have drawn on his extensive Nachlass to reveal a multifaceted writer, theater critic, translator, cabaretist, literary agent and, for a short time, actor (in a Brecht play—_Mahagonny_, no less!—in 1932). The publication in 2008 of Weigel’s autobiography of the years 1906 to 1938 (In die weite Welt hinein:
Erinnerungen eines kritischen Patrioten) traces his entry into the world of Vienna’s Kleinkunsttheater, including his work with Jura Soyfer and other notables in the years before the Anschluss. Then, in 2015, an authorized popular biography of the author appeared (Ich war einmal… Eine Biographie); it gave a comprehensive overview of Weigel’s life, work, and reception, albeit with limited citations.

Wolfgang Straub’s study provides the first scholarly and well-documented portrayal of how Hans Weigel became an “institution” through the networks of individuals who helped shape him and his career paths. This focus on Weigel’s contacts, friends, and business acquaintances at the same time highlights many aspects of the cultural landscape of Vienna from the 1930s to his death in 1991. But Weigel’s networks were not just in Vienna; they included groups in Innsbruck around Lilly Sauter, in Berlin around Hilde Spiel, and in Salzburg around Ilse Leitenberger. The most influential individuals with whom he interacted were, of course, those in Vienna. Many of these figures met at the apartment of Hilde Polsterer, a set designer at the Theater in der Josefstadt whose cultural salon attracted many of the important, if not well-known figures of the time, such as the journalist Inge Morath, the publicist Zeno Liebl and his wife, the publicist and journalist Elizabeth “Bobbie” Löcker, through whom Weigel gained access to many publications, such as Der Turm, Film, Der Optimist, Die Europäische Rundschau, and many others.

While emphasizing the help that Weigel received in establishing himself in Vienna, the author conversely downplays Weigel’s role as a mentor of young writers, arguing that they were more independent in furthering their own careers than has been recognized up to now. He goes a bit far, however, in saying that Weigel was not the “discoverer” of most of the young writers but rather that they came to him. To be sure, there were many other mentors of young writers in Vienna then, such as Hermann Hakel, Rudolf Felmayer, and Hans Löwe. But in the end, most of the young writers gravitated to Weigel, not least because of his perceived effectiveness in finding publishing opportunities for them. The author also cites Jeannie Ebner’s role as editor of the later volumes of the anthology Stimmen der Gegenwart as support for his claim that she, rather than Weigel, largely shaped these volumes. However, Ebner was Weigel’s personal secretary for a few years, beginning in 1952 and thus it is unsurprising that she corresponded with young writers chosen to be in the anthology. In fact, Straub undercuts his own argument somewhat by pointing out how the next generation of writers in the 1960s and 1970s recognized and
emulated his efforts. Gerhard Rühm, for example, a member of Weigel’s circle of young authors in the Café Raimund, published a collection of texts by the young authors of the Wiener Gruppe in 1967, while the Forum Stadtpark (1960) and Rauriser Literaturtage (1971) both invited him to speak about changes in the literary landscape.

No portrayal of Hans Weigel and his work would be complete, however, without mention of his “Bilderbuch-Heimkehr” and his successful re-integration into Austrian cultural life after 1945. That Weigel’s example in this area remains more the exception than the rule is thoughtfully discussed here in a separate chapter, in which the author points up the anomalous role Weigel occupied at that time in Austria as a reintegrated Jewish remigrant. The skepticism of some of his former friends who turned down his appeals to return to Austria may well have been based on the difference between Weigel’s experience in exile and their own. His friend Hilde Spiel, who spent the war years in England, reminded him in 1951 that living in Switzerland during the war was, for an Austrian, not a particularly harsh form of exile. Weigel’s modest successes there as a writer were also not the norm for that time. Subsequently, his call for reconciliation after the war in his essay “Das verhängte Fenster” (1945) convinced few to return, least of all his Communist friends of the 1930s.

Wolfgang Straub’s study is quite compelling and thorough by virtue of its systematic mining of the rich resources that have lain fallow for so long in the Weigel Nachlass in Vienna and in other locations around the world. And the sixty pages of photos help the reader better “flesh out” the many lesser-known names that one encounters here. For the scholar of Austrian cultural landscape from the 1930s to the 1960s and beyond, this book provides many valuable insights and surprises.

Joseph McVeigh
Smith College


Der vorliegende Band enthält achtzehn gesammelte Aufsätze zu diversen Themen und Personen, die das jüdische Geistesleben vom Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts bis in unsere Gegenwart behandeln. Einige der Aufsätze er-
gänzen sich, wie etwa die Arbeiten zu Kafka (vier Aufsätze) oder zu Gershom Scholem (zwei Aufsätze), obwohl sie sicher nicht als zusammengehörig geplant waren. Es geht dem Autor in erster Linie darum, “die Breite, Offenheit und damit Widersprüchlichkeit im jüdischen Denken darzustellen” (7).


Einen breiten Raum nehmen die Diskussionen über Franz Kafka und seinen Freundeskreis (Max Brod, Hugo Bergmann, Felix Weltsch) ein. Im Frühwerk von Brod, das “weitgehend unerforscht” (89) ist, untersucht Voigts die Aspekte des Indifferentismus und der Utopie und im Falle Bergmanns geht es ihm um die Erhellung eines Wirklichkeitsverständnisses, in dem Mathematik und Telepathie zueinander in Beziehung gesetzt werden, zwei

Voigts gesteht, dass er lange Zeit das Wort Gershom Scholems als “Gesetz” betrachtet habe. Das bezog sich vor allem auf Scholems apodiktische Aussage,
dass “die angeblich unzerstörbare geistige Gemeinsamkeit des deutschen Wesens mit dem jüdischen Wesen, auf der Ebene der historischen Realität, niemals etwas anderes als eine Fiktion” gewesen sei. Dieses “Machtwort” Scholems entfachte hitzige Debatten, die immer noch anhalten. Scholem bringt drei Einwände gegen das sogenannte deutsch-jüdische Gespräch vor: (a) Es habe sich um ein einseitiges Gespräch gehandelt, d.h., Deutsche hätten das jüdische Gesprächsangebot nicht erwidert; (b) die Deutschen hätten erwartet, dass Juden ihr Judentum ablegen, und schließlich (c) der Begriff des Gesprächs sei unangebracht, weil “mit den Toten kein Gespräch mehr möglich ist” (316). Inzwischen steht Voigts Scholem sehr viel kritischer gegenüber. Er schreibt, dass es höchste Zeit sei, die auf Scholems Machtwort zurückgehenden Denkverbote zu überschreiten, was er dann auch nüchtern und ohne Polemik in seinem Aussatz “Das Machtwort. Gershom Scholems Position zum ‘deutsch-jüdischen Gespräch’” praktiziert und damit eine solide wissenschaftliche Grundlage zur “Aufarbeitung der deutsch-jüdischen Symbiose” (325) herstellt.


Walter Tschacher
Chapman University


The title of the book Im Liegen ist der Horizont immer so weit weg comes from a 1996 poem by Barbara Frischmuth that appeared around the time of Austria’s entry into the European Union. After urging the reader to lift his
or her eyes to wider vistas, it evokes the home/foreign realm dichotomy, a main theme of her fiction and essays, in the playful question, “Eusterreich oder Östropa?” (7). The book, with the subtitle “Grenzüberschreitungen bei Barbara Frischmuth” emerged from a conference with the same name held in May 2016 in Danzig in honor of Frischmuth’s seventy-fifth birthday. Just as Frischmuth’s literary oeuvre transcends borders of genre, place, culture, gender role, and generation, this volume transcends expectations of what we expect from texts “about” literary works and the lives of their authors. Quite different from the traditional “Festschrift” assemblages of diverse scholarly articles devoted to an esteemed mentor celebrating a milestone birthday, this lovely tribute volume includes some traditionally footnoted interpretations of the honoree’s literary works but also quotations, prose fragments, photographs, poems, playful and humorous pieces, and letters. Several of the contributors, more than forty in number, offer personal comments, either on their experiences reading Frischmuth’s books or on their acquaintance and interactions with her, or both. Of course, mixed-genre books and volumes on writers’ lives and their works are hardly new; nevertheless, this book seems uniquely multifaceted; it appeals to our hearts, our senses of humor, and our appreciations of beauty as well as our analytical minds.

Although they overlap, pieces in the volume can be divided into scholarly interpretations of Frischmuth’s novels and creative pieces of various kinds; the two types are interspersed. In the former category is a study of Frischmuth’s works focusing on cultural anthropology and another on religious and “inter-religious” issues. Several articles discuss specific novels, including Das Verschwinden des Schattens in der Sonne in context of her later literary works; there is also a study of “Interkulturelle Begegnungen” in Die Schrift des Freundes as well as essays on figures from Vergiss Ägypten and two studies of Woher wir kommen, one on the concept “Leerstelle Männlichkeit” and one on “Gefühlsräume.” These scholarly articles make a solid contribution to Frischmuth scholarship.

Some of the texts recount visiting the author and seeing her garden and lakefront environment at Altaussee, Steiermark, her childhood home and abode of recent years. This volume contains a series of photographs of Frischmuth in her garden, subject of four of her most recent publications representing her own genre, the “literarisches Gartentagebuch.” Her increased emphasis on plant life and rural Austria complements the urban and non-Austrian, mainly Middle Eastern, settings of much of her fiction,
also amply discussed in this volume. In an essay on “Barbara Fischmuth’s autobiographische Gartenliteratur,” Isabel Kranze asserts that the books “umkreisen [...] den Garten als konkreten Ort [...] als literarische Phantasie der Autorin und ihrer Seelenverwandten, als Thema der Kulturgeschichte und als Herausforderung für die Naturwissenschaften” (26). Reinhard P. Gruber writes of Frischmuth’s connection to plants: “Sie lebt mit der Vegetation. [...] Sie existiert als Pflanzenschutzmittel selbst, als Madonna der wertvollen Pflanzen” (164).

In addition to established literary critics, the book also includes texts by peers, well-known Austrian creative writers. They include Nobel Prize winner Elfriede Jelinek, Friederike Mayröcker, Peter Handke, Elisabeth Reichart, Peter Rosei, Gerhard Rühm, and several others. These writers contribute congratulatory wishes, letters, poems, and vignettes. One interesting montage piece is Bodo Hell’s “-isch und -ut-Litanei für Barbara Frischmuth,” which presents evocative lists of words ending in these suffixes. Readers must supply their own connections to Frischmuth and her writings. One -isch segment follows: “arkadisch nomadisch enzyklopädisch periodisch melodisch methodisch weder modisch noch alt- oder gar unmodisch episodisch rhapsodisch [...]” (254) Listed under -mut we have “hochgemut, frohgemut wohlgemut alles eher denn Sprach- und Gedankenarmut [...]” (258).

Ingrid Spörk’s provocative aesthetic contribution to the volume consists of four colored photographs of “soft sculptures” from a larger series titled “Simulacra,” a term referring to representations that problematize or replace the reality they presumably reflect. Spörk explains that the sculptures were created “aus einer Verbindung von Fiber Art und Fotographie, Seidenchiffon, Goldfaden und gefärbten Flachs” (143); the result is a creative, mostly non-verbal presentation of “Grenzüberschreitungen.”

A uniquely playful text by literary critic Paul Michael Lützeler is called “Titel-Scherze.” Using the form of an informal letter, he composes a clever portrait of Frischmuth’s life and literary history by stringing together and contextualizing numerous titles of her works. The piece begins “Seit der Flucht aus der Klosterschule,” referring to Frischmuth’s first book, set in a boarding school like the one she attended. A paragraph listing prizes Frischmuth has received is followed by a gently satirical sentence acknowledging the body of literary criticism devoted to her works and their many theoretical approaches, which have changed or “turned” according to the fashions of various


Pamela S. Saur
Lamar University


Vincent Kling and Laura McLary’s study of Lilian Faschinger’s work takes its title from an interview between McLary and this Austrian author. Its writeup comprises the final chapter of the monograph. Comparing herself to Scheherazade from One Thousand and One Arabian Nights, Faschinger tells McLary that she has long written fiction in order to survive. Writing has allowed her to assert her voice and identity as an Austrian woman whose home country is tainted by misogyny. The writing process has additionally formed the working out of Faschinger’s view of Austria, enabling her to ascertain that the place is one she both “loves and hates at the same time” (19). Thus, the lost territory that Faschinger regains through writing is both a voice that men would otherwise talk over and a clear view of the complex relationship she has with her home territory. It is surprising that Kling’s introduction discusses these points at length, yet fails to mention that the name Faschinger is indigenous, almost exclusive, to Austria.

The study underlines the problems that Faschinger perceives in contemporary Austria: sexism, xenophobia, and what she calls Alltagsfaschismus. It shows that she showcases these issues through her characters. Faschinger’s technique of personifying Austria’s shortcomings is most notably seen in
Stadt der Verlierer and in Paarweise: Acht Pariser Episoden. The latter is set in the year 2000 in Paris since Faschinger cannot write about a place if she is based there, preferring to imagine her chosen setting from afar.

The Kling-McLary volume shortly preceded Lynne Hallam’s work Rewriting the Female in Popular Culture, which examines Faschinger’s tendency to draw on preceding texts, as well as on popular and contemporary culture. By contrast, this slightly earlier study turns the focus inwards and shows the overlaps that Faschinger’s novels have with one another. An image that is repeatedly referenced throughout the study is the spiderweb that figures in Paarweise. The (perhaps octagonal) web symbolizes the eight intertwined pairings explored throughout the text. Its cornerstone-like nodes represent the work’s foundation upon the couplings. The Kling-McLary study highlights that many of Faschinger’s characters in this novel are connected by, so to speak, a common thread within the web of connections that extends to the characters in her other novels.

A number of characters in Paarweise are connected by Faschinger’s observation that empowerment and social progress lead back to the very control and oppression that they attempt to overcome. The novel’s multicultural, even “postnational” (227) setting of twenty-first-century Paris does not deter the prescription of social roles based on a person’s country of origin. Faschinger shows that a relationship between race and class supersedes nationality and a system of privilege emerges. Immigrants, subjected to casual racism daily, cannot progress beyond low-paid menial jobs, while their white counterparts host television programs and choose which gallery to hang their work in next. In Faschinger’s Paris, women’s reproductive autonomy is also removed by the very means that exists to ensure it: Jan forces Marie to abort the child she longs for each time he impregnates her.

The concept of control and oppression forming from the social progress that attempts to destroy them extends to Magdalena Sünderin and Stadt der Verlierer. Magdalena Leitner’s liberation from patriarchal values, which she extends to the priest by kidnapping him, results in her own arrest. When postwar Austria, the “Stadt der Verlierer,” is remodeled from the fragments of its wartime destruction, former supporters of the regime are not forced to own up to their past mistakes. They instead slip through the net, allowing fascist attitudes to permeate through to the new age.

The study highlights Faschinger’s treatment of relationships, including the one between reader and narrator, which emerges as a key feature of her
work. Kling points out that the narrator is detached from the action, and this causes the reader to become more involved with the delivery of the story. Since the detached narrator only guides the reader through the action and refrains from immersing him or her wholly in it, the reader is able to imagine the action more vividly. In turn, this allows the receiver of the text to understand, though not excuse, the repulsive behaviors displayed by some of Faschinger’s characters. It is repeatedly argued that Magdalena’s confession may in fact be a lie, a story, and that her real sin is in fact the kidnapping of the priest. In this case, the role of the reader is to be deceived, just as the priest also is deceived. This causes the reader and character of the priest to merge and again draws the reader closer into the story that unfolds. While contributors repeatedly, and correctly, point out that Magdalena’s kidnapping of and confession to the subservient priest represents a reversal of gender roles, another reversal of gender roles has been overlooked. The priest’s captivation by Magdalena’s story enables him to leave the episode alive, and this consequently feminizes him. It causes him to imitate the feminine trait, or at least one associated with a single literary heroine, of using storytelling to stay alive.

Rosie MacLeod
Bangor University


With its broad focus on crime and narration in post-Enlightenment German literature Gestörte Ordnung joins a recent surge in academic interest in German-language contributions to the crime genre. Ulrich Kittstein’s study focuses in particular on fifteen texts that use innovative narrative techniques to highlight the social and cultural disruption introduced by crime. Beginning with Friedrich Schiller’s 1792 Der Verbrecher aus verlorener Ehre and ending with Friedrich Christian Delius’s 1992 Himmelfahrt eines Staatsfeindes, Kittstein shows how the authors use a poetics of crime to undermine a rational worldview. In these texts, he suggests, crime narration becomes a means to expose and test the seemingly incontrovertible truths held by a society. In Kittstein’s words, “Das erzählte Verbrechen [wird] zum Prüfstein für vermeintliche Selbstverständlichkeiten einer Gesellschaft, die
sonst meist dem Nachdenken entzogen bleiben, und zum Schlüssel für eine implizite oder explizite Poetik des Erzählens” (14).

The scope of Kittstein’s study is ambitious. *Gestörte Ordnung* covers two hundred years of literary history in a limited space. An informative introduction and brief conclusion provide the framework for the study’s primary emphasis on crime as a mirror of social, cultural, and narrative disruption. This concept is then explored in fifteen chapters that are arranged chronologically according to the texts’ publication and that each attend to one crime narrative. As he explains in the introduction, Kittstein purposely chose works in which the juridical implications of crime play a minimal role but poetics are key to a narrative understanding. To emphasize the narratives themselves, each chapter describes the social, historical, and political context of the respective literary work followed by a detailed reading of the central themes, poetic strategies, and targeted effects. From the fifteen texts, many are those typically found in studies on German-language crime and detective fiction, such as Schiller’s *Der Verbrecher aus verlorenen Ehre*, Kleist’s *Michael Kohlhaas*, Hoffmann’s *Das Fräulein von Scuderi*, von Droste-Hülshoff’s *Die Judenbuche*, and Süskind’s *Das Parfum*. While Kittstein carefully recapitulates familiar themes and structures, his reading regretfully does little to provide new perspectives on the texts or the authors’ innovations. The same applies to his examination of works that feature crime but are less frequently associated with the crime genre, such as Hauptmann’s *Bahnwärter Thiel*, Brecht’s *Dreigroschenroman*, Dürrenmatt’s *Die Panne*, and Bernhard’s *Das Kalkwerk*. Kittstein carefully describes the respective historical context, plot, and narrative techniques but neglects in-depth theoretical considerations. Linking the readings to a theoretical approach or including references to other analyses would have enhanced the central claims and offered new insights to those readers already familiar with these works or the crime genre.

The most insightful chapters in *Gestörte Ordnung* are those that look at less familiar texts that engage in poetic play with the effects of crime on social and narrative order. Kittstein’s readings of Storm’s *Ein Doppelgänger*, Perutz’s *Der Meister des Jüngsten Tages*, Frank’s *Die Ursache*, Bergengruen’s *Der Großtyrann und das Gericht*, and Delius’s *Himmelfahrt eines Staatsfeindes* bring a new appreciation of these often underrepresented works. Indeed, the greatest strength of *Gestörte Ordnung* is the unique pairing of standard and less standard texts under the heading of innovative crime narration. The often
surprising combinations encourage readers to rethink generic definitions and the ways that texts are assigned to specific genres. The one possible outlier in the otherwise cohesive selection is Stifter’s *Der beschriebene Tänling*, in which no crime occurs. While Kittstein suggests that the novella’s main theme is precisely the threat of the unrealized crime to social order, this text’s inclusion is still questionable in a volume subtitled “Erzählen vom Verbrechen in der deutschen Literatur.”

As a whole, the concept behind *Gestörte Ordnung* is sound. The texts are well chosen to demonstrate how across two hundred years of German-language literature authors have consistently employed complex narrative strategies to mirror crime’s disruption to all structures of order. The chronological arrangement of the chapters and the clear readings recommend this book to readers seeking a basic introduction to depictions of crime throughout German literary history. However, scholars who are familiar with or wishing to expand their knowledge of the German crime genre will find few new insights, primarily due to the lack of a developed theoretical argument. While the introduction includes a few brief references to novella theory and traditional conceptions of narrative function and summarizes some traditional views on the form and function of crime fiction, none of these concepts are pursued or developed. The individual chapters focus on the stories themselves and neglect methodical theoretical considerations and references to secondary sources. Information from the few references at the end of the volume could have been incorporated into the readings, and the list also could have been more extensive. For more rigorous academic investigations of the German crime genre, readers should look at recent publications such as Katharina Hall’s edited volume *Crime Fiction in German: Der Krimi* (2016), Thomas W. Kniesche’s *Contemporary German Crime Fiction* (2016), and Lynn M Kutch and Todd Herzog’s edited volume *Tatort Germany: The Curious Case of German-Language Crime Fiction* (2014). Although a stronger theoretical argument would have been advantageous, Kittstein is to be commended for bringing readers’ attention to the numerous and sometimes unexpected contributions of German-language writers to the crime genre.

Anita McChesney

*Texas Tech University*

With its two central figures, Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek, well-represented by biographical literature and intellectual histories, it cannot be said that the “Austrian Economists” are unfamiliar to English-language scholarship. Indeed, so well established is this branch of economic theory that it is possible to be labeled an “Austrian” in some academic departments without ever having set foot in Austria. Associated with laissez-faire economics and libertarianism, the Austrian Economists are also known to policymakers and politicians. The British prime minister Margaret Thatcher said that she always carried a copy of Hayek’s *Road to Serfdom* in her purse. In *The Viennese Students of Civilization*, Erwin Dekker seeks neither to introduce the Austrian school of economics, nor to bulldoze the current consensus readings of Hayek and Mises as thinkers of methodological individualism and free-market liberalism. His argument is, rather, that the historical, social, and political context of Habsburg and First Republic Austria, as seen from Vienna, significantly shaped the theories of the Austrian Economists. Today, an “Austrian” may never have set foot in Austria, but for Dekker, a greater understanding of the school of Austrian economics can be gained by examining its Austrian context.

That context is one in which the Austrian Economists were greatly motivated by concerns about the future of their civilization. Here, prospective readers of *The Viennese Students of Civilization* might wonder if the term *civilization* in the title phrase will be too unwieldy to be applied critically. And indeed, the book does apply the term broadly. At times, for example, the Austrian Economists’ concern about “civilization” means the invocation of an apocalyptic infrastructural collapse that is equal parts Karl Kraus and the Hollywood disaster film. Thus, Dekker twice cites Ludwig von Mises’s prediction to a student as they strolled along the well-paved Ringstrasse that “grass will grow right here where we are standing,” while Joseph Schumpeter is presented describing his time as a finance minister in postwar socialist Vienna as helping the state to commit suicide (3, 89, 121). Elsewhere, however, the Austrian concern about “civilization” means an appreciation for continuity, where the achievements of civilization are understood as the product of “restraint.” Borrowing from Norbert Elias the sense of civilization as a process of increasing individual and social restraint, Dekker understands the Austrian
Economists to be working through a problematic of civilization in order to study economics. According to this reading, Hayek is not primarily concerned with the individual freedom that the market enables but rather privileges the market because it is a form of civilization that restrains, or disciplines, social and individual behavior. Of Hayek, Dekker observes, “Markets do not work because individuals are rational, but markets allow individuals to make rational choices” (89).

Approaching the Austrian Economists as students of restraint and civilization, *The Viennese Students of Civilization* creates a context in which contributions in economic theory can be seen as contiguous with other intellectual currents in Vienna. This is a great strength of the book. Dekker notes, for example, how closely Hayek’s interest in civilization and restraint aligns with the work of Freud in *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Like Karl Popper and Hermann Broch, moreover, Hayek is said to have balanced his own skepticism about the certainty of knowledge and the prospects for the future with personal courage and a resolve to press forward. Dekker’s attention to the milieu of the postwar Austrian capital also suggests how trends in economic thinking were bolstered by “typically Viennese” means of intellectual association. Like other philosophical “circles” that convened in postwar Vienna (for example, the Geist Circle, the Kelsen Circle, the Spann Circle, and the Vienna Circle), the Mises Circle helped establish research premises, model behavior, and define a coherent intellectual agenda. Of course, members of the biweekly Wednesday Mises Circle connected with other circles, especially the Geist Circle. And it also engendered its own forms of camaraderie. Decades later, for example, Gottfried von Haberler could still perform Circle songs, such as “The Economist in Paradise” and “The Last Soldier of the School of Marginal Utility,” which had been composed by fellow member Felix Kaufman and sung regularly at Circle meetings.

Mises and Hayek eventually emigrated to the United States and Great Britain respectively, and they achieved their greatest professional success outside Austria. *The Viennese Students of Civilization* is acutely aware that these Austrian economists are central, if not sacred, figures in Anglo-American neoliberal economic theory. Indeed, some of the pleasure in reading the book derives from observing its author deliver new insights on the Austrian school of economics while also trying to avoid the ire of the energetic contingent of Hayek and Mises defenders. Here, the case of Janek Wassermann, the American scholar of interwar Vienna, shows just how
fraught Dekker’s task is. Wassermann’s 2015 History News Network article that argued that the “contemporary characterization of Austrian Economics does a disservice to the eclectic intellectual history of Austrian economics” unleashed an angry attack force of bloggers, journalists, and the Foundation for Economic Freedom that can still be accessed online today. For his part, Dekker aims for calm. He describes two legacies of the Austrian school of economics: one within economic theory, the other within practical politics and political philosophy (14). Each, he suggests, represents a meaningful approach to the school. But what is missing within these two distinct legacies is an understanding of how the economic analysis can be integrated with the political analysis. Considering Austrian Economists more broadly, as students of civilization, provides this integration.

Of course, the “two-legacy” schema is an explanatory necessity, not a description of how scholarship, which is rarely so scrupulous, actually functions. And in fact, the title phrase “students of civilization” should be seen as more of a direct challenge to conventional readings of the Austrian Economists than Dekker wishes to say it is. For Dekker, at least while they were still in Vienna, Mises and Hayek considered themselves less economists in the traditional sense—that is, as engineers, policy experts, or physicians—than as interested observers and interpreters of the processes of civilization. As individuals studying processes, moreover, they and their colleagues were far less certain of their conclusions than traditional accounts would suggest. Described as a “therapeutic nihilist,” Hayek, in particular, rejected the idea that the economist can fully grasp what is happening in markets and that specific interventions will yield predicted or desired effects (127).

The Viennese Students of Civilization is a bold and engaging work of scholarship that can be read as an attempt to restore the interwar Austrian school of economics to Austrian intellectual history. The founding figures of Eugen Böhm von Bawerk, Carl Menger, and Friedrich von Wieser are also part of this story, which Dekker recounts from the standpoint of a researcher working in a department of cultural economics. Given the recent emergence of cultural economics as a field, it is perhaps not surprising that it is not entirely clear who the audience for the book is intended to be. Given that the discourse on civilizing processes and civilization is drawn from cultural studies, economic historians might find the book too philosophical. At the same time, Dekker appears reluctant to situate the Austrian Economists within the rich contemporary scholarly discussion surrounding the rise, fall, and trans-
formation of Austrian liberalism. The book succeeds in presenting economic theory to non-specialists for more than two hundred pages, yet regarding the historical, one can still encounter the sentiment that “Schorske is difficult to summarize” (16). The rich and suggestive discussion of the Austrian Economists in *The Viennese Students of Civilization*, however, more than outweighs what is, essentially a matter of emphasis, and Erwin Dekker has written an immensely valuable book.

Michael Burri

*University of Pennsylvania*


So-called “migration literature,” that is, contemporary literature written by authors who immigrated to Austria and whose first language is not German, has attained a place of prominence in the Austrian literary field, gathering attention from publishers, literary critics, and the wider reading public. Authors such as Dimitré Dinev, Anna Kim, Doron Rabinovici, Julya Rabinowich, and Vladimir Vertlib have come to be part of the literary elite whose books can be found on the long list of prestigious literary prizes and in the catalogues of major publishers; the group is well represented in literary scholarship.

The volume *Grenzüberschreitungen: Ein literatursoziologischer Blick auf die lange Geschichte von Literatur und Migration* is part of this burgeoning scholarly interest, albeit with a different focus. The volume has its roots in the research project “Literature on the Move” (www.litmove.oeaw.ac.at), funded by the Wiener Wissenschafts-, Forschungs- und Technologiefonds that has been focusing since 2012 on the literature “zugewanderter AutorInnen in Österreich,” and is the result of the collaboration of three members of the project team, Wiebke Sievers, Holger Englerth, and Silke Schwaiger, each of whom is responsible for 2 or 3 individual chapters. This common foundation results in a tight theoretical, thematic, structural, and stylistic cohesion among the individual essays, resulting in a final product that reads more like chapters of a book than essays by different authors.

The volume connects to the existing research literature by accepting
the current scholarly consensus of considering immigrant authors part of a cultural avant-garde that plays a crucial role in transgressing narrowly conceived notions of national cultures and literatures, the titular “Grenzüberschreitungen.” Yet it aims to set itself apart both in scope, taking a broader historical approach, and in theoretical foundation, diverging from the widely employed constructivist paradigms of performativity, hybridity, and transnationalism. The editors employ instead a historical-comparative approach, the Bourdieuan concept of the literary field and its mechanisms of exclusion, and Yasemin Yildiz’s critique of the monolingual paradigm (cf. Beyond the Mother Tongue) as key concepts in the analysis of altogether seven “zugewanderte” authors and their works.

Thematically, Grenzüberschreitungen is divided into three parts: a substantial introductory essay by Sievers that establishes the volume’s theoretical and methodological framework and outlines the (historical) connections between migration and literature in the Austrian context; “Teil 1,” consisting of three essays that focus on authors (Elias Canetti, Milo Dor, György Sebestyén) who migrated to Austria between the 1930s and late 1950s; and “Teil 2,” which examines in four individual essays the professional progress of four contemporary authors (Seher Çakır, Ilir Ferra, Stanislav Struhař, Tanja Maljartschuk) in the Austrian literary field. In selecting these mostly little-known writers, the authors aim to expand the scholarly focus beyond the few well-established names mentioned above and to put forward a new perspective on the history of migration and Austrian literature. The volume’s central line of argument holds that Austrian literary history can be divided into different periods with respect to the acceptance of immigrant authors, from a period of almost unquestioned acceptance as the result of the Habsburg cultural heritage of authors from the former crown lands up to the mid-1960s, to a period of nationalization of the literary field in the 1970s and 1980s, to a wave of renewed interest in “migration literature” starting in the 1990s. Given the historical and theoretical approach that unites all essays in Grenzüberschreitungen, the researchers are able to demonstrate the use of the German language as a central mechanism of exclusion of foreign-born authors from the national literary field, and also the loss (and resulting lack) of cultural and symbolic capital that migration almost inevitably entails. The three essays of “Teil 1” demonstrate that immigrant authors such as Canetti, Dor, and Sebestyén did not face the same resistance to their inclusion into the literary field, as the Austrian literary establishment consisted largely of
older authors that had a direct connection to the transnational legacy of the Habsburg empire and accepted foreign-born authors with native tongues other than German quite naturally as part of this transnational heritage—as long as they wrote in German. The hegemony of the German language as a passkey to the entry into the national literary field is also apparent in the second thematic part of Grenzüberschreitungen, which details the struggles of the individual authors to gain wider acceptance and recognition of the literary quality of their works rather than being typecast as representative of their ethnic background and providing “authentic” insights into the history and experience of the exotic “other.”

The essays collected in this volume are extremely well researched, clearly structured, and well written. They all provide a short introduction to the biographies of the authors, their entrance into the Austrian literary field, the obstacles to their reception, and analyses of a few of their works that highlight central themes, making them ideal points of entry for anyone interested in these authors. In addition, the overall thrust of the cultural-historical argument connects the current interest in migration literature to its historical precedents and provides valuable (if at times somewhat polemical) insights into the barriers that immigrant authors experience to their acceptance by the literary industry. I would have wished that the authors had paid more attention to the gendered aspect of the mechanisms of exclusion (only two of the seven authors discussed are women), but this is a minor quibble with an otherwise excellent volume.

Michael Boehringer
University of Waterloo


In 1992, Herbert Kuhner, Johannes Diethart, and Peter Daniel published a bilingual German-English anthology, Wären die Wände zwischen uns aus Glas: Jüdische Lyrik aus Österreich, which featured poems by Austrian-Jewish writers defining their identity after the Holocaust. The book was a response to the 1988 Bedenkjahr, the fiftieth anniversary of the Anschluss of Austria to Nazi Germany. Following the election of Kurt Waldheim as president of Austria
in 1986 and the rise of the extreme right-wing FPÖ under Jörg Haider, the commemoration activities in 1988 were part of a turning point in the identity of the Second Republic of Austria, which hitherto had pretended to be the first victim of Hitler’s aggression and thus had seen itself as not responsible for the recent past in World War II and the Holocaust. All this changed in the second half of the 1980s in Austria, as the country started to acknowledge that there were Austrian victims and perpetrators. Today, no one questions Austria’s and some of its citizens’ responsibility for crimes committed in the Holocaust, and there is a growing, if not established awareness of the loss of the country’s Jewish population that before 1938 accounted for 9 percent of Vienna’s total population.

The current volume Wände . . . : Österreichische jüdische Lyriker/ Walls . . . : Austrian Jewish Poets, edited by Herbert Kuhner and published by the Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft in 2015, features nine additional writers and fits well into the program of the Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft, which promotes Austrian exile literature, though not all of the contributing lyrical writers, Ilse Aichinger for example, were in exile during the Holocaust. The book is first and foremost an incredibly useful resource for anyone interested in questions of Austrian-Jewish identity, as it was expressed in German-language poetry. When one thinks of Austrian-Jewish identity Paul Celan’s Todesfuge/Death Fugue is the most important German-language poem in the twentieth century that comes to mind. This anthology takes the reader beyond what is well known. While Celan is not included, there are four poems by Rose Ausländer, who like Celan grew up in Czernowitz, the capital of the former Austrian crown land of Bukovina, and survived the Holocaust there. Other well-known writers include Erich Fried, Peter Hennisch, André Heller, Elfreda Jelinek, and Robert Schindel, to name just a few. Schindel’s poems “Vineta I” and “Vineta II,” which are included in this anthology, provide an interesting representation of what it was like to be Jewish in 1980s Vienna.

It is clear from the listing of authors included in this volume that being Jewish is less defined by a religious identity, but rather by having been persecuted by the Nazis or descending from people who were persecuted during the Nazi period for being identified by the Nazis as Jews. This is crucial to understand, because these writers face a different identity than the majority culture in Austria. Furthermore, this anthology is not limited to the generations
that lived through the Holocaust but also features poems from the second generation of survivors.

There are also poems by writers who may be less known but who are nonetheless interesting, such as Mimi Grossberg, Alfred Kittner, Herbert Kuhner (who edited this volume), and Willy Verkauf-Verlorn, among a total of thirty-nine writers who contributed poems to this anthology. Verkauf-Verlorn’s poem “Wände” inspired the title of the book. His poem “Judesein” ponders the question of what it means to be a Jew without religion and certainly without the construct of race. Verkauf-Verlorn also served as chairman of the Theodor Kramer Gesellschaft from 1987 to 1994.

The English translations by Kuhner are useful and make this volume accessible to readers who are interested in the topic of Austrian-Jewish identity, but who do not read German. Needless to write, however, no translation can do justice to the original poems. This book will be a great addition to any Austrian Jewish Studies library.

Joseph W. Moser

West Chester University
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