



Durham E-Theses

The major literary polemicso Karl Kraus

Carr, Gilbert J.

How to cite:

Carr, Gilbert J. (1972) *The major literary polemicso Karl Kraus*, Durham theses, Durham University.
Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7938/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

A B S T R A C T

This study of the most important of Kraus's polemics against literary contemporaries centres on the relation of language and character. Any attempt simply to extract his opinions or to measure his verdicts against accepted critical opinion has been eschewed, as a misinterpretation of Kraus's whole purpose. Since his polemics were two-pronged attacks - on style and character - his conceptions of language and personality are outlined, and also related to his demand that the polemicist should embody artistic values. As a background to his demand for unity of man and work, the construction of his persona and the dualism in his thought and its implications for his critical procedure are discussed.

His polemics are assessed in relation to his success both in exposing opponents and in personally exemplifying the artistic ethic. His case against Hermann Bahr is amplified by independent evidence that suggests a closer connection between style and behaviour than is evident from Kraus's own polemics. In treating of the relation between ethics and style in the polemic against Maximilian Harden, the unity in Kraus's approach is contrasted to Harden's dualism. Kraus's twenty-year feud with Alfred Kerr is traced in detail, their different tactics are analysed, and the discrepancy between moral victory and practical success is noted. Apart from the personal and publicistic aspects of the polemic against Franz

Werfel, the crucial questions it raises as to the validity of Kraus's linguistic formula are discussed. This was relevant to polemical demands, but rather rigid, as particularly the Werfel case shows; Kraus did not investigate all significant manifestations of character in style. Against Stefan George he failed to exemplify his ideal of unity, in that his individual criticisms of George's translations of Shakespeare's Sonnets are valid, but his own versions fall short of the perfection required to vindicate his polemical position.

T H E M A J O R L I T E R A R Y P O L E M I C S

O F

K A R L K R A U S

by

GILBERT J. CARR

Submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at Durham University
1972

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

C O N T E N T S

Abbreviations and typographical conventions.....	Page i
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Preface.....	v
Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY.....	1
(1 Satire and pölemic: artist and moralist -	
4 Language and character - 6 Man and work -	
9 Polemic as art - 10 The histrionic model -	
13 Private life and public persona - 18 Language	
and originality - 25 Dualism and inconsistency -	
30 Practical justification)	
Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR.....	33
I "Décadence" and Naturalism.....	33
(33 "Überwindung des Naturalismus" - 36 Kraus	
and Naturalism - 37 The polemics of 1892/93 -	
42 "Décadence" and "Jung-Wien")	
II Criticism, Style and Character.....	48
(48 Style: theory - 52 Style and satire -	
57 Style and criticism - 63 Subjectivity and	
opportunism)	
III The Polemic of 1900/01: The Theatre Critic..	67
(67 Aims and misunderstanding - 69 Holzer and	
the Volkstheater - 72 The trial and the	
retrospective analysis - 77 Literary evidence -	
86 Aftermath and recurrence)	
Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN.....	90
I The Press and Corruption.....	90

C O N T E N T S

(90 Harden and Kraus: early relations - 92 The press and corruption - 97 Sexual morality)	
II Harden's Campaign against Eulenburg.....	100
(100 Political background - 103 Polemics and trials - 107 Harden's arguments and Kraus's analysis)	
III Style and Character.....	117
(117 Harden's style - 123 Information - 129 Personality and criticism)	
IV Kraus's Polemics.....	135
(135 Unity - 139 Fact and fiction - 145 Biographical facts and personal motives)	
V Aftermath.....	151
Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR.....	154
I Criticism and Style.....	154
(154 Early relations - 155 The critic and his approach - 157 Impressionism - 159 Phonetic stylization)	
II "Pan" and the Polemics of 1911.....	163
(163 "Pan" and Jagow - 165 Press controversy and polemics - 168 Kraus's arguments - 174 Retaliation - 180 Violence)	
III Kerr's War Poems.....	183
(183 Pacifism or dualism? - 186 Kraus and Gottlieb - 189 Paris - 191 Style and content as proof of authorship)	

C O N T E N T S

IV Legal and Polemical Tactics.....	195
(195 Libel suits - 197 Insults or slander? - 199 Satire within the polemic - 200 Defeatism and denunciation - 202 Quotation and selection - 205 Plagiarism - 207 Copyright - 211 Publicity and reticence)	
V Finale.....	214
(214 Theatre reviews - 218 The trial - 220 The last word)	
Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL.....	222
I Content and Course of the Polemics.....	222
(222 Youthful "hysteria" and editorial reaction - 226 "Elysisches" - 229 "dorten" - 232 Language - 235 Self, psychology and subjectivity - 239 Kraus's answer and "Spiegelmensch" - 244 Aftermath)	
II The Ethical Question.....	246
(246 Admiration and love - 248 "Scheinmenschen- tum" - 253 The jargon of publicity - 258 Man and work)	
III The Poetry.....	261
(261 Kraus's criticism - 263 Form and content - 271 Kraus's changed attitude and the language thesis)	
IV Language and Tradition.....	276
(276 Kraus's positive values - 279 "Spiegelmensch":	

C O N T E N T S

a synopsis - 280 Language and parody - 283 "Magic" and dramatic change)	
Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE.....	289
I Background and Motivation.....	289
(289 Preliminary - 290 Exemplary figures - 293 Public recognition)	
II Kraus's Literary Criticism.....	298
(298 Knowledge of George's work - 299 Rhyme - 302 View of George's originality - 307 The approach to Shakespeare - 309 "Nachdichtung")	
III The Rival Poets as Translators.....	313
(313 Polemic and content - 316 Detailed analysis: CXVI - 324 Departure from the original - 327 Sense, syntax and unity)	
IV Conclusion.....	333
NOTES.....	336
(336 to Preface - 338 to Ch.One - 347 to Ch.Two - 358 to Ch.Three - 374 to Ch.Four - 390 to Ch.Five - 403 to Ch.Six)	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	412

ABBREVIATIONS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL CONVENTIONS

The following abbreviations are used in the text:

F. = Die Fackel, edited by Karl Kraus (Vienna, 1899-1936).
Each issue has its separate pagination, e.g. F.2,6 means
Die Fackel, No.2, page 6, Mid-April 1899; F.2,6-18 means
Die Fackel, No.2, pages 6 to 18. Double or multiple issues,
e.g. Nos. 697/705, October 1925, are referred to by their
first number only, e.g. F.697.

The recent edition of Kraus's works by Heinrich Fischer
is referred to as follows:

DW = vol.1, Die Dritte Walpurgisnacht (Munich, 1952).

Spr = vol.2, Die Sprache (Munich, 1954; 4th.ed.1962).

BWG = vol.3, Beim Wort genommen (Munich, 1955; 2nd.ed.1965).

WF = vol.4, Widerschein der Fackel (Munich, 1956; 2nd.ed.).

LTM = vol.5, Die letzten Tage der Menschheit (Munich, 1957).

LL = vol.6, Literatur und Lüge (Munich, 1958).

WiV = vol.7, Worte in Versen (Munich, 1959).

UWM = vol.8, Untergang der Welt durch schwarze Magie
(Munich, 1960).

UWz = vol.9, Unsterblicher Witz (Munich, 1961).

VH = vol.10, Mit vorzüglicher Hochachtung (Munich, 1962).

SK = vol.11, Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität (Munich/Vienna,
n.d./1963).

CM = vol.12, Die chinesische Mauer (Munich/Vienna, 1964).

Wg = vol.13, Weltgericht (Munich/Vienna, n.d./1965).

Dr = vol.14, Dramen (Munich/Vienna, 1967).

This edition is used wherever possible; works not in it are quoted as from Die Fackel. To facilitate placing within the chronological context, Die Fackel is sometimes referred to in addition to this edition.

Any other works consulted are indicated in the Notes, numbered references to which are given in the text, chapter by chapter.

It is regretted that for technical reasons the "scharfes s" has had to be replaced by a double s. In view of Kraus's meticulous approach to the written word, in all other instances the spelling of quotations from his early works, his manuscripts and the works of others has not been standardized, except in accordance with the edition consulted. The transition to the standard modern orthography took place in Die Fackel during 1902, but discrepancies remained for some time.

For the purposes of differentiation, quotations from Kraus, if isolated from the text, are reproduced without quotation marks. All other quotations, including quotations from Kraus in the body of the text, are enclosed in quotation marks.

Where others' work was quoted or glossed by Kraus, the reference to Die Fackel or Kraus's works is enclosed in square brackets. Thus the poem by Kerr quoted in Literatur und Lüge is on /LL 214/, while Kraus's comment on it is on (LL 214).

Underlining in quotations usually corresponds to spaced type in the original. Where Kraus applied spaced type satirically or critically in quoting, or where the underlining is my own, this is stated in the text or in the relevant footnote.

Parentheses or pauses intrinsic to the original of a quoted text are preserved, as () and ... respectively. Paraphrase added to complete the sense of an excerpt is enclosed in [].

Omissions of parts of sentences quoted are marked [...]. Omissions of one sentence or more are marked [---].

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

I wish to thank the Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, the Bundesarchiv, Coblenz, the Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Berlin and the University Library, Cambridge for permitting and facilitating access to unpublished material, and Dr and Frau P. Schick, Vienna, and Dr E.F. Timms, Cambridge, for kindly informing me of the whereabouts of some of this material. My deepest gratitude is due to my supervisor Dr W.E. Yates, without whose sustained guidance, criticism and stimulus this work would not have been completed.

In 1899, at the age of twenty-five, the Viennese satirist Karl Kraus founded his own periodical, Die Fackel, which he edited until his death in 1936. He wrote the bulk of it himself, ceasing to publish others' work after 1911. His work was a severe indictment of a degenerate society, first on the brink of, then in the throes of, and finally in the aftermath of a catastrophic war - those "last days of mankind" which Kraus felt to be an unprecedented disgrace to humanity and civilization. He "pinned down the age in quotation-marks" (F.381,43). He exposed the hypocrisy beneath its pretensions and poses, the brutality underlying its vulgar superficiality, and recorded them in the distorting mirror of its representative figures' own words. He was a satirist of language; it was both the subject of his criticism and the medium of his art.

This dual nature of his work - art and criticism - is a central concern of this study. P. Schick has warned against reducing Kraus's work either to problems of the age or to problems of language: "Denn für Karl Kraus waren Sprache und Sache eins."¹⁾

Kraus's polemics have received much less critical attention than his satirical art, which has been the subject of some fruitful research. Whether or not such studies accept the "harmony of man and work" aspired to by Kraus, they concentrate either on his technique,²⁾

or on his realization of his vision of language.³⁾ Its critical implications are rarely considered at length. Justified in relation to his satire, this is inadequate as an approach to polemics, the aims of which are more practical and finite, and their full evaluation often depends on background documentation. H.-D. Zimmermann's⁴⁾ isolation of certain rhetorical figures from the historical context of the polemics between Kraus and Kerr amounts, therefore, to the presentation of half-truths for aesthetic consumption, useful as an exercise but insufficient comment on the polemics. On the other hand, M. Borries's application of criteria of historical relativity to Kraus's conception of language is as arbitrary as Kraus's disregard for such criteria in his exclusively stylistic approach to Heine. Her predictable finding that Kraus's thought was "reactionary" rather than "progressive"⁵⁾ has little weight as a criticism of his linguistic Weltanschauung. His polemics cannot be reduced to a content independent of the language which gives them form and meaning. Yet this is attempted by W. Iggers,⁶⁾ who singles out inconsistencies without explaining the background, only to criticize the resulting "opinions" as unsystematic. In her chapter "Literature, literary figures and criticism",⁷⁾ she dismisses the complex fictional quality of Kraus's satire as "unjust", "large-scale slander", and fails to distinguish it from polemics.

Viewed out of context, as they are by Dr Iggers, Kraus's "opinions" on topical issues or literary figures are certainly arbitrary, puzzling and of little more than curiosity value. A detailed study of Kraus's literary polemics needs at least to explain his verdicts. More important, the validity of the equation of style and behaviour may, in turn, be most usefully tested against literary texts, that is, against the work of authors whose language could hardly be excused as a secondary issue, as that of politicians might be. Furthermore, accessible literary works would be a source of evidence independent of that presented polemically by Kraus. The difficulties of such assessment are discussed further in Chapter One.

Since all of Kraus's mature polemics were shaped by his rhetorical skill, they could all be said to be literary. The term "literary polemics" must here be confined to those with literary substance or concerning literary issues. In necessarily confining the scope of this study to Kraus's attacks on contemporary literary figures, at least one "major" polemic - that against Heine - had to be omitted. This was justified not merely because the Heine polemic has received due attention from other critics,⁸⁾ but because the issues it crystallized were also at stake in the polemics discussed here. Of these polemics, there can be no doubt that, in scale alone, Kraus's attacks on Bahr, Harden,

Kerr and Werfel were "major". Yet the opponents were also major figures in their day: the first three as publicists of great literary prestige and influence, Werfel as the spokesman of the Expressionist generation. Stature alone would justify the inclusion of Stefan George, although the polemic was smaller in scale.

Kraus's other notable polemics, for instance against minor Expressionists, against prominent Berliners like Tucholsky or against Benn in 1933, have been omitted as being either too diffuse, too obscure or too firmly embedded in a larger context; and the polemics against Werfel and Kerr adequately characterize Kraus's position on similar issues. His remarks on such major writers as Hofmannsthal, Schnitzler and Hauptmann are too piecemeal to be called polemics and do not provide as clear a perspective on the theme of language as do the polemics considered; and since this study is not simply an assessment of Kraus's literary criticism, but is greatly concerned with his personal embodiment of positive values in polemics against negative phenomena, it has been felt legitimate to omit special treatment of his polemics on behalf of wronged or neglected writers, and only to refer to them, in passing, as points of contrast.

None of the existing accounts has dealt adequately with the literary quality and the cultural purpose of Kraus's polemicizing, and most have failed even to present the facts accurately or do more than reproduce the bias

of one or other polemicist.⁹⁾ There has been no account, up till now, of Kraus's polemics against Kerr, Bahr or George. An accurate reconstruction of each of the polemics and its background is undertaken here, as a prerequisite for meaningful assessment, and to this end unpublished material is drawn upon extensively. Since the polemics vary considerably in form, content and scale, they are treated in different ways.

Kraus's debut against Bahr forms a point of contrast to his later, more literary methods. Therefore some additional literary evidence, independent of Kraus's, is presented, in order to show that there is a much closer connection between Bahr's style and his behaviour than is evident from Kraus's account; the literary issues of the eighteen-nineties and the ethical issues of 1900/01 are part of the same phenomenon, and the connection recurs in Bahr's behaviour in the First World War.

The Harden polemics are here shown to have been Kraus's coming of age as a polemicist - not only in being his personal repudiation of a former mentor, but as a synthesis of his criticisms of the press, the lawcourts and bourgeois ethics into the consistent vision of a cultural critic. For the first time he established in practice the relation of style to character. The ethical and stylistic questions are discussed both separately and together, in order to do justice to the unity of

Kraus's attack on his opponent's dualism.

His polemics against Kerr developed into the most involved literary feud of his career, and show how he fared against an opponent both aggressive and well versed in polemical tactics. Something of this clash of unevenly matched personalities is rendered by the greater emphasis on the details of the tactics employed in the polemics over twenty or more years.

The young Werfel was not merely in the forefront of literary fashion, but his personal reaction to Kraus was typical of his generation. Yet emphasis must be given to Kraus's change of attitude to him and its implications, since these polemics are significant less in themselves than for the crucial questions that they raise: whether his linguistic Weltanschauung was a viable basis not only for polemicizing, but for literary assessment. Here, particularly, it becomes clear that his view of character as reflected in style was rather rigid.

In the Werfel case, Kraus's polemical and satirical art only partly makes up for his critical shortcomings. In the late attack on George - on the unfamiliar ground of verse translation - he fell short of achieving the kind of artistic perfection that he was seeking to exemplify, and so weakened the case he made as a critic. These shortcomings were almost inevitable in view of his belief

in the absolute potential of the personality that is fully integrated in its work. To clarify the relevance of language and personality to polemics and judgement, Chapter One acts as a general, theoretical introduction.

Chapter One

LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY

i) Satire and polemic: artist and moralist

In distinguishing his satire from polemic in "Ein weitverbreitetes Missverständnis" (WF 11f), Kraus maintained that he did not "choose his targets" but reacted to stimuli ("Anlässe") with the relentless force of a fire consuming its fuel. While the moral impulse of the polemicist had to rise to the challenge of outside circumstances, the creative impulse of the artist generated its own energy. This Kraus tersely summarized:

Der Ethiker muss immer von neuem zur Welt kommen.
Der Künstler ein für allemal. (BWG 239).

In such antitheses Kraus tacitly favours the artistic, satirical response. Yet he was a polemicist and moralist as well as a satirical artist.

When he considered his own reactions to particular cases, therefore, as in the following comparison from "Der Fall Jacobsohn", he externalized what in the aphorism above is presented as a difference of temperament, into differences in the respective natures of the satirist's and polemicist's objects:

Aus Grossmann konnte ich Romanzen und Elegien schöpfen, denn er hat Saft; von dem winzigen Anlass, den er bietet, lässt sich gestaltlich etwas Gältiges, Bleibendes, in sich und durch alle Zeiten Verständliches abziehen, ohne Erdenrest einer Voraussetzung, des Sachverhaltes oder der Information. /--/ Wie anders Herr Siegfried Jacobsohn, der ein Einzelfall ist, ein Fall Jacobsohn, den es zwar immer wieder gibt,

aber immer von neuem [] (F.686,54)

A satire could be justified by the artistic validity of the typical, almost fictional figure it created; on the other hand, the polemic against an individual had to be explained and fully documented to be convincing. The attack had to be seen to be provoked by a major grievance, which was to be depicted as such. In order to be effectively combated, the polemicist's target had to be depicted accurately rather than imaginatively - "die Gestalt" had to be "mit der Person kongruent" (CM 194).

Neither the distinction between polemical and satirical responses, nor, indeed, that between the respective objects, was absolute. Polemic has a built-in tendency to become satire, as E.F. Timms notes:

"If the polemic is successful, there comes a point when the person under attack is so effectively deflated that polemical aggressiveness is no longer justified, so that if the figure is to be meaningfully treated any further, it has to be in the form of satirical elaboration. [] If, on the other hand, the polemic fails, there is a danger [] that the polemicist may withdraw into the 'literary' field of satire to win merely verbal victories over an opponent who has proved invincible in reality."¹⁾

The polemicist's target could not simply be overcome artistically, "once and for all", like the object of satire. The real or moral defeat of an opponent depended largely on the effective presentation of weighty incriminating evidence, or, traditionally, on a barrage of irrefutable slurs. Yet the dilemma of a sophisticated polemicist like Kraus, who was as much presenting his

case for the forum of posterity as seeking immediate effect, was that laborious documentation, as well as abuse, compromised the literary quality of the polemic. For this reason Kraus expressed his reluctance to treat "Der Fall Jacobsohn" polemically.

The distinctions were also blurred by the nature of one recurrent evil: the aura of magnitude which public taste could lend to a worthless nonentity. Paradoxically, as Kraus frequently claimed, a successful polemic could so shatter this illusion that in retrospect the treatment might appear too severe:

Polemik setzt das Format des schlechten Objekts voraus, sie enthüllt das Missverhältnis zwischen Geltung und Unbedeutung. (LL 269)

The major evils which provoked Kraus's literary polemics, however, were not purely matters of taste or opinion, but involved publicistic principles. The undue prestige of a mediocre writer was by itself a theme for the satirist; but fuller treatment was needed for venality or sensationalism in an influential writer or for any blatantly unethical manoeuvres by him in public. Kraus, the declared enemy of journalism and commercialism in art, not only exposed the discrepancy between a writer's reputation and quality, but categorically denied independent consideration of the literary quality of a writer whom he suspected of compromising artistic or intellectual ideals. However, it was intellectually more convincing than hurling unmitigated abuse or moralizing about corruption, to counter a writer's harmful influence with a destructive analysis of his style or methods. It was even more convincing to

juxtapose, in one composite character-study, the writer's ethical faults and literary quality: either to contrast his highbrow literary aspirations with its public manifestations, or to confirm the writer's literary and ethical worthlessness. As will be seen throughout this study, satirical elements have an important function within the framework of a polemic.

ii) Language and character

The main theme of Kraus's work was the relation of language to truth, of style to character. As early as 1903 he remarked:

Sprechen und Denken sind eins, und die Schmöcke
sprechen so korrupt, wie sie denken/[...]/ (Spr 21)

His first major two-pronged attack on a writer, against Harden in 1907, established his approach to the man through the style. In 1921 he admitted to a seemingly arbitrary, unjustifiable procedure:

[...] immerhin hat mir schon manchmal eine Zeile
genügt, die über einen irgendwo gesagt war, und wenn
ich dazu noch eine Zeile von ihm selbst zitiert fand,
so glaube ich mehr als genug getan zu haben, um mir
ein volles Bild der Persönlichkeit zu machen. (Spr 84)

He certainly did not aim to be fair to the other writer, as a literary critic would. Yet this is not a straightforward admission, for it stands in a satirical context, where it has the poetic licence of overstatement. Far from being as arbitrary as it claims, Kraus's satirical method was a complex and judicious process of selection and

literary stylization.

Die Fackel was a highly-charged corpus of values, precedents, analogies and cross-references, gradually accumulated from Kraus's practical experience - particularly of language. With that background and in that context Kraus had only to "quote one line..." It was frequently not in the satirist's interest to depict the process in detail, but all the more to present an indisputable "complete picture" of a writer as a fait accompli, as if granted magically, by the grace of Language.

Both the tactical function and the gradual evolution of the language equation have often been overlooked. It was not a simple formula that could be applied categorically to any style or any behaviour; it was not an equation of language and truth. The fact that Kraus's language criticism was not systematic has not been overlooked; but it has been misconstrued or dismissed by critics on the watch for theories.²⁾

The following aphorism of 1914 may at first appear to be a highly disputable inverted commonplace:

Ein Gedicht ist solange gut, bis man weiss, von wem es ist. (BWG 332)

As a casuistic appeal to subjective discretion, this seems to admit bias and uncertainty. Even once it is recognized that the third clause refers to a knowledge not merely of the author's identity but of his character - and by character Kraus meant moral worth - it contradicts the absolute claims of the satirical language

equation. Itself deceptively simplistic, it is a realistic admission of the deceptiveness of language at face value and of the complexity of literary evaluation. In isolation the word or phrase may be ambivalent, and only in a particular context does it gain (or lose) validity or vitality. Even the single work may remain ambivalent until placed in context by the voluntas auctoris. Yet this aphorism implies more, and is its own illustration. It only gains validity in certain contexts, and can only be discreetly applied by a qualified critic of language, like Kraus, whose particular identity and authority is concealed by the mask of universal validity ("man weiss"). In this light the aphorism is not a total denial but an ironic modification - for polemical purposes³⁾ - of the satirist's absolute language equation. The assumptions upon which the satirist worked had constantly to be reassessed and reasserted in polemical treatment of each special case that challenged them.

iii) Man and work

What the aphorism of 1914 merely hints at is the ethical perspective on art which Kraus's astringent moral idealism demanded. A work remained ambivalent until not only the author's attitude to it was known but his approach to his medium - language - and his literary and publicistic ethics. An attack based on such criteria can hardly count as literary criticism. From a purely literary viewpoint, the thesis that connects artistic stature with ethical integrity is an untenable hypothesis. In certain cases,

however, the connection forces itself upon us, and Kraus was skilled and determined enough to demonstrate the causal link in what to less severe critics might seem to be coincidences. A writer's attitude to language, as manifest in his style, could be shown to reflect his ethical attitude, as manifest in his conspicuous public positions or appearances.

To condemn a style in the light of its author's ethics was not, however, to suppose that the style itself had changed. It was a procedure justifiable only in particular polemical circumstances. It was a means of asserting that a purely aesthetic or literal approach to language was insufficient to guarantee the values which Kraus saw affirmed in the highest artistic creation.

Artistic self-fulfilment was Kraus's ethical exemplum; his ideal was not transcendental but inherent in individual integrity and harmony. It could only be realized by the exceptional artistic "Persönlichkeit", in his scrupulously self-critical, creatively unprejudiced approach to his medium.⁴⁾ Perfect self-fulfilment took the form of integration of the self in the work: so completely that there was no residue of the man outside his work.⁵⁾ This is the meaning of the aphorism:

Trauer und Scham sollten alle Pausen wahrer
Männlichkeit bedecken. Der Künstler hat ausserhalb
des Schaffens nur seine Nichtswürdigkeit zu erleben.
(BWG 321)

With a polemical bias, Kraus asserted:

Bei manchen Schriftstellern steht das Werk für die Persönlichkeit. Bei anderen steht die Person vor dem Werk. Man muss sie sich hinzudenken, ob man will oder nicht. [-] (BWG 129).

The ethical concomitant is more apparent in the reference to the negative counterpart, who so failed to realize himself artistically that he was a socially conspicuous "Person" outside his capacity as an artist. The ideal and its corollary - which can scarcely reflect empirical causality - provide a background to Kraus's rigorous rejection of intellectual compromise or of commercialism and publicity in the realm of art. Kraus's polemical aim, to expose the "Missverhältnis zwischen Geltung und Unbedeutung", was, therefore, the indirect affirmation of an ethical ideal of artistic unity.

Kraus did not merely criticize the discrepancy, but eliminated from himself such faults as he found in opponents. The aim of integration of self and work by way of self-criticism is, in the following passage from "Selbstbespiegelung", Kraus's answer to the reproach of vanity:

Sie können es nicht verstehen, dass, wer mit einer Sache verschmolzen ist, immer zur Sache spricht, und am meisten, wenn er von sich spricht. Sie können es nicht verstehen, dass, was sie Eitelkeit nennen, jene nie beruhigte Bescheidenheit ist, die sich am eigenen Masse misst und das Mass an sich, jener demütige Wille zur Steigerung, der sich dem unerbittlichsten Urteil unterwirft, welches stets sein eigenes ist. Eitel ist die Zufriedenheit, die nie zum Werk zurückkehrt. (CM 195f.)

Rigorous, untiring self-criticism is not a generally acknowledged absolute standard.⁶⁾ It is regarded as too subjective to be reliable. Yet this appeal to the exceptional case, to the "Selbstüberwinder" in himself, was meant as a radical alternative to bankrupt norms which had proved too general to guarantee individual responsibility. Through the medium of language, Kraus exercised the authority which this discipline gave him. While other polemicists might belittle an opponent or denounce an evil, Kraus combated the "Format des schlechten Objekts" by setting up against it the authority of his own example.

iv) Polemic as art

In an age where the ideals of liberal humanism were reduced by a capitalist press to hollow clichés, absolute values - if they were not to be denied altogether - could only be guaranteed by an exceptional individual achievement such as Kraus's.⁷⁾ It was not enough to denounce, for instance, the harm wrought by journalistic popularization of culture. A denunciation had to be distinguished from the hollow "opinion" that was its target, it had to be raised to the level of art. Polemic did not merely have the "built-in" literary tendencies to which Dr Timms refers; its literary quality was a stipulation of Kraus's idealism:

Ich bin nicht der Meinung, dass die Meinung in der Kunst genügt, glaube, dass das blosse Rechthaben gegen den Journalismus mit ihm identisch ist, und sage, dass jeder, der ernsthaft behauptet, dass Rudolf Lothar ein Übel sei, sich einer Verdoppelung des

Rudolf Lothar schuldig macht. Ich sage, dass Polemik vor jeder anderen Art von schriftlicher Äusserung durch Humor legitimiert sein muss, damit nicht die Null zum Übel werde, sondern das Übel nullifiziert sei. Polemik ist eine unbefugte Handlung, die ausnahmsweise durch Persönlichkeit zum Gebot wird. [---] Ich halte Polemik, die nicht Kunst ist, für eine Angelegenheit des schlechten gesellschaftlichen Tons, die dem schlechten Objekt Sympathien wirbt. (LL77)

The question of the relation of art and justice, which this raises, will be discussed at the end of the Chapter. Here it is worth examining Kraus's conception of art and "Persönlichkeit" in more detail.

In the draft of an explanatory letter of 1912 to Herwarth Walden,⁸⁾ his friend and editor of the periodical Der Sturm, against which the above declaration was about to be directed, Kraus explained that his mission was not to reform or educate people; art had not to persuade, but to exist in its own right, by its own power, as testimony to an exceptional ethical ideal:

Ich will den Leuten auch nichts abgewöhnen, sie nicht kunstpolitisch erziehen. Kunst hat da zu sein, zu ihr möchte ich keinem verhelfen, das möchte ich ihr nicht anthun.⁸⁾

"Kunst hat da zu sein" complements the appeal to the stature of "Persönlichkeit" as the justification of polemic.

v) The histrionic model

Kraus never concisely defined the term "Persönlichkeit", which particularly underlies his critical approach, and it has been ignored by critics.⁹⁾ He did not always use it in a specialized or ideal sense; indeed, it was

sometimes used with a negative attribute.

Kraus's model for "Persönlichkeit" in the positive sense was the unique actor - particularly the great "echte Bühnengötter" (UWM 348) whose presence on the stage of the old Burgtheater he experienced as a boy. What is striking is that he neither drew on his inspiration, nor set up the ideal of "Persönlichkeit", nor saw a connection between the theatre and the public sphere of politics (CM 98f), until 1908 - the time of the polemics against Harden, which first demonstrated his own strength as a literary polemicist.

In a number of aphorisms of January 1908 (F.241) Kraus used the word "Persönlichkeit". He contrasted Naturalistic actors, whose "naturalness" was the symptom of artistic deficiency, with the "natural" self-expression of "besondere Menschen" (BWG 99), who were so unique that their "humanity" was not obscured but enhanced by their stage roles. Again, this is significant more as a construct of Kraus's thought than as a comment on particular actors. He developed the contrast more fully as an ideal in "Denkmal eines Schauspielers" in January 1914.

At the end of this essay Kraus erected his own literary monument to the rich range of vocal characterization commanded by the great actors of the old Burgtheater, which lived on in his memory. The author's verbal communication was quite incidental to the actor's evocation of elemental passions. For this the text was merely the

stimulus, the spoken word was the medium. Far from undervaluing literary drama, Kraus sought to separate it from the theatre, to purify the word of the mimic and visual elements. This he attempted in his solo recitals, "Theater der Dichtung". As such, the histrionic model had a lasting influence on Kraus's style, his "geschriebene Schauspielkunst" (BWG 284). Indeed, his first-hand experience of Adolf Sonnenthal's rendering of Lear's indictment of Goneril - the impact of which is described in retrospect (UWM352) - must have provided a model situation for the polemicist, rightfully denouncing a traitor in public.

The vitality of such reminiscences¹⁰⁾ is the personal background to Kraus's conception of the timelessness of great artistic achievement. Generalizing his memory of the great actor he wrote:

Das Menschentum, das im durchschnittlichen Komödianten verschwindet, um im grossen Bühnenschöpfer wiederaufzuleben, und nicht anders als in jeder andern Formkraft, die eine Kunst bedeutet, es lebt als ein Beispiel fort [- -] (UMW 350) Dem in diesem Schauspieler ist [. . .] so viel Menschlichkeit, dass man erst hinterdrein gewahr wird, ihre Anlässe seien Rollen gewesen und die Träne sei über Schminke geflossen. (UWM 351)

The great artist appears in public purely as an artist.¹¹⁾

The great performance transcends the significance of the part. The highest art appears so natural¹²⁾ in its vitality as to become a permanent example of the highest humanity.¹³⁾ By "Formkraft" Kraus meant the intense first-

hand experience which could inspire the "personality" to give it its "natural" artistic form.

Far from being mere theatrical artificiality, the social conventions used by the noble court actor were the "Spielraum für die Kraft" (UWM 351) - just as, one might add, his parts were the "Anlässe" for him to give full form to his "humanity". So imbued with the substance of language was Kraus's thought that word associations not only provided a source of word-play, but often formed his arguments and ideas. "Die Zeit" is in German ambiguous, and Kraus's opposition to the "age" coincided not only with his laudatio temporis acti, but with the frequency in his criticism of the ideal of timelessness (or permanence guaranteed by memory) and of the frequent positive usage of such spatial terms as "Spielraum", "Sphäre", "Baumeister warst Du im Raum eines Daseins" (F.888,1). Indeed, Kraus's stylistic exploitation of patterns which counteract the straightforward linear "progress" of common logic may also be linked with this tendency.

vi) Private life and public persona

Kraus made no secret of the strong histrionic element in his style, and his public recitals naturally complemented it. Yet not until recently has a critic, Dr Timms, investigated in any detail the connection between this element and the "satirical monologue" in Die Fackel, and its implications for the traditional image of Kraus's

personality as a model of sincerity. Dr Timms suggests that the "Ich" of Die Fackel was a satirical persona not identical with the private individual Karl Kraus, and that the power of Kraus's word originated not from sincerity or from the "identity of man and work" which Kraus asserted, but from literary stylization.

To accept this important basis for re-evaluation, one need not, however, agree that the passions and extremes of the stylized persona "did not exist" to the same degree in the private individual.¹⁴⁾ Dr Timms, on the recorded evidence of eye-witnesses, refers to the mildness of the "real" Kraus's reaction on learning of ethical or stylistic transgressions and to his "calm, patient and reflective" method of writing. But these were not necessarily an indication of Kraus's state of mind. They were more likely deceptive outward appearances, concealing his real, deeply felt, moral anger at evil and his aesthetic pleasure in language. Indeed, Dr Timms' evidence contradicts not Kraus's claims to and demands for unity of man and work - as summarized in Section iii - but the general misinterpretation of them as simple pleas for sincerity. One may even take the evidence as proof of Kraus's success in integrating himself in his work, in sublimating such passions in his literary existence, to the point where the "private" Kraus became socially insignificant.

Nevertheless, Kraus himself gave contrary testimony on the subject of his method of working - and not only publicly, for he wrote to Sidonie Nadherny:

[--] Ich habe jetzt Arbeiten, in denen nichts als Vernichtung ist, in der grössten sinnlichen Hitze, als wärst Du dabei gestanden, verfasst.¹⁵⁾

On the other hand, he stylized part of that "private" experience to which Dr Timms refers as an example of what he concealed from his public - namely, his relations with Sidonie. He did so not only in published love poems but in letters to her. These show him to have been as uncompromising in love as he was in public life. For example, on 15th./16th. November 1919, during their first estrangement, Kraus wrote that - since he did not wish to be a spectator at his own tragedy, even less act the part of one - he preferred the "ruin of the past" (i.e. the memory of idyllic love) to any makeshift "construction" (i.e. mere friendship) proposed by her as a basis for reconciliation.¹⁶⁾ Not only does he use spatial terms to evoke temporal values, but he dramatizes the most intimate experience for the most intimate audience. In the same letter Kraus wrote:

Die Vergangenheit lässt sich nie von mir abweisen als Erlebtes und behauptet Tag und Nacht ihr Recht, dagewesen zu sein.¹⁶⁾

The terms in which Kraus here affirms unique erotic experience as permanently valid are almost identical to the invocation of his artistic imperative ("Kunst hat da zu sein")¹⁷⁾ and the assertion of the strong polemicist's authority (LL77) already quoted. In his work he made frequent allusions to his "erotic" experience of language. Occasionally he even testified to the formative influence

on his personality of erotic experience - as at the end of "Seine Antwort" (LL 137), where he referred to his love for Annie Kalmar, in words which are also echoed in his declaration to Sidonie.¹⁸⁾

In the formation of both "Persönlichkeit" and work, the same pattern of inspiration - through erotic, even chaotic¹⁹⁾ experience - can be detected. It is not to deny the differences between Kraus's persona in Die Fackel and the "private" Kraus, to assert, on the above evidence, that the stylization was not simply a deliberate selection of data for public consumption. It was a means of recreating his intensely felt experience - whether of love or language or of the "age" and its evils - in that most vital of media, his language. Selectivity was one means towards this higher end, whether used in polemic or confession.

To understand Kraus's work it is not important to know the details of his daily round. It suffices to remember that he isolated "private" from "public" life, and drew inspiration from this separation, which was fully consistent with his aim of self-fulfilment in his work. This much can be elicited from his works.

The "Sonntag" motif and the "Park" motif in Kraus's poetry, according to A. Disch,²⁰⁾ symbolize the isolated "Augenblicke, die ihn von der Obsession der Zeit befreien" and "der vom Zusammenhang der Katastrophe abgesonderte Bezirk, die unversehrte Schöpfung" respectively. As such, they are variations of a significant pattern in Kraus's life, art and criticism. The isolated moments, the

sanctuary of peace and love amid nature, are the poetic stylization of that "private" experience which Kraus guarded as his source of regeneration for campaigns against the "age". His militancy in public was inspired from this inner sanctum, this unpolluted oasis of "timelessness".²¹⁾

Kraus's stylization of his life corresponded to structural features in his work. Just as he did not simply attack polemical opponents, but pitted his whole moral and artistic stature against them and sought to raise his polemic to a superior level: his critical method is characterized by the principles of separation, isolation and contrast of values. Disch even sees a relation between the excerpt form of the aphorism and the "exceptional" ethic of the aphorist.²²⁾ In literary comparisons, Kraus would set an isolated, exceptional example up against all that he condemned as worthless. In textual appreciation or glossing, the single detail or isolated nuance could have such heightened significance that its quality could either transform or expose the whole context. For example, in the controversy over the "Irrenhauslyrik" ("Wort und Wert", Spr 424-435), Kraus distinguished the quality of two versions of a poem on the basis of one word. On a larger scale, as Disch has noted,²³⁾ the beauty of Brecht's idyllic poem from Mahagonny, "Die Liebenden" - which Kraus valued highly - is enhanced by the poignant awareness that the idyll is out of place in the brash "real" world of the play.

The same dualism of public and private, the same separation of a sphere of common intercourse from the innermost intimacy, recurs in Kraus's conception of language and of morality. In the essays collected in Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität and Die chinesische Mauer, he generally condemned the invasion of privacy by a vindictive justice, whose prying into sexual morals, beyond the sphere of legitimate intervention, merely deferred to prejudice and hypocrisy and threatened individual liberty. The same society which made scapegoats of sexual offenders freely exercised ethical and intellectual laxity in genuinely public matters. Kraus therefore counteracted this evil dualism by declaring the private sphere sacrosanct and asserting a ruthless ethical code for public life. He attacked all those who intruded on or publicly exploited private matters, but also those who let personal interests intrude on public ones.

It was no coincidence that his defence of exceptional sensual vitality against an obtrusive and prejudiced normality was accompanied by a more imaginative response to language. His "public" language satire gained authority from his more "intimate", intense experience of language in the "Mutterschoss der Sprache" (Spr 120).

vii) Language and originality

At first sight, Kraus's conception of language as a divining rod to tap the deeper resources of a "pre-established harmony", to seek a "verlorenes Urbild",

would seem to be Neo-Platonic. All ideas were potential in language. Yet his emphasis on the "erotic" experience of language also affirmed the active part of the sensitive user of language:

Die Sprache Mutter des Gedankens? Dieser kein Verdienst des Denkenden? O doch, er muss jene schwängern. (BWG 238)

Such erotic experience is attested in a style pregnant with associations and analogies between the act of love and the act of creation. The creative approach to language, as reverent as the lover's to his partner, was expressed as a paradoxical inversion of the "normal", "good command" of language:

[-] Ich lebe in einer Verbindung mit ihr, aus der ich Gedanken empfangen, und sie kann mit mir machen, was sie will. Ich pariere ihr aufs Wort. Denn aus dem Wort springt mir der junge Gedanke entgegen und formt rückwirkend die Sprache, die ihn schuf. [-] (BWG 134f.)

The "Sprachgedanke" existed as a concentrated symbiosis of form and content, word and idea.

This emphasis on creative activity attuned to the medium was a challenge to the exclusive preoccupation of aesthetes with form and of philistines with content and material - two extreme symptoms of cultural decay, which Kraus diagnosed in "Heine und die Folgen". In that essay Kraus developed his view of originality:

Der Gedanke ist in der Welt, aber man hat ihn nicht. Er ist durch das Prisma stofflichen Erlebens in Sprachelemente zerstreut, der Künstler schliesst sie zum Gedanken. (UWM 205)

The notion of creativity as a synthesis of elements already

existing in rudimentary form has been verified by the first-hand experience of such creative thinkers as Poincaré, Pasteur and Kepler, as recounted in Koestler's The act of creation.²⁴⁾ Sudden insights, the result of collaboration of conscious and unconscious mental processes, may often be in the form of analogy or metaphor, or might constitute the imaginative application of a familiar object or idea in a new context, the fruitful association of two commonplaces, the extension of an existing frame of reference.

So, too, in a vital poetic context was there room for what Kraus called the "altes Wort": the plain, even hackneyed, word, which, if revived and experienced imaginatively, could regain its original aura or be transformed into living matter, part of a vital tissue of associations and relations. Similarly, the value of rhyme and metre could be determined not by formal convention alone, only by their significant function in a context.²⁵⁾ Imaginatively experienced, language was a complex medium which thrived on slight irregularities and tensions. It was not merely a quantity of words, but a "creative element", "das nicht allein im Wort, sondern auch zwischen den Worten lebendig ist" (Spr 413). It was not the mere garb of opinion, but inseparable from the idea as skin from the body; or it was a self-contained natural environment, in which words lived and breathed.

The organic quality of context was fundamental to Kraus's view of originality. His affirmation of the uniqueness and unity of the living context of language accounts for his rejection of extra-linguistic aesthetic

form. This literary policy is comparable to his affirmation of the total impact of an actor's personality or of women "die wie ein Blitz in die erotische Phantasie einschlagen" (BWG 23). In the aphorism from which this is quoted, Kraus contrasted such "total" erotic experience with the aesthete's isolation of the supposed attributes of beauty. Similarly, it was misguided to seek artistic beauty in language by cultivating rare or beautiful words, by removing blemishes or irregularities, by excluding supposed banality. The beauty and the vitality lay precisely in the total effect of interacting elements.

Significantly, Kraus's conception of originality differs from Koestler's findings in his attribution of moral integrity to the active creator:

Der Gedanke ist ein Gefundenes, ein Wiedergefundenes.
Und wer ihn sucht, ist ein ehrlicher Finder, ihm
gehört er, auch wenn ihn vor ihm schon ein anderer
gefunden hätte. (UWM 205f.)

Originality depended on the quality of the act of synthesis and transformation, not on the novelty of the material or even on chronological precedent. The intensity and profundity of experience on the way of discovery and the integrity of the seeker guaranteed to the act that timelessness against which questions of precedent and innovation became meaningless - just as erotic experience could have permanent validity as a "Formkraft". The contrast of the finished product with "original" personal commitment to seeking and finding is more explicit in an

earlier version of the aphorism on the "ehrlicher Finder", which continued:

[-] Da erkannte ich, dass es nur auf den Weg ankomme und nicht auf das Ziel. [-] (F.259,55)

This contrast of "Weg" and "Ziel" also anticipated the poem "Zwei Läufer" (BWG 283). The implication of the poem is that there is no natural end to the earnest quest. The man "vom Ursprung" dies on the path, yet in his incessant, self-critical struggle remains true to the "Ursprung".⁴⁾

Disch²⁶⁾ equates "Ursprung" with "Schöpfung" as the antonym of "Untergang". In taking it as a timeless absolute, a temps perdu beyond history, he fails to relate it to the other key concept, "Persönlichkeit". For "Ursprung" was not a transcendental absolute, but latent at the innermost core of being. It may be lost in time - hence Kraus's laudatio temporis acti - but its values (or traces of them) could still be salvaged by the exceptional personality. This also accounts for why the act of reminiscing had positive value for Kraus. "Ursprung" was a personal mystical concept, symbolizing the source of creation, originality, integrity, nature and language - all that Kraus's separation of "private" from "public" implied. Its antonym, "Ziel", summed up the aspiration to arbitrarily set aims outside oneself - an aspiration that was, paradoxically, complacent, because unself-critical. It thus included aesthetic cultivation of form alone, materialistic acquisitiveness and preoccupation with content alone. Concern with the end rather than the means

reduced individual moral freedom and dignity. The criterion was qualitative; the value was not simply in measurable achievement, but in the rightness of the individual's starting-point, in his being true to it in his concentration and dedication - in fact, in that "nie beruhigte Bescheidenheit" and "jener demütige Wille zur Steigerung" which Kraus invoked to justify his own activity.

The same principle of tireless, ruthlessly self-regulating creative energy determined Kraus's rejection of aesthetic conventions and formalist innovations in literature - hence his opposition to literary fashions and formulae. It accounted for the potentially unending "Langatmigkeit" of his works. His literary principles were embodied in his organic style, an arterial system which carried the life-blood of his literary persona. He acknowledged no formal principle in his or others' prose over and above those inherent in the language itself, such as syntactical structure and word-association. As Dr Timms notes,²⁷⁾ monologue satire is the most rhetorical of forms. Yet Kraus's rhetoric was no hollow virtuosity; it was the natural formal expression of strong convictions. Kraus never discussed his style as rhetoric, which would no doubt have implied something too mechanical for his scheme.²⁸⁾

Just as he disdained the attempts of aesthetes to isolate beauty, so also he disdained the attempts of literally minded journalists to quote his witticisms out of

context:

[-] Sie glauben Proben eines Organismus liefern zu können. Um zu zeigen, dass ein Weib schön ist, schneiden sie ihm die Augen aus. Um zu zeigen, dass mein Haus wohnlich ist, setzen sie meinen Balkon auf ihr Trottoir. (BWG 245)

Since Kraus's style was so organically "langatmig" and gained its vitality from the dynamic interaction of words in context, the quotation of a passage - without a necessarily lengthy explanation or evocation of this context - amounted to amputation from an organism. The result of transplanting it to a literal context, which was devoid of the vitality of the original, was atrophy. Through such arguments Kraus exerts an authority that makes the reverent follower despair of legitimately criticizing or quoting him.²⁹⁾ Yet they were not simply tactical assertions, but the necessary defence of a style that was more integrated and close-knit than others and that derived its power from the development of Sprachlogik over long, inter-connected periods. The arguments only become problematic where they form the basis of an absolute differentiation between apparently similar actions:

Ein Journalist oder ein Redner beschwert sich darüber, dass man ihm Stellen "aus dem Zusammenhang reisst". Seine Meinung leidet [-] Er selbst hat aber keine Ahnung davon, was er am Stil verbrechen kann, wenn er die Meinung korrekt von ihm abzieht. [-] er reisst nicht "aus dem Zusammenhang", sondern aus der Sphäre. Ein Aphorismus, den er zitiert, kann wertlos im Nachdruck sein: sein Wert ist im Buch, dem er entnommen wurde. (UWM 113)

This absolute distinction between literal context and a highly charged "sphere" raises the question of Kraus's critical authority, which can only be decided on the merits of the case. Again, to justify his sacrificing of another's "opinion" to the greater glory of his satirical art - which often meant no more than transplanting it to the "sphere"³⁰⁾ - was simply the absolute prerogative of satire, poetic licence. But the polemicist had to substantiate any qualitative distinction by example, if it was to be anything more than a formula.³¹⁾

viii) Dualism and inconsistency

It was entirely in keeping with Kraus's adherence to "Ursprung" as an ideal, that he did not write for a public, but against an opponent in public. As he himself declared as early as his "Bekenntnisse" of 1905 (F.185,1ff.), he was unique among publicists in consciously flouting the demands of the public, for whose taste and for whose desire for information he had utter contempt. He deplored being importuned by its ignorance and arrogance; he equally resented his work being misconstrued as a collection of jokes, or its titillation of philistine curiosity and Schadenfreude with regard to his "Anlässe". To counteract the reduction of his "Sprachgedanken" to "Meinung", he asserted the aesthetic quality of his work.

Yet this emphasis, too, contained dangers. His virtuosity might merely dazzle the reader and preclude an independent moral response, until, on reflection, the reader

might become sceptical. Successive rapturous admiration and disillusionment was precisely the effect that Kraus had on the Expressionist generation. That this was necessarily connected with his positive qualities as the exemplary "Persönlichkeit", is confirmed by the dualism even in that ideal. However near he came to synthesizing his work and his personality, his artistic ethic remained a composite personal construct. Not only was the unity of man and work based on a dualism between private and public, positive ideals and negative polemics; the dependence on the self in its alliance with language, as sole authority, engendered a further discrepancy - between intention and effect. The histrionic model did not allow for an independent public response. Kraus noted not merely the "Missverhältnis zwischen Geltung und Unbedeutung" in his opponents, but between the genuine "Wesen", the integrity of the "Persönlichkeit", and its sensational side effects which impressed the public (BWG 73f.). Kraus was aware of his short-lived impact as a public performer, and demanded that his audience consolidate the impression by private reading. Yet the discrepancy was endemic in his written work itself.

Uncompromising though he was, his value judgements were bound to appear arbitrary, especially where the distinction between his own artistic or ethical example and what he criticized seemed only to depend on his definition of it. For example, if his aphorisms were "Wortkunst" and

to take them literally was to misconstrue them, Kraus's publication of them exposed them to such misconstruction and was inconsistent with the following categorical statement:

Kunstwerke sind überflüssig. Es ist zwar notwendig,
sie zu schaffen, aber nicht, sie zu zeigen. Wer
Kunst in sich hat, braucht den fremden Anlass nicht.
Wer sie nicht hat, sieht nur den Anlass. [---] (BWG 93)

Far from making concessions to avoid misunderstandings, Kraus modified his work only on artistic grounds. His inconsistency in publishing his "superfluous" works of art would at best suggest that after all, he hoped for more than an aesthetic effect. Yet the more polished formulation could mean a sacrifice of the original experience. For example:

Der Gedanke ist ein Liebesakt. Die Meinung ist bloss
das Kind. Vom Standpunkt der Vermehrung ist sie ja
wichtiger. (F.266,21)

This later became:

Der Gedanke ist ein Kind der Liebe. Die Meinung ist
in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft anerkannt. (BWG 112)

The latter is undoubtedly the more original formulation and more consistent metaphor, but it forfeits the clear distinction between "act" and product. The adoption of "child" as a metaphor for "Gedanke" could be taken as Kraus's tacit admission that, if the original "conception" was no longer witnessed, all that distinguished his brain-children from mere "opinions" was his name for them. They were no longer so visibly different from "opinions" as the erotic act of thought was. This narrowing of the absolute distinctions between positive and negative, which

he still asserted, increases the impression of arbitrariness - but it also gives him exclusive authority, as arbiter of nuances, to infer the authenticity of the child's birth from its quality. His outspoken claim to natural parentage did not, however, prevent society from accepting his aphorisms as opinions.

A more open admission is the following:

[- -] Ein Witz, der als die naturnotwendige Äusserung eines Zorns entstanden ist, hat manchmal das Unglück, so locker zu sitzen, dass ihn jeder Lämmel abreißen kann, der vorübergeht. Die Blüte lässt sich pflücken und welkt rasch [- -] (BWG 115)

This suggests that the more artistically polished, the more "witty" and generalized the formulation of an experience, the easier it could be detached from the original context which gave it its validity. Misquotation, then, was not entirely the fault of the borrower, and Kraus used the same observation - of what he here excuses as "unfortunate" - to discredit Heine as a satirist (UWM 207ff.).

His more polished aphorisms could appear to be mere technical exercises. His polemical skill could be seen, by Kerr and Werfel, for example, as a mere rhetorical trick.³²⁾ According to G. Neumann,³³⁾ his paradoxes were the inversion of commonplaces. Yet Kraus had already answered these criticisms, in accordance with his casuistic view of originality and critical authority:

Eine Antithese sieht bloss wie eine mechanische Umdrehung aus. Aber welcher Inhalt von Erleben, Erleiden, Erkennen muss erworben sein, bis man ein Wort umdrehen darf! (BWG 164)

This entirely leaves open the question of whether the genuine experience was best expressed in these apparently mechanical inversions. Perhaps his attempt to recreate his "Wonne der Spracherlebnisse" stylistically - in complex, dynamic figures on which the reader's mind could not rest complacently - was as impracticable, ultimately, as Rilke's attempt to re-form perception in his poetry. If Kraus himself fell short of the artistic ethic to which he aspired, his authority to condemn the imperfections of others becomes questionable, even where individual criticisms are valid. The discrepancy between language and character, between artistic and moral values, about which Kraus polemicized, would have been sufficient to make anyone else abandon language as an absolute authority.

Max Frisch³⁴⁾ has commented that the aphorism, that is, language alone, contains no safeguards against its abuse. He does so in terms which summarize the aspects of Kraus's style discussed in this and the preceding section. It merely "short-circuits" a process that has "no natural end". It is merely an "end-product" of experience, merely the "visible blossom" of a plant pruned of its roots. Frisch's positive alternative, which could provide the "roots, earth, manure" of experience, is narration - the medium which the "Wortkünstler" Kraus disdained for its stylistically superfluous "Bericht" and "Psychologie" (Spr 208). Some aphorisms, Frisch continues, are valid

statements of experience only if replaced in their original context. Significantly, Frisch refers to "Erfahrung", implying resignation and wisdom, rather than the vitalistic inspiration of "Erlebnis", favoured by Kraus:

"Der Aphorismus gibt keine Erfahrung. Er entspringt wohl aus einer Erfahrung, die er ins Allgemeine überwinden möchte; der Leser aber, der bei der Erfahrung nicht dabei war, vernimmt nur dieses Allgemeine, das sich für gültig erklärt, und obschon man nun meinen könnte, gerade das Allgemeine ginge also jeden an, zeigt es sich, dass der Leser, will er mehr als einen Kitzel haben, es seinerseits wieder auf ganz bestimmte Fälle und Personen bezieht [7.7]"³⁴⁾

This criticism is not typical of the philistine obsession with "Stoff" which Kraus condemned. As a check on the aesthetic one-sidedness of language criticism, it is born of a similar experience of disharmony to that which induced Kraus, in the name of art or language, to draw on more than aesthetic or linguistic criteria in polemics. It calls into question the very ideal which inspired his activity. Yet his reaction to the disharmony was not to lose faith in language but to assert with more subtle casuistry the need for it where there was no harmony a priori. His ideals were hypotheses which only "worked" in practice. Disputable in themselves, they were the basis of some justifiable polemic.

ix) Practical justification

Kraus's differentiation between the "organic" quality of his style and the merely literal context of a journalist,

quoted in Section vii, was a variation of a time-honoured rhetorical formula³¹⁾ for belittling opponents' works and discounting as distortion their criticisms of one's own. It was also aimed to disqualify any third party from passing unfavourable comment. The absolute powers vested in Kraus's "Persönlichkeit" were so designed as to turn his invincibility into infallibility, however subjective his criticism, whatever the motivation. To claim moral authority on the basis of artistic stature is unacceptable in principle, but it could be demonstrated and even justified in polemical practice.

As Kraus said, in exceptional circumstances the "unbefugte Handlung" could become an imperative (LL 77); then, he claimed, a certain kind of prejudice was "über die Zweifel des Rechts erhaben" (BWG 161); then, if one polemicist had "die Macht, Recht zu haben", his opponent could not have "das Recht, Recht zu haben" (BWG 251). Such excessive claims are utterly relevant and legitimate in a polemical situation. For though it was often open to doubt whether Kraus was initially justified in launching an attack, if his opponent reacted it almost invariably proved Kraus's moral or literary point, as well as his superiority:

Die Art, wie sich die Leute gegen mich wehren, beweist so sehr die Berechtigung meines Angriffs, dass ich immer bedaure, die Abwehr nicht vorher gekannt zu haben, weil ich sie sonst als stärkstes Motiv in den Angriff einbezogen hätte. [- -] (BWG 206)

This makes it difficult to assess fairly the proportion between moral justification and literary virtuosity in

his polemics. Indeed, since for Kraus the one ideally implied the other, the difference may seem to be a matter of indifference. In order to question the substance of Kraus's verdicts, one is often forced into the trap of having to strip the "content" of its form; and this, according to Kraus, would produce an arbitrary misconstruction. To avoid such a literal approach, on the other hand, one would have to confine oneself to testing whether, in all cases, he did have "die Macht, Recht zu haben".

The present detailed study of his polemical practice bears directly on this problem, since the question of justification cannot be settled theoretically. It can help to illuminate how, in individual contexts, Kraus's subjective, ultimately impracticable idealism could gain absolute authority and serve as its own weapon. To show how this was possible, it is, after all, necessary to separate the ethical cause from the literary treatment, to examine both "Sprache" and "Sache". Yet this is not necessarily a violation of his work and intention, so long as it is acknowledged that one is, in the process, suspending the laws by which his literary verdicts existed at all - incorporated as they were into his own literary context; and so long as "Sprache" and "Sache", having once been identified, are viewed together, in context again. To do this might do less serious violation to the inherent unity than an uncritical reverence for the latter might do, in conveying no more than "opinion" or technical virtuosity.

Chapter Two

H E R M A N N B A H R

I

"DECADENCE" AND NATURALISM

1) "Überwindung des Naturalismus"

Hermann Bahr, born in Linz in 1863, was the leading avant-garde literary, art and theatre critic in fin de siècle Vienna. Right from his turbulent student days, he was prone to making outspoken proclamations and to rapidly changing allegiance, and he continued to do so, in a somewhat modified manner, after his move to Berlin in 1884. His first play, Die neuen Menschen, a social problem play, earned him the recognition of the Berlin Naturalists, whose enthusiasm for Zola and Ibsen he shared.

Yet even his appreciation of Ibsen in 1887¹⁾ showed critical insight into the conflict between the form and content of Ibsen's plays. Such discrepancies suggested to Bahr that Ibsen had merely prepared the way for the synthesis of Naturalism and Romanticism, which was "die gegenwärtige Aufgabe der Litteratur". Similarly, in his essay on Zola (1889),²⁾ he disputed the connection between characterization and theory and defied the dogma of German Naturalism by emphasizing the artistic quality of Zola's depiction of milieu and of his style.

In his epoch-making essays around 1890 Bahr demonstrated greater mental agility, aesthetic sensibility and erudition than his German counterparts. His decisive influences were French, especially after the stimulus of visits to Paris in 1888 and 1889. Soon after his return to Berlin in May 1890,³⁾ Bahr began his campaign "Die

"Überwindung des Naturalismus".

During 1890 he collaborated on the periodical Freie Bühne, but after his break with Otto Brahm, the failure of his Die neuen Menschen at its stormy première in January 1891 and the controversy over his new play Die Mutter (1891), Bahr turned his back on Berlin. He visited St. Petersburg with the actors Emil Reicher and Josef Kainz. Here he gained decisive impressions of the theatre and was the first Central European critic to discover Eleonore Duse, who was then invited to Vienna.⁴⁾

Bahr returned to Vienna at that time, soon after a banquet given for Ibsen in April 1891⁵⁾ had demonstrated the existence of an Austrian avant-garde. Impetus had been given to this movement by E. M. Kafka's periodical Moderne Dichtung, the initial manifesto for which had been written by Bahr in January 1890,⁶⁾ and which continued as Moderne Rundschau throughout 1891. As herald of "die Moderne" and particularly inspired by Bourget, Huysmans and Barrès, he cultivated and advocated a new, impressionistic style that would capture psychological nuances as vividly as the Naturalists depicted external milieu. By 1892, Bahr was acclaiming the later Ibsen as "der Symbolist, der allen Naturalismus überwunden hat".⁷⁾ In the same year, he pioneered the performance of Maeterlinck's L'Intruse. He soon became leader of Jung-Wien, the literary circle which included Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal and Beer-Hoffmann, and which met in the Café Griensteidl.

Moderne Rundschau contained Hofmannsthal's review of Die Mutter.⁸⁾ He described how Bahr, though continually cultivating, discovering and staging himself, in every mood, in every setting, was never the same from one work to the next. Alluding to the

author of Die Mutter, Hofmannsthal concluded: "Glaubt er denn an sein Gestern selber noch?"⁸⁾

Hofmannsthal saw the problem of identity between past and present selves as characteristic of the constantly evolving modern sensibility. The restless search for, and subtle analysis of, every nuance of experience paradoxically removed the individual from spontaneous involvement into a complex aestheticism which sapped his vitality. Hofmannsthal illustrated this in his comparison of d'Annunzio's Roman Elegies with Goethe's, in 1893, where he summarized the modern dualism as follows:

"Heute scheinen zwei Dinge modern zu sein: die Analyse des Lebens und die Flucht aus dem Leben. Gering ist die Freude an Handlung, am Zusammenspiel der äusseren und inneren Lebensmächte, am Wilhelm-Meisterlichen Lebenlernen und am Shakespeareschen Weltlauf. Man treibt Anatomie des eigenen Seelenlebens, oder man träumt. Reflexion oder Phantasie, Spiegelbild oder Traumbild. Modern sind alte Möbel und junge Nervositäten. Modern ist das psychologische Graswachsenhören und das Plätschern in der reinphantastischen Wunderwelt. Modern ist Paul Bourget und Buddha, das Zerschneiden von Atomen und das Ballspielen mit dem All; modern ist die Zergliederung einer Laune, eines Seufzers, eines Skrupels; und modern ist die instinktmässige, fast somnambule Hingabe an jede Offenbarung des Schönen, an einen Farbenakkord, eine funkelnde Metapher, eine wundervolle Allegorie."⁹⁾

This summarizes the many-faceted aestheticism first proclaimed by Bahr, in Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, as "eine nervöse Romantik", "eine Mystik der Nerven".¹⁰⁾ These phrases show that Bahr's allegiance was not strictly to Symbolism, but to the décadents, for whom the world was "ein Gefüge komplexer und bloss physiologisch bestimmter Sinnesempfindungen" and the

artist "ein Vermittler von sensations".¹¹⁾ For instance, in his essay on Buddhism¹²⁾ - which he called the "religion of décadence" because it marked a trend away from rationalism and the will - Bahr quoted Bourget's maxim: "Il faut sentir le plus possible en analysant le plus possible". This sentiment was reiterated by Andrea in Hofmannsthal's Gestern.

ii) Kraus and Naturalism

Kraus's first contribution to M. G. Conrad's Die Gesellschaft, in June 1892, was an enthusiastic book-review of Gestern.¹³⁾ In this, Kraus referred to Hofmannsthal's critique of Die Mutter and called Bahr "der echteste Andrea der Litteratur". Kraus's first view of Bahr, then, seems to have been influenced by Hofmannsthal. But Bahr's restless changeability, depicted ironically by Hofmannsthal, was to be rejected outright by Kraus.

Kraus called Gestern a brilliant example of a Naturalism not yet "überwunden", as Bahr would have. This arbitrary interpretation of the play, as H. Arntzen emphasizes,¹⁴⁾ reflected Kraus's own demand for activism and bold social comment. It was his first public affirmation of the socially and culturally militant Naturalism of Conrad's periodical, which attacked false conventions, philistine hypocrisy, the trivialization of literature by journalism, and, in accordance with a realistic attitude to life, resolved to make truth and sincerity literary criteria.¹⁵⁾

Kraus identified with Conrad's ideals, and also with his antipathy to Bahr's "charlatanism", which seems to have been the target of Conrad's attack, in June 1892, on the latest "-isms". The vulgarity of Conrad's jibe at purveyors of "die virtuose Nervenkunst", in their "fin de siècle chapels and brothels", "mit ihrem Ismus-

Schwänzchen wedelnd",¹⁶⁾ seems to have set the tone for Kraus's attack on Bahr in Die Gesellschaft in 1893.

Conrad's ideal figure was the committed poet:

"[.] der gesunde, schlichte, weise Mann, der männliche Mann, der Zeuge der grossen Natur, der Herz- und Nierenprüfer der Gesellschaft, der Maskenabreisser der stolzierenden Gemeinheit, der Tröster und Mutmacher der Armen und Gedrückten, der holde Freund und Labsalspender einer neuen Menschheit."¹⁶⁾

This is more explicit a confrontation of "charlatanism" with integrity than Kraus's later reactions to the "Format des schlechten Objekts". Yet it does indicate the influence that Naturalists like Conrad and Bleibtreu had on Kraus. Very common in their manifestos - and in the early Kraus - was the substitution of emotive, ethical (or even biological) criteria, like "gesund", "männlich", "wahr", "echt", "ehrlich", for aesthetic verdicts. Thus Kraus called the performance of Die Weber, at the Freie Bühne in Berlin in February 1893, "ein ehrlicher Erfolg",¹⁷⁾ and referred to the "dichtenden Hungerleider Deutschlands, die es mit ihrer männlichen Kunst und ihren gesunden Idealen ehrlich meinen".¹⁸⁾ Even as his literary taste became more refined, Kraus retained "virility" and its antonym in his critical terminology.

iii) The polemics of 1892/93

Max Burckhard, who in 1890 had assumed Directorship of the new Burgtheater on the Ringstrasse, had been responsible for staging not only Ibsen there, but also Hauptmann's Einsame Menschen and Kollege Crampton. He had met with criticism, particularly from conservative quarters. Ludwig Speidel, for instance, lamenting the disappearance of the old court theatre and its style, had

suggested the new house be abandoned. Bahr had opposed this, urging the Company to adapt its traditional style and repertoire to its new surroundings.¹⁹⁾ In his theatre reviews for the Viennese daily Die Deutsche Zeitung, which he joined in the autumn of 1892, therefore, he continued to support Burckhard's innovations.

To this newspaper, it seemed that even the Berlin press was campaigning against the Burgtheater and its new director.²⁰⁾ In November 1892, Burckhard had accepted Ludwig Fulda's play Der Talisman, but on hearing that Fulda wanted the Vienna première to follow the one at Berlin's Deutsches Theater, Burckhard took offence and turned down the play altogether. The Deutsche Zeitung published the correspondence, with its own vote of thanks to the Director for rebuffing the "presumption of preferring a commercial theatre in Berlin to the first and foremost German stage".²¹⁾ Bahr's comment on the affair, on 20th January 1893, was a sarcastic insinuation that the Berlin literary "clique", who were demanding a German boycott of the Burgtheater, themselves really depended on Vienna:

"Herr Fulda, der in Wien erst für die ausserkaiserhofische Welt entdeckt worden ist, ganz wie Herr Hauptmann von Direktor Burckhard aus den Coulissen der 'Freien Bühne' in das helle Licht des ersten deutschen Theaters gezogen wurde, wird sicherlich selber der erste sein, der mit seinem nächsten Stücke wieder betteln kommt. [---]"²²⁾

This attack was part of Bahr's own campaign against Naturalism.

Even though Kraus was critical of Fulda's plays,²³⁾ and though he had also welcomed Burckhard's innovations,²⁴⁾ he now objected to the brusqueness of the refusal. Bahr's claim that Burckhard was the author of not only Fulda's but Hauptmann's fame, provoked the most indignant reaction from Kraus:

Diese Kühnheit ist ohnegleichen! ~~[-]~~ Jetzt kommt so ein verdrehter, kreuznährischer Französling, der halt so gern in Paris geboren sein möchte, aber trotz alledem nur aus Linz ist, so eine parfümierte Halbweltsdame daher und schreit der Welt in die Ohren: Was wäre denn dieser Herr Hauptmann, wenn der Burckhard nicht wäre?

This appeared in the polemic "Zur Überwindung des Hermann Bahr", in Die Gesellschaft in May 1893.²⁵⁾ Kraus was incensed at Bahr's sneer at his literary hero Hauptmann, especially as it was accompanied by the recommendation to Burckhard of Austrian talents whom Kraus felt to be inferior to the "dichtende Hungerleider Deutschlands". He was particularly angered by Bahr's "Herr Hauptmann", to which he retaliated with "Halbweltsdame". One aspect of Bahr's "perversity" was his denial of Hauptmann's impact on stage.²⁶⁾ In 1913, Kraus contrasted Bahr's tribute to the established Hauptmann with his arrogance and disrespect towards the gifted newcomer of 1893. It was this, Kraus said, that had justified his own attack on Bahr, which he retrospectively admitted to have been childish and disrespectful (F.363,58).

Kraus's outburst far exceeded the bounds of literary retaliation. It was an attempt to expose the spuriousness of Bahr's diverse activities. Bahr, the avant-garde literary critic, had departed from purely aesthetic arguments against Naturalism to participate in press feuds. Such an occasion somewhat justifies Kraus's highlighting his less celebrated, journalistic activities independent of the affair, such as his interviewing,²⁷⁾ his publicizing of protégés like the painter Ferry Beraton, or his uninformed small-talk about bald waiters, which "appeared weekly" under the pseudonym Mepherl.²⁸⁾

Kraus quoted not only Bahr but his admirers - for example, what he considered to be an unctuous tribute by Felix Hollaender,²⁹⁾ describing the various "phases" of Bahr's development, just as Bahr had

traced the latest phases in art. In fact, Hollaender's article is not uncritical, but goes too far in regarding Bahr's Dora as nearing perfection. This Novelle is very light-weight, all too obviously a technical experiment in short, simple sentences. Kraus strongly begged to differ about Bahr's "Dora-Schmarrn",³⁰⁾ and yet his polemical reaction was even stronger; a denigrating summary of Bahr's most recent "phase" - Bahr, the hack:

Bahr - der Tagschreiber, der als Litterat überhaupt nicht mehr ernst zu nehmen ist, der im Dienste eines Tagesblattes kritzeln muss, was ihm zum Kritzeln gegeben wird, Bahr, der nur so von oben herab von "denen draussen" spricht, wie wenn er selbst nie in der Bewegung gestanden hätte, Bahr, der "anständige Mensch", der allwöchentlich sein Huhn im Topfe der "Deutschen Zeitung" hat, der brave, lammfromme Philister, Bahr, der diensteifrige Reporter und Scheininterviewer, [···] der die Berliner, Pariser, Londoner, Madrider Theaterkorrespondenzen macht, ohne seinen Stil verstellen zu können, der allsonntäglich unter der Chiffre "Mepherl" den heillossten Blödsinn zusammenquarkt [···]³¹⁾ Ich wenigstens empfinde ihn als wunderliche Kombination von heimlichen Nerven und unheimlicher Arroganz.³²⁾

In this polemic, as later, Kraus turned his opponent's catch-phrases against him. The phrase "heimliche Nerven" is robbed of its esoteric pretensions by the pun with the colloquial "unheimlicher Arroganz". The repetition of Bahr's name, like a magic formula to invoke his dubious talents, parodies a similar anaphora in Bahr's rhapsodic tribute to Bourget in "Krisis des Naturalismus":

"[···] Bourget, [···] der unermüdliche Jäger nach sensations

nouvelles, von dem gilt, was er einmal von Stendhal gerühmt hat [...] Bourget, der rastlose Spürer alles Besonderen und Unvergleichlichen in unseren Empfindungen [...] Bourget, das eigentliche philosophische Gewissen dieser fin de siècle [...]"³³⁾

Kraus did not quote the model for his parody, as he did in his later Sprachglossen. The gloss "Brahm, Kleist, Bahr und Ich" (F.336,22), for example, was also occasioned by Bahr's elaborations on a famous name. But there Kraus's critical parody consists of a mimic confrontation of text and "criticism". The gloss is economically constructed from two paragraphs of Bahr's text, beginning "Brahm-ein echt märkischer Mensch", to which, as a third paragraph in larger print, Kraus attaches his parodistic note, beginning "Bahr-ein echter Linzer".

Rhetorically not as sophisticated as his equally vehement later polemics, Kraus's outburst in 1893 followed time-honoured polemical practice in presenting a homogeneous negative image of the opponent, unrelieved by positive qualities. Hence he did not attempt to take Bahr's literary efforts seriously, but merely poured scorn on the results. His denunciation was so directly abusive that it even shocked his own friends and allies in Berlin. Thus, Liliencron³⁴⁾ objected to its "grober Ton", Holz disapproved, and Dehmel, almost implacably angered at such effrontery towards a fellow modernist, criticized Kraus's "pharisäischer Ton"³⁵⁾ and ascribed Bahr's spiritual bankruptcy not to weakness of character but to "Berufsmisere".³⁶⁾ Kraus, however, already adamantly refused to compromise his convictions for any professional bonhomie.

iv) "Décadence" and "Jung-Wien"

In his review of Gestern, Kraus naively equated the terms "naturalistic", "natural" and "genuine". He also revealed his incomprehension of Bahr's objections to the lack of "psychology" in Naturalism, by declaring that it was the fine psychological insight which made Gestern naturalistic -

[...] eine psychologische Studie, die den Dichter vielleicht zufällig zu dramatischer Form, zu Vers und Reim führte.¹³⁾

At this early stage, Kraus's assertion that the form could be incidental was not a criticism - as it later was of Heine - but an indication of his indifference to genres, art styles and "-isms". Regardless of these extra-linguistic aesthetic forms, art had to be "natural". This was quite specifically a matter of style, in the detailed, linguistic sense:

Vers und Reim von Meisterhand behandelt, keine Zeile, die gemacht klingen würde, kein Reim, der den Dichter Schweiss gekostet haben mag. Die Sprache, so schön, so edel, so natürlich-ungezwungen, wie auf das Kolorit der Scenerie gestimmt, so klassisch-ruhig.¹³⁾

The language was not at all coincidental; and yet what was a highly artistic style seemed natural and graceful. This may characterize Hofmannsthal's early verse-however inappropriate the term "naturalistic" - but it also anticipates Kraus's own organic conception of language and of the "natural" artistic personality. His repeated admiration for Hofmannsthal's "kostbare Gedankensplitter" and "Gedankenperle" also reveals an alertness to nuances of formulation, which was later to inform his satires and linguistic criticism and to inspire his own

aphoristic creation.

In this light, Kraus's growing objections to the exotic conceits of the Viennese décadents may be better appreciated. Although, therefore, it was exaggerated to link the pretentiousness of Bahr's French cult with his self-consciousness as a provincial, as Kraus did, his reproach that Bahr's literary influence was harmful needs more serious consideration.³⁷⁾ As in later polemics, Kraus maintained that the opponent's bad influence justified fuller treatment of him than he was worth in his own right.

Aber die verheerende Wirkung, die dieser Mann in unserer jungen Litteratur ausübt, ist grösser als man zumeist denkt [—] Man sieht es an unsern patschuliwedelnden Decadencepintschern und artigen Bologneserhündchen, wie korrumpierend Hermann Bahrs ganz absurde Sensationsriecherei und Originalitätshascherei auf junge Talente einwirkt.³⁸⁾

The "Bologneserhündchen" allude to Hofmannsthal's "Prolog zu dem Buch Anatol", which, in a review of Schnitzler's play in January 1893,³⁹⁾ Kraus had acknowledged, albeit with sardonic reservations about the fragility of Loris's verse. For the first time now, his allusion is not modified by praise. This was no doubt partly due to the purely evocative, decorative self-indulgence of the "Prolog zu dem Buch Anatol", in which the "psychological insights" of Gestern were lacking.

Far more obviously ornate and self-indulgent was the verse of Felix Dörmann, which the allusion to waving patchouli evokes. In a review in February 1893,⁴⁰⁾ Kraus had described Dörmann as a posing décadent, who wasted his "Formtalent" on morbid, neurotic

subjects, and had substantiated his restrained comments with quotations from Dörmann's ostentatiously languid verse.⁴¹⁾ Even the term "Formtalent", which implied a skill alien to "natural" artistry, was faint praise from Kraus, who by 1901 applied it to Hofmannsthal (F.79,21). Kraus's review had been appreciated in Berlin, particularly by Liliencron,⁴²⁾ but had been personally resented in the Café Griensteidl, as is clear from Kraus's impassioned self-vindication to Schnitzler.⁴²⁾ Allegations that his criticism had been personally motivated - a stereotype reproach that he was to meet throughout his career - Kraus answered by attesting his incorruptible hatred of the aesthetes' narcissistic mannerisms:

Ich hasse und hasste diese falsche, erlogene
"Decadence", die ewig mit sich selbst
coquettiert, ich bekämpfe und werde immer
bekämpfen: die posierte, krankhafte, onanierte
Poesie!⁴²⁾

Even Bahr was to distance himself from décadence, as his by no means flattering review of Dörmann in October 1893 shows.⁴¹⁾ It has not been possible to trace any initial encouragement of or direct influence on Dörmann by Bahr. It is also doubtful whether Bahr influenced Hofmannsthal more than he was influenced by him,³⁷⁾ and any stylistic extravagance in the early Hofmannsthal was never as uncontrolled as Bahr's own enthusing about him. That Bahr was deserting a helpless protégé in distancing himself from Dörmann seems even more doubtful, since Dörmann was among the avant-garde at the Ibsen banquet in 1891. The indirect influence which Bahr's propagation of and subsequent abandonment of décadence may have had, however, is quite another matter. Whilst his Studien zur Kritik der Moderne (1894) contained an earlier

enthusiastic essay on "Décadence",⁴³⁾ by November of that year, in another essay of this title, he was critical even of the major décadents - Wilde, Montesquiou and, by implication, Stefan George.⁴⁴⁾ The implications of such rapid changes of allegiance as occurred here will be discussed in conjunction with Bahr's style, in Part II.

At least up to the end of 1893, Kraus still associated with Hofmannsthal, Beer-Hoffmann and Schnitzler. Yet it is also evident from letters⁴²⁾ that his company became an embarrassment the more he voiced his scorn for mutual associates. According to Schnitzler's notes,⁴⁵⁾ Kraus's first direct attack on the more gifted Jung-Wiener appeared in Die Neue Freie Presse of 12th June 1895, in his review of Fanny Gröger, with whom he ironically contrasted them:

In unser junges Österreich, wo die Talente so dicht an einem Kaffeehaustisch zusammensitzen, dass sie einander gegenseitig an der Entfaltung hindern, wird Fräulein Gröger eine willkommene Abwechslung bringen. Während ihre literarischen Altersgenossen, aus Furcht, "ein Spiel von jedem Druck der Luft" zu werden, sich längst in das Schneckengehäuse ihres vorgeblichen Ich zurückgezogen haben und nur zeitweise heraustreten, um dessen kokette Windungen zu betrachten, scheint sich Fräulein Gröger trotz ihrer Jugend ein offenes Auge erhalten zu haben.⁴⁶⁾

Schnitzler⁴⁵⁾ saw in the remarks a slight against himself and Hofmannsthal as well as against Beer-Hoffmann.⁴⁶⁾ Not until 6th November 1895, however, did he note that they were no longer associating with Kraus, who was then ascribing the "stage success" of Liebelei to "contacts".⁴⁵⁾ It was therefore no surprise to him when Kraus's Die demolierte Litteratur contained satires on all the "talents" in the Griensteidl circle.

In the above quotation, Kraus's aversion to the "narcissistic" introspectiveness of the décadents and to their lack of vitality is expressed in two motifs which were to recur in Die demolierte Litteratur: the picture of the mutually inhibiting talents crowding the coffee-house,⁴⁷⁾ and that of the "Schneckengehäuse ihres angeblichen Ich",⁴⁸⁾ which in the pamphlet followed the sketch of Schnitzler.⁴⁹⁾

As this suggests, the full-length satire Die demolierte Litteratur brought together motifs, allusions and quotations from Kraus's shorter review-articles, notes and letters of the years 1893 to 1896,⁵⁰⁾ including the polemic against Bahr; but it contained no new polemical utterances, and lacked the pathos of indignation that had driven Kraus to his abusive tone of 1893. What was new was the comprehensiveness and the coherence of the view. The argument against aestheticism was amplified by successive allusions to each of the Jung-Wiener. This provided a context in which Bahr's "unwholesome influence" could be gauged satirically. The supercilious lightness of touch was partly determined by the change of focus from the individual opponent to the group. The attack did not centre on Bahr, although as the group's leader the "Herr aus Linz" loomed large behind the other sketches - a mere figure of fun, with a coquettishly dangling forelock.⁵¹⁾ And so, scattered witticisms and sketches of individual idiosyncrasies were gathered and unified.

The satirical "demolition" of an artificial, posing literary cult was enacted in the harsh perspective of the real-life demolition of the Café Griensteidl, which had not merely housed it but had provided a cultured, hermetic milieu. Precisely

because the real predicament of "Nervenkünstler" being threatened by a pick-axe was so incongruous, Kraus could afford to indulge in a vivid "farewell" evocation of this milieu and its idiosyncrasies. Kraus's authority was not language, but the outside world of healthy common sense:

Das Leben wird die Krücke der Affectation zerbrechen...⁵²⁾

From this vantage-point, he did not have to argue, but merely to observe and be witty. His methods included physical caricature, parody and quotation. Bahr's sudden assumption of Goethean serenity - after his earlier phase as cultural pioneer - was mimicked in the self-important gestures and catch-phrases of the "Herr aus Linz"; but most effective was a specimen parody of Bahr's style, which is discussed in Part II, Section ii.

II

CRITICISM, STYLE AND CHARACTER

i) Style: Theory

In the essay "Die neue Psychologie" (1890), ⁵³⁾ Bahr outlined the new literary style that was to supersede Naturalism. The Naturalist novel had depicted "les états de choses". For Bahr, a far more compelling means of depicting the interaction of milieu and character was the Symbolist emphasis on "les états d'âme" or "intérieurs d'âme: the full and precise depiction of the inner world of an otherwise indefinable Ich, by means of symbolic or periphrastic elaboration on subjective sense impressions. In an illustrative example, Bahr recalled how old-style psychological motivation would have rationalized the "inner development" of a character retrospectively, in order, say, to account for his political conversion. With this Bahr compared how the new style, more true to life, would show there to be no logical inner development, only a gradual, partly subconscious absorption of impressions, until quite unexpectedly the subject found his mind had changed.

"Jeder solcher Prozess wird ganz auf den Nerven und in den Sinnen vollzogen [...]" ⁵³⁾

- that is, without conscious choice by the individual. Anticipating the stream of consciousness technique, this indicates Bahr's considerable insight into some psychological processes. Yet, as will be seen, it also provides autobiographical insight into its author's otherwise inexplicable changes of opinion - a major point which eluded Kraus's scrutiny of Bahr's style and public gesturing.

In his stylistic recreation of spontaneity, Bahr indulged - even if less naively than the Naturalists - in the illusory belief that the Ich-persona of the narrator could be completely excluded. The total aesthetic appreciation and "nervous" susceptibility to all impressions, which he advocated, implied a suspension of conscious individual control and a denial of a philosophically definable ego.⁵⁴⁾ The following comment by O. Walzel is also true of Bahr's attempt at stylistic spontaneity:

"Der Impressionismus will grundsätzlich das Denken zurückdrängen und nur die Eindrücke anerkennen. Er behauptet, dass die Eindrücke ihre Reinheit und Echtheit verlieren, sobald sie dem Denkprozess unterworfen werden."⁵⁵⁾

Each experience had to be savoured aesthetically. No other relationship had to exist between "Ich" and "Welt":

"Wir haben die Welt von uns abgestreift und das Künstliche ist unsere Natur. Wir haben uns unser selbst entledigt, um den Nerven besser zu dienen. Welt und Ich - es soll alles bloss für die nervöse Sensation sein."⁵⁶⁾

This is clearly alien to Kraus's later conception of the creative integrity of the personality at the "Ursprung". It is therefore surprising to find even apparent similarities between Bahr's pronouncements on style and Kraus's later formulations about the organic and erotic properties of language, the "altes Wort" and the reflection of character in style.

For example, in his essay "Vom Stile",⁵⁷⁾ Bahr demanded that style have the sensuous richness of the original impression and bear the hallmark of its origin, "die Kräfte seiner Geburt", "die Umgebung, in welcher er wuchs, sich gestaltete und verwandelte".

In his tribute to the seventy-year-old Ludwig Speidel in 1900, Bahr anticipated Kraus's notion of the "altes Wort", when comparing Speidel's effective use of the single word with the impressionists' overworking of epithets:

"Alte Worte, die er aufruft, erwachen wie aus einem langen Schlafe und erheben sich und sind wieder jung geworden [..]"⁵⁸⁾

In "Vom Stile" Bahr demanded:

"Irgend ein herausgerissener Satz über irgend ein Gleichgültiges soll genügen, wie eine ausführliche Stiftungsurkunde seines Charakters den ganzen Künstler zu zeigen, unverkürzt wie er ist [..]"⁵⁷⁾

Kraus certainly knew the Speidel article (F.36,27), but there is no evidence that Bahr's "Vom Stile" had any direct influence on the "language thesis" that Kraus formulated many years later, from his own experience.

Furthermore, there was certainly an uncanny echo of Bahr's demand that a style should testify to "den ganzen Menschen", in Kraus's assertion - discussed on page 4 - that one line can provide "ein volles Bild der Persönlichkeit" (Spr 84); but - as I have argued - Kraus's was not a simple act of faith in language, but had a tactical purpose for the satirist.

In "Vom Stile", on the other hand, Bahr advocated his stylistic ideal - of combining the personal, the factual and the suggestive - in more direct allusions. First he rejected any one formula for good writing, for fear of producing imitative or impersonal stereotypes. Yet he then speculated on which of the two recent stylistic trends - the austerity of Stendhal or the flamboyance of the Goncourts - was more appropriate to present

needs. His descriptive accounts of modern stylists were valuable - until he began to use them as departure-points for speculation, which came dangerously near to the "formula" that in the previous breath he had rejected. This also applies to his formula for Symbolism, according to which the required emotion could be evoked by

"[...]" ganz andere und entfernte Thatsachen [...], welche fähig sind, das gleiche Gefühl, die nämliche Stimmung, den gleichen Zustand, [...] zu wecken."⁵⁹⁾

For the layman this was a helpful initiation into stylistic technique, but as a model it was scarcely appropriate. This objection is perhaps implicit in Kraus's parody of Bahr's style in Die demolierte Litteratur. Scepticism towards Bahr's conception of a modern style - which surely conflicts with the notion of a personal style - could well have induced Kraus to assert his stylistic ideal by more indirect, provocative means.

In Selbstbildnis, Bahr was to admit his own earlier error in thinking artistic form was a glove that must fit everything. He had not realized

"[...] dass in der Kunst der Handschuh nicht über die Hand gezogen wird, sondern aus der Hand selber wächst[...]"⁶⁰⁾

Superficially at least, this approximates to Kraus's own contrast between language as "Kleid" and as "Leib", for instance in the following aphorism:

Der Gedankenlose denkt, man habe nur dann einen Gedanken, wenn man ihn hat und in Worte kleidet.
Er versteht nicht, dass in Wahrheit nur der ihn hat, der das Wort hat, in das der Gedanke hineinwächst. (BWG 235)

Yet while Kraus strictly separates the two approaches, Bahr turns the inappropriate initial metaphor into a mixed metaphor, which Kraus would no doubt have taken to disqualify Bahr as an authority on the subject.

ii) Style and satire

It was not always clear from Bahr's own evocations whether he was affirming or satirically negating the subject - so far-fetched were the metaphors which embroidered it. It was, for example, exaggerated to liken the refinement of Hofmannsthal's sentences to "der kranke Hauch aus den fieberschwülen Kissen einer schmerzlichen und blassen Frau."⁶¹⁾ He did not always succeed with his unique metaphors, in exciting the appropriate impression. Kraus, for instance, rightly ridiculed (F.40,27) Bahr's observation on Novelli's artistic control while acting:

"Tief in ihm scheint es in einemfort zu knacken und zu prasseln; er muss in einemfort explodieren".⁶²⁾

Its incongruity was more effectively exposed by quoting a facetious Bahr-Kenner's supposition that it referred to Bahr's new motor-car. (F.51,28).

Kraus had parodied the choicest of Bahr's clichés and similes in the following passage from Die demolierte Litteratur:

"Er will den Viseur, aber mit der wienerischen Note, nicht in der Technik der Franzosen, wie ihn etwa Pierre Blanchard gezeichnet haben würde oder ein anderer französischer Eigenname, den nur ich kenne, wenn ich von Ferry Beratton absehen will, der ihn dann aber auch von mir hat. Es ist dies die Kunst der Nerven, von den Nerven auf die Nerven, und man muss dabei an Berti Goldschmidt denken und an die psychologie blasée

der Stendhal und Huysmans, von den Goncourt's über Lavedan bis zu Loris und Maurice Barrès und nach Portoricho, die mit der feinen Nase für den Geruch der Dinge, die wie ein letzter Rest von Champagne ist und sich wie die zähe Schmeichelei verblasster alter Seide fühlt, aber immer ein bischen in dem lieben traulichen Wienerisch des Canaletto."⁶³⁾

Not as skilled as Kraus's later mimicking of Harden, this parodies Bahr's loose syntax, his connoisseur's jargon ("er will...") and his liberal use of French words. Such stock phrases as "ich musste an... denken", also, served his predilection for name-dropping, parodied in the introduction of the fictitious Pierre Blanchard. Two details of how Kraus showed up the pretentiousness of florid writing by bringing out the banality of its content are, firstly, his juxtaposition of the phrase about the "Geruch der Dinge" - from Bahr's ecstatic essay, "Loris", of 1892⁶⁴⁾ - with "Portoricho", a brand of cigars (!); secondly, his contamination of Hofmannsthal's picturesque "Wien des Canaletto" with the very epithets sentimentally applied by Bahr, in his essay, to Loris's Viennese accent. Some nuances Kraus lifted direct from the "Loris" essay, where Hofmannsthal's language was "dieser schwüle Parfüm, wie letzter Nachgeschmack am anderen Tage von Champagner" and Hofmannsthal's handshake was evoked in precisely the same "silk" simile! Such extremes show how little exaggeration was needed to discredit Bahr's impressionistic technique. At most, insertions like "oder ein anderer [....] den nur ich kenne", rather in excess of Bahr's norm, were enough to stress the ostentatious irrelevance of Bahr's erudition, as Kraus summed up:

Noche heute versteht er es, uncontrolirbaren Thatsachen den Schein des Erlebten zu geben, Dinge, die er

gerade anbringen will, tiefursächlich zusammenzuhängen.
Es ist - um in seinem Styl mit Goethe zu sprechen -
ein ungemeiner Zettelkasten, den nicht er, sondern der
ihn hat.⁶⁵⁾

While Die demolierte Litteratur relied on allusive caricature and parody for its effect, in the early Fackel Kraus began to use the more economical, and antithetical, textual gloss, exposing Bahr's impressionism as a means of impressing through any empty cliché. In 1902 he quoted Bahr's comment on the Japanese actress Sada Yacco⁶⁶⁾:

"Man erinnere sich, was sich Goncourt einmal aus den Mitteilungen eines Gelehrten über die chinesische Sprache, an die sich ja die japanische wesentlich anlehnen soll, notiert hat [F.93,29]"

Kraus added that even the oldest people could not remember, nor would have Bahr, had not the news of the visitor from Japan impelled him to check his reference in Goncourt. Even though the reference was not to Japanese, Bahr evidently felt it necessary to display his reference work.

In later years, when Bahr's style - if not his behaviour - had become less flamboyant, Kraus used his by then established technique of the Sprachglosse to expose his opponent's insincere shifts of allegiance and turns of phrase, particularly by contrasting them with some truthful or reliable norm. Here are several examples from the war years.

In "Gruss an Bahr und Hofmannsthal" (F.423,41-52 ;Wg 47-56) he contrasted Bahr's rhetoric with established fact. Bahr's affirmation of war in a quasi-wistful letter to Hofmannsthal was not, as Bahr would have, "wafted by the wind to your camp-fire"

on the Eastern Front; on the contrary, it had been accessible to all readers of the Berliner Tageblatt (of 21st August 1914), including Hofmannsthal by his "Wachtfeuer", which was not in Warsaw but in the Kriegsfürsorgeamt in Vienna!

Secondly, in the same essay, Kraus used the device of pretending to detect a "misprint", to contrast Bahr's blasphemous apostrophe of "this sacred moment" of war - "Möge es uns Gott erhalten!" - with the simple piety of "Möge uns Gott erhalten!" which Kraus claimed his print-setter took it to read.

Thirdly, in "Ich warne das neue Österreich" (F.462,25-29; Wg 94-98), Kraus contrasted Bahr's phoney persona with the integrity of the pacifist Heinrich Lammasch. Now turned pacifist, Bahr dared to pay tribute to Lammasch as "one of us" (Wg 96), and to apply the maxim "der Stil ist der Mensch" not only to Lammasch's "matter-of-fact self-sufficiency", but to his own "chaos", which had once made him "chop up every sentence, revel in adjectives and juggle with punctuation". (Wg 95). Not forgetting Bahr's alteration of theatre reviews or his more recent affirmations of war, Kraus asserted that Bahr had not only changed his style since those "chaotic" days but also his judgements; indeed, had changed his earlier judgements with the aid of his later style: which was not the work of an honest man (Wg 95f.).

At the height of his polemic, between 1899 and 1901, Kraus's satire and parody of his opponent's stylistic idiosyncrasies and exaggerations was still rudimentary and piecemeal. One example will show that Kraus had not yet fully developed his technique of exposing a writer's false attitudes in the very language that expressed them. Bahr dedicated his book Wiener Theater (1899) to

Ludwig Speidel, with the following words:

"Diese Sammlung von Recensionen [···] soll zeigen, wie ich von unsicheren, aber desto heftigeren Forderungen einer recht vagen Schönheit nach und nach doch zu einer reinen Ansicht der dramatischen Kunst gekommen bin und das Theater, was denn sein Wesen ist, erkannt habe. Dies verdanke ich Ihnen allein. [---] Und Sie haben mich auch gelehrt, was unser, der Kritik, dieser 'scharfen Magd der Produktion', wie Sie sie geheissen haben, Amt ist: den Schaffenden zu helfen. Darum habe ich Sie gebeten, mein Buch mit Ihrem Namen schmücken zu dürfen."⁶⁷⁾

Kraus commented (F.2,30) on the bad German, particularly of the clause underlined here - which, however, he misquoted. When Bahr celebrated Speidel's seventieth birthday in 1900,⁶⁸⁾ Kraus was surprised that Speidel, the master feuilletonist, did not object to the tribute:

[···] ja, er liess es zu, dass der Gaukler, gierig nach des Meisters Erbe, ihm einen Band seines Kritischen Gestammels widmete, die Echtheit seiner Gefühle in einem falschen Relativsatz betonend [···] (F.36,27).

This was the closest that Kraus came, in these years, to equating style with character. He did not quote Bahr's bad German here - which was, incidentally, not a relative clause - but his remark merely accompanied a reminder of the suddenness of the "sympathy for" and "sense of indebtedness to" a critic whom Bahr had attacked a few years previously. Not yet qualified to document the false ethics through the style, Kraus neglected to mention the ingratiating circumlocution in the Schachtelsatz about the "scharfe Magd der Produktion". The later Kraus might no doubt have asserted that the syntactical separation of "unser, der Kritik"

from "Amt" corresponded to the critic Bahr's ("der Kritik") abandonment of his official responsibility ("Amt"), in "helping" playwrights ("den Schaffenden"), which at this time included himself! The background to this is discussed at length in Part III.

iv) Style and criticism

Bahr made a virtue of the changeability of his opinions and moods, which was closely linked, in his literary personality, with his extravagant style. This was at best vividly sensuous and evocative, but often too uninhibited in its intoxicated exuberance, which he both explains and demonstrates in the following proud confession from "Das junge Österreich":

"Man vergisst, dass ich in einem Punkte anders als die Anderen und für mich bin. Die Anderen stellen ihre Natur auf eine einzige Note [∞] Aber mich treibt es, die Fülle der Noten, den Schwall und Strudel ihrer gischenden Fluth, ihren bunten Sturm zu formen; nicht eine einzelne reizt mich, sondern das Flirren und Flackern ihrer bewegten Menge nur, wie sie sich berstend streifen, stossen und reiben; in den Grund will ich keiner dringen, aber die ganze Fläche dieser breiten Zeit möchte ich fassen, den vollen Tausel aller Wallungen auf den Nerven und Sinnen."⁶⁹⁾

In his restless protean aspiration to "Vielseitigkeit", Bahr was reluctant to commit himself fully to one stand, or to penetrate the source of his intoxication. The passage illustrates how inextricably linked, how symptomatic of his character, were both his reluctance and his stylistic ebullience.

The ambiguity and the appeal of Bahr's stylistic raptures

enabled him to attract interest in his subject, while remaining less consciously committed to it or less convinced of its permanent value than the extravagant terms of his spontaneous, ephemeral, enthusiasm would suggest. The boldness of his pronouncements deceived as to how provisional his commitment was, and the spontaneity was a sign that he, too, only became aware of this as soon as some new preference made him critical of the former one. This accounts for the ease with which he "overcame" each "phase".

This dubious changeability was accommodated in his conception of a new, more provisional, form of literary criticism. In "Zur Kritik der Kritik" (1890), he denied the possibility of making value judgements in the rapidly changing modern world:

"Sie ≠die neue Literaturkritik≠ hat nicht länger den Künstlern zu declarieren, was ewig schön ist, sondern sie hat aus den Künstlern zu konstatieren, was derzeit schön ist."⁷⁰⁾

And so, he might depict phenomena which to the purist⁷¹⁾ were suspect and unwelcome, such as the feuilleton, by substituting for critical evaluation an alluring evocation-cum-prophecy. In his essay "Feuilleton" (1890), he thus predicted that a moment would come when the feuilleton would oust all other literary forms, for, though it was an instrument of the sensualist -

"≠...≠ das eigene Ich an der fremden Welt zu reiben, dass es die Nerven kitzelt, das ist, einschläfernd wie der sanfte Strich einer Angora, noch das beste Mittel, das Leben wegzueskamotieren ≠...≠"⁷²⁾

- it was also the only instrument left which could approach "modern truth". This analysis, while perhaps accurate, itself represents both the very feuilleton style under discussion and Bahr's own evasion of critical commitment, which leaves the impression

that he was in favour of his subject.

In the more pretentious press the feuilleton was an appropriate vehicle for the impressionism of which Bahr was an exponent C. Schorschke⁷³⁾ says about the feuilleton-writer that "the subjective response of the reporter or critic to an experience, his feeling-tone, acquired clear primacy over the matter of his discourse. To render a state of feeling became a mode of formulating a judgement. Accordingly, in the feuilleton writer's style, the adjectives engulfed the nouns, the personal tint virtually obliterated the contours of the object of discourse."

What Kraus, in Die demolierte Litteratur, had parodied as the dabblings of a group of impotent "Stimmungsmenschen", had, by the next decade, become the fashionable style of impressionistic newspaper-reporting. In his essay "Heine und die Folgen" (1910) - in which he attacked this much proliferated style of journalism by discrediting its supposed originator, Heine - he suggested that, in the hands of feuilletonistic talents, the idiosyncrasies of art for art's sake had become a means of diverting attention from the facts of the case, namely the press's base interests. He sarcastically remarked:

"Über die Zahl der Toten. $\overline{\cdot\cdot\cdot}$ gehen die Meinungen auseinander, wenn sich nicht eine Korrespondenz ins Mittel legt. Aber die Stimmung, die Stimmung treffen sie alle; und der Reporter, der als Kehrrechtsammler der Tatsachenwelt sich nützlich machen könnte, kommt mit einem Fetzen Poesie gelaufen. $\overline{-}$ Der eine sieht grün, der andere sieht gelb - Farben sehen sie alle. (UWM 194)

Kraus blamed Heine for creating this bastard style, this "Verquickung des Geistigen mit dem Informativischen",

"Mich verfolgt nämlich ein Missverständnis durchs Leben. Während ich immer bloss, was rings um mich ist und wird, wahrzunehmen, auszusprechen, darzustellen trachte und weiter nichts als es sammeln und ordnen will, meint man, es sei mir um ein Urteil zu tun [---] ich kann nicht verstehen, dass man mich nun deshalb, weil ich etwas aufzufinden trachte, stets selbst dafür verantwortlich [---]macht."76)

This protestation of innocence begs the general question of whether a critic can "merely" observe without committing himself, and begs the particular question of whether Bahr's vivid exaggerations, or even his "mere descriptions", can possibly have been objective, considering how drastically some needed revision.

D. G. Daviau,⁷⁷⁾ trying to vindicate Bahr's changes of attitude, quotes the above passage as proof that Bahr recorded impressions "objectively". This standpoint could only be valid if one defined an "objective" impression as a subjective one disowned by its recorder. For what Bahr's quotation indisputably admits is a reluctance to form critical judgements and to accept responsibility for what he wrote. However conceivable philosophically and aesthetically fruitful it may be, "merely recording" without implicating oneself ethically is an impossibility for a publicist, especially for one so demonstrative as Bahr. Bahr's "awareness" of his changeability, which Professor Daviau cites, is ethically far from an excuse for it. That Bahr was "mistakenly indentified with the ideas he discussed" was, pace Professor Daviau, entirely due to his manner of presentation, which belied his subsequent attempts to disown them. This is central to Kraus's polemic in 1901, and can be confirmed by another glaring example: Bahr's attitudes to the war.

In 1912, in his pacifist essay "Friede",⁷⁸⁾ Bahr urged that mere pacifist conviction was insufficient to prevent war, and that a pacifist had to commit himself actively. He proved his point by default when he himself actively participated in the war fever of 1914. His Kriegssegne⁷⁹⁾ is the inspired vision of a prophet of war. He proclaimed the outbreak of war as "ein heiliger Augenblick", one in which "das deutsche Wesen ist uns erschienen". Contrary to Professor Daviau's thesis about Bahr's "service to Austria",⁷⁷⁾ he was an advocate of the German, military virtues, and saw German Classical and Romantic music as "Enthusiasmus mit Disziplin", as "unsere Mobilmachung".

By 1917, however, having lost his enthusiasm for the war, he was recommending an honourable peace and the dissolution of the alliance, now only believing in an "Austrian war".⁸⁰⁾ A similar disillusionment was experienced by many on both sides, and it would be understandable, if not entirely making amends for earlier patriotic excesses. What, however, is the clearest proof of Bahr's dishonesty is his attempt, in his Tagebuch for 8th January 1920, published in 1922,⁸¹⁾ to "overcome" his war-fever retrospectively:

"Ich schwärmte nicht mit, hielt aber dafür, dass wir, nachdem das Unglück einmal geschehen und der Krieg ausgebrochen, alles aufzubieten hätten, um zu siegen."

This desperate attempt to gloss over an indelible mark, the style of an enthusiasm already committed to print, sheds an ethically sinister light on Bahr's "Überwindungen". On detecting Bahr's surreptitious retrospective alterations to the bias of earlier theatre reviews, Kraus, in 1900/01, had too narrowly defined such

irresponsible opportunism as materially motivated.

v) Subjectivity and opportunism

In the early Fackel, Kraus sought to show just how venal Bahr was as a journalist. His polemic failed to show the closest correspondence between at least certain qualities of Bahr's style and character. With his absolute ethical criteria and his lack of a historical viewpoint - or of Bahr's sense of evolution - Kraus merely succeeded in denouncing the cultural prophet as a jack-of-all-creeds, either satirizing outward manifestations or tracing them all too specifically to material motives. Instead of isolating the suspect attitude discussed in Section iv, Kraus sought, by sheer profusion of evidence, to expose Bahr's insincerity and subjectivity. Hence Kraus's repeated, rather facile jibes at Bahr's pretensions to Goethean "Vielseitigkeit" and "Abgeklärtheit"⁸²⁾ - Bahr did sometimes discuss Goethe subjectively. Hence his scorn for Bahr's mission "to bring culture to Austria"⁸³⁾ as "jener Drang nach Paris, der in Linz stecken geblieben ist".⁸⁴⁾ The implication, that culture is not importable, can be accepted without denying the value of outside influences; yet the view that Bahr's propagation of the French décadents was his exclusive contribution to such a "cultural revival" in Austria is adequately refuted by H. Kindermann,⁸⁵⁾ who emphasizes Bahr's "revival" of the Austrian Baroque tradition, and by Kraus's own later jibes at these efforts of Bahr's.

A further attempt to discredit Bahr was Kraus's suggestion that his interpretations were subjective not only in depending on recent literary impressions, but in reflecting

his extra-literary, personal interests, such as his (frustrated) aspirations to the patronage of the Duke of Darmstadt (F.93,25), or his (successful) aspirations to a post on the Neues Wiener Tagblatt. Kraus accused Bahr of flattering the editor of this newspaper at an appropriate time (F.15,31) and even of changing his opinion of Maurice Barrès at his behest (F.53,27). Though consistent with Kraus's main polemical theme, these trivial slurs on Bahr's ethics are impossible to substantiate today, and are of lesser interest than those instances which Kraus documented more fully.

One example of these was Bahr's obituary tribute to Nietzsche in 1900, which completely contradicted his impudent remark in a published "conversation" with Barrès, in December 1892, that Nietzsche was no more than an amusing feuilletonist with a "legible" (sic) style. To this contrast Kraus added one between Bahr's superficial opportunism and the radical struggles of the virulent Nietzsche:

Und doch sei der Überwinder Nietzsche ein Kämpfer
gewesen, dem Hermann Bahrs Methode, jede Richtung
zu Überwinden, indem er ihr den Rücken kehrt,
gänzlich fremd war. (F.53,27)

This view of Nietzsche as a "Kämpfer" also reflects Kraus's rudimentary ideas on the polemical "Persönlichkeit" - the opposite of which Bahr was. In 1903, Kraus concluded that Bahr "changed his developments as other men changed their shirts" (F.138,14f).

A case in point was Bahr's support for Peter Rosegger's initiative in "discovering the provinces". He publicized the revival of Austrian Heimatkunst by writing Franzl (1901), a

sentimental piece of provincial realism centring on the dialect poet Franz Stelzhamer. Kraus contrasted the "turbulent" author of Die Mutter, of the previous decade, with the Establishment figure dabbling in naive art. For Kraus, it was "die Speculation auf naturfromme Einfachheit"; not even if a hundred years' development separated them could one and the same author have sincerely composed Die Mutter, with its "Sexualismus", as well as Franzl, with its sentimentality; the only common element in all Bahr's apparent changes was his speculativeness (F.68,10). Again, without necessarily accepting Kraus's dogmatic denial of the possibility of such a development, one may agree about the spuriousness of such cultural gestures, particularly Bahr's patronizing of a popular tradition from which he was cut off. Both plays are stylistic freaks, all too consciously written as programmatic experiments: the first a reproduction of milieu, the second of dialect. Noteworthy is Kraus's: "beides ist unecht" (F.68,10), a value judgement quite alien to Bahr's relative, evolutionary aesthetic principles, and a sign that the protean phenomenon of Bahr, by its negative example, was leading Kraus to his own quite different principles of creative integrity. Yet without a clear formulation of these principles, Kraus's assertion of his ethical principles amounted to attacking Bahr for venality alone.

This one example clearly refutes Professor Daviau's claim that Bahr's fluctuations of sympathy ceased after 1891. Professor Daviau sees the motivation, after that date, of Bahr's gradual transference of energies from the cultural to the political sphere, as a "belief in the future of Austria"

and bases this thesis on Bahr's own allusion to "Alt-Österreich" in his Selbstbildnis.⁸⁶⁾ Such a vague notion scarcely does justice to the diversity of cultural phenomena embraced by Bahr in his "universality" after 1891. It also in no way answers Kraus's insinuations about Bahr's more specific changes of allegiance coinciding with changes in personal favour or fortune. It does not account for the connection between the tone and bias of Bahr's reviews around 1900 and his simultaneous success with Viennese social cliques - which was the main ground on which Kraus attacked him.⁸⁷⁾ Nor does it account for the connection between Bahr's loss of influence after 1901 - after the possibilities of his fostering Viennese taste and exerting influence socially were exhausted - and the appearance, shortly after his departure for Berlin, of his very critical book on that society, Wien (1907).⁸⁸⁾

III

THE POLEMIC OF 1900/1901: THE THEATRE CRITIC

i) Aims and misunderstanding

In his first Fackel, at the beginning of a lifelong campaign against the press, Kraus called the corruption among theatre critics the most blatant example of the financial profitability of journalistic influence (F.1,15f.). His general conclusion was:

Dieselben Leute, die gestern noch als freie Recensenten auf freien Plätzen sassen, tauchen heute als dankbare Autoren vor dem Vorhang auf und werden morgen von den Redactionscollegen überaus schmeichelhaft besprochen sein. Kritische Machthaber, welche aus der von ihrer Gunst und Gnade abhängigen Theaterkanzlei Tantiemen beziehen [7] (F.1,14)

At the end of the first issue, in a small footnote (F.1,28), he declared war on Bahr, that "importer of culture and kingmaker among poets".

It is impossible to-day to gauge the extent of the corruption which evidently existed then, and as performance itself is so crucial a factor in the formation of a theatre critic's verdicts, it is difficult to draw reliable conclusions on such reported abuses as the fabrication of stage successes through press reviews. An alleged case of this was the acclamation of Oskar Friedmann's banality Das Dreieck by critics (including Bahr) who had condemned Ibsen's Pillars of Society (F.4,17ff.).

On other occasions Kraus reproached Bahr with sponsoring mediocrity. Between 1894 and 1899, in his capacity as cultural

editor of the influential new radical weekly Die Zeit, Bahr was the major spokesman for the literary and artistic avant-garde in Vienna, yet displayed very catholic tastes. Related to his anticipation and cultivation of art trends was his aptitude for discovering literary talents. Despite his awareness and insight, which Professor Kindermann's book stresses, Bahr's enthusiasm sometimes led him to over-estimate passing trends and minor talents. Thus he discovered actors of stature like Duse and Kainz, but also the Deutsches Volkstheater Company; he was ecstatic over the young Hofmannsthal, but also dedicated his play Das Tschaperl (1898) to Karlweis, "Unser Wiener Aristophanes". In Die Zeit, he acclaimed the latter's Das grobe Hemd on 6th February 1897, and called Strindberg's The Father stupid on 8th May 1897.

Professor Kindermann⁸⁹⁾ calls it an error of Kraus's to have denied merit to successes that Bahr acclaimed. This is a relativist view, which exaggerates the value of such figures as Karlweis or Goldschmidt. Kraus certainly ignored Bahr's appreciation of the contribution of "average talents" to the continuity of cultural traditions.⁹⁰⁾ Yet more crucial is Kraus's ignorance of the fact that Bahr's criteria were theatrical rather than literary. Whereas Kraus saw dramatic literature and acting as two separate arts, Bahr saw that acting, at least on the German stage, had suffered from "der falsche Respekt vor dem 'Dichter'".⁹¹⁾ He was convinced that the mimic and visual elements should be better exploited, hence his appreciation of Max Reinhardt, whom Kraus detested.⁹²⁾ An example of the lack of common ground between their conceptions of drama is Bahr's defence, in 1903, of Trebitsch's

Burgtheater, rejected a play by Schnitzler, Bahr and five other critics intervened on the dramatist's behalf. They campaigned to defend the rights of all young talents against unscrupulous theatre managements. As in the Burckhard-Fulda dispute, Kraus did not defend Bahr's adversary, but objected that Schnitzler was no longer among the "unrecognized talents at the mercy of theatre managements" - of which there was a more glaring example, which Bahr was not opposing. Bukovics, the Director of the Deutsches Volkstheater, had gone back on his word to the unknown author Rudolf Holzer. Bahr's non-intervention in that dispute, Kraus asserted, was determined by his vested interests in the Volkstheater (F.53,5f.).

In September 1899, by which time Bahr was prominent among influential press circles, he had praised the Volkstheater to the point of flattery in his final review in Die Zeit. This had drawn Kraus's attention to his "business relations" with Bukovics, his "Missbrauch des kritischen Amtes" (F. 19,30). As well as reviewing the Volkstheater regularly in the press, he also enjoyed the royalties from his plays which were staged there. Kraus believed that he wrote favourable reviews because Bukovics staged his plays, and that Bukovics staged his plays to keep the reviews favourable.

For Kraus, the most blatant illustration of Bahr's illicit connection with the Volkstheater was his behaviour on the occasion of the "Wechselgastspiel" in May/June 1900 - the exchange visits of the Deutsches Volkstheater to Berlin and Otto Brahm's Deutsches Theater to Vienna. In a preview,⁹⁴⁾ Bahr enthused about the cultural advantages of such an exchange and demanded objectivity

from the Viennese in judging the visitors. Then, in the Neues Wiener Tagblatt on 21 st May 1900, he himself ignored this plea and used the occasion for a polemic against the Berlin Naturalists.

Kraus, who was himself critical of the "episodic" style of the Berliners (F.43,20; F.138,15), was no longer concerned with the niceties of acting style when it came to diagnosing Bahr's hostility to the guests. He openly accused Bahr of material dependence on the Volkstheater and of biasing his review in revenge for the failure in Berlin of the Volkstheater and his play Der Star. Kraus asserted that Bahr's remarks had been dictated not only by personal animosity towards Brahm, but by personal gratitude to Bukovics for the critic's usual perquisites as well as for a special bribe, a plot of land. Kraus's sarcasm was more measured than in 1893, and the puns "Freiplatz" and "Grund" give his indictment a decisive formal momentum:

Man muss, wenn man auch für ein Annoncenblatt schreibt, nicht so unbescheiden deutlich seine materielle Abhängigkeit von einer Theaterkanzlei annoncieren. Aber Herr Bahr hatte nicht einen, er hatte mehrere unsaubere Gründe für sein kritisches Vorgehen. Herr Brahm hat ihm sein Stück "Josephine" abgelehnt, und Herrn Bukovics ist er nicht nur für Tantiemen, sondern auch für die Überlassung eines Freiplatzes zu Danke verpflichtet. Andere Journalisten lassen sich durch Freiplätze vom Tadeln nicht abhalten; aber ein Kritiker, dem ein Theaterdirektor gleich einen Freiplatz in Unter St. Veit schenkt, hat guten Grund - zum Bau einer Villa. (F.43,25)

This villa - in Ober St. Veit - was designed by the Secession architect Joseph Olbrich. It sustained Kraus's attention for a time, for Bahr's flattering feuilletons on Olbrich had also aroused his suspicion that Bahr had "earned" not only the plot of land but the villa (F.43,27). Both allegations are impossible to verify to-day;^{95a)} yet, cited together, they do confirm suspect patterns of behaviour characteristic of Bahr.

iii) The trial and the retrospective analysis

Not until February 1901 did Bahr and Bukovics take proceedings against Kraus for these allegations. In the intervening eighteen months he had repeated and added to them; in order to provoke a lawsuit in which, he hoped, the court would acknowledge the principle that it was ethically improper to combine the roles of critic and author at the same theatre. But he lost the trial, because two of his allegations were deemed to be false.

Firstly, Bahr was able to produce a bill of sale for the plot of land, which Kraus had alleged had been donated by Bukovics for services rendered. As Kraus pointed out, the deal was suspect - for the sale was registered on 8th November 1900, five months after his mention of the donation, and it was at a "give away" price (F.69,9).⁹⁵⁾ Yet the court accepted it as authentic and convicted Kraus.

Kraus was certainly rash in making allegations based on hearsay. Yet he had no reason to doubt the reliability of his source, especially in connection with the second charge.

Bukovics denied he had given Holzer his word to stage his play, and he accused Kraus of libel, though Kraus had in good faith based his allegation on Holzer's own word. At the trial, the witness Holzer appeared to suffer an attack of amnesia and to faint. Holzer evidently abandoned the champion of his cause for fear of spoiling his prospects with Bukovics. Bukovics did not even keep his promise at the trial that the play would be staged, in September 1901 (F.85,20) - and a year later it was still not staged (F.102,22).

This alone would confirm that Kraus's allegations were justified - in substance, if not in letter. And in fact, in October 1913 (F.387,24ff.), Kraus quoted and commented upon a press report that vindicated him. Holzer now publicly admitted that Kraus, his "opponent" in the 1901 trial, had, contrary to the verdict of the court, been "sachlich im Rechte". Kraus now concluded that the witness Holzer's "opposition" was proof of the intimidating power of theatre directors, which that court had not seen.

Let down by allies like Harden and Bleibtreu, who pledged only tactical or polemical support, Kraus lost the trial from inexperience and from a naive belief in the possibility of asserting ethical principles before a judicial forum. Bahr, with considerable rhetoric, impressed upon the jury that his livelihood was at stake. The jury ignored Kraus's ethical arguments and the "hundred well founded insults", and were swayed by the two false facts (F.69,11). Bukovics's counsel questioned Kraus's right to concern himself with his client's business, since he, Kraus, did not have to pay the Volkstheater's

Berlin deficit. In retrospect, Kraus suggested that on this primitive logic - which had appealed to the jury - he would have been acquitted if he had claimed that his fight against Bahr was personally motivated - by a desire for "revenge" (F.69,14). This trial was the first to impress upon Kraus the flaws in the judicial system and the ignorance and hypocrisy of its practitioners, which was to be the subject of his polemics in Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität.

Not only were jury and defence witness against him, the court-room was packed with "Jobber, Pressleute und Librettowucherer" who, feeling themselves threatened by the existence of Die Fackel, applauded thunderously (F.69,11f.) when Kraus was fined 1800 Kronen;⁹⁶⁾ and the mildest of newspaper reports was biased against him.⁹⁷⁾

Now - as on future occasions - Kraus resorted to Die Fackel as a forum where he could administer poetic justice. He claimed that the heavy fine was nothing compared to the sum he would have had to pay to the liberal press to publicize detailed material from the trial (F.69,11). In the February numbers of Die Fackel, he made up for his tactical defeat with a polemic which (though lacking the sustained, intense rhetoric, or the formal, artistic coordination of later polemics in Die Fackel) was convincing by the sheer weight of documentary evidence. In retrospect, he analysed the course and content of the trial, now accounting for his own mistakes and the court's omissions. He scrutinized the facts and figures about the plot of land (F.69,9), about Bahr's revenue and debt to Bukovics (F.69,16), disproving Bahr's claim to be a "successful author" in no need

of bribes (F.69,15) - this had been obscured at the trial by the quotation of sums partly in Gulden and partly in Kronen (F.69,9 and 15). He revealed that Bahr's plays were "durchgepeitscht" by the Volkstheater management.⁹⁸⁾ He discussed the matters of principle - theatre contracts (F.69,16ff.) and "Incompatibilität", the illicit combination of activities of critic and playwright at the same theatre - and supported his arguments with quotations and statements from reputed critics such as Harden, Fritz Mauthner, Bleibtreu [F.69,23-33] and even the once idealistic Bahr [F.69,46f.]. Mauthner, for example, setting aside the issue of conscious corruption, warned of the dangers of involuntary bias and suggested that an honourable critic, rather than open himself to temptation, ought to withhold his plays from any theatre whose productions he reviewed in the press (F.69,28f.). Even if the existence of a deliberate bias in favour of the Volkstheater cannot now be proved for certain, it is undeniable that a scrupulous critic would have avoided such compromising relations with a theatre.

A weapon Kraus exploited only after the trial (F.71,26f) was Bahr's own plea that the ethical problem exposed by Kraus was merely theoretical, since it was common practice, and not illegal, to combine the reviewing and writing of plays. Bahr admitted that he himself followed the example of colleagues in this "old Viennese tradition". Journalists were paid so little that they were "forced to combine as many literary activities as possible", in order to make a living. He said that the question could only be settled by a change in the system - which he would welcome,

"[...]⁷ weil mir nichts angenehmer wäre, als dem Chef meines Journals zu sagen; 'Ich darf kein Stück mehr schreiben, gib mir die dreifache Gage'. " [F.71,26]⁹⁹⁾

Bahr's open admission that his "creative" writing was, above all, a source of income was an evasion of Kraus's point about his combination of "incompatible" activities at the same theatre. Yet Kraus could not have wished for stronger proof than this of Bahr's material motives - another point that was ignored by the court. As to Bahr's claim that financially he depended on his reviews of the Volkstheater, Kraus sarcastically took this as an admission that he feared losing the royalties that he "earned" through them; and he ironically suggested starting a fund to enable Bahr to cease writing plays (F.71,28).

All this confirmed Kraus's earlier scepticism about Bahr's own campaigns against corruption before he had joined the Establishment. Although Bahr had attacked the leaders of the Künstlergenossenschaft for having business interests, he had never once pilloried any of these corrupt critics and art-dealers by name. In 1900, reflecting on the insincerity of these attacks, Kraus had said that this caution had been rewarded: the blackmailers were still at large and Bahr's impersonal attacks would not prevent them from electing him President of Concordia ¹⁰⁰⁾:

Der unpersönliche Anticorruptionismus dient der Wiener Journalistik als Deckmantel für eigene, bereits vorhandene oder erst noch zu übende Corruption. Der sachliche Kampf gegen die Corruption ist aber in Wahrheit der persönliche, den ich in der "Fackel" führe. (F.57,24)

By not naming the corrupt practitioners and merely blaming the system, the critic could himself enjoy the advantages of the

system; his criticism was harmless, since it did not threaten those who perpetuated the system. Kraus's own uncompromising attitude towards the institutionalized evils which he condemned distinguished him from all those writers whose idealism was mere lip-service.

That Bahr's protean denial of his former self involved him in hypocrisy, might be seen from his reaction to Otto Ernst's play Die Gerechtigkeit. The play, according to Kraus, depicted a critic's blackmailing of a theatre director into staging his plays (F.121,20). Kraus quoted Bahr's comment on the play:

"Der Tendenz des Otto Ernst stimme ich mit Freuden zu und ich bewundere seinen Muth. Es ist mir auch ziemlich gleich, ob sein Stück einen künstlerischen Werth hat. Der sittliche ist so gross, dass er alle anderen Bedenken verschwinden lässt".¹⁰¹⁾

Like Bahr's cultural manifestos, this statement would be acceptable in isolation. But just as his diverse cultural stands are difficult to reconcile as the firm conviction of one man, so this otherwise unobjectionable remark - by a critic-cum-playwright whose own stage fame was largely due to his pre-eminence as a theatre-critic - must seem insincere.

iii) Literary evidence

An allegation that served merely to reinforce Kraus's main arguments was that of plagiarism. He noted a striking similarity between Bahr's play Der Athlet and Bracco's Tragödien der Seele (F.67,21;F.68,14), and between Bahr's Josephine and Bleibtreu's Schicksal (F.67,22). The allegation becomes less

sensational than Kraus made it appear, once it is specified. As Bleibtreu explained,¹⁰²⁾ it was not formal plagiarism but "das geistige Plagiat", the theft "eines ganzen Stoffes". Such a possibility even seems consistent with Bahr's uninhibited susceptibility to all impressions and his lax attitude to authorship. Kraus neither investigated nor proved this point, but merely reproduced the allegation. He had not yet formulated his own view of originality and plagiarism, according to which he would have had to show whether the "borrower's" context debased rather than enhanced the material that he had taken.

The impression one derives from a comparison of Josephine (1898) and Schicksal (1888) - which Kraus did not undertake - is that in his play Bahr not so much copies as travesties Bleibtreu's conception of the relationship between Napoleon and Josephine. Whereas, in Schicksal, Josephine at first mocks Bonaparte, but then becomes the inspiration of his idealism, his "star" of destiny, the hero in Bahr's play is reduced to the "all too human" level in an erotic burlesque. Here Josephine mocks, rather than inspires, his heroism, and the heroism itself is caricatured as the preoccupation of a hardened and arrogant man. Typical of the excesses of Bahr's unfulfilled proclamations is this play's incongruously pretentious foreword, which announced a trilogy on human life:

"[...] wie der Mensch für sich zu leben glaubt, aber dann vom Schicksal zu seiner Bestimmung eingefangen wird, bis er sein Amt getan, seine Geschäfte verrichtet, seine Rolle ausgespielt hat und nun wieder vom Schicksal entlassen werden kann."¹⁰³⁾

In this foreword the word "Schicksal" recurs frequently, and

Bleibtreu might well have taken this as the basis of his charge of plagiarism. Kraus's mention of the plagiarism is therefore not convincing, but gained effect in the context of better documented allegations of intellectual dishonesty.

A significant part of Kraus's evidence still accessible today is "Wie das Glück einzog" [F.69,33-37], his documentation of how Bahr's reviews of the Volkstheater had become more favourable as his relations with Bukovics had improved. Kraus quoted excerpts from Bahr's reviews of the Volkstheater in the Deutsche Zeitung (1893/94), all of which were very disparaging and some even abusive, contrasting them with examples of Bahr's reviews in Die Zeit (1894-1899), which showed a steady "warming" to Bukovics. Kraus dated the turning-point at the 30th November 1895, when Bahr had written:

"Es scheint, das alte Glück, das eine Zeit schmollen wollte, zieht wieder im Volkstheater ein." [F.69,36]

He argued that the acceptance of Josephine for performance at the Volkstheater was a token that Bahr had by then moderated his criticism enough not to prevent acceptance.¹⁰⁴⁾ By the end of 1896 Bahr had nothing but praise for the Company and Director. In court, Bahr argued that he had changed his opinion as he came to know the Company "at work". Kraus ironically replied that that was all that he had tried to assert (F.69,37).

In trying to document Bahr's change in tone, Kraus omitted the detailed comments on production. His presentation of the material is misleading in another respect, too. His often brief excerpts, however characteristic, are quite out of context, and he did not attempt to represent Bahr's opinion

evenly through the years. Thus he quoted ten negative reviews from 1893 extensively, but the intervening years, in which the change took place, are unconvincingly documented: three excerpts from 1894, four negative comments and one positive one from 1895, one positive one from 1896, two from 1897, one from 1898, and then, in full, the final flattering tribute of September 1899. This obscured the fact that in the decisive years, 1895 and 1896, there is no consistent "warming" to Bukovics. Kraus's documentation merely proves that Bahr's attitude went from one extreme to the other over a number of years - in 1893 undisciplined and outspoken, in 1899 more conservative and lenient. This itself may serve to cast doubts on Bahr's reliability, but such biased documentation weakens Kraus's case; and the immediate question of venality was not settled.

A more convincing disclosure was that Bahr had falsified some of his Volkstheater reviews from the years 1893/94 for republication in his book Wiener Theater, by omitting passages referring to the incompetence of Bukovics and his actors. Kraus introduced his evidence by quoting part of the dedication to the book, discussed on page 56 above, and adding:

Da Herr Bahr gleichzeitig aber auch - "nach und nach doch" - zu Tantiemen gekommen ist, so durfte er nicht alle Feuilletons, die er seinerzeit geschrieben, in das Buch aufnehmen. Solche Vorsicht erheischte natürlich nur die Abtheilung "Deutsches Volkstheater". Hier mussten nicht nur gewisse Stellen eliminiert werden. Was verschlug's, dass da und dort der Sinn in sein Gegentheil verkehrt ward? (F.69,37)

Bahr's disparaging Volkstheater reviews of 1893, quoted by Kraus in "Wie das Glück einzog" [F.69,33ff.], were not incorporated

in the book edition, and several scathing passages from those Volkstheater reviews which were reprinted were omitted. On the other hand, severe criticisms of the Burgtheater and Raimund-theater productions were faithfully reprinted. To take an example not mentioned by Kraus - from Die Zeit of 12th October 1895 - Bahr wrote of the Burgtheater première of Schnitzler's Liebelei:

"Das Schauspiel war schlecht insceniert; das wienerische Wort ist hier am Platze: schlampert. Die Schauspieler standen immer im Rudel um den Souffleur, ohne je zu einer natürlichen Gruppe, zu einem ruhigen Bilde zu kommen. Die angenehme Laune des ersten Actes wurde durch eine forcirte und ungemüthliche Lustigkeit mit Gepolter und Tapage gestört [···] Alle Stellungen, Bewegungen, Beleuchtungen waren falsch. Durch diese saloppe Regie wurden auch die unbeschreibliche Grösse und Pracht der Sandrock und die köstlichen Gestalten der Herren Zeska und Kutschera beschädigt."

This was reprinted word for word in Wiener Theater.¹⁰⁵⁾ On the other hand, some of the criticisms of the Volkstheater were couched in terms similar to the above and yet omitted from the book - for example, those excerpted by Kraus, in "Wie das Glück einzog" [F.69,35f.], from Die Zeit of 17th November 1894 and 25th May 1895. Their omission cannot be explained by the predictably greater interest for Schnitzler in posterity than for the other authors reviewed, since one of these, Anzengruber, would surely have deserved mention in a book which Kraus, in 1899 (F.2,30), had criticized for its excessive name-dropping.

This criticism was superseded in 1901 by an ethical verdict,

based not on the amount of name-dropping but on the omissions.

Kraus filled over six pages of small print, by juxtaposing discrepancies between eight pairs of book and press reviews F.69, 37-45. This was a technique which he was to use frequently and effectively in Die Fackel, but in 1901 his extensive quotation was less stylistically orientated than later, and more a factual documentation of discrepant opinions. Here only brief excerpts from these excerpts can be quoted. It is clear why the following omission had been expedient for Bahr and why it now served Kraus so well F.69,45:

Wiener Theater, p.257

"--- In der Wiener Bearbeitung der 'Komödianten' fehlt eine Scene, die an der Comedie der beste Treffer des Stückes ist ---"

Die Zeit 27.X.1894 (p.59)

"--- In der Wiener Bearbeitung der 'Komödianten', die von einem Analphabeten sein muss, der weder deutsch noch französisch kann und die Gesetze der Sprache so wenig wie die Gesetze des Anstands ahnt, in dieser ganz dummen und phantastisch jämmerlichen Verstümmelung, fehlt eine Scene, die an der Comedie der beste Treffer des Stückes ist ---"

On the other hand, some criticisms later omitted by Bahr but quoted by Kraus F.69,40f., if severe, had in context appeared quite convincing:

Wiener Theater, p.216

"Bei den milderer und leicht zufriedenen Wienern fand es heute einen raschen und starken Erfolg. Er gehört auf das Conto des Herrn Tyrolt. Seine Kunst hat den Abend gerettet."

Deutsche Zeitung, 19.III.1893, p.8.

"Bei den milderer und leicht zufriedenen Wienern fand es heute einen raschen und starken Erfolg. Er gehört auf das Conto des Herrn Tyrolt. Seine Kunst hat den Abend gerettet. --- sie ist nicht nach meinem Geschmacke, weil ihr jede

Natur und der schlichte Adel der
Empfindung fehlen und alles immer
aus dem Kopfe kalt berechnet wird;
[...]
das Herz hat keinen Theil,
und wer gefühlte Kunst will, die
nichts künstelt, mag sie nicht
leiden. Aber ich darf nicht
verhehlen, dass sie bei uns den
Leuten noch immer gefällt [...]"

Why did Bahr, who advertised his frequent changes of attitude, so nonchalantly, here try to conceal the change by omitting this and other criticisms, which, if somewhat subjective, were apparently no more so than others which he did reprint?

Kraus had expected Bahr to argue that it was not fitting to preserve remarks on actors and producers for posterity, especially scathing remarks. But Bahr, at the trial, had pleaded that for Die Deutsche Zeitung he was working under great pressure, and would regret his choice of words the next day. Kraus retorted that he clearly regretted the choice of words, but not as soon after the deed as the next day! He objected, also, that Bahr had purged some reviews from Die Zeit, which was not a daily (F.69,38). Here he ignored the fact that Bahr did soon modify his tone after he joined Die Zeit, and that very few of his reviews from that periodical needed changing. Of course it is legitimate for an author to revise his work for new editions, but the revision of opinions of a live performance can at best only rely on recalling the very impressions which occasioned the remarks under revision. Bahr's revisions, however, were more drastic still; in some cases he omitted entire passages crucial to the overall verdict. Indeed, as Professor Kindermann

has shown,¹⁰⁶⁾ Bahr always distinguished between the idea, the dramatic form and the staging of a drama. Thus, even when he called Skowronnek's Eine Palastrevolution an empty, cold piece of journalism,¹⁰⁷⁾ the omission in Wiener Theater of a long appraisal of the Company's performance, of how the Company was suited to such "Benedixiaden",¹⁰⁸⁾ left a gap in the review which was not consistent with Bahr's practice - for elsewhere he described how a farce by Schönthan and Kadelburg was well acted and - in a similar innuendo - well suited to the "talents" of particular actors, despite its banality.¹⁰⁹⁾

Furthermore, there seems to be no reasonable explanation why only his Volkstheater reviews were significantly affected. H. Nedomansky,¹¹⁰⁾ who in investigating the discrepancies in Wiener Theater agrees that some texts were shortened, then claims that not only Volkstheater reviews, but those of other stages were altered, and that "Sinnveränderungen konnten nicht festgestellt werden". The evidence cited above would refute these assertions. Nevertheless, one must agree with Dr. Nedomansky¹¹¹⁾ about the difficulty of assessing the harmfulness of the theatre corruption, or Bahr's part in it, on only indirect, literary evidence.

For Kraus, the only plausible explanation for Bahr's uncharacteristic omissions was his material dependence, certainly around 1899 and 1900, on the Volkstheater. He summarized the case as follows:

Die rechte Hand, sagte ich, schreibt günstig und die linke nimmt Tantiemen; ein causaler Zusammenhang sei wahrscheinlich, denn es sei auffallend, dass die eine immer günstig schreibe, wenn die andere Tantiemen bezieht. Gleichwohl: die Rechte kann sich darauf

ausreden, sie wisse nicht, was die Linke thut. Der Weg, den der kritische Gedanke von dem Gehirn durch die Feder bis auf das Papier nimmt, ist schwer zu controlieren und die Hemmung durch ein materielles Interesse gerichtsordnungsmässig nicht zu beweisen. Anders bei Herrn Bahr. Er ist vielleicht der einzige Kritiker, der einen offenen Einblick in die Werkstätte seiner Sympathien und Antipathien gestattet. (F.69,38f).

The pattern of irresponsibility which Kraus here related to material interests corresponds strikingly to that which we have seen to characterize Bahr's attitude to his own work and actions generally. In this sense Kraus's polemic can be justified, and at the same time criticized for not going deep enough.

Professor Kindermann's summary⁸⁹⁾ blurs the facts of the case. He claims that Kraus's findings in no way alter Bahr's stature as a great "Theatermann" and critic:

„[...] Karl Kraus' [...] Beschuldigungen [...] erscheinen heute aus der Entfernung unwesentlich gegenüber der unbestreitbaren Grösse und Einflusskraft des Theaterkritikers Hermann Bahr.“⁸⁹⁾

In dismissing the ethical issue by appealing to Bahr's influence and stature, Professor Kindermann altogether begs the question of whether this influence on the theatre of the day was not, indeed, corrupt; and then precariously uses his own acceptance of it as a basis for his repudiation of Kraus's polemic as destructive and unjust. But Kraus attacked Bahr precisely because of his great influence, because he felt it to be corrupt. The alleged corruption would not have been such a serious public issue in a man of lesser stature and influence. The confidence of readers in Bahr's opinion- which Professor Kindermann cites - is less an excuse for Bahr than a pointer to the very real responsibility which in this case Bahr neglected. He should have been more

scrupulous than he appears to have been. As to how "unwesentlich" this may all seem to-day, study of Kraus's documentation and the literary evidence alone gives one the clear impression of intellectual dishonesty on Bahr's part - which is surely no small matter for a literary historian. The question of how far Bahr's material interests directly influenced his behaviour, however, is impossible to determine - and even of smaller significance than the finding that Bahr lacked a sense of responsibility as a writer.

iv) Aftermath and recurrence

To assess the extent to which Kraus's polemic contributed to Bahr's loss of influence, to his gradual estrangement from the Deutsches Volkstheater, from Vienna and, eventually, from the theatre, is also beyond the powers of the present-day observer. Even in 1901 the tide was turning. When the actors of the Volkstheater refused to appear in any more of Bahr's plays, Kraus wishfully attributed it to his campaign (F.83,10). The actual cause of this "mutiny" was Bahr's enthusiastic tribute, in the Neues Wiener Tagblatt of 16th October 1901, to the visiting actress Réjane, at the expense of the Viennese actors. Kraus felt that it was the consequence of the actors "seeing Bahr at work" (F.83,11f) - an allusion to Bahr's own terms for his changed attitude to them (F.69,36).

Yet, Kraus noted, Bahr continued to profit from his dual capacity. Schlenther had accepted his play Der Apostel for production at the Burgtheater in 1901. Kraus suggested that Schlenther had taken the cue from Bukovics, and that Bahr

would soon be writing of how "das 'alte Glück, das eine Zeit schmollen wollte'", had returned to the Burgtheater (F.83,11). Kraus then reflected (F.85,12) on whether Schlenther was really seeking the influential critic's favour, or perhaps revenging himself on a former enemy, by exposing Bahr's weakness as a dramatist. After this, using his method of juxtaposition, Kraus did infer a change of attitude on the part of Bahr (F.85,19; F.102,28).

By 1903 Bahr's relations with the Volkstheater had cooled considerably, so much so that, in the Neues Wiener Tagblatt on 4th October, he admitted feeling ashamed of having ever been performed there - because of the abysmal quality of the latest production there. Kraus ironically commented (F.144,26) that, if only he had anticipated this volte-face, he need never have undertaken his costly polemic. Then he noted that Bahr was still "ashamed" to attack Bukovics openly and had picked upon Weisse, the man who had turned down Bahr's Das Tschaperl (F.144,27).

For Kraus at least, the polemic of 1900/01 had exposed Bahr's corruption beyond doubt. He therefore adopted a more satirical tone now, in treating apparently similar material. In "refusing to commit himself" on whether Bahr was revenging himself on Weisse, Kraus was using the ironic device of the praeteritio¹¹²⁾ to propagate press rumours that added to his ethical case against Bahr. He similarly "refused to believe" (F.144,30), but nevertheless repeated, the story that Bahr had refused to return the advance royalties he had received for Das Tschaperl. This affair had a later parallel, in 1913, when Bahr refused to return his advance fee after his

revue, commissioned by Ronacher's cabaret, was banned. Kraus used the news to expose the hypocrisy of Bahr's claim that he never cared for money [F.381,33ff.;LL 299ff.7]; just as in 1903 he did, after all, conclude that Bahr had respectively praised and criticized the Volkstheater, according to the fate of his own plays there (F.146,31).

To sum up, Kraus noted that Bahr's estrangement from the Volkstheater would mean a change of fronts - and that one could expect him to enthuse at the coming "Gastspiel" of the Deutsches Theater, which, by strange coincidence, had recently accepted Bahr's Der Meister into its repertoire. Kraus concluded, playing on the words of Bahr's confession of 4th October:

Herr Bahr hat sich bekanntlich geschämt, dass nie eines seiner Stücke bisher im Berliner Deutschen Theater aufgeführt wurde... (F.146,31)

Bahr did, in fact, turn towards Berlin. 1903 saw the beginning of his friendship with Max Reinhardt, with whom he was to work as producer in 1906/07. He left Vienna in 1906, embittered after his loss of favour in the latter years.

His loss of influence and his absence from Austria until 1907 was marked by his disappearance from Die Fackel. From early in 1904 to October 1909, he was merely mentioned on no more than eight occasions. Kraus had delineated his character once and for all, and every surprising volte-face, every exaggerated gesture, needed no more than satirical treatment. So it was as the subject of glosses that Bahr frequently appeared in Die Fackel from 1909 to the mid- 'twenties. One

exceptional occasion, when Kraus's attacks on Bahr took on polemical pathos, was his treatment of Bahr's war-time machinations. Yet even this - with the possible exception of the belated review of Kriegsseggen⁷⁹⁾ - was not full-scale polemic, but part of the broader canvas of the hypocritical Hinterland.

Chapter Three

MAXIMILIAN HARDEN

I

THE PRESS AND CORRUPTION

i) Harden and Kraus: early relations

Maximilian Harden (1861-1927) was the most sophisticated and most outspoken opposition publicist in Wilhelminian Germany, and edited and compiled his influential weekly periodical Die Zukunft, for thirty years from 1892. His energetic realization of the motto "aussprechen, was ist" earned him a reputation as the best informed and most feared political critic. His erudition and literary patronage also earned him great intellectual prestige.

Kraus first expressed his admiration for Harden in September 1892,¹⁾ when he welcomed the foundation of Die Zukunft. It was not until he sent Harden a copy of Die demolierte Litteratur - which was appreciated²⁾ - that any significant contact was made. Kraus hoped for a mention in Die Zukunft, but despite Harden's repeated promises neither Die demolierte Litteratur nor Die Fackel was publicized by him.³⁾ Despite Harden's requests for a contribution from Kraus, none ever appeared in Die Zukunft.⁴⁾ Kraus's return offer, to publish anything of Harden's too outspoken for Germany, was "seriously considered"⁵⁾ but never taken up.

In 1897 Die Neue Freie Presse offered Kraus the

prestigious post of the late Daniel Spitzer, a satirical columnist, and Harden urged him to accept.⁶⁾ Even at this stage, Kraus wanted to be a more militant political satirist⁷⁾ than the post would allow - an ambition he only partly fulfilled, in 1898, on the Viennese periodical Die Wage. During Kraus's subsequent preparations for the founding of Die Fackel, Harden's advice was invaluable, particularly on questions of editorial policy and publication. Yet Harden - who was himself Kraus's model as the lone, committed polemicist - was sceptical of his chances of long-term success, and even now urged Kraus to use Die Neue Freie Presse as a springboard for his career.⁸⁾ This newspaper, however, was the outstanding landmark in the "weiter Phrasensumpf" of the press (F.1,1), which Kraus intended to "drain".

Harden, too, had attacked the hollow phrases of the press at the beginning of his career.⁹⁾ In 1899, to Ernestine Lothar, the wife of the Editor of Die Wage, he claimed that the idea, format, title and "Rochefort manner" of Die Fackel were his, and was annoyed that Kraus copied him.¹⁰⁾ Yet his letters to Kraus express impatience more where his advice was not followed, as over the choice of title (sic) and the timing of publication.¹¹⁾ To Frau Lothar, he expressed misgivings that Kraus "had so little to say", while to Kraus he voiced his approval of the planned rubrics for

"Pressdummheiten",¹²⁾ which were Sprachglossen in embryonic form. Harden's ambivalence suggests uneasiness towards a bête noire.

Kraus later asserted (LL 118) that Die Fackel had its own character from the start. One sign of this was his - in Harden's view lamentable¹³⁾ - lack of a good economics correspondent. While the early Fackel still readily committed itself on topical issues, Kraus's indifference to political or economic "opinion" - as provided by the press and by Harden - grew, to the point where in 1908 he prided himself on having "so little to say" in this sense:

Betrachtungen über die "Lage" wird man darin nicht finden. An solchem Werk wäre allerdings kein "Ich" beteiligt. (CM 195)

More and more, Die Fackel reflected his very personal vision and disdained any such informed commentary on current affairs as Harden provided for his educated public.

ii) The press and corruption

The model for Kraus's rejection of a set programme - "kein tönendes 'Was wir bringen'" (F.1,1) - was Harden's declaration in the first Die Zukunft:

"[...] durch eigenen Werth, nicht durch tönender Prologe gestelztes Pathos, sollen diese Blätter sprechen."¹⁴⁾

"Vom Bel zu Babel", the essay which contained this declaration, also attacked theatre corruption, especially where its most rampant forms - the prostitution of underpaid actresses and venality in theatre critics -

were combined, as at the Ronacher, the newly opened cabaret.

Using the analogy of Cyrus, Bel and Daniel, Harden likened the journalists to the priests of Bel and the illicit venality to the secret passages in the temple. He saw it as his mission to expose these, "die sorglich bisher noch verhüllten Zusammenhänge [..] zwischen Theater und Prostitution"¹⁵⁾ He pictured himself as Daniel in the lions' den of the press, but also felt he had a few allies, "die den Muth haben, [..] rückhaltlos hier die Wahrheit zu künden und der Zukunft Zeichen zu deuten".¹⁶⁾ The prophetic pathos and the complex, classicizing rhythm of this "prologue" might, however, deserve to be called "tönend" and "gestelzt":

"Als unter dem Drommetengeschmetter der festlich beleuchteten und befeuchteten Zeitungschreiber dereinst der inzwischen unselig entschlummerte Kaiserbazar eröffnet war, da sprach von den alten Grosskaufleuten Berlins zu seinen Freunden der Tüchtigste /.../"¹⁷⁾

The overlaid syntax is characteristic of Harden's constructions for setting a scene.^{17a)} Despite his recognition that "similia similibus curantur", his weapons were unsuited to his target; the prophetic stylization, however ironical its intention, was an over-reaction, quite unrelated to the base and obvious corruption at which it was levelled. Instead of exposing venal journalists verbatim - as Kraus was to do - Harden admitted, for instance, that Theodor Wolff, "one priest

who fed this Bel", was ignorant of the evil social factors whose instrument he was. It was the general evil, not the symptom, that Harden attacked, and to do so he adopted the Biblical persona and equally ponderous archaic language, which was more suited to his major theme: the Kaiser. The discrepancy between his polemical aims and his ornate style remained unnoticed for fifteen years.

Harden's open letter of congratulations and encouragement to Kraus on the foundation of Die Fackel, and Kraus's reply to it, were both printed in the second issue (F.2,1-17); and already they begged to differ about the press. The enemy of press corruption in Berlin pleaded for leniency from Kraus towards the more literary press of Vienna, which he regarded as a cultural ally. He wanted to see newspapers run by writers who would "proclaim the truth"; if publicists of integrity did not own the means of production, the press would degenerate to the American level:

"[F.2,1] und die Journalistik, der heute schon Depeschen und Reportage wichtiger sind als Stil, Können, Sachkenntniss und Überzeugung, hört völlig auf, ein Zweig der Literatur zu sein." [F.2,4]

He therefore praised Kraus's good example, but considered him too harsh on individuals, who were not to blame for the corruption of the institution. He warned Kraus not to forget "die grossen Gegenstände menschlichen Mühens, [F.2,1] die wirtschaftlichen Zusammenhänge, die Alles erklären, Alles verzeihlich machen" [F.2,5]. He accepted

that many of the press's faults were determined by its function within the social structure.¹⁸⁾

In reply, Kraus acknowledged the plea for leniency and for attention to greater evils, but suggested that Harden did not know Vienna well enough to see that in a country tyrannized by press cliques and resounding with their pretty disputes, the economist was helpless (F.2,16).¹⁹⁾ There was no greater topic for the satirist than the Austrian press. Despite their "lästiger Impressionismus" (F.2,9), Kraus conceded that Viennese journalists were talented stylists; but, he argued, did they not deserve the sharpest attack if they abused these talents and exerted a bad influence, as Bahr did (F.2,13)?

In his campaign against Bahr in 1901, Kraus received much advice²⁰⁾ but only nominal support from Harden, who made a non-committal statement of principle [F.69,25] condemning in general terms what, in a letter to Kraus, he called "diese Art von Pressherrschaft" [LL 130]. He regretted that he could not become personally involved, because of his friendly relations with Bahr [F.69,23]. Though grateful for the advice, Kraus must have been disappointed at the caution of the man whose militancy he admired. Unknown to him, however, Harden had just written to Bahr to voice his relief that Bahr was not angry with him:

"Und wir Beide, nourris dans le sérail, werden auf unsere 'alten' Tage doch nicht anfangen, auf Das zu hören, was dem Einen über den Anderen vors Ohr

gebracht wird."²¹⁾

This astonishing display of geniality towards a man whose "corruption" he was encouraging Kraus to expose, is only surpassed by his retrospective distortion of his attitude to Kraus's campaign as one of open disapproval.²²⁾ He did not openly express disapproval of this or any other of Kraus's actions.

As this episode illustrates, Harden's relations with the "better" Viennese journalists were compromised by his alliance with their enemy Kraus. That his attitude was less radical than Kraus's, was further demonstrated in April 1903, when an essay of his appeared in Die Neue Freie Presse. Quite sanguine about this apparent change of policy by Harden, Kraus found it consistent with Harden's lenient attitude of 1899, and established that their difference of opinion was one of principle:

Nichts ist [...] Harden's Pressebetrachtung fernerliegend als der Glaube, dass man sich durch gelegentliche Mitarbeit mit den geheimsten Tendenzen eines Blattes identificiere, fernerliegend als meine Idee, dass man die corrupte Presse allen verführerischen Glanzes einer literarischen Form entkleiden müsse. Harden, der an das Zeitungswesen den Massstab einer relativen Ethik anlegt, will die Presse verbessern. Ich will sie verschlechtern, will es ihr erschweren, ihre schändlichen Absichten hinter geistigen Prätensionen wirken zu lassen, und halte die stilistische Presse für die gefährlichere. (F.136,18)

Kraus believed that discussions on economics should not be cloaked in a florid style. He wanted a clear distinction between literature and a pretentious journalism

that camouflaged base commercial interests.²³⁾ Kraus, probably misconstruing Harden's intentions, felt that he had compromised his original mission.²⁴⁾ Later, he summed up Harden's reformist attitude to the press in an allusion to his pose as Daniel in the lions' den:

Er möchte dem Raubtier die Zähne nicht ausbrechen, sondern plombieren. (SK 89)

Although Harden directly confronted the Kaiser, criticized government policy and polemicized against social abuses, he did not make an imaginative, radical challenge to bourgeois values, as Kraus did from "Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität" on.²⁵⁾ He was an independent and sophisticated journalist, but up to 1918 he remained intellectually very much a part of the society he so sharply criticized from his lone vantage-point.

iii) Sexual morality

How narrowly bourgeois Harden's mentality was became clear in several controversies over sexual morality, from which it transpired that he was now more concerned about immoral women than about corrupt journalists. In May 1904, Harden condemned the Berlin actress and prostitute, Jenny Gross, one day after her funeral, insinuating that her immoral earnings were the source of her wealth as "Grosskapitalistin im Bühnenreich".²⁶⁾ Harden's moral pathos gave Kraus the impression "einer pathetisch geadelten Betrachtung des 'Neuen Wiener Journals'" (SK 90) - it was no better than the lewd

gossip of "Theaterschnüffler". According to Kraus, sexual offences were only made evil by the publicity their prosecutors created; the major evil was the influence of the corrupt press.

It was the Hervay affair²⁷⁾ which caused the decisive break between Kraus and Harden. A Styrian Bezirkshauptmann had fallen for an exotic visitor, married her, and then committed suicide on finding that she had deceived him over her past experience and marital status. The "culprit" became victim of a witch-hunt. Later recalling his disagreement with Harden, Kraus said that while Harden had scorned the immorality of the woman, he had scorned the primitive mentality of the man and the provincial community (LL 131).²⁸⁾ At the time, in November 1904, he had publicly expressed his disdain for Harden's rigid attitude and cynical comments on others' private lives (SK 116).

Just before this, in October 1904, he had criticized Harden's condemnation of the "sluttish" Princesses of Coburg and Saxony (SK 87). On the one hand, Harden paid tribute to the former Austrian Prime Minister Koerber,²⁹⁾ who, in Kraus's opinion, was most to blame for the extent of press corruption. On the other hand, he sneeringly evoked the way Louise von Coburg's eye was caught by her lover's virile appearance,³⁰⁾ and became indignant at the fact that Louise von Sachsen had slept with a dozen men of all classes and was still a heroine.³¹⁾

In January 1905, Kraus condemned the tastelessness and meanness of Harden's outlook. This was most clearly revealed in Harden's ironic insinuations about the Socialist politician, Südekum, who had come to Louise von Sachsen's rescue in true romantic style.³²⁾ When a double entendre was suspected in his remark that she had "shown" her gratitude, Harden claimed this to be an innocent reference to a letter of thanks.³³⁾ Kraus, for the first time, subjected Harden's style and logic to close scrutiny, and remained unconvinced by his excuses:

Aber ein ehrlicher Publizist bekennt, was er mit dem Satze "die sich dankbar erwies" gemeint hat.

(F.173,7)

The verb can, of course, also mean to "prove". It was one of a number of verbal ambiguities which, despite Harden's earnest protestations, served his polemical purpose and preserved for him the appearance of literary decorum. Such weapons he exploited in his major "moral" campaign, against Eulenburg.

HARDEN'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST EULENBURG

i) Political background

Harden's acquaintance with the retired Bismarck was the decisive political inspiration for his virulent opposition to government policy and Wilhelm II's unfelicitous "personal rule". In the course of these campaigns, he was thrice sentenced for lèse majesté to a total of over one year's internment. Though always a strong voice of opposition, he was no republican and even anti-Socialist. He was initially in sympathy with the conservative Agrarian Party and sceptical of industrial and colonial expansionism on the English model. After Bismarck's death, however, his criticism of the autocratic Prussian system grew. By 1908 he was demanding a constitutional monarchy. He moved away from Bismarck's foreign policies, as H.F. Young suggests,³⁴⁾ the more he was convinced that Germany's power was in industry and trade and needed to be secured by a consistent, self-assertive foreign policy.

The consequence of "personal rule" was the opposite of Harden's ideal: an erratic, often diplomatically tactless, but basically timid policy. The failure of constitutional safeguards against such imperial faux pas as the Daily Telegraph affair of 1908 was a clear symptom of the system's flaws.

Philipp Fürst zu Eulenburg-Hertefeld was Wilhelm II's closest friend and personal adviser. He did not aspire

to political office, but trusted in his personal influence to promote the conservative, royalist, Prussian policy which he believed to be in Germany's interests. As J.C.G. Röhl has shown,³⁵⁾ Wilhelm II's "personal rule" was more active than has been supposed; his often arbitrary decisions were put into effect. Dr Röhl,³⁶⁾ after tracing Eulenburg's part in the fall of Bismarck, in the rise and fall of Caprivi and in Bülow's accession to the Chancellorship, concludes that he was the chief architect of the Kaiser's triumph - that is, of his wresting of power from the responsible statesmen.

Harden adopted Bismarck's antipathy to Eulenburg and his warning about the harm that loyalist, romantic adoration such as Eulenburg's might cause to a "dramatic temperament" like Wilhelm's.³⁷⁾ As H. Rogge's summary shows,³⁸⁾ Harden attacked Eulenburg throughout the eighteen-nineties - particularly for his dominant role in the "Byzantine camarilla" at court, and for the way he cushioned the Kaiser, with anachronistic illusions about his divine right and destiny to rule alone, from the real nature of what concerned him as a political ruler. Harden deplored the failure of statesmen, courtiers and the press to "speak the truth" to the Kaiser.

In 1902, as his health weakened, Eulenburg resigned his Ambassadorship in Vienna, and thereafter emerged from the background only when consulted.³⁹⁾ The Hohenlohe memoirs, however, among their rather indiscreet

disclosures, contained hints as to Eulenburg's influential background role, his "vermittelnde Stellung", in imperial politics.⁴⁰⁾ After the publication of the memoirs, in October 1906, there was a press scare about a camarilla's plot to overthrow the Chancellor and to secure the Kaiser's sovereignty by appointing a nonentity.⁴¹⁾ It was supposed that constitutional procedures were being sabotaged by a clique, which was headed by Eulenburg.

Typical of the vacillation between tactlessness and indecision in Wilhelminian foreign policy was the handling of the Morocco crisis of 1905/06. What began with German suspicions of French revanchisme became a policy of acquiescence, sealed by the royal assent, to French "peace" overtures.⁴²⁾ The advocate of a forceful anti-French policy, Baron Holstein, was manoeuvred out of office, and Germany suffered what in Harden's view was a diplomatic humiliation. Holstein suspected Eulenburg of engineering both his downfall and the policy of appeasement.⁴³⁾

Although he came to agree with Holstein on foreign policy, Harden did not become the instrument of his revenge, as was supposed.⁴⁴⁾ It was quite consistent with Harden's opposition to the "camarilla" that in November 1906 his attacks intensified. Horrified at the news that Eulenburg had entertained in the royal presence a reputedly homosexual French Councillor of Legation named Lecomte, Harden suspected that such meetings

accounted for Germany's capitulation to French "overtures" over Morocco. J. Haller⁴⁵⁾ denies that this personal audience had sinister political repercussions or could have affected the foreign policy of earlier months, but he then, unwittingly, provides evidence⁴⁶⁾ that Eulenburg had previously conveyed Lecomte's hints about Morocco, if not to the Kaiser, then to the Chancellor. Eulenburg's intercourse with Lecomte was, then, politically indiscreet, but it undermined not the Chancellor's position but Holstein's.

ii) Polemics and trials

In a series of attacks in Die Zukunft, Harden made several obscure references to the abnormalities of Eulenburg and his politically harmful group of extravagant spiritualists and "enthusiasts". In "Praeludium", in November 1906, he first threatened that Eulenburg's unwholesome influence had to be exposed.⁴⁷⁾ The next issue contained a fictitious conversation between "der Harfner" and "der Süsse", which cryptically demonstrated his inside knowledge that Eulenburg and his friend Graf Kuno Moltke referred to the Kaiser as "das Liebchen".⁴⁸⁾

Approached by a mediator, Harden agreed to keep silent only if Eulenburg withdrew from politics. The Prince did leave the country, but returned in January 1907. By this time Harden was horrified by his findings on the extent of homosexuality in high circles.⁴⁹⁾ In his next

attacks,⁵⁰⁾ he reflected upon the Kaiser's timid foreign policy and hinted at Lecomte's illicit liaison with Eulenburg. By April 1907, there were signs that Eulenburg desired conciliation, and Lecomte was recalled from duty after the French Ambassador had noted rumours about his homosexuality.⁵¹⁾ In "Roulette", in April 1907, Harden considered, in the light of another homosexual prince's surrender of an Order conferred upon him, that Eulenburg - whose "vita sexualis" was equally unhealthy - ought to resign from the Chapter of the Black Eagle.⁵²⁾

On 2nd May, the Kaiser got wind of the scandal and ordered a purge. Suspects were forced to resign their official posts. Eulenburg, who denied the charges but withdrew from his prominent position, was asked, along with Moltke, to clear his name. On being approached, Harden accepted the assurance that Moltke was not homosexual. This agreement might have satisfied both parties, and Harden's attacks might thus have achieved the removal of the "offenders" from the royal presence.⁵³⁾ Yet, fearing that his acquiescence could allow their reinstatement, Harden added the proviso that he might be forced, politically, to combat "die allgemeine Rückwirkung einer normwidrigen (wenn auch ideellen) Männerfreundschaft, an deren Bestehen und an deren ins Politische überschweifende Tendenz ich nach gewissenhafter Prüfung authentischer Dokumente nicht den geringsten Zweifel habe".⁵⁴⁾ This ploy led to the biggest scandal of the Wilhelminian era. After refusing to duel,

Harden had to face a lawsuit brought against him by Moltke.

In June 1907, provoked by press chivvying about "backing down" and "mincing his words", Harden clarified his arguments in two articles.⁵⁵⁾ He stated that he had not alluded to homosexual practices, only to the effeminate nature of men who influenced the Kaiser; he was, on principle, against the persecution of homosexuals, and his motives were purely political. He repeated these assurances at the trial, in October 1907, and in his published account of it,⁵⁶⁾ adding that he did not consider it an insult to speak of a man's abnormal tendencies. He had not attacked Moltke personally, he said; indeed, Eulenburg had been his target. His case was based on documents which had come to his notice when advising Moltke's ex-wife in her divorce suit in 1902, and, he insisted, his use of the material had been discreet.

Harden was acquitted, but at last the scandalous disclosures caused concern in the highest circles,⁵⁷⁾ and the Crown Prosecutor intervened. After an appeal by Moltke, the verdict was rescinded and Harden was tried, in the New Year period, for libel. His chief witnesses were discredited in court, five of the six questions he had for Eulenburg were discounted, and he was sentenced to four months' imprisonment. Now he appealed, questioning the legality of these proceedings. Only his defeat made him go further in his allegations.⁵⁸⁾

On two separate occasions Eulenburg denied under oath ever having indulged in obscene practices. Harden now saw the oath as a weapon, but also the impossibility of the influential Eulenburg's being tried for perjury by a Prussian court.⁵⁹⁾ To bring pressure to have the verdict against him rescinded, he sought to establish in a court his most incriminating evidence⁶⁰⁾ - of Eulenburg's homosexual practices. A defamation suit was therefore arranged in Munich, by collusion⁶¹⁾ between Harden, his solicitor Bernstein and the Editor of the Neue Freie Volkszeitung there, who accused him of having no evidence or of being bought off by Eulenburg. If the trial had been authentic, it would simply have been a matter of Harden's showing the court the documents from the Berlin trials - as Kraus noted (F.259,12). He could have proved the defamation without reference to new evidence, by claiming - as in the first trial - that he had acted in good faith. But at the Munich trial the petty court judge was "sympathetic", and Bernstein, on home ground, intimidated the witnesses Ernst and Riedl into disclosing details about the absent Prince's "obscene practices" twenty-five years before! The sensational consequence was Eulenburg's arrest for perjury. The perjury trial, which began on 29th June 1908, was an even worse scandal. The ailing Prince was broken and tortured by the proceedings, while the indulgence shown to him was resented by Harden as "the most insolent example of class justice that has ever existed".⁶²⁾ Harden believed that, long after guilt

had been established, the trial was protracted in order that the defendant's (allegedly) sick condition might move the jury. How authentic⁶³⁾ Eulenburg's sickness was may be inferred from his collapse in court. The trial first continued in his hospital ward, then was suspended indefinitely. A year later it was resumed, but the prisoner collapsed again and the trial was postponed sine die, pending his recovery.

Meanwhile, the Moltke-Harden case was reopened - without Eulenburg being summoned as a witness! - and in April 1909 Harden was fined 600 Marks. A further appeal stage was only forestalled by a satisfactory statement from Moltke and an offer from Bülow to bear the costs of all three trials. This at last silenced Harden. He had completely underestimated the disastrous repercussions his "few words" would have. They certainly did not alter the method of government, as the Daily Telegraph affair confirmed. By this time, Bülow's machinations and false promises outraged Harden so much that he came to see even Eulenburg as a "pure beam of light" in comparison.⁶⁴⁾ Although, therefore, there were political grounds for Harden's campaign, its effect was politically more damaging than the evil it combated.

iii) Harden's arguments and Kraus's analysis

The question of whether Harden's campaign was ethically and logically sound necessitates a definition

of the connection, in Eulenburg's case, between homosexuality and the alleged evil influence. The Lecomte affair seems to be the only clear instance of a politically indiscreet liaison. Harden knew about it, but could at most suspect its effect on policy. Although backdoor manoeuvres typified particularly Eulenburg's part in Wilhelminian politics and are alien to constitutional principles, the policy of appeasement that they seem to have fostered in 1906 can be criticized - as a matter of opinion - only politically, not morally. Harden was simply of another opinion. Yet he eventually used tactics that were equally questionable. This is a sad reflection on the general political frustration of democratically minded intellectuals in Wilhelminian Germany, who eventually welcomed World War as a panacea for the ills of their society.

Harden's attacks were not aimed at any specific political indiscretion by Eulenburg or Moltke. He accepted that Moltke performed his duties well and was only harmful as Eulenburg's friend and tool.⁶⁵⁾ He never showed precisely what political damage Eulenburg had caused; he merely "warned" about possible harm.⁶⁶⁾ This might suggest that his allusion to homosexuality was simply a tactical weapon against an enemy whom he could not oust by other means. Yet what made this well-read polemicist so unique - influenced as he was by theories of hereditary influence and psychopathology -

was that he believed homosexuality itself to be politically harmful. This was the basis for his spurious distinction between homosexual practices, "which as a private matter did not concern" him, and abnormal inclinations in any public figures, about which "the public had a right to know".⁶⁷⁾

On the one hand, Harden provided the double-edged explanation:

"Was ich bekämpft habe, ist: die Einwirkung normwidriger (wenn auch ideeller) Männerfreundschaft. [- -] Asexuell oder sexuell [. .], edle Männerliebe oder ideelle Männerfreundschaft: normal ist's nicht. Auch nichts, was den Menschenwerth unter allen Umständen mindert."⁶⁸⁾

It becomes evident, however, that his sympathy and respect for homosexuals was theoretical, not strong enough to overcome all his preconceptions. Thus he felt that they were inclined to lie and intrigue. He concluded:

"Aber sie passen nicht auf jeden Platz, nicht in jede Region. Sie können, wo mehrere sich zusammenfinden, unbewusst Schaden stiften. Besonders an Höfen, wo die ganzen Männer es schwer genug haben. Und wenn man, wie es heute schon Mode geworden ist, die Abnormen als die bessern, edlern Menschen preist, dann treibt man Gesunde ins Verderben."⁶⁹⁾

Without ever proving his initial assertions, Harden descends in the final sentence to false, alarmist pathos which begs the question about the very norms it purports to uphold.

These assertions Kraus called a downright lie, and

he sharply defined the respective relevance of cause and symptom, the obscuring of which was a necessary foundation for Harden's argument:

Günstlingswirtschaft ist ein Übel im Staat, das der mutige Publizist aufdecken mag. Missbrauch des Subordinationsverhältnisses in der Armee mag seine Kritik herausfordern. Solche Erscheinung, nicht ihre Ursache, ist die Normwidrigkeit, die uns bekümmert. [---] Aber nicht die Richtung des Geschlechtstriebes, die Berührung des Pflichtenkreises ist das Übel. (CM 75)

Kraus argued that the influence of homosexuality in diplomacy was no greater than that of normal sexual inclinations; to claim it to be more was an exploitation of prejudice rather than a fight against corruption. To Kraus's analysis one might add that the main danger of homosexuality in high circles is its greater vulnerability to blackmailers. Harden did not show this - rather he exploited it, albeit in a campaign which, he insisted, was in the national interest. Whatever its intention, in the context of a polemic against "abnormal" politicians his initial differentiation between the pathological but "not dishonourable" tendencies - to which he was alluding - and illegal homosexual practices, amounted to a pretext for avoiding prosecution and a tactic for exploiting public prejudice. This was seen by Kraus:

Herr Harden aber fühlt gar nicht, dass der blosse Hinweis auf eine "Anlage" ungleich niedriger ist als die Beschuldigung päderastischen Handelns, für deren

Wahrheit oder Unwahrheit es einen einfachen Beweis gibt, während dort ein Rest von Unklarheit fortwirkend das Gespött des Pöbels herausfordert.
(F.242,18)

The consequence of Harden's allusions to "tendencies" rather than offences was the grotesquely indiscreet investigation of details of Moltke's private life, at the first trial. Inevitably the suspects tried to clear their names of these slurs by the only possible means - by denying offences, which could be proved or disproved, albeit at the cost of further court room disgraces in 1908 and 1909. Yet in his first peroration, Harden blamed Moltke for forcing him to make the disclosures:

"Da er mich aber verklagt und durch künstliche Konstruktionen meine paar Worte umzudeuten unternommen hat, war ich, als Angeschuldigter, zu dem Versuch genöthigt, seine Normwidrigkeit, die in den Artikeln nicht behauptet ist, hier zu erweisen."⁷⁰⁾

In letting himself be forced into drawing such conclusions, Harden belied his former discretion; in this light it appears as the tactic of a blackmailer.

Harden certainly did aim to be "discreet". His allusions to abnormality were meant to be clear enough to discredit the "group" in initiated circles, but cryptic enough to avoid a public scandal. He failed to see the inconsistency in his hope that veiled allusions to incriminating evidence, while containing the scandal on a "discreet" scale, might force the suspects to depart - under threat of scandal. For a sex scandal is

by definition only scandalous once exposed in public. Discretion, as Harden understood it, was a half-hearted precaution against the inevitable distortions of his subtle definitions by a scandal-mongering press. His simultaneous attempts to "avoid" and to exploit the possibility of a scandal can scarcely be dismissed as a minor inconsistency. It was a serious lapse on the part of this experienced publicist to fail to predict the repercussions of his action, and merely to rely on the Chancellor's intervention.⁷¹⁾ In the polemical context, Harden's hypocritical evasion of responsibility amounted to a casuistic obscuring of his real "political" aims - as Kraus's gloss on the following passage suggests:

"Ich habe nur darauf hingewiesen, dass die Sache zu einem grossen politischen Skandal auswachsen könnte; einen solchen zu verhindern war der Zweck meines Schreibens."⁷²⁾

Aber dass die Verhinderung von derselben Person angeboten wird, die den Skandal verbreiten kann, macht die Sache so peinlich. (F.242,45)

At first the controversy centred on the formulation of these provocative allusions. Pressed for an explanation, Harden professed - with yet another innuendo - that he had not intended any double entendre about "Carlino" von Tschirschky, Secretary of State at the Foreign Office:

"Ich würde mirs dreimal überlegen, ehe ich von einem Mann behauptete, er unterhalte seit langem enge Beziehungen zum Fürsten Eulenburg. Um seine Wünsche ans Ohr des Kaisers zu bringen, braucht der

Fürst nicht den Staatsmann Carlino [..] zu bemühen.
Das gehört doch wohl zum Pflichtenkreis des Grafen
Kuno Moltke."⁷³⁾

At the first trial, Harden had denied that this was another slight to Tschirschky's virility. Kraus noticed that it was more a slur on Eulenburg, "whose company compromised any man's reputation." He believed that the choice of "Mann" instead of "Menschen" was, after all, carefully considered (F.242,33). This may seem like hair-splitting, but it is confirmed by the implied contrast between "Staatsmann" and the more intimate relation to Eulenburg implicitly attributed to Moltke.

In the following passage, from Harden's evocation of how English fears about German Weltpolitik were being allayed, the plaintiff objected to the cryptic pun "warm":

"Blickt auf diese Tafelrunde. Philipp Eulenburg, Lecomte (den Tout-Paris nicht seit gestern kennt), Kuno Moltke, Hohenau, des Kanzlers Civiladjutant.
Below: Die träumen nicht von Weltbränden; habens schon warm genug."⁷⁴⁾

Harden protested against "gewaltsame Interpretiererei",⁷⁵⁾ and insisted that "warm" meant "bequem", not "homosexuell". The text had only a political meaning, and "homosexuell" would be absurdly out of context, meaningless, for it would not preclude belligerent ambitions. Kraus called this splitting the "Doppelsinn des Witzes". Harden did not want to say they were homosexual, nor did he merely mean they were cosy; he wanted to say both, and "warm" provided the required ambiguity (F.242,34).

Harden also insisted that the parenthesis referring to Lecomte recalled only the latter's peaceable family background [F.242,35]. Yet it is more likely that a diplomat's "reputation" that is hinted at in a phrase like "nicht seit gestern" is one for something more conducive to gossip than mere peaceability. Harden's knowledge of Lecomte's homosexuality would confirm this and Kraus's analysis. The clearest confirmation is the context itself. These were not key names politically, but at least four of the five were homosexual suspects, and this Harden knew.⁷⁶⁾

Kraus discredited Harden's claim that his words were harmless, in an analogy. If one says that A has long fingers and then claims one's choice of words to be a stylistic preference and not an insinuation about A's honesty; but at the same time one can prove that A is a thief: this fact confirms that one did insinuate that A was dishonest (F.242,37). The two ideas were too inextricably associated in the writer's mind for his aesthetic predilections to remain independent of his moral attitudes. And so it may be generally valid to protest, as Harden did:

"Hat es denn einen Zweck, ist es denn würdig, einem Schriftsteller, schlecht oder gut [F.242,37], eine Interpretation seiner Worte aufzuzwingen, die er ablehnt?"⁷⁷⁾

But such professions of innocence were belied by the author's general polemical intention. Kraus allowed

no laxity on this point:

Ehrlich kann alles gemeint sein, aber ist es die Ehrlichkeit des künstlerischen Schaffens? (F.242,29)

Unawareness of double entendre was no excuse for a professional writer, whose attitude to his medium, language, had to be scrupulously sensitive:

Der Schriftsteller muss alle Gedankengänge kennen, die sein Wort eröffnen könnte. Er muss wissen, was mit seinem Wort geschieht. Je mehr Beziehungen dieses eingeht, um so grösser die Kunst; aber es darf nicht Beziehungen eingehen, die dem Künstler verborgen bleiben. (BWG 122)

This marks the establishment of Kraus's absolute perspective as language satirist.

To illustrate his point, in the aphorism of June 1908 which contains this statement (BWG 121f.), Kraus analysed another of Harden's puns. Criticizing Eulenburg's style, Harden wrote that he had more talent for writing than for politics, since in this sphere "später fehlte es an Sitzfleisch und Ernst".⁷⁸⁾ Ernst was also the name of the fisherman whose former homosexual relations with Eulenburg were exposed by Harden at the Munich trial. Kraus suggested that the pun was worthy of Heine's cheap attack on Platen, but one of which Harden was too humourless to be conscious. Factually he was probably mistaken here, for Harden made another pun on Ernst in a letter to Holstein.⁷⁹⁾ But his point was valid in the context of Harden's disclaimer of previous puns; and Harden's conscious pun suggests

that his public disclaimer was, after all, merely rhetorical, and confirms Kraus's first point. Harden's literalist pleading for his "discreet" insinuations gave Kraus the cue to "take his word", and so to dismantle his style, to cut the literary figure down to size.

STYLE AND CHARACTER

i) Harden's style

"Ein, unter Laienleitung, aus einer vor geputztem
Schaupöbel oft in den Formen des Yankeetheaters
geführten Untersuchung entstandener Bericht, der,
als ein von der Kommission dem Senat der Vereinigten
Staaten vorgelegter, immerhin ernsterer Beachtung
würdig ist als der Reporterkehricht." /F.360,56/

This sentence from Harden's article "Titanomachie", of
15th June 1912, which Kraus excerpted in his "translation"
rubric "Desperanto", illustrates what he called Harden's
"Elephantiasis der Satzglieder" (LL 112). Meaning can
only be deciphered from this periphrastic bombast if
one applies some contrived rule of grammatical precedence:
the individual units are intended not to interact, but
to occupy fixed positions within the congested arrangement
of Schachtelsätze.

Harden's treatment of language as dead letter -
illustrated by this example - accounts for his narrow
interpretations of his ambiguous allusions, and to a
great extent justifies Kraus's dismantling of the elements
of his style, which were not organically unified. His
great intellectual ability, his sophistication and sense
of complexity, did not enhance his literary qualities.
Clearly he did not always write sentences like the above,
but such imbalance and confusion was the result of his
inflexible adherence to set patterns, formulae and norms,
which was a consistent feature of his method as a publicist

and his outlook generally.⁸⁰⁾

No doubt to have used words as florid ciphers to camouflage and decorate his views would have been justified as a defence against censorship, as Dr Weller claims it to be;⁸¹⁾ but he treated themes great and small in this way. Some literary subject matter, for instance Tolstoi's Resurrection,⁸²⁾ lured Harden into pretentious stylization; but this was not always the case, as his essay on Zola of 1902 shows,⁸³⁾ which Kraus acknowledged as masterly (F.119,34). Dr Weller himself admits that Harden hoped to make politics "literaturfähig",⁸⁴⁾ and mentions his frequent exposition of a subject by means of parables, fables and fairy-tales⁸⁵⁾ - that is, "literary" stylization. Harden's experiments with words or names, not always relevant and seldom elegant, could give a prophetic or bombastic emphasis to topical matters, as Kraus derisively noted:

Wenn er über gleichgültige Dinge zu schreiben hat,
nennt er's "Molybdänomantie" oder "Suovetaurilia". (CM 60)

Such titles sometimes served as a mythological guise for leading articles on politics. His borrowings, too, were symptomatic of his desire to appear different - even at the expense of accuracy, as Kraus coolly noted:

Denn der Bernard Shaw, der geschichtliche Grössen
verkleinert, ist eben darum kein "Mikromane", ein
Kaiser bestimmt kein "Imperat" [̄.̄.] (CM 63)

Such studied individualism was also evident in Harden's idiomatic, grammatical and orthographical idiosyncrasies.

He preferred often cumbersome preceding genitives or substituted a dative for a genitive: "dem Problem die Lösung zu finden" [CM 60]. He insisted on retaining archaic or apart spelling and phrases like "Tag vor Tag"; he continued to write "Rath", "Waaren", "Erlebniss" with a "scharfes s", "kopiren", and wrote pronouns with capitals: "Das", "Niemand", "Etwas", "das Andere". He omitted the "s" in compounds like "Geburt(s)tag", "Zeitung(s)herausgeber". Under the misconception that these were false genitive forms, and not simply assimilated for the sake of euphony, he retained the "s" where he saw a genuine genitive, as in "Reichsgericht" (CM 59f.).

Harden's uniqueness was only superficial. True originality, in Kraus's view, was more than the sum of stylistic idiosyncrasies. In his glosses, parodies and "translations", he even tried to show that Harden's language, "Desperanto", was not only preposterously stereotyped but imitable; and from signs of Harden's influence on the style of others he inferred that the style was not inherent in his personality:

So wenig haftet die Eigenart dieses Stils an der Persönlichkeit und so sehr an dem erlernbaren Trik. Vom Trik aus kann freilich auch der Charakter, oder wie diese Stilisten sagen, "das Ethos" erobert werden. (F.242,39)

This anticipates the argument against Heine's imitable originality, in "Heine und die Folgen" (UWM 191 and 196). The Harden case was the first where Kraus's literary and ethical criterion was the unity of man and work.

His assertion later, that he had exposed the literary nonentity "an einem Stil, der hier wirklich den Mann bedeutet" (LL 111), implies that both style and man were false. Yet this only became clear when juxtaposed - as in Kraus's "translations" - with some independent standard.

Dr Weller⁸⁶⁾ has noted the discrepancy between Harden's aims as a publicist and the effect of his obscurely ornate style, which was - despite its individuality - characteristic of the age that Harden criticized. Indeed, Harden's ability to write and speak without the pretensions of his persona as author of Die Zukunft⁸⁷⁾ is a fact that confirms Kraus's conclusions about the lack of artistic necessity in his style.

Harden's desperate attempts to obscure his lack of originality were the theme, therefore, of Kraus's first full-scale onslaught, "Maximilian Harden. Eine Erledigung" of October 1907. Here Kraus's metaphors spring to life as if to assert, by their own vitality, the opponent's sterility: Harden's language was literally stilted, a self-elevation above banality, which proved not that it was more lofty than the average, but that it did not have "proper legs to stand on" (CM 59). Kraus continues:

Schwulst ist Krücke. Humorlosigkeit bedarf der Affektation. Witz ist kein sprachlicher Neutöner, er setzt die Sprache voraus und verträgt keine terminologische Hemmung. Temperament hat so viel zu sagen, dass es nicht Zeit hat, kalligraphische

Schnörkel anzubringen. (CM 59)

The "kalligraphische Schnörkel" are not meant literally, but sum up all of Harden's elaborations, which were substitutes for inspiration. Kraus criticized his abuse of aphaeresis for similar reasons:

Wer sich darauf verlegt, Präfixe zu töten, dem geht's auch nicht um die Wurzel. Wer "weisen" will, beweist nicht; wer "kündet", hat nichts zu verkünden. (CM 59)

In reporting the Hau murder trial,⁸⁸⁾ Harden called Karlsruhe "die Fächerstrassenstadt", "die Hardtwaldstadt" and "Friedrichs stille Residenzstadt" [CM 62]. Kraus exposed the pretentiousness of such formulations by an inverted percontatio, a series of questions and answers in which he "corrected" the commonplace with Harden's phrase:

Hau übersiedelte nach Amerika? Nein, er ist "zu den Sternenbannerleuten gegangen". Er kommt aus Amerika zurück? Nein, "aus Atlantis". [---] Cui bono, fragt sich in solchen Mordaffären die Justiz? Nein, "die Frage des Lucius Cassius Longinus Ravilla klingt auf jeder Mordstätte dem Kriminalisten ins Ohr". (CM 62)

This method he adapted in his "translations" from Harden.

Kraus's rubrics "Harden-Lexikon", "Übersetzung aus Harden" and "Desperanto", for which he adapted his device of two-column juxtaposition, were, indeed, his most effective means of confronting Harden's verbiage with its plain meaning:

"Das Ohr lässt von aussen her | Man hört nichts

keine Schallwelle durch das
ovale Fenster ins knöcherne
Labyrinth"

(LL84)

"Der liebste Kömmling"

Der willkommenste Besuch

(LL 102)

"Sich mit frevler Hand aus
dem Sonnenbezirk jäten"

Sich umbringen

(LL 254)

It was clearly with Harden's neologisms in mind (F.237,9)
that he formulated the following aphorism:

Nur eine Sprache, die den Krebs hat, neigt zu
Neubildungen. (BWG 122)

Kraus often used the "translation" convention as a
vehicle for satirical variations. Thus he emphasized
Harden's obscurity by simulating the layman's bewilderment
by means of translator's questions-marks:

"Unter den Kalimafkon, dem
prächtig wallenden Trauer-
schleier, verwest der Leib
des von grossen Kriegern und
Organisatoren geschaffenen
Staates"

??

(LL 80)

He did not always remain "faithful" to the original, but
deflated it with a satirical point. Thus the translation

"Die zurückgestaute Wahrheit
stürzt über die Beinpfosten
der Mundschleusse"

Der Fischerjackerl beeilt
sich, die Wahrheit zu
sagen

(F.254,44f.)

was modified in the book version to:

Einer beeilt sich,
auszusprechen was ist

(LL 85)

Although at first the Munich trial - to which the original referred - demonstrated to Kraus the evil consequences of Harden's following his polemical slogan "aussprechen, was ist" at all costs, his play on the slogan here rather emphasizes the inability of its obscurely verbose author to live up to it.

And so, after Kraus's success with his polemical "Erledigung" of Harden's literary reputation, his scrutiny of the stylist necessarily became a satirical procedure. As such Harden could no longer be taken seriously - even though he remained harmful in other respects; hence the occasional bathos in Kraus's attacks:

[/Er] schreibt schliesslich Artikel, die zwar von weitem nach erpresserischer Gesinnung riechen, aber in der Nähe sich bloss als die Hilferufe eines ungeschickten Angebers erweisen, den die Konsequenz einer einmal begangenen Lumperei um den Verstand gebracht hat. (LL 110)

Polemical invective was now only necessary in combating the cultural damage caused by Harden's obsession with information, especially about others' sex lives.

ii) Information

In Kraus's view, yet another arid, decorative substitute for original thought and temperament was Harden's display of erudition. Harden was extremely well-read and knowledgeable on a vast range of subjects. He had great respect for experts and educated men - his intellectual peers - and Die Zukunft contained

numerous learned contributions. But he tended to dispense his knowledge more liberally than argument and content required. Dr Weller argues that his quotations counteracted his tendency to obscurity and that the information they contained provided his arguments with a firm basis.⁸⁹⁾ Yet the tendency of Harden's references to be far-fetched and of his erudite excursions to be tedious gives Kraus's dismissive generalization some validity:

Seine Zitate kürzen die Darstellung nicht ab, sondern verlängern sie, und bespiegeln den Erzähler, nicht das Erzählte. (CM 63)

An example cited by Kraus were Harden's apostrophes to the defence counsel in his report of the Hau trial.⁸⁸⁾

"Kennen Sie D'Aguesseau?" introduced a potted biography; "Kennen Sie Beaumarchais?" preceded the pedantic location of a quotation [CM 63]. Kraus evoked such long-windedness by observing that, before attacking a minister, Harden would inform his public on the Langobards' royal precedence - a feature of Harden's stylization that Dr Weller notes⁹⁰⁾ - and concluded that his "Bildungsgepäck" made his journey so laborious that fellow-travellers felt sympathy for him (CM 61).

A blatant example of Harden's tedious, ostentatious knowledgeability was his article on aeronautics, "Zeppelin",⁹¹⁾ which Kraus glossed in his "Harden-Lexikon" of October 1908. The first half of the nearly page-long excerpt (LL 104) - a string of names, translated as "Ich

kenn mich in ~~der~~ Luftschiffahrt aus" - was taken from one page of Die Zukunft; most of the second half (LL 104) from two pages.⁹¹⁾ Kraus cannot be reproached for quoting the names out of context, for Harden's context here was nothing but a profusion of names and facts. This is confirmed by other glosses from the same article (F.261,36-41; LL 103-105). On the other hand, if extrinsic information appeared in his political essays undigested, it too could be extracted with impunity.

It is no surprise, then, to find the motif of the "Zettelkasten" recurring in Kraus's satire of Harden. According to Professor Young, Kraus "continued to propagate the false notion that Harden spent most of his time over file-boxes searching for odd facts to astound his readers".⁹²⁾ The "false notion" to which Professor Young objects was propagated by the press, and Harden, proud of his knowledge, went so far as to deny it himself.⁹³⁾ Kraus's adoption of it had a quite different emphasis. To him, it was irrelevant what the source of his knowledge was:

Herr Harden hat es einmal bestritten, dass ausser seinem Kopf ein anderer Zettelkasten bestehe, aus dem er seine Herrlichkeiten holt. Gibts dennoch einen, so hat gewiss nicht der Harden ihn, aber er den Harden. Gibts keinen, umso schlimmer. (CM 61)

Kraus was not "propagating" a fact about Harden, but criticizing Harden's very obsession with facts. When Alfred von Berger even compared Harden and the legendary

"Zettelkasten" to Shakespeare and Bacon, Kraus preferred to believe that there was more to Shakespeare than "stupendous knowledge", "während bei Herrn Harden das Wissen die störende Hauptsache ist" (LL 156). What marked Harden's activity as literary journalism - and made it quite different from Kraus's satirical treatment of material - was his lack of control over his fact-finding impulse.

His arid erudition was also closely related to his obsession with "material" on opponents' sexual habits. This relation Kraus traced in a passage which evokes the anachronistic "mythological" gestures of both Harden (here Jochanaan) and his enemy Wilhelm II (Herodes):

Von dem Manne, der mit der Gebärde eines Herodes den Staub aufwirbelt, den seine Günstlinge von den Schuhen schütteln müssen, bis hinunter zu seinem seltsamen Jochanaan, welcher den Dreck aufrührt, den sie von sich gaben, und welcher seit Jahren abgehärmt in einer Zisterne haust, von der man ursprünglich glaubte, sie sei ein Zettelkasten, die aber in Wahrheit ein Detektivbureau ist. (CM 88)

The vision of this prophet was that of the voyeur. Kraus's biblical sketch is not itself decorative; the allusions are part of a pastiche contrived to expose Harden's decorative persona as a disguise for sinister intentions.

Even more tasteless than his Eulenburg campaign as a demonstration of Harden's supercilious, informed muck-raking, was his account of the Schoenebeck adultery

case, in which a Hauptmann von Goeben was co-respondent.⁹⁴⁾ Harden dressed his investigation with a display of "Baedeker-Bildung" (LL 257) on the provincial scene of the crime, before informing his readers not only about the affair but about the perverse origins of Goeben's sexual impulse -for example, the infantile pleasure he had derived from "riding" on his mother. At this point Kraus voiced his disgust by insisting "Herr Harden weiss", and emphasized the offensiveness of the voyeur's posture by alluding to the origins - or at least the sources - of Harden's "knowing":

Und Herr Harden weiss, dass sich im Unbewussten des Knaben dieser Eindruck festgesetzt hat. Ob er nun bei der Assoziation dabei war, oder den Hauptmann untersucht, oder gar ein Werk über Psychoanalyse gelesen hat; ob er's vom Hörensagen weiss oder ob es ihm am Ende ein Hofrat und fünf Ärzte aus dem Annoncenteil der "Zukunft" eidlich bestätigt haben - Herr Harden weiss, welche Vorstellung dem Herrn von G. beim Reiten zu schaffen macht. (LL 261)

Precisely where he insinuated himself into others' privacy, for such questionable values as a sexual norm or the national interest, Harden's authority as an informant was a far uglier and more ill-boding phenomenon than the offences that he denounced.

Consequently, Kraus felt it expedient to excuse Eulenburg's perjury as a desperate act of self-defence against the lewd public eye (F.251,47). But he went too far in his general apologia for a decadent aristocracy

that today may be difficult to imagine as the lesser evil. He was reacting rather extremely in face of the threat to individual values from a brash egalitarian mentality that persecuted "abnormality". He had seen that even Harden's conviction after the second Moltke trial - for his apparent lack of proof - meant a triumph for this mentality. Not the lack but the furnishing of such proof ought to have condemned him; to sentence him for being uninformed was to glorify the weapons "mit denen man der Kultur künftig wirksamer beikommen kann" (F.242,19). This future was only too close. Harden was to damn himself morally in the following months by publicly exposing the most sordid details of his opponent's past.

The justification of Kraus's fears can be seen today, when sexual blackmail is felt as a slighter threat only because modern society has fewer "moral" prejudices to be exploited. Yet the "egalitarian" spirit of informing has triumphed far beyond the sphere of politics, and - so far, at least in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. - no longer tyrannizes only aristocrats and public figures, but the individual citizen in his most private life. With the aid of hidden cameras, bugging devices, lie-detectors, psychoanalytical jargon, data storage systems and statistical forecasting,⁹⁵⁾ the high priests of information wield far greater power than Kraus could have foreseen, even when he envisaged something of this

development in "Die deutsche Schmach" (CM 85-90) in 1908. That a reputed literary patron and man of culture like Harden could earnestly increase the threat to the human values inherent in culture, made him an exceptional case. Therefore, while the satirist cut Harden the stylist down to size, the wider, more sinister aspect of the informed publicist needed to be combated polemically. Kraus summarized his verdict from the hypothetical perspective of a posterity incredulous of what had once been possible in Germany:

Dass einer den Strangulierern der ursprünglichsten Menschenrechte geholfen, aber in einem Winkel seiner Zeitschrift heuchlerisch die Kultur protegirt und sich bei den Ästheten Absolution geholt hat.
(CM 90)

iii) Personality and criticism

Harden's statement of his criteria for judging a writer's personality, in his polemic of 1902/03 against Sudermann, could well have acted as a formal stimulus for Kraus to construe a more unified ideal, according to his own experience and his satirical purpose. For example, Harden anticipated Kraus's pithier "aesthetic" justification of satire and polemic, by special pleading for the strong personality whose criticism could have a life of its own:

"Wo ein Kritiker menschlicher Einrichtungen und artistischer Leistungen als Individualität Etwas

bedeutet, wo man ihm lauscht, weil er spricht, nicht, weil er von Diesem und Jenem erzählt, da verhallt sofort auch die Frage nach der objektiven Richtigkeit seines Urtheils."⁹⁶⁾

Kraus himself had eschewed "objectivity" in favour of value judgements as early as 1899 (F.14,15); but Harden here emphasized the critic's personal merit, which, even if a verdict appeared unjust, could give his activity a significance which transcended that of the subject criticized. The proof of personal stature in Kraus's conception was to be the work; in Harden's, the emphasis was different. In terms that seem to resemble Kraus's later demand to take "den ganzen Menschen" into account to assess a poem, Harden explained why his literary verdicts were not those of an "objective reporter":

"Ich suche hinter dem Werk den Menschen, hinter der Leistung die Psyche, der sie sich entband, und halte jede andere Art der Kritik für unfruchtbar und unnützlich."⁹⁷⁾ [---] Ihn muss ich, die Summe seines Wollens, erkannt haben, wenn ich das Werk wägen will."⁹⁸⁾

His aim was more openly non-literary than Kraus's - to shed light on "sozialpsychische Zusammenhänge":

"Wichtig für die Beurtheilung des Werkes ist, zu wissen, wie der Autor sich öffentlich und im Privatverkehr giebt, mit welchen Waffen er seine Siege erficht, welche Stützen er und wo Freunde sucht, wie der Geldgewinn, wie eine Niederlage auf ihn wirkt und in welcher Rüstung er wirklicher oder eingebildeter Feindschaft entgegentritt."⁹⁸⁾

Once the writer ventured outside his "house", he belonged to the public interest. Kraus, too, came to use similar

criteria - but not as the substance of his literary criticism, only as its stimulus. Public indiscretion by a writer might provoke him to expose the writer's style. Whereas, for him, the final judgement on a writer's stature had to be a literary one in form and substance, Harden's verdicts could have an extra-literary reference and disregard the artistic principles of unity and autonomy.

Thus, on the one hand, it was little more than a minor polemical point of Harden's, to contrast⁹⁹⁾ Und Pippa tanzt!- dished up by Hauptmann "unfertig" in a short time - with Goethe's Faust, the product of fifty years. On the other hand, in "Zola"⁸³⁾ - an informed study of background and influences and a penetrating assessment of the writer and his impact - Harden's note on the warming to Zola, after the Dreyfus case, of certain critics who had previously condemned him as sexually abnormal, was a relevant part of the complete picture of man and writer. But when Harden himself adopted such "moral" criteria in criticizing Wedekind's content,¹⁰⁰⁾ or when he even used intimate biographical detail as a key to interpret Eulenburg's poems to Fritz von Farenheid, which had hitherto been printed privately - he came close to the mentality of the philistine. Indeed, he was stretching his critical principles for dubious polemical purposes and ignoring the aesthetic autonomy to which he occasionally paid lip-service.

For he condemned Eulenburg's verse for its "typically homosexual" artificiality¹⁰¹⁾ - a humourless reiteration of Heine's sarcasm on Platen's forced style¹⁰²⁾ - and stated in an unoriginal excursus that homosexuality was a denial of the individual's cultural purpose, namely of dutiful procreation. With this, Germany's leading cultural figure was resorting to a dangerous pseudo-biological notion of Kultur and, on an issue that demanded a purely literary assessment, was affirming the philistine morality against which the whole force of Kraus's cultural polemics of these years was pitted.

Kraus ironically referred to a descriptive passage by Eulenburg, which Harden had dismissed, as the "best thing to appear in Die Zukunft" (F.254,45) - an obvious tilt at both Harden's style and his taste as an editor. For, while carrying on his great political campaigns and moralizing about homosexuality, Harden patronized the fashionable Jugendstil Anacreontics of Hugo Salus and Theodor Suse. Kraus referred to Suse as one of Harden's "dichtende Rechtsanwälte" (LL 25) and in a brief gloss enumerated the stock ornamental and floral imagery of the period, which characterizes Suse's verse, There is, indeed, very little to choose between the quality of Eulenburg's poem and, for example, Suse's "Veilchen", which Harden published shortly after his criticism of Eulenburg's dilettantism.¹⁰³⁾ No consistent correlation can be found between Harden's aesthetic

patronage and his political campaigns or his moral pathos - except in the false, ornamental style common to all.

Yet he moralized not only against political opponents, but in his account of the Hau murder trial.⁸⁸⁾ The accused had once contracted syphilis and was suspected of relations with his sister-in-law. While more or less taking such "circumstantial evidence" as proof of Hau's guilt, Harden extolled the accused's cool behaviour and dignity in a sensation-hungry court room. This would seem to account for Kraus's warning (CM 56) that a moralist like Harden should not subscribe to the following absolute aesthetic attitude:

"Dass einer ein Mörder ist, beweist nichts gegen seinen Stil."

This approximate translation of Wilde's "The fact of a man being a poisoner is nothing against his prose"¹⁰⁵⁾ does not seem to have been cited by Harden. If, however, one takes "Stil" in a wider sense than "prose", it certainly reflects his attitude to the Hau case, which was inconsistent with his subjection of art to moral criteria elsewhere. Kraus exposed the discrepancies in Harden's attitudes and style so ruthlessly that his paradoxical assertion of the correspondence between style and ethics became a summary of his own polemical aims and achievements against Harden himself:

Ich gehe in der Schätzung stilistischer Vorzüge weiter und mache sie zum Massstab moralischer Werte. Das einer ein Mörder ist, muss nichts gegen seinen Stil beweisen. Aber der Stil kann beweisen, dass er ein Mörder ist! (CM 56)

Whether or not Kraus was directly influenced by Harden's critical maxims, he was able to a great extent to incorporate the ethical imperative into his artistic persona. With Harden there seems to have been no similar reconciliation of his views, expressed in Kampfgenosse Sudermann, of artistically justifiable criticism and of morally defective art.¹⁰⁶⁾ Anticipating "Heine und die Folgen", Kraus's summary of the incongruity between form and idea in Harden's literary persona applies both to his style and to his whole activity as a publicist:

In der literarischen Persönlichkeit lebt der Gedanke von der Form, und die Form vom Gedanken. In Herrn Harden vegetieren sie armselig nebeneinander, die Meinung fristet ihr Dasein von der kläglichen Gewissheit, dass sie die andern nicht hatten [..] (CM 58)

Kraus differed from others not merely in his opinion of Harden, but in the unity between his artistic formulation, his stylistic criticism and his ethical verdict on Harden; a unity that distinguished him from his opponent. Through it, he could claim not merely to have given a complete picture of the opponent, but to have integrated completely the artistic and ethical impulses in his own work.

KRAUS'S POLEMICS

i) Unity

So far, the substance of Kraus's arguments and the reflection of Harden's personality and public actions in his style have been considered separately. We have also noted how the tendency of Kraus's stylistic criticism to become satire, the more it was successful, was counteracted by the need to attack the culturally harmful publicist polemically. We must now examine the composition of Kraus's polemics in their own right and its relevance to his purpose.

In his first polemic, "Maximilian Harden. Eine Erledigung" (F.234,1-36; CM 53-80), the disclosures about Harden's style - summarized in Part III, Section i above - were more than satirical jibes; they were the corpus delicti in the case against the author and his character. For the first time in a full-scale attack, Kraus's authority was language, and it opened up a formidable perspective on his former mentor. Yet the force of this total demolition of a literary idol was not simply destructive; Kraus's language came into its own. Despite its apparent spontaneity and pace, and without an overtly stylized structure, this first invective had its own formal consistency.

The six-page opening section (CM 53-58) explains Kraus's motivation. The Moltke case, he begins, was barely even a stimulus to what is an independent attack,

as inevitable as an "Elementarereignis" (CM 55). Kraus's perspective is nevertheless not narrowly personal. Indeed, the figure of Harden is set firmly, like a dubious landmark, in the German cultural landscape, where "Geist" and "Schönheit" are threatened by the "Schnittern der Sensation". Kraus maintains that Harden is reducible to nought, once the snobbery of his readers is subtracted and the "Zähler von Ehebrüchen" is divided by the "Nenner von Päderasten" (CM 55). This appears to be mere word-play; yet it is amplified by a seemingly exhaustive succession of moral charges. These are devastating enough, but they are only preliminary to Kraus's main theme, the relation of ethics to style, which is documented in the second section, of eight pages (CM 58-66), where Harden's style is ruthlessly analysed and - in a passage entitled "Molybdänomantie" - parodied. In the wake of this onslaught, there follows a four-page review (CM 66-71) - and revision - of Harden's literary status, now with Kraus himself as a point of contrast. Only after he has treated of Harden's defects as a polemicist and demonstrated his own merits in a rhetorical tour de force does he return, in the final third of his essay (CM 71-80), to view the Moltke-Eulenburg affair in detail. If he had done more earlier than merely allude to the affair, it would have obstructed the broader literary perspective. He would have become too involved with the nuances of Harden's forensic tactics to be able to ascend to a "literary" level, without appearing

to divorce literature and ethics - as Harden almost hypocritically did in his inclusion in Die Zukunft of prestigious literary contributions, which had as little intrinsic relation to his political and economic policy as did the advertisements. Preceded as it is by the literary evidence, Kraus's discussion of the affair - far from being a separate pronouncement by a polemicist reacting to the latest topical controversy - becomes the most appalling corroboration of the ethical findings of the literary analyses.

It would exceed the economy of this dissertation - which is also more than a stylistic analysis of one polemic - to do full justice to the virulence and elegance of Kraus's rhetoric, by extensive quotation and analysis. A general characteristic of Kraus's "Langatmigheit" were the numerous aphoristic sententiae, the semantic complexity of which was balanced by syntactical parallelism. Repetition of syntactical structures served to order material and to build tension. Such highly-charged formulations appeared at any stage of a polemic, often in clusters after a less dense illustrative or narrative section, as a means of summary and abbreviation. Word-play, as C.J. Wagenknecht has shown,¹⁰⁷⁾ was the radically terse form that gave to Kraus's pronouncements their vividness and impact. It also enabled him to draw repeatedly on similar material without sounding repetitious. Each allusion or statement was set firmly in the particular train of thought determined by his

Sprachlogik.

An example from the introductory section shows how Kraus established the cultural perspective on the Moltke-Harden case through the medium of language. He sounds the attack with oblique references to themes that he develops only later. He sets up allusive cross-references between the literary and moral spheres, to assert the unity which underlies his assessment of Harden's failings. Here, too, he builds up to a natural climax by using parallelism in the overtly varied form of a disiunctio¹⁰⁸⁾:

Ich werde also den Beweis, dass er ein unzulänglicher Schriftsteller ist, nicht mit Enthüllungen aus seinem Geschlechtsleben führen. Um meine Überzeugung darzutun, dass er zum Ratgeber der Nation nicht taugt, werde ich ihn nicht durch die Behauptung kompromittieren, dass er den Geschlechtsverkehr normal ausübe. Wenn ich sagen will, dass seinem Angriff der Schwung, seinem Hass der Humor fehlt, werde ich nicht zu ergründen suchen, ob er im Ehebett seinen Mann stellt. Und wenn ich schliesslich behaupten werde, dass noch nie ein geschwolleneres Mundstück, nie eine geziertere Zunge sich in normwidrige Beziehungen zur schlichtesten Realität gesetzt hat, so bleibe ich in den Grenzen literarischer Kritik. (CM 55f)

He does not use the praeteritio in the traditional way: as a means of suggesting what, rhetorically, one claims one will not mention or seek to prove.¹⁰⁸⁾ He genuinely does not aim to use against Harden the absurdly incongruous substance of the sexual allusions he disdains

here. Indeed, the device is a literary means of distancing himself from his opponent's irrelevant criteria and dubious tactical judgement. At the same time it is an ominous announcement of his polemical intent; by saying how he will not proceed, he makes his concealed weapon more fearsome.

ii) Fact and fiction

After his thorough "Erledigung" of Harden, Kraus's polemic became more diversified. "Maximilian Harden. Ein Nachruf", of January 1908 (F.242,4-52), was not so much a confrontation with Harden himself as a dispute with Harden's supporters over his literary stature, and an analysis of the legal arguments to date. The stylistic evidence was no longer central to the polemic, but was consolidated elsewhere in satirical rubrics. Even if R. Scheu's evocation of Harden's loss of fame overnight¹⁰⁹⁾ is a wishful exaggeration of the practical effect of Kraus's "destruction" of the writer stylistically, the advantage that Kraus evidently gained by it gave to his second polemic a generally more serene and less urgent tone. To consolidate his success in undermining Harden's literary reputation, he took issue, in a long-winded digression, with the reputable writers - Heinrich Mann, Hofmannsthal, Wedekind and Strindberg among them - who had expressed their solidarity with the convicted Harden. Only in their estimation was Harden still a literary

power to reckon with.

Yet despite its great length and discursiveness, this "Nachruf" was as concentrated in detail as other works. For example, Kraus summed up his disapproval of Wedekind's support for Harden in the following allusion:

Dieser Polyphem, der mit seinem Einauge Welten
sieht, die den Zweiaugigen verschlossen sind, muss
in seiner Höhle einen Niemand bewirten. (F.242,28)

The analogy to the deluded giant is self-explanatory, but Kraus omitted the detail that had evoked it. The stimulus was Harden's prudish incredulity and faintly patronizing attitude to the naive treatment of outspoken subjects in Frühlings Erwachen:

"Niemand wundert sich über die Schmutzhäufung,
Niemand wühlt gierig in dem Kehricht."¹⁰⁰⁾

Kraus not only scourges Harden's eccentric orthography, but uses it to imply that its author was this "Niemand", who had been "rummaging in the filth". This is typical of the verbal rather than visual inspiration of Kraus's powerful imagery.

In order to discredit Harden's factual obsessions about the sexual habits of others, Kraus used figurative variations on the theme of "abnormality" - as in his praeteritio quoted above (CM 55f.). Thus while Harden had disowned his pun on Lecomte's use of the "back entrance" at the Foreign Office,¹¹⁰⁾ Kraus noted that Harden proudly entered the court room "by way of the front"

(F.242,50). While Harden sought to prove Eulenburg's intimacy with the dubious witnesses Bollhardt and Riedel, Kraus declared that Harden's "geistige Verbindung" with them was more compromising than a physical liaison (F.242,52). After the dubious Munich trial he asked:

Was ist bedenklicher? Wenn ein Journalist seinen Richter "unsern Richter", oder ein Fürst seinen Fischer "meinen Fischer" nennt? (F.254,46)

Thus he exploited his opponent's turns of phrase in a literary perspective that raised ethical questions.

Yet some imaginative elements in his picture of Harden had their own justification. Of course Harden was not literally "ein mit hundert Kilo Bildung beladener, auf Stelzen daherkommender Ritter" (LL 114) - but as the drastic reduction in effigy of his verbose, superfluous pathos this lapidary caricature was utterly convincing.

Professor Young⁹²⁾ claims that Kraus abused poetic licence in his attacks. This is to take too literally material handled imaginatively by Kraus. True, the exploitation of cheap press rumours, like those about Harden's commercial or personal motives was in itself unworthy of Kraus. To allege that Harden simply cashed in on his scandalous revelations (CM 69) was to fail to account for the deadly earnest of his moralizing. Yet as a point of contrast to this pathos, the more logical "profit" motive did illuminate the deviousness of Harden's "patriotic" crusade against perversion - although Kraus did not state this explicitly.

Of course it was preposterous to stylize Harden's relations with Bismarck and his enemies as "Die Forum-Szene" (CM 81-84) from Julius Caesar, with Mark Anthony's speech delivered in Harden's style. Yet there was a precedent in Harden's evocation of the Hau trial in the costume of Nero's Rome;¹¹¹⁾ and the analogy was a valid means of contrasting his euphemistic stylization of sordid insinuations with the Shakespearean character's genuine political attack. The factual details of Harden's acquaintance with Bismarck may have been disputable; and Kraus's references to Bismarck's "Hausverbot" after Harden had broken his confidence - second-hand as they were (F.237,26) - were of little more than formal value in his arguments, as a precedent, say, for Harden's alleged breach of his confidence in 1904 (LL 133). Yet one theme of Kraus's jibes - Harden's posturing as the retired Bismarck's exclusive confidant - can be substantiated,¹¹²⁾ and even conforms to the pattern of Kraus's stylistic evidence on Harden. Although Dr Weller claims that Harden's exemplary political individualism was directly inspired by Bismarck,^{112a)} the posturing - especially as it increased with retrospect - raises doubts as to how deeply formative the experience was; and these doubts are not dispelled by Dr Weller's account.^{112b)}

Kraus's composite caricature of Harden was naturally more "unfair" than the biographer's picture. Where

biographers merely take note of inconsistencies and shortcomings, Kraus, with ruthless perspicacity, sought to relate them, as symptoms of an incomplete personality. What was evident in Harden's style was borne out by his over-dramatization of his experience of Bismarck, by his contempt for misinformed public opinion and his concessions to its norms, and by his bitter, but loyal, opposition to an anachronistic autocracy:

Er will die Reichsfassade reinfegen. Aber sein Arbeitskittel ist ein wallendes Gewand, das ein Van de Velde entworfen hat /.../ (BWG 248)

This diagnosis of the Jugendstil through the desperate gestures of its political prophet, who borrows an aesthetic rather than functional persona, is one lasting example of Kraus's fruitful use of poetic licence.

Throughout his aesthetics, the ornate gesture, the stylistic formula or cliché are seen as transferable, since they are not the intrinsic expression of an original "Persönlichkeit". In the "Erledigung", he varied his motif of the florid gesture devoid of inspiration, in order to claim that he, in his youthful enthusiasm, had once imaginatively projected his own vitality into his hero:

Er sah aus, wie ich mir ihn schuf, und Herr Maximilian Harden lieferte für meine Erfindung die Gebärde. Ich sah Blitze zucken und hörte Donner krachen; denn in mir war Elektrizität. [-] Welchen Respekt hatte ich vor Herrn Maximilian Harden, weil seine Leere meinem Ergänzungstrieb entgegenkam! (CM 58)

This paradoxical disembodiment and transfer of his former idol's power is, indeed, an inversion of the conventional version - where the youth draws inspiration from the elder man - as a letter of 1898 confirms. After a visit by Harden to Vienna, Kraus, whose admiration for him was then at its height, had written him a "Liebesbrief", as he himself called it:

Was für Veränderungen haben Sie doch in uns traurigen Leuten bewirkt! Warum mussten Sie mit Ihrem frischen einzigen Geist in unsere Dürre und Armseligkeit fahren?! Jetzt sind Sie wieder zuhause, lächeln unserer Gefühle und haben in uns eine Leere zurückgelassen [7.7]¹¹³⁾

The image "Leere" is conventional, but even here the intense admiration was part of a sharp contrast - with his disillusionment in "mediocre" Vienna. This comparison clearly shows the extent to which the Kraus of 1907 - in transferring not only attributes but his own images - was stylizing his own past for polemical purposes, in the "creative medium of memory".¹¹⁴⁾ Whereas, however, Harden asserted the fact of his former acquaintance with Bismarck, Kraus is here evoking the nature of his acquaintance with Harden in an overtly fictitious manner. He is not so much rationalizing as revising the experience, asserting the quality of his imagination, and of his newly discovered histrionic impulse, against the fact - and against the poor figure that his former idol cuts, in the new, ethical perspective. For although the striking feature of their early correspondence is the

passion of the young Kraus's reactions, often unrelated to Harden's sober or resigned tone, the evocation here has validity chiefly as an expression of recent disillusionment. It is the Kraus of 1907 who is the "Theatermeister" (CM 58); his ability here to exploit the dramatic potential in language, and to stage this memory with the aid of poetic licence so as to translate moral scorn into a verbally live performance - this proves the authenticity of the emotional experience and of the "Ursprung" of the histrionic impulse that he is tracing.

iii) Biographical facts and personal motives

The above passage (CM 58) Kraus juxtaposed with Harden's "reply" at the head of his polemic "Seine Antwort", in June 1908 (F.257,15-48; LL 107-138). As expected, Kraus's attacks had been ignored in Die Zukunft, but a reply - certainly unworthy of a reputed publicist - had appeared in the Viennese gutter press (LL 115). Its appearance confirmed Harden's earlier ambivalence towards the press, particularly his lax attitude to it in Vienna. Far from keeping entirely aloof, he had ambiguously made a statement to a journalist, while adding that it was not for publication.¹¹⁵⁾

The content of Harden's statement illustrated not so much his ambivalence as his shameless exploitation of opponents' personal background to compromise them.

He claimed that Kraus had once been an enthusiastic admirer, whom he - to his own disadvantage - had encouraged until he tired of the "poor devil" and "made it clear" that he disapproved, for instance, of Kraus's attack on Bahr and defence of Frau von Hervay. He had severed relations with Kraus by replying brusquely, he concluded, and ever since then Kraus had insulted him. Harden not merely reduced Kraus's change of attitude to the trivial personal level of "ingratitude" and "revenge", and contradicted himself in doing so; he blatantly distorted the various episodes to which he alluded without naming them. His insinuation about Kraus's "grotesker Roman mit der..." was thus in the manner of his other tasteless but cryptic sneers.

Kraus opened his polemic of July 1908 with further references to the cultural evil of Harden's "political" campaign. Dismissing Harden as a serious literary opponent (LL 110), he then retraced his speculation on the unlikelihood of Harden's polemicizing against him:

Mit jedem Satz, den er gegen mich schriebe, würde er meine Feindseligkeit gegen seinen Stil rechtfertigen. (LL 112)

He decided that more literary or stylistic revelations would be too devastating, and made the concession of meeting Harden the fact-finder on his own ground: that of documentation. He answered each of the insinuations about personal motives, in detail, by factual correction and ruthless analysis of Harden's logic and innuendoes.

Otherwise reluctant to descend to "erweisliche Wahrheit", Kraus here felt obliged to refute these "erweisliche Lügen"; for, in polemic, any slurs that are likely to stick must be accounted for if their victim is to survive.

The notion that Kraus was revenging Harden's "express disapproval" of his campaign against Bahr was unfounded, and he quoted proof of Harden's support for him [LL 129f.] - which was one of Harden's two faces in this affair, as we have seen in Part I, Section ii. It is possible that there was an estrangement in 1901/02¹¹⁶⁾ - if so, it could as well have been a sign of Kraus's disillusionment as of any disapproval by Harden. Yet their subsequent correspondence up to 1903 shows no signs of either disapproval or resentment.¹¹⁶⁾ The Bahr affair was quite unconnected with Kraus's attacks on Harden in 1907/08.

Kraus likewise corrected Harden's version of the break of 1904. He felt that their disagreement on the Hervay case had been a "freundschaftliche Auseinandersetzung" (LL 131), but the matters of principle in this and other affairs of 1904 were enough to have caused a break. There had been no "brusque answer" from Harden; if one had ever been sent, it would have been a logical anomaly. For, according to Harden's phrasing, it would have been both the result and the cause of Kraus's attacks. Kraus took the point ad absurdum by suggesting that perhaps he had written it, after a breach of

confidence by Harden (LL 134).

To defeat Harden, Kraus by no means exploited the letters merely factually; they became almost literary motifs, tracing Harden's casuistry. When Harden remarked: "ich [̄.̄.] liess ihn [̄.̄.] nicht mehr zu mir kommen", Kraus exposed it as an ambiguity which concealed the possibility that he had no intention of visiting him (LL 108). He also showed the illogicality of Harden's citation of both revenge and ingratitude as motives for his apostasy:

Ich, H., habe dem K. Unfreundlichkeiten erwiesen, darum greift er mich an, also aus rein persönlichen Gründen; und dies, wiewohl ich ihm Freundlichkeiten erwiesen habe: ich hätte erwarten können, dass er mich aus persönlichen Gründen schonen würde... (LL 116)

He did not deny his former admiration, but could prove that it had been reciprocated. More important, he sought to disprove the allegations of revenge, in order to show that he was ungrateful, but from impersonal motives - and from a "tiefere Treue gegen mich selbst" (LL 118). His disloyalty to Harden, who wrote: "Ich bin der Selbe geblieben", was marked by a radical change of taste (LL 117f.) as he matured; but it was much more. It was concomitant with his discovery of an "Ursprung", of a source of integrity and inspiration within his own experience.

In his development, morally and artistically, into an original avenger of Geist and Kultur - beyond the level

of Harden's anti-corruptionism, the formative influence was his love for Annie Kalmar, who died in 1901, but whose memory he cherished. His defence of female "offenders" and his criticism of Harden's sexual prying were the polemical reflections of an "erotically" inspired cultural vision.¹¹⁷⁾ In defiling the memory of Annie Kalmar, Harden vindicated Kraus's previous criticisms of his disrespect for the dead and for the privacy of others. His slur on Kraus's "grotesker Roman" exemplified the obnoxious mentality that his devious "literary" expression had concealed:

Die Unfähigkeit, vor dem Geist zu bestehen,
vergreift sich am Geschlecht. (LL 136)

Kraus threatened to punish any further incursion of this kind with the non-literary beating it deserved (LL 137f.). After a reference to Harden's "knowledge" of his "affair", he called Liliencron to witness:

Deutschlands grosser Dichter weiss, wo der Roman
beendet liegt, und hat das Grab in seinen Schutz
genommen. Herr Harden in seinen Schmutz. (LL 137)

This terse word-play¹¹⁸⁾ is the focus for all his wrath to flare up and consume the intruder in a powerful invective that is all the more convincing as it is a personal confession of faith in the formative experience, which the "affair" had been:

Ich aber sage ihm: Ein Roman, den der andere
grotesk findet, kann mehr Macht haben, eine
Persönlichkeit auszubilden, als selbst das Erlebnis,
von einem Bismarck geladen, von einem Bismarck

hinausgeworfen zu sein. Aus den Erkenntnissen dieses grotesken Romans erwuchs mir die Fähigkeit, einen Moralpatron zu verabscheuen, ehe er mir den grotesken Roman beschmutzte. [-] Herr Harden ist tot - der groteske Roman lebt. Er hat die Kraft, immer wieder aufzuleben, und ich glaube, ich verdanke ihm mein Bestes. (LL 137)

In this context, the question whether or in what circumstances Harden lost favour with Bismarck is of little consequence. Certain of Harden's actions were not worthy of a writer of integrity. Even if his inside knowledge of Bismarck gave him authority as a publicist - in a pattern comparable to Kraus's inspiration by "private" values - this knowledge was information rather than a deep experience; it had not enhanced him as a "Persönlichkeit".

AFTERMATH

According to Dr Rogge,¹¹⁹⁾ Harden "replied" to Kraus - again, not in Die Zukunft - by criticizing Simplicissimus, which had published some of Kraus's satires. The "reply" has not been traced; but Kraus, aware of his polemical superiority, would scarcely have omitted any significant jibe of Harden's when quoting from it in "Der Patriot", of December 1908 (LL 86-98). As the title suggests, this essay scrutinized Harden's "patriotic" action - against Simplicissimus, for publishing satires of Germany in its "French edition" - and compared it with his other "patriotic" action, against Eulenburg. There was no further reaction from Harden.

Up to 1914, Harden remained the target of Kraus's moral scorn and stylistic satire. From urging an aggressive and even Pan-German policy before the War and enthusiastically welcoming its outbreak, Harden changed his attitude after several months. Die Zukunft was repeatedly confiscated, and by May 1915 its Editor was appealing for peace. His name all but disappeared from Die Fackel, and after the War only one longer satire of him, "Erlösergeburttaggabe" (F.561,14-28), appeared in it.

On 3rd July 1922, Harden only barely survived a vicious attempt on his life by paid assassins. Not only was this an example of the infamous growth of right-wing violence against leading political figures; the trial

exemplified the mockery of justice¹⁰²⁾ which allowed Nazi leaders later in the 'twenties to denounce Jews and other "traitors" from the dock. Himself a victim of such denunciation, Harden overcame his resignation and spoke out boldly, with true prophetic insight. He quoted a "European's" view that "Ihr Deutschen geht zugrunde durch Eure Solidarität mit Euren Mördern!" He also drew a parallel between the isolation of Jews in Germany and Germans in the world; for want of a coherent national history, the Jews fled into the myth of Messianism, the Germans into the Nordic myth.¹²¹⁾

In "Die Affäre Harden", in November 1922 (F.601,41-49) - before the trial - Kraus expressed his disgust and horror at the bestial act of revenge by a völkisch mentality on a man who had rehabilitated himself since the Eulenburg era. Glad at Harden's survival, Kraus criticized his refusal of police protection as rash; for a writer's duty was to be courageous morally and intellectually, rather than to expose himself to physical attacks. Kraus acknowledged Harden's frequent display of that courage, but saw even this affair in the perspective of his press criticism. Harden had recovered quickly enough from the savage assault to provide a press interviewer with a first-hand account - which, Kraus insisted, showed signs of stylization by Harden. The word "blutrünstig", in its literal, archaic sense, would never have been used by a common journalist to describe

a bleeding arm (F.601,43).

Finally, in May 1927, a few months before Harden's death, Kraus translated a last passage of "Desperanto", which proved that Harden had not lost the ability to construct bombastic periods. Kraus expressed his "menschliche Anerkennung" for a man who through his suffering had done more for German liberty than all the vociferous "Protestliteraten" together (F.759,102f.). That Kraus found room for such a tribute is evidence of the appearance, on the cultural and political horizon of post-war Germany and Austria, of far more ominous spectres.

Chapter Four

A L F R E D K E R R

I

CRITICISM AND STYLE

i) Early relations

Alfred Kerr, the pen-name of Alfred Kempner, became his legal name in 1911. Born in Breslau in 1867, Kerr settled in Berlin and in 1900 became theatre critic for August Scherl's widely read new newspaper, Der Tag. He became the most influential and most feared Berlin theatre critic in the first three decades of this century, moving from Der Tag to the Berliner Tageblatt in 1920.

He first met Kraus when both were correspondents for the Breslauer Zeitung between 1896 and 1898. There was some mutual recognition. In a sharp criticism of Das Tschaperl (1897), Kerr praised Kraus's attacks on Bahr, while in a letter to Kerr, Kraus expressed his pleasure at Kerr's rejection of Bahr's play.¹⁾

In 1897, Kerr won his polemical spurs by denouncing the music critic Wilhelm Tappert for accepting bribes. He used every means to prove the old man's corruption, and the campaign resulted in a libel action. There was no conclusive evidence of corruption, though Tappert admitted having accepted small fees for tuition and fares. This, and several professional opinions on the ethics required of a critic created an unfavourable impression, and Tappert was forced to withdraw the libel charge. Broken by the trial and its consequences, he died in poverty in 1907. In 1924 Kraus recounted that he had dissociated himself from Kerr after the trial, shocked by his cruelty to an old man of such worth (F.649,78). In 1928, Kerr produced correspondence to prove that

the break had not been immediate, but Kraus insisted that he had distanced himself as the extent of Tappert's suffering became known. There was certainly no correspondence between 1898 and 1907.²⁾

Kerr was rarely mentioned in the early Fackel and only then in passing comments: on his stylistic "clowning" (F.35,32), such as his serious use of the word "crudel-schön"³⁾ in a critical context, and his manneredness (F.73,31). In December 1902 (F.123,17), Kraus called Kerr's reply to Sudermann's polemic against theatre critics inferior to Harden's.⁴⁾ The extent to which he was biased here by his relations with Harden, who was Kerr's enemy, is evident from his reversal of this verdict in his polemic against Harden (F.234,11; CM 60). The revised verdict, indeed, seems more accurate: Kerr's destructive literary criticism, of the lack of credibility in Sudermann's characters, is more effective than Harden's assurances as to his own moral integrity in face of Sudermann's cheap insinuations. Yet Kraus later (F.787,115) accounted for his temporary rapprochement with Kerr - whose style he had still criticized in January 1907 (F.216,25) - as a tactical expedient against the mutual enemy, Harden. His first positive assessment of Kerr in Die Fackel appeared in January 1908, when he called him one of the few discerning critics in Berlin (F.242,12). A year later he reprinted Kerr's verse tribute to the actor Alexander Girardi and praised it as "fein und einprägsam" (F.270,19).

ii) The critic and his approach

Kerr believed that a critic's observations need be no more second-hand than an artist's, that criticism was itself an art form:

"Der wahre Kritiker bleibt für mich ein Dichter: ein Gestalter. Und es ist beinahe kein grosser Unterschied,

ob er einen ernsten Autor gestaltet oder einen ulkigen und schlechten Autor gestaltet. ~~Der~~ Der Dichter ist ein Konstruktor. Der Kritiker ist ein Konstruktor von Konstrukturen."⁵⁾

Throughout his career he asserted his "originality" against the authors he reviewed. Despite his affinity with the Romantic ironists and Heine, he preferred Realist and Naturalist drama, with its emphasis on depiction of character. His concern was the present, or those products of the past that were still relevant. He therefore had no undue reverence for traditions, in either art or language, and was scornful of works that dated. He even recommended ruthless edition of the classics for production. The best of his critical work was, indeed, his appreciation and analysis of Naturalist drama - a lasting contribution which has only recently been rediscovered.⁶⁾ He was more scathing about some now classic modern authors, such as Strindberg and Brecht.

Kerr's stylistic ideal was:

"Geistiges möglichst ungeistig, sinnlich, heiter, unscheinbar zu sagen."⁷⁾

To this end he dispensed with the conventional syntax and rhetoric of complex sentences. He adopted an emphatic, staccato style and reflected, in his consciously subjective manner, the blunt colloquial idiom of the "average" Berliner. This was his means of reaching the mass newspaper public which read his theatre reviews; but, according to G.F.Hering,⁸⁾ even this intimate approach failed to achieve the genuine partnership with his readers to which it aspired. He blamed the obvious manneredness of his style onto "der Defekt im Leser".⁹⁾ This aggressive attitude of the "auf sich gestellter Monologist"⁸⁾ also accounts for his conception of the critic's role.

iii) Impressionism

Despite his preference for realism and his stress on Sachlichkeit, Kerr's style was impressionistic, and raises problems similar to those mentioned in connection with Bahr's overtly different impressionism.

Kerr even admitted:

"Mit der Sprache kann ich zwar den Ausdruck für solche Dinge finden - aber gleichen Wert hat er nicht dann, wenn ich die Dinge 'schildere', nämlich abmale; sondern gleichen Wert nur, wenn ich was gleich Schönes hinsetze, [···] das mit dem abzumalenden Gegenstand nichts zu tun hat, kurz, wenn man frei 'dichtet'." ¹⁰⁾

L. Spitzer has illustrated Kerr's weakness for certain impressions and suggested that such a procedure led to a "destruction" of observed reality and its substitution by a subjective, magical order of associations and fantasies. ¹¹⁾ Although he was susceptible to nuances and details, and capable of penetrating analysis, his reviews were very much stylizations of his own impressions of a performance, and conveyed less about the form or substance of a drama. His travel sketches displayed the same sense of nuance, the same subjective approach, and a sometimes lyrical enthusiasm for the world of the senses.

The pitfalls of this impressionability can be illustrated by examples not quoted by other critics. In evoking the actress Tilla Durieux's reaction to the police chief's indiscreet advances - in the affair discussed in Part II of this chapter - Kerr captures the nuance of her smile, but then has to correct it with "aber doch":

"[···] als sie mit ihrem feinsten Angoralächeln, ... aber doch befremdet auf das Papierchen sah." ¹²⁾

The correction suggests that the "nuance" is not an observation related to the situation. In the next example, too, the lyrical evocation of detail is unrelated to the realities of what is a

polemical situation. Kerr asks the police chief - who had confiscated texts by Flaubert - what he would say in the following contingency:

"Lassen Sie die Bovary zumnsten Mal auf einem canarischen Eiland , und es liefen Ihnen, setzen wir den Fall, im weissrosigen Dunkelmorgen über das Jochbein Tränen "¹³⁾

The situation is so hypothetical that it seems to be evoked solely for the sake of the decorative, exotic association.

Kerr's initiation of the police chief into the creative world of the intellectual illustrates how he could extend himself in enumerative rhetoric:

"Schöpferhirne kennenlernen. Regungen, noch so geheime; die sonst vertuscht, versteckt abgelogen werden; Aufrichtigkeiten von Kerlen, die mit Bewusstsein, doch halb unbewusst, vergessen haben, welche Wächterschar auf der Welt um sie lebt; welcher Schwindel; welches Menschengespreiz; welches Fliehen von der Wahrheit; welches Märchengestrüpp um sie wächst, dämmt, gebietet, droht - und alles herunterdrückt." ¹⁴⁾

Although the passage is controlled and free of mannerisms, it clearly illustrates Walzel's claim that impressionism limits thought by a barrage of impressions,¹⁵⁾ which in this case are of dubious relevance to Kerr's polemical purpose. The profusion of material is not easily contained, either by the parallelism and repetition or by the obvious punctuation. Some individual facets of the picture remain obscure, mere links in a rhythmic accumulation. Even the emotive verbs counteract rather than reinforce each other, since their juxtaposition isolates them from an immediate semantic context.

More characteristic of Kerr was a terser division of his prose into short, simple syntactical units, the aim of which was to crystallize each facet of an argument. Yet this did not guarantee clarity of meaning, as his telescoped account, in 1924, of his

relations with Kraus shows:

I

"[--] Er hatte mich gestern, am Lützowufer war es,
besucht - als Mitarbeiter derselben Bresläuer
Zeitung. Gestern; das Leben lag dazwischen. (Schiller:
pfeilgeschwind).

II

Indessen Krach; Abgrenzung. Innen, bei mir, mit
Lächeln." [F.649,78f.]

The isolated nouns, "Krach", "Abgrenzung", can at most suggest the estrangement, vaguely describe personal reactions, but not explain the circumstances intelligibly. Kraus particularly objected to the mock-lyrical use of "gestern", which blurred the fact that he had not visited Kerr "yesterday" or at any time since 1897 (F.649,80). Since "pfeilgeschwind" is both out of context and too abbreviated to be a meaningful indication that the years had flown (F.649,80), the reference to Schiller is superfluous ostentation (F.787,164).

What Kraus meant, in 1907, by calling Kerr "dieser Virtuose der Kurzatmigkeit" (F.216,25), is clarified in a similar reference to Heine's prose as "jener kurze Atem, der in einem Absatz absetzen muss, als müsste er immer wieder sagen: so, und jetzt sprechen wir von etwas anderm" (UWM 207). This certainly characterizes Kerr's over-punctuated texts and numbered paragraphs.

iv) Phonetic stylization

Kerr's means of imposing order on his diverse perceptions were mainly stereotyped emphatic devices. W. Huder characterizes Kerr's sense of form and texture as follows:

"Seine Prosatexte sind nach Strophen geordnet. Sie bauen sich auf, sind modelliert nach dem unmittelbar erfahrenen Klang, sind pointiert, lieben den Stabreim

und das Wortspiel, aber immer um der Sache willen, nie aus purem Unfug."¹⁶⁾

The "prose strophes" are Kerr's numbered paragraphs, and the claim that other effects were always relevant is contradicted by Spitzer's penetrating analysis of Kerr's "Sprachmischung".¹¹⁾ They were often purely decorative caprice even where dialect and slang were the stimuli to his "Klangphantasie", and even though his innovations reflected his preference for the colloquial.

His love of exotic places, too, was that of the Romantic outsider, and his impressions were interspersed with puns, flippancy asides, and dialect parodies which showed little differentiation within the region or nationality.¹⁷⁾ The foreign vocabulary or exotic and regional ingredients of style were not - as in the Naturalist drama Kerr admired - closely connected with milieu. They were transferable ciphers of Romantic self-expression and burlesque, and were exploited to this end even where blatantly out of context. This general characteristic of Kerr's humour - which was not mentioned by Kraus - can be illustrated by Kerr's choice of rhymes. In "Ballade vom Alexanderplatz",¹⁸⁾ the splitting of one word by enjambement and the distortion of pronunciation can be taken as an effective satire on the police chief's ignorance of literature:

"Tief im Sessel sass das Ober-
Haupt der Polizei - und stierte
Auf die Schrift von Gustav Flaubert,
Die er zweimal konfiszierte."

Yet similar distortion of rhyme-words - with a tendency towards slang and burlesque - was, in "Der deutsche Schwund",¹⁹⁾ a mere clowning trick after the manner of Heine:

"Die Fassade stilvoll-knallig
Öffnet den Schlossbau von Versailles."

Durch die Pracht des Mittelgangs
Kommt man ins palais de dangs.

[→]

Alle Namen sind franzö'sch,
Und es riecht nach schweissigem Fleesch."

The lack of a specific satirical purpose in this self-indulgent parody raises doubts as to his originality and - more significantly - as to his discretion in choosing subjects deserving of satirical treatment. Such pastiche of two languages and local slang was to be one of his major resources in producing chauvinistic war jingles.

His matter-of-fact arguments were punctuated by stereotyped devices, such as the interjections "Ecco", "basta", "sakra", "item", "etsch", "hä?" and the parentheses "(das ist ernst gemeint)", "(wollte sagen)", or "(dieser Satz kommt nie zu Ende)". Their emphatic value is itself questionable, since their insertion often suggests that Kerr's argument cannot support itself. These and other pointless idiosyncrasies could reduce a serious context to a ridiculous level of self-parody, as in this reference to the social stigma of actresses:

"Gegen Schauspielerinnen [→] lebt etwas von jener Stimmung, die Schnitzler vor langer Zeit (in einem Früh-Stück) wie mit dem Silberstift gezeichnet hat..."²⁰⁾

To criticize this, Kraus would have needed no more than to have printed "Früh-Stück " in spaced type.

Some of Kerr's coinings were effective, however; the compounds "Zweckschlamperei" and "Plüschphantastik"²¹⁾ for example. He also formed nouns from adverbs ("ein Aufwärtser") or with an ending in "-ich" ("der Einüberich"). "Einüberich " was one of his thirty coinings for "Regisseur". "Regisseur" he would often write pseudo-phonetically as "Reschissör", "Feuilleton" as "Följetong". For additional emphasis he would protract a word phonetically ("soooo ists

schöön") or break it up into syllables or letters ("ent-zück-end",
"d-u-m-m"). He would "stutter" to debunk an opponent ("Sein St...
Sti..Stil"/LL 213) or would repeat an important sentiment three
times ("die Seligkeit, die Seligkeit, die Seligkeit des Daseins").
Yet it remains highly questionable whether all these clowning tricks
justify Kerr's claim that his mission was a renewal of language.²²⁾

II

"PAN" AND THE POLEMICS OF 1911

i) "Pan" and Jagow

Pan was a literary and political review published by the Paul Cassirer Verlag in Berlin. Its foundation in November 1910 was a sign of the existence of an activist spirit among Berlin intellectuals, and Heinrich Mann's "Geist und Tat" appeared in it in January 1911.²³⁾ In the first issue there appeared an open letter from Kerr, with the refrain: "Ich sehne mich nach einem Blatte, das $\sqrt{\dots}$ ". Here he described the kind of cultural and political activity that he expected of a radical periodical. It should involve itself, without being influenced or intimidated by political parties, vested interests or the demands of the public. It should have the courage to decide each case on its merits and to support a worthy cause, to organize opposition forces and resolutely to attack abuses of power.²⁴⁾

Kerr's letter served not only as a call for political action, but as a means of announcing his presence to the editors. Consistent with his view of criticism as an independent activity - "über das Theater hinaus"²⁵⁾ - he longed for more decisive action than composing feuilletons and reviews for Der Tag.^{25a)} His disillusion underlies his speech "Der Zensor und die Künstler",²⁶⁾ where he protested against theatre censorship on the grounds that the effect of the stage was less powerful, and therefore less corrupting, than everyday experience. He defended art against the threat of state intervention, as it offered spiritual solace to a materially deprived minority.

In January 1911, there appeared his satirical poem "Der deutsche Schwund",¹⁹⁾ which contained attacks on Max Reinhardt's stage extravaganzas and on police brutality. This issue of Pan was

confiscated by the police, allegedly for an obscene passage from Flaubert's journals.²⁷⁾

In an open letter of 1st February 1911,²⁸⁾ addressed to Jagow, the Berlin Prefect of Police, Kerr criticized the confiscation, in a restrained but ironic tone. In the hopeful attempt to reason with an uncomprehending autocrat, he attested the journals' aesthetic and historical value - they illuminated Flaubert's novels^{27a)} - and asserted that their educative value outweighed any risk of their corrupting immature minds. He thus combined the arguments of an aesthete and a disbelief in the seductive power of art. Yet since argument of this kind could scarcely sway Jagow, it amounted to a gesture of condescension to a powerful intellectual inferior. Its purely formal function as part of a more general polemic against Jagow is confirmed by Kerr's concluding exhortation to him to investigate more urgent matters, such as the police's murder of an innocent old man.²⁸⁾

A second, edited, instalment of the journals was published in the same issue as Kerr's protest; but it, too, was confiscated. In the next issue, of 16th February, Kerr repeated his arguments against the charge of pornography²⁹⁾ and satirized Jagow in the poem "Ballade vom Alexanderplatz".¹⁸⁾ The incursion by the censor into the realm of art appeared to be one of those "political" issues which Kerr had initially urged Pan to contest resolutely. To combat Jagow, however, he now drew on other information about him, unconnected with the affair.

Jagow had sent the actress Tilla Durieux a note, in which an allusion to his duties as theatre censor formed the pretext for a rendezvous. He discovered the fact that she was the wife of Paul Cassirer, Pan's publisher, only after the note was in the

latter's hands. Jagow was at the mercy of Pan. Kerr now conceded the futility of rational political criticism in an autocracy - and therefore of reasoning with Jagow.³⁰⁾ He decided to use this "scandal" as a political weapon, to cause the censor's downfall by exposing the discrepancy between his public actions and his private behaviour. In a second open letter to Jagow, of 1st March 1911, therefore, Kerr published the note, but defended himself against any criticism of meddling in private affairs, by claiming that the allusion to official duties had made it a public matter.³¹⁾

After initial misgivings about publication, Cassirer had been swayed by Kerr's arguments,³²⁾ and these he then even allowed Pan to publish. In the first of two statements that confirmed Kerr's authorization to discuss the affair, Cassirer claimed that he could not prevent the publication, as he had no editorial powers; he had intended to resign if Kerr were to publicize the scandal, but Jagow's proclaimed indifference to what Pan printed about him personally had forced him, Cassirer continued, to pursue Jagow onto political ground, and to allow colleagues to discuss the case.³³⁾ This plea of innocence is unconvincing on the part of one who stood to profit from a sensational publication, at some cost to his domestic peace. It would seem that fear of prosecution by Jagow had been his one deterrent. The second statement, which also announced his settlement of the "private" dispute between himself and Jagow,³⁴⁾ was equally hypocritical, since it appeared weeks after Kerr's open discussion of the affair.

ii) Press controversy and polemics

In the press controversy the Jagow scandal provoked, Kerr was supported by a number of intellectuals. While Die Schaubühne attacked him,³⁵⁾ Ludwig Thoma's März supported him and Kurt Hiller's reply

to Die Schaubühne's attacks, which was also a tribute to Kerr as an artist, was published in the new radical periodical Die Aktion.³⁶⁾

In January 1911,³⁷⁾ Franz Pfemfert - just before he founded Die Aktion - expressed his annoyance at "Heine und die Folgen" and urged Kerr to punish Kraus for his "böse Schrift". Only Kerr, he said had the right to take Kraus on. While Kerr remained silent, however, Pfemfert's remark revived Kraus's interest in him as one of the prominent followers of Heine.

Four days after Hiller's tribute, on 31st March 1911, Kraus published an attack on Kerr, "Der kleine Pan ist tot" (F.319,1-6; LL 186-192), discussing the Jagow case and the commercial motives of Cassirer. Pfemfert replied with "Der kleine Kraus ist tot",³⁸⁾ remarking that Kraus had added no new arguments to those of Die Schaubühne already dealt with by Hiller. This ignored the different bias of Kraus's attack, and Kraus subsequently distanced himself from Die Schaubühne (LL 197). Although Pfemfert admitted that his reaction to "Heine und die Folgen" had given Kraus a pretext for attacking Kerr, he again urged Kerr to reply to Kraus; but Kerr did no more than quote Pfemfert.³⁹⁾ Pfemfert also organized a "Rundfrage über Alfred Kerr", which - as he later, rather excessively, claimed⁴⁰⁾ - diverted attention from Kerr's silence and restored his image after what in 1911 he had called "malicious"^{41a)} attacks. Among the writers who paid tribute to Kerr - apart from those closely associated with Pan or Die Aktion - were Wedekind, Altenberg, Dehmel, Bahr and Lasker-Schüller.⁴¹⁾ The inquiry produced diverse responses, ranging from conditional acknowledgement to effusive eulogy. It contained evidence of Kerr's stylistic influence and several attacks on Kraus, but above all confirmed Kerr's prestige in the less conservative literary world.

Kraus's criticism of Kerr as a literary figure in his second polemic - "Der kleine Pan röchelt noch", of 29th April 1911 (F.321, 57-64; LL 192-201) - was broader than in his first. It included a brief analysis of style, a stylized delineation of the hollowness of Kerr's "political gesture" and of the lack of unity in his polemics. It contained an excursus on Pfemfert, and, in allusions to a possible lawsuit by Cassirer, Kraus introduced the motif of "teamwork", which characterized his opponents' tactics.

In his next attack on Kraus, "Don Karl",⁴²⁾ Pfemfert abandoned former restraint and made several exaggerated and unfounded allegations about him - for instance, that his campaign was commercially motivated. Although Kraus's inference about Cassirer's suspect motives would also have been hard to corroborate in detail, his polemics were more concerned with Kerr's behaviour, as reflected and defined by his written statements.

Kraus's third polemic, "Der kleine Pan stinkt schon", appeared on 2nd June 1911 (F.324, 50-60; LL 201-211). In both this and the second essay, Kraus took issue with Kerr's supporters. He asserted that a strong polemicist would not need them (LL 199). A favourite tactic of his was to expose a writer by revealing the worthlessness and tastelessness of his supporters. While this no doubt characterized some of those who rallied behind Kerr in Die Aktion, to assert a kinship between admirers and admired was only a polemical formula. Indeed, Kraus was the first to disown his "hysterical" admirers. Here, however, he unjustifiably blurred the distinction between Kerr and his followers. He included Kerr among "those who admired until they were rejected" (LL 207), and supported this assertion with a reference to the behaviour of Kerr's supporters. Apart from thus

confusing identities, Kraus dismissed Max Brod's attack,⁴³⁾ which contained a criticism of the "Pathos und Kalauer" in his style, as a reaction to non-recognition (LL 207ff,). Kerr, in later polemics against Kraus, also made the trivial point about non-recognition.⁴⁴⁾

iii) Kraus's arguments

In "Der kleine Pan ist tot", Kraus argued that Kerr's case rested on an obscuring of Jagow's intention. Kerr had claimed, or implied, that Jagow's allusion to his official post was a potential weapon and means of corruption. Kraus, however, thought Jagow not so naive as to furnish the victim of such "threats" with written proof of his intentions. On the contrary, Kraus argued, Jagow's mention of his office was intended to cover him from attempts to construe his visit as anything more than harmless and official. The most it revealed was his sexual curiosity (LL 189).

On this assumption - and discounting the possibility of a set-up or of commercialism on Kerr's part - Kraus considered that sexual priggishness seemed to lie behind Kerr's misconstruction of the note's purpose. Jagow had done nothing illicit, and the note was at face value not at all improper. Only a pedantic interpretation of bureaucratic ethics could make it seem otherwise. Even Kerr had to admit that Jagow did not have adulterous intentions,⁴⁵⁾ but in seizing on the "incriminating material" he acted prematurely. For these reasons, he was forced to exaggerate the argument about Jagow's abuse of power, on the one hand, and to excuse the exploitation of the trivial affair as an "ethischer Spass",⁴⁶⁾ on the other. In Kraus's view an "ethischer Spass" of this kind exploited the moral hypocrisy of the public, just as Harden's

moral pathos had:

[...] es gehört schon ein tüchtiges geistiges Defizit dazu, zu glauben, es sei kulturvoller, durch die Enthüllung eines hochgestellten Lasters das Gewieher des Bürgers herauszufordern, als seine Wut. [...] als ob Schwankfabrikanten nicht rückwärts gekehrte Mucker wären und die Zote nicht das Widerspiel, das widrige, der Zensur. (LL 194)

As in the Eulenburg affair, he condemned the exploitation of evidence about others' sexual desires as scandal-mongering irrelevant to the alleged political aims. Kerr's campaign neither caused Jagow's fall nor raised the ban on Flaubert, but Pan's sales were inevitably boosted. Although, a year later, Kerr was to become Editor and even invest money in Pan, at this stage he was only indirectly involved in its fortunes - despite his ironic confession about a "fortnightly urge" to attack Jagow.³¹⁾

Kraus's acknowledgement of his "idealistic" motives (LL 193) was not a concession, for it introduced a subtler criticism. He went on to imply that this idealism was a routine gesture, a pretence. Cassirer's volte-face and Kerr's prompt exploitation of the scandal suggested to Kraus that Kerr, with his distinctions between "private" and "public" and "authorized" and "unauthorized" actions, was obscuring the nature of their collaboration (LL 190). Kerr was responsible for creating the sensation, Cassirer for exploiting it commercially. Kerr could profess that his purely political resolve was free from commercial motives, while Cassirer, from precisely these commercial motives, could profess to be powerless to thwart his colleague's resolve. Well versed in detecting connections between the journalist's "right hand", which wrote, and "left hand", which accepted bribes and royalties - as if

the one were unrelated to the other - Kraus here saw a similar collaboration ("Arbeitsteilung", IL 200) between two accomplices, each of whom evaded the moral consequences of the joint action by denying his connection with the other.

For example, their reactions to Kraus's attacks complemented each other: Kerr, on the literary side, quoted Pfemfert's attacks,³⁹⁾ while Cassirer, on the business side, allegedly⁴⁷⁾ started legal proceedings against the Berlin agent of Die Fackel, Herwarth Walden. Denying the fact in an anonymous note entitled "Grössenwahn",⁴⁸⁾ Pan accused Kraus of trying to create a sensation and cash in on its affairs! A "Häufung von Zufällen" (IL 203), to which Kraus ironically referred, suggested that Cassirer had tried, but failed, to initiate a legal action. In this case, Pan's disclaimer was a polemical gambit to conceal the failure. Improbable is the version that he went through the motions to mislead Kraus - although such diversionary tactics characterized Kerr's later polemics and trials against Kraus.

In "Der kleine Pan ist tot", Kraus had noted what amounted to polemical shadow-boxing by Kerr (IL 190). The pattern of Kerr's diversion from key issues can also be detected in details of his arguments, not discussed by Kraus. For example, in contrasting the Jagow affair with Harden's attack on Eulenburg, Kerr wrote:

"Keine Vermengungen! Es schiene mir falsch, einen Hundertfünfundsiebziger mit vererbter, eingeborener Abweichung, für die er nichts kann, in Schuld und Pein zu jagen, wenn er längst politisch machtlos geworden ist."²⁰⁾

Here the humane motivation, Kerr's sympathy for a victim of persecution, is belied by the conditional, which makes it a superfluous front for the political motive: "He should not be tortured if he is politically

powerless". Another use of elaboration to cover the implications of his argument was Kerr's denial that he had any personal resentment of Jagow:

"Blätter der Rechten sprachen von 'Hass' gegen Herrn von Jagow. Ganz falsch. Ich würde mit ihm auf einem Kutterwrack zwischen Pellworm und Nordstrand meine letzte Rinde teilen. Aber: ich halte mich für berechtigt, moralisch einem, der für mein Gefühl ein Schädling ist, jeden Schaden zuzufügen [...]"²⁰⁾

The hypothetical "reconciliation" in the fictitious, exotic setting is quite irrelevant, and confirms Kraus's general diagnosis of Kerr's superfluous ornamentation.

In "Der kleine Pan röchelt noch", Kraus summed up the futile diversionary nature of Kerr's "ethischer Spass" by analogy with Weinberl's "Jux" in Nestroy's Einen Jux will er sich machen (LL 193f), and traced it to the "Tatendrang eines aus den Ereignissen ausgesperrten Feuilletonisten" (LL 197) - to Kerr's frustration in the purely aesthetic realm of the theatre.^{25a)} The Jagow campaign certainly gives one the impression that Kerr exaggerated the incident for the sake of polemical exercise, in the shape of formulae like those discussed above. It is another sign that he lacked the capacity to react to a situation in the appropriate manner.

Kraus exposed Kerr's polemicizing - both against Jagow and against Tappert - as formally correct exercises that lacked the conviction and "Leidenschaft" of his own attacks, which, Kraus claimed, even "im Missgriff der Person" never failed to prove his point. By contrast, Kerr's polemics were occasional reactions to a situation - more often he inserted attacks as irrelevant, laconic parentheses in his reviews:

Herr Kerr, der sich zum Kampf gegen die Korruption

von Fall zu Fall entschliessen musste, hat keinen Zusammenhang mit seinen Wahrheiten. Er ist ein Episodist, während Herr Harden kein Heldenspieler ist. Er will sich nur Bewegung machen, er schwingt Keulen, damit das Ästhetische Fett untergeht. Theaterkritik ist eine sitzende Beschäftigung. Man sieht im Zwischenakt den Zensor mit der Salondame sprechen und ruft J'accuse. Es entsteht eine kleine Panik und man beruhigt sich wieder. Es jaccuselt im Feuilleton schon die längste Zeit. (LL 198f.)

In this display of virtuosity, Kraus seeks to establish as well as claim a difference of quality between their polemics. The passage generates its own logic and consistency from puns and word-coinings ("Panik", "jaccuselt") and from vivid images that both illustrate and grow spontaneously out of preceding statements.

Its literary quality is not only formal, however; the pattern of Kerr's activity described in the first sentence, for instance, conforms to Kraus's schematic conception of polemic and satire, discussed in Chapter One. Kerr is seen as an example of the polemical "Ethiker" - in the aphorism (BWG 239) quoted on page 1 - who, unlike the artist, had to be born "immer von neuem". But his polemics and his style, Kraus claims here, have no intrinsic necessity, there is no integration of personality and work. So Kerr could abandon his apparently unique style when writing for a public outside Berlin (LL 195). On the other hand, Kraus claimed that a "blood-test" would always prove the identity when he himself descended "von einer Apokalypse zu einem Hausmeistertratsch" (LL 196).

Another part of Kraus's literary scheme was his critical terminology for delineating the lack of unity and necessity in an opponent's work. His dismantling of Harden's stylistic façade was accompanied and followed by his general opposition to ornamentation - not only the

fashionable elaborations of Jugendstil, but any verbal or literary pretence. In his criticism of these years, ornament was a sign of the vacuity, or even the falsehood, that it was designed to conceal. Thus Kerr was "der Typus, der seine Gehirnwindungen als Ornament trägt" (LL 193) - an insult justified in view of Kerr's complication of the trivial Jagow affair by hair-splitting arguments of principle.

A further part of Kraus's critical scheme was his assertion of the paradoxical kinship between the materialist and the aesthete - both remote from the "Ursprung". This he postulated in "Heine und die Folgen" (UWM 188), developing the aphorism drawn from his "Apokalypse" of October 1908 (UWM 21), where he had defined the polarity of aesthete and politician:

Jenem löst sich das Leben in eine Linie auf, diesem
in eine Fläche. Das nichtige Spiel, welches beide
treiben, führt beide gleich weit vom Geiste, irgendwohin,
wo sie überhaupt nicht mehr in Betracht kommen. [---]
Es ist derselbe Mangel an Persönlichkeit, der die
einen treibt, das Leben im Stoffe, und die anderen,
das Leben in der Form zu suchen. [---] (BWG 109)

This would clarify his observation that Kerr was a frustrated aesthete, "und mögen ihn noch lineare Naturen um seine Raumfülle beneiden" (LL 193). "Linear" describes the aesthete - for the Jugendstil had reasserted the aesthetic properties of line. "Raumfülle" refers to the illusion of topical, political "Stoff" in Kerr's polemical "escape" from literary discipline.

One formulation of the idea that the aesthete was indulging in a quasi-political gesture, echoes the reference that Kraus made in "Heine und die Folgen" (UWM 192f) to a transferable stylistic formula:

Die rechtschaffenen Hyänen gehen auf den toten Krieger.
Die literarischen auf das Privatleben eines Polizeidirektors. Aus solchem Leben erhoffte sich ein
ästhetischer Schlemihl Bereicherung, das nannte er Tat,
das war die politische Gebärde, auf die es jetzt alle
abgesehen haben, die bisher ihre Zeit damit verbrachten,
für die letzten Dinge einer Tänzerin die Formel zu
suchen. (IL 202)

Although Kraus's scorn for the "enemies" of a police chief may appear to place him on the side of the autocrat, the terms of the "hyena" metaphor are also prophetic - and anticipate the Hyenas (of the press) in Die letzten Tage der Menschheit. In 1914/1918, familiar reviewing techniques were to be disastrously applied to the "theatre" of war - where not only were the critics unqualified but their verbal "formulae" altogether destructive. The stereotyped lyrical metaphors of journalism, which in "Heine und die Folgen" Kraus deplored for their transferability, lent themselves to abuse by patriotic journalists and war-poets, as formulae for capturing the mood of a gruesome reality. The quasi-political gesture - of the leading article, or the war poem or the report from the front - was certainly to become something "auf die es jetzt alle abgesehen haben". The futile polemical exercise of the politically frustrated intellectual, as Kraus depicted it in 1911, foreshadowed in minor key the affirmation of the outbreak of war, that national act of liberation from political frustration.

iv) Retaliation

On 1st May 1911, in the middle of an impressionistic discourse, "Das Theater des Erfolgs",⁴⁹⁾ Kerr inserted^a a jibe about Kraus's cheap emulation of Wilde and Nietzsche as an aphorist. Kraus printed it with a satirical gloss within his second polemic, concluding that it was not a reply but "ein Schwächezustand". (IL 206). Kerr,

compared to Harden, was, indeed, an "Episodist". Kraus's treatment of him accordingly lacked the pathos of his attacks on Harden, and his dismantling of Kerr's style was less thorough than his operations against Harden's.

In "Der kleine Pan ist tot" Kraus had dismissed Kerr's stylistic mannerisms as weaknesses. His "Scherz, Satire, Ironie und tiefere Bedeutung", Kraus said, were exhausted by the word "Ecco",

[...] wozu aber, wenn er gereizt wird, in der Parenthese noch die treffende Bemerkung "Es ist auffallend" hinzutreten kann. [...] Herr Kerr begann fliessend zu stottern, teilte den Polizeipräsidenten in sechs Abteilungen und fühlte sich aristophanisch wohl. (LL 187)

In "Der kleine Pan stinkt schon", introducing Kerr's jibe, Kraus inverted conventional logic - as he had against Harden - to assert Kerr's inferiority:

Jedes Wort, das er spricht, wirft ihn um. Er wehrt sich nicht, weil ich ihn angreife, sondern ich greife ihn an, weil er sich wehrt, [...] recht hat der, der es sagen kann. Herr Kerr kann es nicht einmal stottern. [...] Früher, in seiner Glanzzeit, hätte er noch sagen können: Herr Kraus hat einen A..a..ar..tikel gegen mich geschrieben. Es war nicht, wie's auf den ersten Blick scheint, gebrochenes, sondern gespieenes oder noch ein anderes Deutsch. (LL 206)

The motif of polemical suicide was repeated at the end of the essay (LL 211) and became the key to Kraus's next polemic, "Der kleine Pan stinkt noch", of 8th July 1911 (F.326,28-36;LL 212-218). If Kerr's "episodic" asides could be parried by a string of witticisms, his major attack, "Caprichos", on 1st July 1911,⁵⁰⁾ was felt by Kraus to be so inadequate that he safely printed it in full and invoked the "suicide" formula.

In "Caprichos", Kerr repeated that Kraus was seeking publicity, just as he only feigned hostility to the public, whom he would

woo with demands that it should ignore him. He criticized Kraus's anti-democratic position. Kraus, he said, could write amusing parodies of Harden, but also banalities in defence of sexual freedom; he could gloss Die Neue Freie Presse, but certainly could not write:

"Blieb ihm die Gabe des Schreibens auch verwehrt
(caccatum non est dictum), so weiss er doch, Reporter-
meldungen auf der fünften Seite des Wochenblatts für
Leitomschl und Umgegend mit vernichtender Schärfe zu
beleuchten." [LL 212]

With "(caccatum non est dictum)", the parenthetical translation of an obscenity, Kerr was answering Kraus's crude inference from his "stuttering" (LL 206). Yet although the implication may be similar, Kraus's jibe about "noch ein anderes Deutsch" is both less pretentious and less clumsy than Kerr's periphrase, and its internal rhythm and final position enhance its authority; while Kerr's main slur is reduced to a mere syntactic and rhythmic obstruction within a trivial context of ironic concession.

Some of Kerr's criticisms of Kraus's style at least bear serious consideration. That it was a copy of Daniel Spitzer and Maximilian Harden, however, was an observation which ignored the originality of Kraus's synthesis of these and other formative influences. To show Kraus's banality, he quoted some "Afferismen" - one of Kerr's better puns, which suggested, wrongly, that Kraus "aped" Nietzsche. He emphasized Kraus's merely mechanical inversion of commonplaces:

"Kitsch, mit der Hand gefertigt, dessen Arglosigkeit
sich in mechanischer Umdrehung äussert, in mechanischer
Gegensätzelei, in Geistesschwäche mit 'scharfsinniger'
Haltung oder 'menschenfeindlicher' Haltung [...]" [LL 212]

Despite the polemical bias, this did touch on a major problem of Kraus's writing, although - as I have suggested in Chapter One - it ignores the skill of such inversions, the insight they could afford and the "experience"

behind them.

Yet these criticisms of Kraus's style were accompanied by undisciplined verbosity and generalization, which came as a surprise from a supposedly terse stylist:

"Er fälscht gewiss nicht - er geht nur in Irrungen
ziemlich weit, so dass der alte berliner Scherz
'Karlchen hat wieder mal gelogen' und zwar in der
dümmsten schlichtesten spasslosesten Weise glatt gelogen,
erfunden, geschwindelt um einen Augenblickshalt zu
haben, weil er sich auf die Grossmut und Gleichgültig-
keit seiner Gegner verlässt...dieser Satz kommt nie zu
Ende; wollte sagen: so dass der alte berliner Scherz
'Karlchen hat wieder mal gelogen' gewiss nicht ohne
weiteres für ihn zur Beleuchtung dient..." /LL 213/

Kerr's inability to sustain polemical prose with any sophistication was confirmed by his recourse to abuse. He called Kraus a silly liar, "dummes Luder", "schale Haut", and "sent him packing" with the capriccio "Krätzerich" /LL 214/

In his previous essay, Kraus had reasserted his own ability to give artistic form to vulgar subject-matter, and so exemplify the unity between his ethics and his art:

Ich dichte nicht Poesie, um es dann mit der Krätze zu
halten. Ich mache aus der Krätze ein Gedicht und
veranstalte Sympathiekundgebungen für die Poesie. (LL 205f.)

Kerr seized on this statement in "Krätzerich", three four-line stanzas that rehearse the vulgar formulation of a few trivial points, but scarcely with the verve and fantasy of a capriccio:

"Krätzerich; in Blättern lebend,
Nistend, mistend, 'ausschlag'-gebend.

[—]

Wie der Sabber stinkt und stiebt,
Wie sich's Kruppzeug Mühe gibt!

[—]

Vor dem Duft reisst mancher aus,
Tachtel-Kraus. Tachtel-Kraus,
Armes Kruppzeug - glotzt und schreit:
'Bin ich ä Perseenlichkeit...! ' " LL 214

Kerr was following time-honoured polemical practice,⁵¹⁾ in seeking to discredit Kraus as a "scabious" muck-raker by slinging the muck at him; but, far below Kraus's sophisticated level, it only revealed his own mindless vulgarity. And so Kraus could print Kerr's verse and prose polemic with the remark:

Es ist das Stärkste, was ich bisher gegen den Kerr
unternommen habe. (LL 214)

Here - as later - the most direct attack on Kerr was to let him destroy himself.

In his vigorous finale, Kraus again confused Kerr with his followers, but he was now more justified in counting him among the "poor devils" (LL 214f.) who had come to grief in their clash with him. Kraus declared that he had simply laid out the body after Kerr's suicide, and that any further reply would be reprinted in Die Fackel as an obituary (LL 218).

Kerr did reply, on 1st August 1911 with "Die schale Haut in Wien".⁵²⁾ That its non-appearance in Die Fackel was a sign of Kraus's inadequacy or defeat, can be discounted, in view of its weakness; and that Kraus was attempting to ignore Kerr is made unlikely by the promptness of his other reactions.⁵³⁾ Indeed, he did mention it, but belatedly, in February 1912, in the gloss entitled "Lessing" (F.343,3f.;WF 350), when he admitted that he still owed Kerr something from the summer.

Kerr suggested that Kraus's changes of attitude to Simplicissimus, Die Neue Freie Presse and Harden were personally or commercially motivated, and presented Kraus's attacks on him

in the same light:

"Gewiss auch kein Zufall, dass er bei mir gebettelt hat; dass ich ihm einen Beitrag versagte; dass er Verse von mir zudringlich und lobend nachdruckte, was ich völlig überhörte...Poverino."⁵²⁾

In addition to being as trivial as Kraus's, Kerr's assertion that the attacks were the revenge of an offended former admirer was an obvious distortion by over-simplification. It is hard to see how Kraus's reprint of Kerr's "Girardi" (F.270,19) was both "zudringlich und lobend" and "ignored" by Kerr. Whereas Kraus's attack on Kerr was part of his broader cultural criticism, Kerr's replies were obviously pure retaliation on a trivial personal level. Far from retorting with would-be factual allegations like Kerr's, Kraus, in "Lessing", laid bare the cheapness and staleness of their substance: he reproduced the hollow formula, in outlining Kerr's own successive moves, and took it ad absurdum by means of aposiopesis - omitting all but the conjunctions from the subordinate clauses. Ironically assuming the capacity of "dragon" himself, Kraus here turns Kerr's description of Lessing as a "Drachentöter im Bürgerkleid" into another jibe at its author's lack of polemical effectiveness:

Herr Kerr ist [-..] ein Bürger im Kleid des Drachentöters. Der Drache aber lebt und nimmt den Kampf mit dem Bürger auf, wenn er Zeit hat und wenns ihm noch Spass machen sollte, einen zu beachten, der von Scherl entlassen wurde, weil, von Herrn Cassirer angestellt, um, von Herrn Cassirer entlassen, wiewohl, und von Scherl wieder aufgenommen wurde, warum? (WF 350)

Kerr had ended his "Die schale Haut" by reprinting from "Caprichos" his rambling, "unending" sentence about Kraus's lies [LL 213], quoted above on page 177 . Again he failed to complete it, breaking off the quotation at "um einen Augenblickshalt zu haben" and adding three

-180-

dots and the words "man lese das nach".⁵²⁾ His polemic had thus petered out, in the absence of an immediate reaction from Kraus.

v) Violence

Kerr's polemics drew on cheap press rumours in one further respect. The theme of physical violence recurred throughout the later exchanges in 1911. The note "Grössenwahn"⁴⁸⁾ alluded to the number of blows incurred by Kraus in the past:

"Herr Kraus bekam oft Hiebe, Ohrfeigen, Prügel, bald auf den Mund, bald sonstwohin (kurz, wo er Sitz und wo er Stimme hat) $\angle \cdot \cdot \cdot \angle$ "

This recalls the emphasis on physical attacks in Fritz Wittels's caricature of Kraus in his novel Ezechiel der Zugereiste (1910).⁵⁴⁾ Apart from being unoriginal, Kerr's allusions were inane and cowardly. Yet he repeated and even amplified them, in "Caprichos" and "Die schale Haut", blurring the facts to give the impression that Kraus was a slanderer deserving of such punishment. After considering whether to take Kerr to court over the misrepresentation, Kraus decided that the reference to others' brutality proved more against the author than against the victim and made a trial superfluous (LL 216). Kraus had already recalled, for the purposes of contrast, his own threat to Harden at the end of "Seine Antwort" (LL 138). This had been a "literary" argument, the rightfully indignant reaction against one who could not keep his "intellectual distance" in polemic (LL 204f.). In "Caprichos" Kerr dwelt on the subject, calling Kraus "ein wandelndes Museum für Tachteln" [LL 212] and joking about the "holidays" Kraus's cheeks were having. In "Die schale Haut" he inserted the following hints:

"Es bleibt jedoch eine Auffassung vorstellbar, wonach
Wichse für einen ehrabschneiderischen kleinen

Schmierian wohl in Betracht kommt. Senge des sittlichen Rechts auf intuitiver Grundlage. Ich hoffe gezeigt zu haben, wie derselbe Zweck ohne die Unannehmlichkeit einer Berührung erfüllt werden kann."⁵²⁾

The final two sentences do not clarify Kerr's intention. If, after all, he was not proposing further physical punishment of his enemy, the heavy emphasis he gave to this theme confirms the hollowness of his arguments against Kraus. Kraus himself had only taken up the "physical" motif of Kerr's cheeks to mock Brod's remarks on Kerr's handsomeness (LL 208). Here one might note, however, that in the 'twenties Kraus overworked his satirical allusions to Kerr's small mouth.⁵⁵⁾

Finally, Kerr's allusions to physical violence against a personal enemy might be seen as a trivial precedent for his cowardly, occasionally brutal war poems. In each case he was evoking - even invoking - the brutality of others. In October 1925, Kraus recalled that Kerr's wishing harm on Germany's enemies was consistent with his polemic of 1911:

Er legte eine Gewalttätigkeit an den Tag, die man dem süßsen Jungen gar nicht zugetraut hätte und die er später gegenüber dem Feind ausserhalb der Literatur bewährt hat, dem er "Senge" und "Dresche" androhte. (UWz 280)

Kerr had, indeed, threatened the enemy with the following verses, published in September 1914:

"Heiliges Russland! wenn es doch gelänge

Und du kriegtest die verdiente Senge.

Logisches Vernunftgebot -

Scharfe Dresche tut dir not.

[--]

Weises England ! [--]

Wünsche dir mit letzter Suada

Alle Freuden der Armada.

[--]

Allen Führern bei der Deutschlandhetze

Wünsch ich Bandwurm, Hühneraugen, Krätze,

Zur Ernährung schimmelfeuchtes Stroh -

Und noch Rheumatismus im Popo."^{56a)}

It is the lasting merit of Kraus's polemics of 1911 that on a personal, literary level they exposed a side of Kerr's mentality that was to commit misdemeanours in wartime, which are less easily reconciled with feuilletonist's regular products.

KERR'S WAR POEMS

i) Pacifism or dualism?

Kerr, a self-styled pacifist, volunteered in August 1914 for the armed home guard, but was turned down, perhaps because his pen was felt to be more useful than his rifle. In "Aus dem Kriegsbuch eines Hirnwesens",⁵⁶⁾ he described the dilemma between his cosmopolitan, pacifist ideals and his patriotic instinct to "defend" his country in the hour of need. It was an account of the change in his feelings. Kraus glossed part of it in 1926 (F.735,83f.).

Kerr began by evoking the mood of war-fever, and dissociated himself from compatriots who found pleasure in violence,^{56b)} as well as from those who saw war as a solution to human problems.^{56c)} Nevertheless, he saw the necessity of a war for Germany, to free her from the net of the Entente's intrigues. This capitulation to aggressive tactics, against his "rational" judgement, is familiar from the Jagow campaign.³⁰⁾ Denied the chance of defending his country with arms, he vented his anger at the invading Russian "dogs" and urged: "Das Blut soll in Hitze kommen".^{56d)}

As the foreign invasion of even a border province of his homeland would present any pacifist with a dilemma - how to defend his home without renouncing his ideals - Kerr's anxiety at the invasion of East Prussia is understandable. But his furious reaction [F.735,84] to a British invasion of Togo is a different matter. The invasion of a remote colony was surely not drastic enough an incursion on the pacifist's liberty for him to advocate a "defensive" war, as

Kerr then did. The Pan-Germanist, colonialist assumptions behind his sentiments would scarcely seem compatible with true pacifism.

With this, Kerr was identifying himself with those whom he had condemned in the previous paragraphs:

"Man weiss, dass es am letzten Ende, nach allem, was wir angestrebt (und morgen wieder anstreben werden - und was einzig anzustreben ist) einen Rückschlag bedeutet. Aber das Gefühl ist da. Sie sollen merken, dass wir noch am Leben sind."^{56b)}

He excused the general lack of moral resistance to war fever, on both sides, by blaming a "Verbrecherschar" and the "lack of time to think". Then he made his apologia for war:

"Unsrer Haut müssen wir uns wehren - unsrer heut noch pochenden Herzen.

Ich juble schon über einen Bruch des Völkerrechtes. Obschon der Aufbau dieses Rechts, des Rechts, das Grösste geblieben ist bis zum heutigen Tag (und, in drei Teufels Namen, wieder zu sein hat - und einzig zu sein hat).

Das Unterbewusstsein nimmt oftmals die Führung."^{56e)}

The weakness of Kerr's impressionism now becomes clear. His objective analysis of his feelings in retrospect scarcely makes amends for the failure of his objective faculty to control them at the time. Indeed, it reads like an affirmation of the power of the moment, which had overcome rational objections. For the period of the war, in order to "help" his fatherland - "bis zum letzten Hemde; [..] bis zum letzten Wurf Speichel [..] bis zum letzten Knochen; bis zum letzten Hohnwort"^{56f)} - Kerr compromised and twisted his ideals as was politically expedient, and reduced his pacifism to an excuse or alibi, while he simultaneously composed chauvinistic

verse like that quoted above on page 181f and printed in his essay as an example of his vain attempt at war poetry.

Yet a genuine pacifist would not have written the verse at all, and would certainly have refrained from publishing it, in whatever context. "Aus dem Kriegsbuch eines Hirnwesens" -which Kerr later called an "indictment" of war - is no more than ^{an} account of his dualism. His regular output of "patriotic" verse, as the war progressed, proved that the initial attempts of the "Hirnwesen" had not been "in vain". While condemning war in general in literary periodicals and in his books, he continued throughout the war to publish chauvinistic jingles under a pseudonym in Der Tag. This might explain his wish to forget this period. Yet in commenting on the time between the 1905 and 1917 editions of his Das neue Drama, he wrote:

"Seitdem wurde die Welt in Blutwiderlichstes verstrickt
[--] Die Lebensdauer der Wahrheit bleibt verlängert um
so viel Zeit, wie notwendig ist, stinkende Nachwirkungen
eines viehischen Begebnisses vergessen zu lassen; den
elendesten Rückfall; den Vortrab der Spät-Entafften."⁵⁷⁾

The capacity to forget, in the 'twenties, was surely a contributory factor in the rise of those "Spät-Entaffte" who founded the Third Reich.

Despite his own "Rückfall" in the First World War, Kerr was a brave and active literary opponent of Nazism from about 1930 until 1945. Among his propaganda broadcasts for the B.B.C. during the Second World War was a talk "Deutsche Psyche", in which he described the ambivalent response - "sozusagen in zwei getrennten Stockwerken" - that characterized "morally sensitive Germans". Consciously opposed to Nazism and

its brutality, they would, in their subconscious, feel a national kinship with the "monster":

"Sie hassen ihn aus Pflicht, fühlen sich aber durch den hohen Grad seiner Barbarei...geschmeichelt. Das sind die Schlimmsten. Moralisten, die instinktmässig höchst unmoralisch sind."⁵⁸⁾

Here Kerr was condemning a dualism akin to that in which he had personally been implicated in the First World War - and after.

ii) Kraus and Gottlieb

As in most of his critical activity, Kraus lent authority to his attack on the cultural and moral as well as physical atrocities of the War through his own unique example - his pacifist stand, his public criticism of war leaders and journalists and their propaganda, and his generous support of charities for the disabled. During the war, his drama Die letzten Tage der Menschheit, the severest indictment of the war's evils, took shape, and much of its material was published in glosses and essays in Die Fackel. Just one of the innumerable disgraces glossed by Kraus, but not worthy of full-scale polemical treatment at that stage, was the verse production of Kerr and several others in Der Tag under the collective pseudonyms of "Gottlieb", "Peter" and "Caliban". It was widely known that Kerr was author of many Gottlieb poems.⁵⁹⁾ Of the estimated five to six hundred Gottlieb poems⁶⁰⁾ the number attributable to Kerr is not exactly known. Kraus asserted that Kerr was author of the bulk of them, and between 1926 and 1929 he reprinted in Die Fackel twenty different Gottlieb poems by Kerr, mostly in full. For the purposes of the present work,⁶¹⁾ nearly ninety have been traced, without extensive study of Der Tag.

In October 1916 under the title "Ein deutsches Kriegsgedicht" (F.437,7;WF 210f.), Kraus glossed a "Runänenlied" by Gottlieb. His comment was:

Hinter dem Pseudonym verbirgt sich mit Recht Herr
Alfred Kerr. (WF 211)

The poem may be taken as an illustration of Kerr's perversion of his gift for mimicry of dialect and foreign accents. Its third, fourth and fifth stanzas read:

" Gebrüllescu voll Triumphul
Mitten im Korruptul-Sumpful
In der Hauptstadt Bukurescht,
Wo sich kainer Fisse wäscht.

Leider kriegen wir die Paitsche
Vun Bulgaren und vun Daitsche;
Zogen flink-flink in Dobrudschul,
Feste Tutrukan ist futschul!

Aigentlich sind wir, waiss Gottul,
Dann heraingefallne Trottul,
Haite noch auf stolzem Rosscu,
Murgens eins auf dem Poposcu!"

Obvious features of Rumanian word-formation, like endings in -scu and -ul, are parodied - as in the pun with "Trottel". The primitive level of such jokes as the "unwashed feet" can only be explained as satisfying the demands of readers coarsened by war. That it was a perfunctory rhyme with the "foreign" pronunciation of "Bukurescht" scarcely makes it better. The crude humour nearly surpassed the contempt for Rumania, which was evident in Kerr's verse long before Rumania entered the war on the side of the Entente in July 1916 after Brousilov's offensive, and at a time when Germany was receiving grain from Rumania.⁶²⁾ The "Rumänenlied" was the basis of the satirical scene, "Kerr am Schreibtisch", Act III, Scene 20 in Die letzten Tage der Menschheit, in which Kraus added the following parody, as comment:

Denn es dichtet Alfred Kerrul
tglich was sich reimt fr Scherul.
Doch er ist kein solches Rossul,
sondern kerrt zurck zu Mossul.

Ecco.

(LTM 362f.)

"Mossul" alludes to Mosse, the owner of the Berliner Tageblatt,
which Kerr joined after leaving Der Tag.

Kraus read this scene, along with other extracts from his drama,
at his public recitals in the early 'twenties. He alluded to other
Gottlieb poems, one of which, "Pupillarische Sicherheit", described
Germans farting at the names of Edward Grey and Churchill. This
he first printed in November 1921 [F.577,40]. Kerr did not react
directly to this unwelcome publicity, but in his review of a recital
by Kraus in February 1924 [F.649,78ff.], he damned him with faint
praise. Kraus saw it as an example of Kerr's misleading stylization of
facts - in which perspective it was analysed in Part I, Section iii.

At a recital in Berlin on 30th March 1925, Kraus's audience
responded sensationally (F.686,28f.) to "Kerr am Schreibtisch". Kerr
reacted by inserting a brief but irrelevant paragraph against Kraus into
a theatre review, where he "thought of little Kraus", "welcher die
verbitterte Lustigkeit eines Dorfklupfels irrig als Rechtsgefhl
ausbietet" [F.686,30]. This spiteful allusion to Kraus's congenital
spinal affliction - which is worthy of Bekessy, the "Revolverjournalist"
whom Kraus was fighting at this time⁶³⁾ - made Kraus consider legal
action, as a means of contrasting Kerr's influence as a critic with
his practice of injecting private malice into his criticisms; and
also of recalling his authorship of vile war poems (F.686,31). He
renounced the idea, for he felt that even a stigmatization of Kerr
in court might not reduce his harmful influence as a critic. Kraus

did not attack him in earnest until 1926, when he went on a peace mission to meet French diplomats, whom, in 1914, he had wished "Rheumatismus im Popo".⁶⁴⁾ Meanwhile, Kraus reprinted Kerr's war poem "Ostpreussen" - a formal exhortation to whip the Russians out of "Immanuel Kant's land" - and a photo of Kerr with a beard (F.686,32), perhaps to be construed as the culprit's disguise.⁶⁵⁾

iii) Paris

In January 1926, Kerr lectured at the Sorbonne and was guest of honour at a lavish reception. During his lecture on dramatic art as a means towards unity between peoples, on 19th January, a Serbian student publicly accused him of writing the verses "Serbien muss sterbien" and "Jeder Schuss - ein Russ."⁶⁶⁾ Visibly troubled at the mention of war poems, Kerr was vehemently able to deny authorship of "diese idiotischen Verse" [F.717,52]. After this reassurance, he was received enthusiastically, but he cancelled an official dinner engagement and left Paris the next day.

In his essay "Kerr in Paris", of March 1926 (F.717,47-61), Kraus compared the conflicting press reports on Kerr's visit, some of which made light of the Serb's disturbance or claimed Kraus was behind it. Kraus only wished that the Serb had been a reader of his, for then he might have quoted a genuine Kerr poem. He then glossed some more examples.

Kerr's feuilleton "Erinnerung an Paris", of April 1926,⁶⁷⁾ contained tributes to cultured Frenchmen who were pacifists like himself, effusive descriptions of the receptions, and characteristic mannerisms of style. He illustrated his belief that politicians were preventing artists from achieving reconciliation, with a ponderous allegory: France and Germany were two gigantic buses, whose drivers (the politicians) braked when the passengers (the artists)

wanted to approach each other. This vision - which ended with the question "Wann werden Künstler zu Chauffeuren?" [F.735,75] - received due treatment in the essay "Der Friedmensch", of October 1926 (F. 735, 70-95), where Kraus, alluding to Kerr's narrow escape in Paris, suggested that the caution of the drivers prevented not reunion but a crash. In a full satirical analysis, he also made fun of Kerr's fond recollections of the trip. When Kerr attributed to the German Ambassador, "der Tischnachbar Hoesch", "etwas von unserem Saft in seinen Adern" [F.735,77], Kraus added the repartee "während wir etwas von seinem Saft, den bekannten fabelhaften Weinen der Deutschen Gesandtschaft, übernehmen" (F.735,77), to account for Kerr's enthusiastic report on other events. Kerr took this comment as an insinuation of corrupt bias and later quoted it as an example of libel [F.787,13 and 128]. In his explanation of the passage, Kraus emphasized its satirical nature: the reference was not to bribery, but to the "intoxicated" effusiveness of the feuilleton (F.787,53). Here he was not accepting the full implications of his text - however pedantic Kerr's objection was.

Near the end of his feuilleton, Kerr had inserted - as paragraph XIX - another attack on him, which he now reprinted in full [F.735,78] as a further example of Kerr's polemical incapacity. It had contained the reproach that Kraus had misrepresented his "pacifist" essay of 1914 as an affirmation of war. Kraus had in fact merely glossed the poem in it (F.717,50); and only now did he expose the sentiments in the rest of the essay (F.735,84). Furthermore, Kerr had called it a swindle to ascribe to him, as Kraus had (F.717, 55) - in "revenge" for the attack of 1925 and for "Die schale Haut",⁵²⁾ which had never been "answered" - a "grausam schlechtes" Gottlieb poem [F.735,78]. In replying to this (F.735,92f.), Kraus made a factual

-191-

error. He mistook "Die schale Haut" for the "Caprichos"⁵⁰⁾ which he had "answered" in 1911. Kerr, too, was wrong, for Kraus had dismissed "Die schale Haut", in February 1912.

iv) Style and content as proof of authorship

Kraus's other error - of wrongly ascribing to Kerr (F.717,55) the Gottlieb poem "Aus Russland", which mocked the Russian soldiers drowning in the Masurian lakes and "having to drink water instead of vodka" - had more serious implications; for Kerr was to use it as evidence of Kraus's libel.

Kraus believed that only a public confession of guilt would have proved the sincerity of Kerr's peace mission of 1926. Such a confession - as he well knew - would also have damaged Kerr's image, and so for Kerr was out of the question. Far from recanting, however - and he later affirmed his wartime position⁶⁸⁾ - he denied authorship of the "Masurengedicht" with even greater hypocritical indignation than he had the Serb's mistake. This gave the impression - which in the following statement of September 1927 is explicitly asserted - that he had never written "idiotic", "sadistic" verses:

"Ich habe niemals Grausamkeiten geäußert, wie dieses Gedicht sie enthält, das qualvoll in den Tod Sinkende verhöhnt. Ich lege Wert auf die Feststellung, dass ein solches Verspotten Hinscheidender mir unendlich widerstrebt hätte, Herr Kraus hat bedenkenlos und prüfungslos die Unwahrheit gesagt. Die wirklich im Krieg von mir verfassten Gedichte hatten immer nur die Tendenz dem eigenen bedrängten Lande zu helfen; sie waren oft satirisch-derb - aber wesensverschieden von diesem [· · ·] Gedicht, Meine Verse waren oft derbste Abwehr und Aufforderung zur Abwehr: aber nicht Sadismus gegen Sterbende." [F.787,11f.]

Instead of demanding the publication of a correction, he accused Kraus

of libel. Such over-reaction seemed, to Kraus, to be the sign of a bad conscience - the attempt to obscure the truth by means of a half-truth (F.735,80). Kraus, in glossing "Aus Russland", had remarked that it exceeded the most "patriotic" products of the war (F.717,55). In fact, there were many jokes and jingles composed on similar themes.⁶⁹⁾

Stylistic identification was the only means of ascertaining authorship when the author failed to claim his poem. Kraus insisted that he had conscientiously compared the style of the Gottlieb poems with that of Kerr's other poems. In retrospect, however, Kraus (F.735,86) and Heinrich Fischer,⁷⁰⁾ who had collected the poems for him, noted that the language of the "Masurengedicht" lacked the "tänzerische Note" which distinguished much of Kerr's poetry. "Tänzerisch" was an allusion to Kerr's typical verbal flippancy and jingling metre, which travestied the Nietzschean demand for a new spirit of gaiety. The poem indeed lacks these and other features of Kerr's style, and Kraus's error is surprising:

" Aus Russland

Nun hat man im Reiche des weissen Despoten
Den ersten sittlichen Anlauf genommen,
Und hat den Branntweinverkauf verboten,
Den wackeren Truppen zu Nutz und Frommen.

Sie sollen sich fern von der Wodkiflasche
Allmählich gewöhnen ans Wassertrinken,
Damit der Geschmack sie nicht überrasche,
Wenn sie in die Seen Masurens versinken." [F.717,55]

The humour of the poem, Kraus remarked in retrospect (F.735,86), was "mehr von der geformten Art [] als von der gequirkten [] des Herrn Kerr", but he maintained that Kerr's occasional stylistic variations could still have accounted for the formal difference of

the poem from others with similar sentiments. This is surely the significant point. Kraus made a bad mistake over the style of the poem; Kerr most strongly objected to such sadistic sentiments being ascribed to him. Yet were the "idiotic verses" about drowning Russians drinking lakewater so very different from his wishing Englishmen "alle Freuden der Armada",^{56a)} in the poem from his "pacifist" essay, or so different from his delight in starving Russian soldiers being forced to eat candles and bug-power? Kraus now printed in full the Gottlieb poem, "Stallupönen", which described this, and added:

┌···┐ nun erdreiste er sich, die Vermutung, dass er
im Krieg der Bestien in Grausamkeit versiert war, in
jener scheusslich gewitzten Grausamkeit, die das
eigene Leibeswohl hinter der Schanze eines Schreibtisches
deckt, für "einfachen Schwindel" zu erklären! (F.735,87)

He added that, even if Kerr disowned them - and he knew he could not - it would not free him from his share of responsibility for all the poems written under the collective pseudonym (F.735,86). Kraus believed that those who had served in Scherl's livery of war and offered clients bloodthirsty jokes at breakfast as an ersatz for coffee (F.735,87), had no right to insist on individuality or disown any Gottlieb product. To quote Heinrich Fischer's words:

"┌···┐ die Unmenschlichkeit der paraten Pointe, die
Unerlebtheit der witzigen Anschauung, die Schnoddrigkeit
eines gereiften Intellekts, der einen Hymnus dichtet,
wenn Ersatznahrungsmittel aus Stroh erfunden werden,
unablässig in heiteren Versen für die Kriegsanleihe
wirbt ┌···┐"⁷⁰⁾

- this cheerful routine of Kerr's war effort was the real scandal.

Kerr took exception to Kraus's remarks, most of all to the reproach of "cruelty from behind a desk", which he made the grounds

for his libel case. He considered it a reproach of cowardice, which his voluntary enlistment excluded. Kraus acknowledged Kerr's enlistment (F.735,84); but this did not, he said, exclude subsequent cowardice, the cowardice not of exempting oneself from service but of inciting others to fight, from a position of safety (F.787,188f.). He had vented his frustration at not joining the fighting, in a dishonourable way. To show the hypocrisy of his indignation, Kraus quoted in full ten Gottlieb poems definitely written by Kerr [F.735,81-92]. Kerr was one of those, Kraus continued, who were not pro-war but certainly had not been against this one (F.735,83f.). When he later claimed to have been "gegen den Krieg - aber für Deutschland" [F.787,15], Kraus captured this dualism in a satirical amplification of a "pacifist" declaration [F.787,15] by Kerr:

Er hat nicht nur "dauernd während des Krieges, gegen die bestialische Torheit dieses menschlichen Atavismus gewettert", sondern auch dauernd für sie [F.787,61]

LEGAL AND POLEMICAL TACTICS

i) Libel suits

Kraus's "Der Friedenssch" ended with an ultimatum: if Kerr should call him a swindler again, he would furnish conclusive proof of Kerr's part in producing the Gottlieb poems (F.735,95). Kerr replied to this essay with another insertion, quite irrelevant to the theme of his feuilleton - "Zur Jessner-Hetze", in the Berliner Tageblatt of 21st December 1926 - where he called Kraus "der kleine miesse Verleumder mit moraligem Kitschton". On 3rd January 1927, Kraus's solicitor Oskar Samek wrote to a Berlin colleague to ask whether, according to German law, if Kraus sued Kerr for libel, Kerr could bring a cross-action against Kraus for any libel contained in the October issue of Die Fackel.⁷¹⁾ Kraus wanted to sue Kerr only if there was no chance of a cross-action,⁷²⁾ but the Berlin solicitor rashly initiated the proceedings on 8th March 1927, before this was certain, thus starting a series of legal battles which were to last five years. This first action continued over a year before being abandoned, without ever being contested in court.

Kerr's tactics soon became clear. As the day of the trial approached, he would present a pleading containing "evidence" against Kraus or objections to the charge, and thus succeeded in postponing the trial again and again. For example, on 29th April 1927, Kerr's solicitor appealed against Kraus's charge, on the grounds that Kerr had acted in self-defence in replying to attacks from Kraus. On 5th May 1927, he presented a pleading stating in detail why Kraus's action was invalid. The reply of Kraus's solicitor was countered on 23rd June 1927, when Kerr's solicitor brought the feared cross-

action. There followed an exchange of pleadings, including a long tract written by Kerr himself and presented on 16th September 1927 [F.787,8-24]. The numerous allegations and half-truths in both this and Kerr's next pleading, dated 1st February 1928, demanded piecemeal refutation and correction. Kraus's remark about the latter pleading sums up the tactics as a whole:

So kurzen Atem auch die Lüge des Kerr hat, sie läuft
doch so flink, dass man mit dem längsten nicht nachkommt.

(F.787,122f.)

This may seem like Kraus's first admission of defeat, but his own reply, of 29th October 1927 (F.787,26-89), was the most tightly argued and fully documented exposure of Kerr's mentality yet undertaken by him. The length of these tracts made a further postponement necessary. By this time, admitting the futility of such proceedings, Kraus considered the possibility of an out of court settlement - if Kerr would publicly withdraw his insult and pay both legal costs and a sum of compensation (for his war poems) to the war-blind.^{72a)} At the next hearing, on 2nd February 1928, before which Kerr's second long pleading was presented [F.787,89-199], an accord was reached which was not as favourable as that wished by Kraus, since Kerr's cross-action was from a formal legal viewpoint as valid as his own action. This settlement, by which action and cross-action were to be withdrawn and legal costs shared, was initiated by Kerr's solicitor, who succeeded in belittling the case as "das übliche Literatengezänk".⁷³⁾ According to an eye-witness,⁷³⁾ Kraus's Berlin solicitor tacitly accepted this trivialization of a matter most urgent to Kraus. Kraus sharply reprimanded him for his acquiescence, and sought a new Berlin solicitor.⁷⁴⁾ It was a tactical victory for Kerr.

On the other hand, the advantage which Kraus gained in discontinuing the suit was the acquisition of Kerr's pleadings. In September 1928, he published in full Kerr's pleadings of 16th September 1927, his own of 29th October 1927, and Kerr's of 1st February 1928, with his own objections to it interpolated as glosses (F.787,1-208). For sheer persistence of argument and weight of documentation - which irrefutably captured Kerr's double-dealing, his obscuring of issues by sophistry and his use of denunciation as a diversionary tactic - it was one of Kraus's most convincing polemics. Here a brief thematic outline must suffice.

ii) Insults or slander?

Before publishing these documents under the title "Der grösste Schuft im ganzen Land..." - which alluded to the proverbial "Denunziant" - Kraus called Kerr a disreputable blackguard ("Schuft") in two successive public recitals, in Berlin on 27th and 30th March 1928. He announced his readiness to prove the term to be a fair description, if Kerr cared to sue him. Kerr did not, which suggests that his cross-action was a mere retaliatory measure to support his claim that he had been answering Kraus's "insults". His reaction to the first recital was the following note in the Berliner Tageblatt of 29th March - the words underlined here were spaced for emphasis, in Die Fackel:

"Die faden Fehden

"Ein Wiener Literat (ich nenne den Namen nicht : um ihn zu ärgern) hat in einer 'Vorlesung' unsaubere Beschimpfungen wider mich versucht. (Wer glaubt ihm?)" /F.787,17/

Even this attempted diversion, when Kraus quoted it in his second recital, rebounded on Kerr; to Kerr's question "Wer glaubt ihm?"

the audience shouted "Alle!" (F.781,17). He then took Kerr's remarks to pieces, as a starting-point for his argument:

Ich nenne den Namen des Herrn Kerr, ich nannte ihn
stets und ich habe den Träger dieses Namens einen
Schuft genannt. Die Absicht, ihn zu ärgern, hat mich
nicht geleitet, sondern die Absicht, die Theatermenschheit
von ihm zu befreien. Wer mir glaubt? Ein Saal, der
es durch dröhnenden Beifall bezeugt hat [-] Herr
Kerr wird vor mir satirisch und setzt die Vorlesung,
die ich gehalten habe, in Gänsefüßchen. Aber diese
Füßchen eines Gänserichs hinken [...] (F.781,17)

The latter jibe played on Kerr's formation of words in "-ich".

As to the "insults", Kraus saw a great difference between the withdrawal by a Viennese writer from a Berlin lawsuit over the word "Verleumder", and the tacit acceptance by "the leader of Berlin's cultural life" of being called a "Schuft" before a Berlin public (F.781,21). Furthermore, Kerr had atfirst sought to excuse his use of "Verleumder" as being not a factual assertion but a general characterization of Kraus's insulting behaviour.⁷⁵⁾ By contrast, Kraus declared that "Schuft" was not a mere insult but designated a certain "unehrenhafte Gesinnung" (F.781,17).

In "Die faden Fehden", Kerr referred to Kraus's renunciation of legal action, but Kraus noted the bias of this seemingly harmless remark by recalling that Kerr's solicitor had initiated the accord (F.781,18). Kerr concluded with a book-reference, to one of his attacks on Kraus. In assuming that the reference was to Caprichos,⁷⁶⁾ Kraus made another factual error. The polemic in question, however, was a new insertion in the reprint of the 1926 Paris feuilleton for the book edition of 1928.⁷⁷⁾ In the book, the polemic was given a sharper edge in paragraphs

18 and 21. The individual slurs were mostly cryptic *précis* of the denunciatory arguments from Kerr's first pleading, but with a noticeably different bias - which is discussed in Section iv below. Even such jibes as "Pst! dieser Herr hat sich in den Schutz der Justiz gestellt"⁷⁸⁾ - which H.-D.Zimmermann⁷⁹⁾ has vaunted as a legitimate device for stressing the opponent's need of protection - was strictly applicable not to Kraus but to Kerr himself, when, later in the year, he sought an interim injunction against Kraus. This "device" was a distortion of fact.

iii) Satire within the polemic

Kerr attacked Kraus again in the poem "Der Polemist", published in his "Steile Strophen", in the Berliner Tageblatt of 12th April 1928. It consisted of forty-two rhymed trochaic "Vierheber" in four strophes of unequal length, with several irregular short lines.

The poem opens with the thesis that "this fellow's work reminds me of cheese". There follows an attempt to illustrate Kraus's "stinking" activities as a publicist. Kerr alludes to his "hair-splitting" linguistic criticism and "moral indignation", but the connection with "cheese" is not apparent. Such references are embellished by alliteration and slang. Kerr - who had called Shakespeare "berufsmässiger Schwan vom Avon"¹³⁾ - was not for the first time calling Kraus's work routine,⁸⁰⁾ when he wrote:

"Sittlich die Empörungsmiene.

Polemistviech mit Routine." /F.781,29/

Yet these very lines amply illustrate the hollow routine of Kerr's own production. The first line provides a rhyme for "Routine", but is a stilted reiteration of the content of a preceding sentence. "Polemistviech" labours the vulgar pun already contained to greater effect in the title.

The longer second strophe is characterized by more alliteration and dense clusters of stronger abuse:

"Ehrenschänder, Schmähsschriftschmierer,
Aufgeblähter Jammerzwerg." [F.781,29]

Freed from any initial comparison to cheese, the insinuations are at least comprehensible. Kraus is designated as a scandalmonger versed in the tricks of a pettyfogger and hungering after publicity. At most, Kerr could heap abuse on his opponent in the manner of Fischart,⁵¹⁾ but as soon as he sought to establish his reproaches, as in the finite clauses in this poem, their primitive nature becomes all too clear. Kraus was swift to see the suicidal implications, for example, of the remark that he "stuck to the smallest excrescence" and was a "Parasit an Parasiten" - for Kerr, himself one of Kraus's "stimuli", was admitting that he was one of the parasites off whom Kraus lived (F.781,34). In the final strophe Kerr departs from the metrical scheme in order to invoke Götz von Berlichingen - that is, his most notorious remark!

The inadequacy of Kerr's "short-breathed" vulgarity as an answer, either to Kraus's moral reproaches or to the eloquent rhetoric he sustained over hundreds of pages, had even aroused his mock-pity (F.781,30), until the thought of the theatre critic's "harmful influence" (F.781,34) drove him to apply the "torture of full quotation". The interplay between the satirical and polemical modes can be seen especially after a weak reply by his opponent; Kraus could afford to waver playfully between Kerr's "Unbedeutung" and his "Geltung", between Kerr's literary weakness and his influence as a critic.

iv) Defeatism and denunciation

The pleadings to the court centred on the issue of Kerr's war poetry. In answer to Kraus's condemnation of his false

pacifism and to the reproach of cruelty, Kerr asserted that Kraus had distorted his words, had misquoted him and given a biased selection of his poems. He rectified this by quoting milder passages from the Gottlieb poems [F.787,14 and 22ff.], and repeated the allegation of libel over the "Masurengedicht" [F.787,11] and his assertion of the possibility of simultaneous pacifism and "patriotism" [F.787,15].

Alongside this apologia, Kerr sought to divert attention from the issue by denouncing Kraus as a defeatist [F.787,18ff.]. This was a perfect illustration of Kraus's reproach that Kerr twisted ideals according to need. On the one hand, he declared, he was a pacifist; he had condemned the war in stronger terms than Kraus or anyone else; on the other hand, he had helped his country in the hour of need.⁸¹⁾ He then used the most extreme nationalistic, militaristic arguments to denounce Kraus's purely pacifist stand and hostility to his country. He quoted [F.787,19f.] excerpts from the poems "Das Lied des Alldeutschen" (WiV 203ff.) and "Hausmannskost" (WiV 218) and from Kraus's note on distorted reporting by a nationalistic newspaper [F.787,78ff.]. By means of extremely biased interpretations Kerr aimed to arouse the most primitive nationalistic sentiments in the judges.

Yet in the book-polemic,⁷⁷⁾ aimed at a "literary" forum, this massive denunciation was omitted. Here Kerr simply stated that he himself was not a "sentimental pacifist".⁸²⁾ Instead of damning Kraus as a defeatist, he highlighted the "contradictions" between Kraus's anti-democratic, antisemitic, militarist stand and his appreciation of the war manifesto in 1914,⁸³⁾ and his later opposition to the war. According to Kerr, this had amounted to jokes about the Kaiser and a personal antipathy to Alice Schalek.⁸³⁾ These satirical allegations and the denunciation of Kraus to the

court were equally false; and their juxtaposition - which, owing to his ignorance of the book-polemic, Kraus did not undertake - illustrates the very duplicity of the extreme nationalistic pacifist Kerr, about which Kraus had initiated the polemic in 1926.

v) Quotation and selection

Kraus had earlier stressed Kerr's hurried departure from Paris; and at the end of his pleading (F.787,85f) he rather provocatively quoted a nationalistic critic's praise of Die letzten Tage der Menschheit⁸⁴⁾ and a Catholic critic's attack on Kerr,⁸⁵⁾ to show that it was not only his followers who were against Kerr. Kerr's last trump was to answer these references - "for the sake of symmetry" - by quoting an attack on Kraus by what he harmlessly called "Stimmen aus Tirol"/F.787,193/. This was the Tiroler Antisemitenbund's denunciation of Kraus as a "Deutschenhasser", after his forced departure from Innsbruck in 1920, when extreme nationalists disrupted one of his recitals. Kerr took the reference straight from Kraus's full documentation of the incident in Die Fackel (F.531,142f.). Kraus expressed his disgust at the way Kerr, "ein linksorientierter Jude" - under the pretext of "symmetry" - mobilized "die Innsbrucker Hakenkreuzler" against him and idly denied the relevance of any antisemitic bias in the criticism, when full quotation of the text would have exposed its blatantly racist bias. Even the mention of "antisemitism against Kraus" appealed to just such instincts in the judges (F.787,194).

One grotesque example of Kerr's tendentious misquotation was his version of the gloss on the Deutsche Tageszeitung. In this Kraus had taken the paper's defamatory review of one of his recitals as an illustration of how the nationalistic press copied the stylistic

mannerisms of that "jüdischer Plastiker", Kerr. He had concluded:

Die Deutsche Tageszeitung aber ist ein Organ "Für das deutsche Volk!-Für deutsche Art!-Für deutsche Arbeit in Stadt und Land!" Wie der deutsche Gott Bomben auf Nürnberg regnen liess, so lügen und fälschen sie wie eh und je. Wie ihre Generalstabsberichte so ihre Darstellungen von einem Vortrag, von einer Wirkung, von einem Publikum. "Auch ein Vortragender" bin ich diesem Gesindel, das, wenn ein Schock von der Sorte neben mir im Saal das Wort zu nehmen wagte, ein Laut von mir wegbliese. Alles in allem geht meine Ansicht dahin, dass die Entente halbe Arbeit geleistet hat. So unbesiegt wie die Deutsche Tageszeitung war noch nie ein Besiegter! (F.546,20f.)

The passages underlined are those omitted by Kerr in his first pleading [F.787,22], where he used the text to suggest how far Kraus went if his vanity was hurt. The first sentence had emphasized the nationalistic sentiments, which were contrasted to the "Jewish" style and technique. The "bombs on Nürnberg" was an allusion to the false press reports of a French attack before the declaration of war in 1914, which had served as propaganda for a "defensive" war (WF 207). The final sentence had returned to the newspaper and the theme of the gloss (F.546,15ff.) - "unbesiegt" alludes to those civilian (and Jewish) profiteers who "survived" the war, in contrast to the supposedly defeated nationalists. In omitting this and in bringing the "bombs" and the "uncompleted task" closer together, Kerr was insinuating that Kraus wanted more bombs on Germany (F.787,80).

In his second pleading, Kerr denied that Kraus had referred only to the paper, and asserted that the final sentence (the "Nachsatz") did not alter the fact that the "Zusatz" (the words he had quoted) referred to a country, not a paper [F.787,181].

Der Nachsatz folgt also auf den "Zusatz", der, wenn er nicht gefälscht wird, seinen ganzen Sinn von ihm empfängt. Der Kerr hat das Vergleichselement zur Hauptsache gemacht, die Reihenfolge der Sätze geändert, er hat entstellt und umgestellt, kurz, er hat, gleich den militärischen Vorbildern, "umgruppiert". Wie ihre Generalstabsberichte so ihre Darstellungen noch von meiner Darstellung ihrer Darstellungen. Sie lügen und fälschen wie eh und je, und so unbesiegt wie der Kerr war selbst die Deutsche Tageszeitung nicht $\overline{\angle \cdots \angle}$ (F.787,184)

Not only Kerr's sentiments, then, but his methods were a discredit. His method of quotation was itself an example of the distortion and misrepresentation for which he reproached Kraus, as Kraus pointed out:

Was aber den Schriftsatz des Beklagten zu einem Unikum macht, ist der Umstand, dass er zum Beweise der Behauptung, ich sei ein Verleumder, zu Mitteln greift, die förmlich ein Beispiel für die Methode bedeuten, die er mir zum Vorwurf macht und die er als Kennzeichen meiner verleumderischen Praxis auffasst: "die Methode, von der K. lebt, gedruckte Stellen auszuschneiden, einen so wiedergegebenen Text des Kerns zu entkleiden und zu entstellen...indem er ein Gewirr von verstümmelten Zitaten, Irreführungen, Wortklaubereien tätigt, bis ein verleumderisches Bild entsteht". (F.787,25)

It was to give the lie to Kerr's reproach that Kraus printed the pleadings in full before embarking on his analysis.

vi) Plagiarism

In his first pleading, Kerr accused Kraus of condemning others of plagiarism but committing it himself [F.787,18]. He made no explicit reference, and it became clear that his source of information for this and other allegations was the gossip of Kraus's enemies in the press, and a misreading of Die Fackel itself. In reply, Kraus forestalled any further attempt to obscure the issue, by recounting the affair in detail (F.787, 66ff.).

In July 1920, he had exposed and condemned the plagiarism of Jean Paul's Vorschule der Ästhetik by a young writer, Georg Kulka (F.546,45-67). Kulka's excuses were weak, but a more determined reply to Kraus was made by his former disciple, Albert Ehrenstein,⁸⁶⁾ who sought to expose a plagiarism by Kraus in the very issue of Die Fackel that contained the exposure of Kulka. In his clever, facetious parody of Kraus's style and technique, larded with puns, Ehrenstein "revealed" that Kraus's poem "Apokalypse" (F.546,78ff.; WiV 326ff.) was largely a plagiarism of Luther's Book of Revelation, except for a few link-passages provided by Kraus.

In October 1920, Kraus admitted that he had, indeed, based his poem on Luther's text - and that the remaining passages were from Leander van Ess's version (F.552,11). As he explained in "Vom Plagiat" (F.572,61ff.; Spr 149ff.), he considered it legitimate to use "Wortmaterial" from other sources, provided that the new form or new context enhanced the value or significance

of the original, or was at least worthy of enhancement by the "quotation". An example of this he cited (Spr 149) was his integration of two lines of Hamlet's monologue, from the translation by Schlegel and Tieck, in the rhetorical context of his own review of his themes, in "Nach zwanzig Jahren":

Geschlecht und Lüge, Dummheit, Übelstände,
Tonfall und Phrase, Tinte, Technik, Tod,
Krieg und Gesellschaft, Wucher, Politik,
der Übermut der Ämter und die Schmach,
die Unwert schweigendem Verdienst erweist,
Kunst und Natur, die Liebe und der Traum -
vielfacher Antrieb, sei's woher es sei,
der Schöpfung ihre Ehre zu erstatten! (WiV 259)

Kraus argued that in such cases the omission of quotation marks was justified and even original (Spr 150). Furthermore, Luther's Bible and the Schlegel and Tieck edition of Shakespeare - like the Authorized Version and Shakespeare in English - are among the works which have determined the substance of the literary language, sources which remain recognizable even where quoted creatively, as by Kraus. Jean Paul's classic hardly falls into this category, and Kulka added no new significance by printing parts of it under his own name. Kraus's "plagiarism" of Revelation, on the other hand, far from obscuring the source - which is even indicated in the poem's title - was "die aus einer politischen Welt geschöpfte Vision" (F.552,10), a direct allusion to the relevance of the apocalyptic allegory to the phenomena of the Great War (F.787,67).

In his second pleading, Kerr used this affair as the basis⁸⁷⁾ for his allegation of plagiarism [F.787,150]. In doing so, however, he himself committed a similar deed - of borrowing without naming his source. He referred to Ehrenstein's criticism,

and added that Kraus had used not the "recognizable" Luther text but a less familiar one. This was a misreading of Kraus's own account, in his pleading (F.787,66), of the evolution of his poem, Kraus had admitted to borrowing from both sources. Kerr's allusion to "recognizable" and "less familiar" translations was another example of his pedantic deviation from the main issue to make a spurious minor case against his opponent, which Kraus called "Tonfallschwindel" (F.787,153). His underhand borrowing from Kraus, moreover, could be detected in his use of such phrases from "Vom Plagiat" (Spr 150) as "Einschöpfung" [F.787,162f.], and from a telltale misprint - "Leander von Ess" for "van Ess" - copied from Kraus's pleading.⁸⁸⁾ Van Ess was so "unfamiliar" to Kerr, Kraus commented (F.787,159f.), that he blindly reproduced the misspelling. To Kraus, this amounted to a plagiarism by Kerr of the very person he was accusing of it. And so even here Kraus could turn Kerr's "arguments" against him, even if it was not plagiarism in the literary sense.

Kerr's allegation [F.787,162] that Kraus had plagiarized an aphorism by Lichtenberg in an attack on the critic Herbert Ihering (F.657,162), was credible only on the basis of an incomplete, utterly distorted reproduction of Kraus's text. Kraus's correction showed (F.787,163-166) it to be as grave a distortion as that of the Deutsche Tageszeitung gloss. In accounting for each of these charges, Kraus demonstrated not only his opponent's falsehoods, but his own sensitive awareness of style, and even originality in glossing this second-hand material.

vii) Copyright

Kraus reprinted the pleadings in "Der grösste Schuft im

'ganzen Land..." with scrupulous accuracy, both to distinguish his from Kerr's methods of quotation, and to precipitate a polemical suicide by Kerr even more devastating than that of 1911:

Die geistige Entscheidung zwischen mir und dem Alfred Kerr beschränkt sich auf den Unterschied, dass ich [···] ihn nur (unzitiert) abzudrucken brauche, um zu bestehen, während er keinen ganzen Satz von mir zitieren könnte, ohne zu fallen. (F.787,206f.)
Unbeschränkt verfüge ich über sein Autorrecht und was immer er nun beginnen wird statt zu enden, die gefährlichste Waffe bleibt in meiner Hand: ihn abzu-
drucken! Den Krieg hält kein Gottlieb durch! (F.787,207)

This was Kraus's triumphant conclusion to two hundred pages of polemic, in which Kerr had been presented undistorted, before being demolished.

Several pages earlier, recalling the controversy over authorship of the Gottlieb poems, Kraus had challenged Kerr to publish his "Gottliebs" under his own name, or else he would print them all under Kerr's name, with the instruction "Das Nichtgewünschte bitte zu durchstreichen" on the title page (F.787,191). Kraus later insisted that this was not a serious threat but a satirical jibe (F.795,55), but Kerr took it seriously enough to apply for an interim injunction, on 25th September 1928, restraining Kraus from publishing under his name not only the Gottlieb poems by other authors, but also any Gottlieb poem and any poem by Kerr! This transference of a matter of criminal law to the civil court, by a hopeful combination of the laws on property and copyright,⁸⁹⁾ reopened the legal battle for several months. In his plaint of 21st September 1928, Kerr again denounced Kraus as a defeatist and presented himself as a good patriot.⁹⁰⁾ There is no evidence in Kraus's correspondence of any immediate intention

to publish the Gottliebs - certainly of no illegal publication - and such a publication as Kerr feared would not have been a commercially viable proposition. If at all, the poems would have formed part of a further polemic, and not a separate volume,⁹¹⁾ Yet on this issue Kraus does seem to have over-emphasized the harmless literary nature of his boasting.

Nevertheless, there was no justification for the court's inclusion in the ban of the many poems that Kraus had not "declared" he would print, especially since Kerr's case rested partly on another distortion of Die Fackel. He juxtaposed Kraus's declaration of June 1928, that his intention to publish Kerr's pleadings was serious (F.781,20), with his ultimatum of September about publishing the Gottlieb poems (F.787,191); and he misquoted Kraus's reference to publishing the pleadings (F.787,207) as "Unbeschränkt werde ich über sein Autorrecht verfügen". This error gave a crucial bias to Kraus's intention, yet the court duplicated it in its own verdict!⁹²⁾ Despite acknowledging most of Kraus's arguments, the verdict was most favourable to Kerr; the court was even moved by Kerr's fear of being made ridiculous by the "planned" publication.

The only method of reprinting Kerr's poems left open to Kraus was that to which Kerr had objected [F.787,If.] before being exposed as "Der grösste Schuft im ganzen Land", namely, fragmentary quotation in a "critical context" or in a "scholarly work". Even here there was some confusion, due to differences between German and Austrian law.⁹¹⁾ Oskar Samek, Kraus's Viennese solicitor, maintained that the quotation of Kerr's war poems had always been accompanied by a "critical appreciation", and only the sentiments had been condemned.⁹³⁾ An appeal was considered, but Kraus finally decided to let the matter drop and to make a formal rejection of the court's biased verdict.⁹⁴⁾

On 14th March 1929, the interim injunction became legally binding.

At his recital in Berlin on 1st October 1928, after reading some ten war poems of Kerr's (F.795,64-66), Kraus - to a tumultuous audience response (F.795,66) - read out the interim injunction just served on him, and remarked that the measure would guarantee to Kerr's infamous war poetry precisely that immortality which its author had wished to avoid, in restraining him (F.795,54). When Laserstein, his Berlin solicitor, doubted the efficacy of the "Kleinzitat",⁹⁵⁾ Kraus put an exclamation mark in the margin of the letter, for the restrictions perfectly suited his established method of glossing, as he showed in the next stage of the polemic.

Kerr had "reacted" in the Berliner Tageblatt to "Der grösste Schuft im ganzen Land..." on the day of its appearance (3rd September), with the poem "September". In it he had called Kraus "der kleinste Schuft im ganzen Land" and a "Fötus im Café" who had caught him "stealing spoons" [F.795,76f.]. This fatuous and cryptic allusion was another seemingly harmless diversionary tactic. In his speech of 1st October 1928, "Der grösste Schriftsteller im ganzen Land", Kraus showed the linguistic vacuity of Kerr's abuse - of "Lügenfötus" for example (F.795,78) - and, in the printed text (F.795,67-91; December 1928), demonstrated how, even within the restrictions of the injunction, it was possible to defeat Kerr, by reprinting the poem with an ironic "critical appreciation" and spacing certain lines and words. For example:

Die dritte Strophe drückt stoischen Gleichmut im
Hinblick auf die Vergänglichkeit alles Irdischen aus:

"O Mensch, du musst das Dasein segnen,

Wie bald ist man ein Würmerfrass.

Was auch für Nummern dir begegnen -

Es macht halt Spass."

Die letzten Verse sind der Ausklang in eine gleichwohl zufriedene Wehmut, die das Erdenleben bis zum Tode [···] als eine hübsche Episode ansieht, "mit Witzen vollgestopft". Einer von diesen ist zum Beispiel die Anrufung des Zivilgerichtes zum Schutze vor Verewigung. Ein anderer der Ausweg, sie dennoch herbeizuführen. (F.795,77)

For Kraus, an ironic counterpart to this episode was Kerr's detection of another plagiarism: of Brecht's omission from the songbook from Die Dreigroschenoper of any acknowledgement of K.L.Ammer, from whose translation of Villon he had borrowed freely.⁹⁶⁾ Kerr's claim that Brecht's borrowing was in no way creative is contradicted by recent criticism.⁹⁷⁾ When, apart from a lawsuit, there followed a general denunciation of Brecht in the press, Kraus defended him, in August 1929 (F.811,129ff.; WF 404ff.). Despite certain reservations, Kraus trusted in Brecht's originality rather than Kerr's information, and saw the case as another illustration of Kerr's undue authority in the Berlin theatre - and as another diversion of attention from the issue of his authorship:

Es wäre nur noch zu sagen, dass er im Vergleich mit Brecht insofern mehr Pech hat als dieser, als es noch niemand eingefallen ist, zu enthüllen, dass die Gottlieb- Gedichte nicht von ihm seien, und ich glaube, dass er heute eine weit grössere Summe, als er mir mit Hilfe der deutschen Justiz für "einstweilige Verfügungen" abgenommen hat, dafür geben würde, dass sie nicht von ihm wären. (WF 406)

viii) Publicity and reticence

Both Kerr and Theodor Wolff, Chief Editor of the Tageblatt, strongly objected to Kraus's advertisement of "Der grösste Schuft im ganzen Land..." in the Berlin streets.⁹⁸⁾ Such resentment of

publicity, by representatives of a paper that thrived on it and on advertising revenue, was - if understandable - rather illogical. Kraus reminded his readers that in 1924 the Mosse Verlag, which published the Tageblatt, had twice offered advertising space in that paper to him (F.657,189). Now, on 1st October 1928 he announced (F.795,90f.) that he was taking up this old offer, to advertise "Die Akten zum Fall Kerr" (F.787). It was to be another satirical point of contrast. The Berliner Tageblatt, however, having accepted fee and small-ad, did not print it. Kraus was amazed at this failure to honour a business agreement:

Es ist einfach ungeheuerlich, dass ein Inseratengeschäft, das noch nie die Ware selbst geprüft hat, ermächtigt wird, missliebige Kunden selbst nach Vertragsverschliessung abzuweisen, wo doch schon die vorherige Abweisung offenbar unerlaubt wäre.⁹⁹⁾

He brought an action against the Mosse Verlag in November 1928, but the court freed it from its obligation, after Mosse had presented a pleading¹⁰⁰⁾ denouncing Kraus in even cruder terms than Kerr had (F.795,100f.,f.n.). Kraus did not appeal, because of the great expense of another trial, and did not fulfill his intention of publishing the opponent's pleading.

While the Berliner Tageblatt was accusing Kraus of over-advertising himself, Kerr announced his next polemic against Kraus, "Antwort und Abfuhr", on 28th September 1928 in the Buchhändlerbör-senblatt [F.795,102f.]. Kraus looked forward to another "suicide" by Kerr (F.795,91), and when in mid-October it did not appear as announced, he expressed his disappointment, in terms that alluded to the interim injunction:

Kerrs Verfügungen sind einstweilig. Meine von Dauer!
(F.795,103)

In a reference to the scene "Kerr am Schreibtisch" (LTM 362), he said:

Mit dem Rumänenlied wurde er fertig, mit den faden
Fehden nicht. [—] Wenn [seine "Antwort und Abfuhr"]
bis zum Christkindl nicht erschienen ist, so schreibe ich
sie und erwarte gegen diesen ..Plan der Unterschlebung
meiner Abfuhr eine einstweilige Verfügung. (F.795,104)

This was similar to the satirical threat which had provoked Kerr's interim injunction. Kerr did, in fact, issue a second, to prevent Kraus from advertising his next polemic, "Der grösste Feigling im ganzen Land" (F.806,32-42). In this essay, of May 1929, Kraus reported that the "Antwort und Abfuhr" had still not appeared. He remarked that the withdrawal from a trial was nothing compared to the writer's failure to fulfil his promise of literary retaliation (F.806,34). Adhering to the formula of the "Kleinzitat" demanded by the injunction, Kraus quoted first a Gottlieb poem and then, by way of contrast, a recent poem by Kerr against war.¹⁰¹ He wished that Kerr had written it at the right time, and concluded his essay - which was followed by a parody of Kerr's poem, also entitled "Krieg" (F.806,42; WiV 510) - by calling Kerr the biggest "Schuft und Feigling im ganzen Land, der so komplett die kriegerische wie die polemische Wehrpflicht verleugnet" (F.806,41).

In May 1930, Kraus proposed a truce with Kerr, in "Befriedung" (F.834,1-11). He ironically conceded that since, with the Hague Conference meeting, the idea of peace was prevalent, and since Kerr was a pacifist, not only towards Germany's former enemies and Max Reinhardt but towards him - "Antwort und Abfuhr" was never published - it would be cruel to continue to attack Kerr (F.834,6). He therefore suggested (F.834,11) that Kerr should donate to the war-invalids and war-blind the estimated value put on his war poems by the court

(F.795,58): 20,000 Marks! This, he thought, might relieve Kerr's guilty conscience, which was evident from various unprovoked utterances of his (F.834,7).¹⁰²⁾ By March 1931 (F.847,73), Kerr had not responded to this "blackmail", as Kraus had ironically called it. So Kraus now offered to help him raise the money, by reciting the Gottlieb poems in public - if only Kerr would lift the ban on them! Needless to say, there was no response to this suggestion.

V

FINALE

i) Theatre reviews

On his death-bed, Harden had stated that Kerr had been engaged by the Berliner Tageblatt in 1920 on condition that he adopt a more favourable attitude to Max Reinhardt. This allegation was witnessed and published by Franz Pfemfert - in the Prager Presse of 27th November 1927.¹⁰³⁾

Pfemfert had sent copies of the article to Kerr and Theodor Wolff, neither of whom reacted. At the end of "Der grösste Schuft im ganzen Land", Kraus revived the issue by recalling Kerr's silence in face of Harden's allegations (F.787,204). In "Verleumdungsparadies", in the Berliner Tageblatt on 6th September 1928, Kerr at last declared the idea of his venality to be a swindle¹⁰⁴⁾ invented by the "two allies" Kraus and Pfemfert, that Pfemfert had "no witnesses", and that Kraus's reminder was the first he knew of it [F.795,80]. In his recital of "Der grösste Schriftsteller im ganzen Land" on 1st October 1928, Kraus declared that he himself had not made the allegation but had only quoted the testimony of Pfemfert; that the latter was not the only witness;¹⁰⁵⁾ and that the term "allies" was

more applicable to Kerr and Wolff (F.795,81). Indeed, their collaboration recalls Kerr's and Cassirer's. Wolff had amplified Kerr's statement, by saying that the allegation was a downright lie, too fatuous to need a serious denial [F.795,81]. In three letters dated 14th September 1928, he repeated that it was "lügenhaft", and expressly refused to succumb to Kraus's publicity - seeking tactics [F.795,82f.]. This provoked Kraus to take legal action against him, in the hope of proving Kerr's venality in court.

By October 1929, when the case was first heard, Kraus had checked Kerr's earlier reviews against his later ones and noted a "vehemente Gesinnungsumschwung" at the time of his engagement. He conceded that Kerr and Wolff might be able to dispute the existence of an express agreement, but he was not convinced

[F.827,71] dass nicht schon der blosse Eintritt des Kerr in das Haus Mosse den Hebel jenes Umschwungs bildet, der bei den Beziehungen des Herrn Reinhardt zum Hause Mosse sich automatisch vollziehen musste und der auch tatsächlich in einer Antithese von überwältigender Beweiskraft ersichtlich und dokumentarisch darstellbar ist. (F.827,71)

It has not been practicable to make a comprehensive comparison of Kerr's reviews in Der Tag up to 1919 with those in the Berliner Tageblatt after 1920. From a study of Kerr's five-volume Die Welt im Drama (1917), it is clear that as early as 1904 Kerr was very critical of Reinhardt, whom he compared unfavourably with Otto Brahm; and that by 1908 and 1909 his remarks had become very disparaging. Of the numerous references in this edition, here are a few examples. On 1st October 1908, he wrote:

"Reinhardt ist im Grunde seines Mehlspeis-Innern ein versetzter Bayreuthregisseur."¹⁰⁶⁾

On 27th March 1909, we read:

"Durchschnittlichkeit einer Aufführung mit mehr Mängeln als Fehlern."¹⁰⁷⁾

By 1913 his rejection of Reinhardt was very emphatic; for example, on 23rd November Much ado about nothing is called "ein Greuel."¹⁰⁸⁾ Typical of Kerr's comments up to 1914 were "G'schnas", "Brillanz", "Gekitzel", "Flottheit", "ohne Bau", "In Nebenpunkten reizvoll; nichtig im Tragischen". On the other hand, among the few reviews from the 'twenties included in the 1954 selection Die Welt im Drama is the very lenient review, dated 21st November 1929, of Reinhardt's production of Shaw's Der Kaiser von Amerika,¹⁰⁹⁾ which Kraus mentioned as the opposite pole to Kerr's earlier attitude (F.827,72).

Kraus never published a juxtaposition of Kerr's criticisms, as he had done of Bahr's. He believed¹¹⁰⁾ that those of Kerr's reviews presented by Wolff to refute the alleged existence of an agreement were sufficient proof of it. Wolff regarded them as proof that Kerr criticized Reinhardt after his engagement; Kraus claimed that they proved not only that the former antagonist became "ein so behutsamer Tadler, ein so zögernder Ironiker", but that Kerr's own cryptic admissions in them revealed how "eine gründliche Remedur seiner kritischen Tonart" had been expected of him.¹¹¹⁾

In his review of Hamlet on 19th January 1920,¹¹²⁾ Kerr criticized the breaking of stage illusion by the use of a "round" stage at Reinhardt's Grosses Schauspielhaus; it brought actors and audience closer together without facilitating empathy. At the same time he dismissed books which talked of a

new common relation between actor and public:

"Liegt nicht in alledem eine Lust am Zurückschrauben?
Man hielte sich für einen Schubiack, wenn man das
nicht offen sagte - unbekümmert um die Bücher."¹¹²⁾

Kraus believed that the underlined parenthesis really revealed Kerr's fear of annoying the Chief Editor, even with such a "timid" criticism, and that Kerr was "worried" not about contradicting "books", but about defying editorial restraints. The remark sounded like the conclusion of arguments he might have had with the Editor, "die Gegenwehr gegen den Versuch [···], in die Domäne seiner Überzeugung einzugreifen".¹¹⁰⁾ This very arbitrary interpretation was borne out in the review by further parentheses after restrained comments, such as Kerr's plea:

"Muss ein Kritiker das nicht sagen?" The Dramaturg and the "shareholders' resentment", which Kerr here openly mentioned as threats to his freedom as a critic, had never previously inhibited him. From this Kraus inferred that Kerr had an unmentioned commitment - to the Editor - on his conscience.

Wolff quoted part of Kerr's review, dated 6th January 1921,¹¹³⁾ of Florian Geyer - produced at the Schauspielhaus by one of Reinhardt's assistants, Karlheinz Martin - to show that Kerr had criticized the new house itself, irrespective of who was producer. This may be so, but it also revealed - as Kraus promptly noted - how tame had been Kerr's criticism of the shattering of stage illusion in Reinhardt's production, compared to the pejorative epithets he used about the same effects in Martin's:

"Ein kindisches Zurückschrauben. Ein lächerliches
Aus-der-Stimmung-reissen."¹¹³⁾

In contrast to his campaign against Bahr in 1901, Kraus's case here rested not on a mass of documentation, but on the sophistic-

ated analysis of stylistic nuances in the smallest, but most relevant, selection of literary evidence. What stylistic evidence there is is convincing; but it seems incredible that Kraus, with his long experience, could have hoped to persuade a court of law of the existence of an illicit agreement by means of a Sprachkritik more subtle than is forensically expedient.

ii) The trial

The proceedings opened on 3rd December 1928, and Wolff brought a cross-action, taking offence at Kraus's designation of Kerr's disclaimers in "Verleumdungsparadies" as "ein frecher Schwindel" (F.795,81). The proceedings went on until 1932, partly because of the difficulty of making Reinhardt, the chief witness, appear and commit himself. On 29th October 1929, Kerr, Wolff and Reinhardt were forced to appear in court, and, according to Kraus, "da ihrer mehrere waren, ging's, wie stets bei Glatteis, leichter" (F.827,70). This cryptic comment conceals the fact that the first verdict, of 5th November 1929, was unfavourable to Kraus.¹¹⁴⁾ This was as far as the case was reported in Die Fackel; thereafter - apart from continuing to gloss Kerr's style (F.852,84f.) - he only referred to Kerr's personal embarrassment at the trial (F.868,17). Such facile jibes, which smack of resentment, fit into Dr Timms's category, of "merely verbal victories over an opponent who has proved invincible in reality".¹¹⁵⁾

Apart from the literary analysis, Kraus obtained evidence that Wolff had made other "agreements", and had rejected unfavourable reviews by competent critics of film and cabaret.¹¹⁶⁾

His evidence was further strengthened when Wolff admitted, in his pleading of 31st January 1929,¹¹⁷⁾ that he had been the "unknown host" (F.743,50) at the "reconciliation" dinner held for Kerr and Reinhardt in September 1926. Wolff, who had hitherto denied being the host, claimed that the dinner took place too long after Kerr's engagement for it to have affected his judgement of Reinhardt or his terms of employment. Kraus replied¹¹⁸⁾ that the dinner merely sealed the reconciliation which Kerr had made in print, without which the dinner would not have been possible; the fact of the dinner, and the publicity it received, were surely enough to confirm the intention of the alleged pact. This recalls the pattern of corruption that Kraus had seen in Bahr's "arrival" at the Volkstheater.

Despite Kraus's confidence about his evidence, the verdict was not very favourable to him. At the appeal stage - the hearing was on 19th October 1931 - Wolff's cross-action was rejected. In its verdict,¹¹⁹⁾ the court acquitted Kraus but did not award him costs. Wolff was acquitted of the charge of wrongfully calling the allegation of an unethical agreement "a lie", because the allegation could not be proved. The court thus rejected Kraus's analysis of Kerr's style, in the absence of "further evidence" - it discounted the testimony of prosecution witnesses, as insufficient proof of the existence of an agreement.¹²⁰⁾ On the second count - Wolff's reference to Kraus's publicity-seeking and lack of commitment - he was found guilty of insulting Kraus, but exempted from punishment because he could claim he had acted in self-defence, protecting his "legitimate interests".

iii) The last word

Kraus's final polemic, in 1932, was partly provoked by the distorted reporting of the revised verdict of the Wolff trial, in the Berliner Tageblatt of 20th October 1931, under the title "Auch in zweiter Instanz". It gave the impression that the court had confirmed the original verdict, that Wolff had not been sentenced for the proven insult, and that the cross-action had been rejected after a concession by Kraus. Because of the emergency powers in force in Germany at the time, further legal action was not possible. Instead, Kraus exerted his right to a correction in the Tageblatt. It was published on 28th October 1931, under the title "Noch immer Herr Kraus", with the editorial comment that Kraus was abusing his rights by insisting on a false assertion. Kraus's solicitor sued the paper, and when proceedings were suspended, the costs were borne by the paper.

A full account of this episode was included in Kraus's final, unpublished polemic, which he initially called "Noch immer Herr Kraus und Das Rassentimentferkel",¹²¹⁾ alluding to Kerr's and the Tageblatt's slurs. What throughout all the proceedings against Kerr and his colleagues had not failed to dismay Kraus was that, according to German law, an insult was deemed legitimate if it was an "on the spot reply" to an alleged insult or libel. Even when months would elapse between Kraus's "insult" and Kerr's "reply", Kerr could claim that he had replied as soon as he had read the insult. Wolff, too, was saved by the same loophole. The failure of all Kraus's efforts to pin them down in court - to which this loophole had contributed - underlies Kraus's last polemical reaction to a jibe by Kerr, which he correspondingly retitled "Beleidigungen dürfen auf der Stelle erwidert werden".

Kerr's latest parenthetical jibe illustrated Kraus's theme. In his review of Clarence und die Nutzniesser, in the Tageblatt of 6th July 1932, Kerr had alluded to some criticisms of the press that were made "mit rabbulistischen Kniffen kleiner Ressentimentferkel". Without naming Kraus, he had repeated that someone whom the press boycotted could still be "ein Ferkel". Kraus's answer was to trace Kerr's resentment, not only of his moral defeat of 1928, not only of the conclusion to the Wolff trial and his ignominious treatment at it (UWz 228), but of the appearance in the May issue of Neue Rundschau - a review normally most well-disposed to him - of an article that compared Kraus favourably with Berlin polemicists.¹²²⁾

With this, Kraus was descending to Kerr's level - if not in expression, at least in the triviality of the points he scored. This last polemic was so resigned and lacking in urgency and wit that it barely deserves the name. The fact that it was never published, suggests that Kraus himself was aware of its futility. What at times - such as in 1928 - had been his most triumphant literary campaign, thus ended, in 1932, with the literary reflection not of defeat but of his practical failure.

Chapter Five

FRANZ WERFEL

I

CONTENT AND COURSE OF THE POLEMICS

i) Youthful "hysteria" and editorial reaction

Kraus's general experience of the Expressionist generation was that its initial ecstatic enthusiasm and admiration for him turned to equally hysterical resentment, hatred and disillusion. The Werfel case was typical of this; yet Kraus was not merely taking issue with Werfel personally, but attacking the ethos of the generation whose leader and representative figure Werfel was.¹⁾ Only in the context of Werfel's "Geltung" at the time can this apparently trivial personal dispute be recognized as an important part of Kraus's cultural criticism. Its other, negative significance is in illustrating the limitations of his linguistic Weltanschauung.

Having patronized Else Lasker-Schüler²⁾ and other early Expressionists, Kraus wearied of the sheer number of "talents" with ambitions of being published.³⁾ Particularly after his polemics against Kerr, Brod, Die Aktion and Der Sturm, in the years 1911 and 1912, he actively and publicly dissociated himself from the "hysterics" in general. In November 1911, when Kraus discontinued the publication of others' work in Die Fackel, Werfel was one of the very few exceptions, and continued

to enjoy his patronage. The break came in 1914; but it was not until June 1916 that the polemic gathered impetus. Werfel published a moralizing poem addressed to "Einem Denker"¹⁹⁾ - evidently Kraus - in the June issue of the Neue Rundschau; Kraus replied mildly on 15th June with the gloss "Der Atem der Weltgeschichte" (F.426,24); Werfel reacted with a reproachful letter on 17th July.⁵⁶⁾ Kraus followed this in November 1916 with the satirical poem "Elysisches" (F.443,26f.; WiV 77f.), which started the polemic proper.

Willy Haas, initially an ardent admirer of Kraus but later a resentful enemy, had been responsible for the first publication by the young Prague poet Franz Werfel, in the Viennese newspaper Die Zeit in 1907, and for showing Werfel's poems to both Kraus and Max Brod. Kraus had printed three of them at the end of April 1911 [F.321,31-33], before the appearance of Werfel's first volume, Der Weltfreund, and a further one shortly afterwards [F.327,37]. Brod had interested the publisher Axel Juncker in the poems and made Werfel known in Berlin circles by reading them at a recital on 15th December 1911.⁴⁾ At that time Kraus had printed five more poems from Der Weltfreund [F.339,47-51] with laconic approval. In 1912 the ecstatic admiration in Werfel's letters to Kraus had intensified.⁵⁾

Towards the end of 1911, Werfel was appointed reader by the new Kurt Wolff Verlag in Leipzig, and Wolff soon

became affected by his enthusiasm for Kraus. By 8th October 1913 he had secured a contract to publish a de luxe edition of Die chinesische Mauer⁶⁾ and a new volume of Kraus's essays. Kraus's confidence in him and Werfel was nearly shaken, however, when Kurt Hiller's Die Weisheit der Langenweile,⁷⁾ published by Wolff, contained a slur on Kraus's integrity. Hiller had also been an admirer, and even now he sent Kraus an advance apology, in which he called him "christushaft".⁷⁾

In Kraus's view, the worst aspect of this case was his own publisher's part in it. In a letter of 9th December 1913, he blamed Wolff for publishing attacks on him by hysterics; it was incompatible with the enthusiasm Wolff had shown for him and his work; the only solution was to withdraw from the contracts, so that he could attack the system - "das Unwesen, das die Wertlosen zu Autoren macht" - without involving himself in an editorial capacity in the firm's affairs.⁸⁾ In reply, on 14th December 1913, Wolff reluctantly agreed to Kraus's withdrawal, admitting and regretting his negligence in editing Hiller's long manuscript.⁹⁾ His promise to delete the offending passage seems to have rescued the project for Die chinesische Mauer, which appeared in 1914.

The gloss "Dorten" (Spr 31-47) of January 1917, which was directed specifically at Werfel, contained

Kraus's account of their relations with Wolff. Here he confused the date of his declaration and withdrawal from the contract⁸⁾ with that of his break with Werfel, in April 1914 (Spr.43f.). In October 1915¹⁰⁾ a special arrangement had been made, whereby Wolff could publish Kraus's books, not in the same "house" as the authors Kraus disapproved of, but in a new Verlag der Schriften von Karl Kraus (Kurt Wolff). In this way Kraus had hoped to insulate himself from the "hysterics" and to keep his relations with Wolff intact (Spr.44). In "Dorten" Kraus was reacting to Werfel's complaint about his "tactless behaviour" towards him, also a "guest in Wolff's house"; he had come to see Werfel, the very pillar of the house, as unreliable. The polemic provoked by the "tactless" satire "Elysisches" confirmed these fears. The special arrangement was a mere expedient, which covered up Kraus's irreconcilable differences with a publisher intent on recording the words of the age and presenting them for discussion.⁹⁾

This was shown in 1921, when the crisis of 1913/14 was repeated, over Werfel's polemic against Kraus in the drama Spiegelmensch. After Wolff's failure to prevent its publication (F.561,61), Kraus terminated the contract for the publication of his own works (F.561,63). In retrospect, Wolff admitted he had been wrong not to have dissuaded Werfel from polemicizing, and that this was a failure on his part as publisher.¹¹⁾

ii) "Elysisches"

"Elysisches.Melancholie an Kurt Wolff" (WiV 77f.) employs the Schillerian metre of Werfel's "Vater und Sohn".¹²⁾ Werfel's poem treats the recurrent Expressionist theme of the father - son conflict, first evoking an almost pre-existential harmony, then the growing sense of alienation in adolescence to the point of hostility, and finally a provisional reconciliation.

"Wie wir einst in grenzenlosem Lieben
Spässe der Unendlichkeit getrieben
Zu der Seligen Lust, -
Uranos erschloss des Busens Bläue,
Und vereint in lustiger Kindertreue
Schaukelten wir da durch seine Brust.

Aber weh! Der Äther ging verloren,
Welt erbraust und Körper ward geboren,
Nun sind wir entzweit.

[--]

Und der Sohn harrt, dass der Alte sterbe
Und der Greis verhöhnt mich jauchzend: Erbe!
Dass der Orkus widerhallt.
Und schon klirrt in unseren wilden Händen
Jener Waffen - kaum noch abzuwenden -
Höllische Gewalt.

Doch auch uns sind Abende beschieden
An des Tisches hauserhabenen Frieden,
Wo wir's nicht verwehren trauten Mutes,
Dass, gedrängt von Wallung gleichen Blutes,
Träne auf- und niedersteigt.

[--]

Und die leichte Hand zuckt nach der greisen

Und in einer wunderbaren, leisen
Rührung stürzt der Raum."¹²⁾

Typical of Werfel's early poetry is the alternation between cosmic abstraction and trivial but evocative domestic detail. Thus lines 5 and 6 add charm to the preceding abstractions; the "hands" of the final strophe are more subtly human than the violent mythical hands of the antepenultimate strophe. Yet the emotion which overwhelms at the end signifies a loss of clarity. The conflict seems to have been a mythical construct, and the reconciliation seems like an intense form of sentimentality.

The language also contains discrepancies. The emergence of "Körper" is, paradoxically, most abstract, and with the elevated "ward" and the omission of articles sounds even more pretentious than the infinites which invoke Uranos and Orkus. The Schillerian echoes of "des Tisches hauserhabenen Frieden, wo das Wirre schweigt" mix strangely with such telegraphic abbreviations as ":Erbe!". It remains doubtful whether such pseudo-Classicism was suited to the Expressionists' new message.

Werfel's eclecticism is parodied in "Elysisches", where the colloquial and the Baroque, the trivial and the metaphysical, would-be Classical echoes and the Jewish jargon of Prague are juxtaposed. The diverse provenance of Werfel's inspiration is parodied in a

dense pastiche: the affected archaisms, some redolent of the Goethezeit ("zeucht", "Ergetzung", "ergeusst", "der Phantasei Erfindung"); phrases with a Jewish or commercial flavour ("ausgerechnet", "Gewure", "dorten", "stark aufliegen"); Classical references ("Orkus", "Olympus", "Kamönen") and the almost flatulent expressions of the pantheist ("hingeschwellt am Tag", "schaukelt auf der Morgenröte", "entzückt im Flügelkleide wandelt"). One strophe can illustrate Kraus's parodistic extension of the eclecticism to include Werfel's unacknowledged oscillation between the cosmic or Classical pretensions and the local commercial sphere of Prague:

Solchem Wesenswandel wehrt kein Veto,
hin zu Goethen geht es aus dem Ghetto
in der Zeilen Lauf,
aus dem Orkus in das Café Arco,
dorten, Freunde, liegt der Nachruhm, stark o,
liegt er dort am jüngsten Tage auf. (WiV 78)

"Wesenswandel" plays on the Expressionist theme of a radical moral regeneration from within, but insinuates that the Prague poets' bombastic idealism is the key to literary success, to a much less moral change within them than they proclaim for man. The pun "der Zeilen Lauf" reduces the dimensions of a cliché to those of the printed page; and "am jüngsten Tage" is a pun on the title of a series of Expressionist works published by Kurt Wolff,¹³⁾ and thus implies a connection between Werfel's religious themes and the commercial "salvation"

that these themes will assure him. This dubious "Wesenswandel" is hinted at in the commercial quotation ("liegt stark auf") for the Day of Judgement, and also in the alliterative sound-modulations: "Goethen"- "geht"- "Ghetto", "Orkus"- "Arco". In the second strophe, "Orkus" is contrasted to the "infinite", but here it leads to the Prague literary café. The local, Jewish elements - which do not appear in Werfel's verse - were a means of bringing his cosmic aspirations down to earth, just as Kraus had once deflated Bahr's cosmopolitanism by recalling his provincial origins. Kraus's satire is complex, subtle and even obscure, yet the parodistic intention of rhymes like "reibt sich - Leipzich" and "Arco - stark o" is unmistakable.

iii) "dorten"

This satire provoked an indignant letter from Werfel, dated 25th November 1916. Kraus published this, in January 1917, together with his reply "Dorten" (F.445,133-147;Spr 31-47). Werfel criticized the line "Denn wer nur am Worte reibt sich", the rhyme of "Arco" with "stark o" and the form "dorten" [Spr 31]. Kraus replied that these phrases were a parody, and that although the lines and the rhymes themselves were cheap, they gained value in context,

[...] erst in dem Zusammenhang und Zusammenklang der Sphären, die hier sächselnd und jüdelnd einander zusprechen. Ein "sich am Worte reiben" soll Gestalt

bekommen und bekommt sie in einem klappernden: "denn
wer nur am Worte reibt sich" und dieses Geräusch ist
[...] zugleich mit dem Reim "Leipzich" dagewesen und
nicht diesem zuliebe erfunden worden. (Spr.36)

"Dagewesen" implies timelessness at the "Ursprung", as opposed to the mere invention of a rhyme, say, in the manner of Heine. Although Kraus's rhyme does seem to be a legitimate parody, and not self-indulgence, the absolute distinction he asserts in what is a subtle matter is problematic.¹⁴⁾

Kraus made a casuistic digression to document the legitimacy of "dorten" in High German, and used some of his classical references as jibes against Werfel's disbelief. He followed it by admitting that he had intended "dorten" - despite its legitimacy in High German - to evoke the Jewish jargon of the Café Arco, a milieu which he then recreated in a fictitious conversation between two of its guests, illustrating this usage of "dorten" (Spr 38f.). He added that Werfel had overlooked other Jewish phrases in the poem.

In "Die Metaphysik des Drehs", an open letter to Kraus, printed in Die Aktion on 3rd March 1917,¹⁵⁾ Werfel rejected Kraus's explanations. Referring to Kraus's clip-clopping ("klappernd") line ending in "reibt sich", he doubted whether this was the best way of evoking a rubbing sound; he refused to see the couplet as "sächselnd" and "jüdelnd"; and he "proved" that "reibt sich" was not the "only possible" rhyme for

"Leipzig" by inventing a trivial story in rhymed couplets, in which twelve out of twenty-one lines were alternative rhymes to "Leipzig".¹⁶⁾ Yet these formal, coincidental rhymes have none of the relevance that the rhyme of "reibt sich" and "Leipzich" has for its context. Werfel was right to see Kraus's retrospective analysis of "dorten"¹⁷⁾ as a polemical trick - although this does not detract from its correctness - but to deny the parodistic intention and to call it a slip on Kraus's part, as he now did, was foolish.

He expected Kraus to have an answer to his objections, for, he said, Kraus was a master of the "Dreh", the casuistic trick of twisting any argument to his advantage.¹⁸⁾ He doubted whether, in all honesty, Kraus could claim the lines to be "deliberately bad", as he had done in the heat of polemic:

"Würden Sie, Karl Kraus, auch in einer Welt, wo es nicht um Sieg und Niederlage geht, nicht um Rechthaben und Unrechthaben, /. . . in einer Welt der Wahrheit und nicht der beweisbaren Wahrheit, - und wenn Sie in jener Welt vor keinem anderen Richter stünden, als vor sich selbst, aber wie es vom Richter gefordert ist und geschrieben steht, mit dem Gefühl, über einem glühenden Abgrund zu hängen, - würden Sie dort über diese zwei Verse die Worte wiederholen /. . .? Die Antwort, die Sie sich geben, wird die Wahrheit über Sie selbst sein!"¹⁶⁾

Here Werfel evades the immediate issue - which is a matter of Sprachgefühl - by appealing to a remote, hypothetical forum, an absolute but subjective Day of

Judgement. This was characteristic of the patterns of rhetoric he used to elaborate trivial subjects or personal relations - as discussed further in Parts II and III. The scepticism towards factual, "forensic" truth and the notion of self-trial are Expressionist features, which recur in some poems of Der Gerichtstag and in the drama Spiegelmensch.

iv) Language

Der Weltfreund and Wir sind contained numerous expressions of a pantheistic love for the world, but as Werfel developed and became aware of how remote might be the prospect of overcoming individuation through such acts of love, the amount of abstract generalization increased and his attention was drawn to the obstacles to reunion. In the volume Der Gerichtstag (1919), a most pessimistic work, language was seen as one such obstacle, being a source of social divisions and a means of self-assertion.

Werfel's poem "Einem Denker"¹⁹⁾ of 1916, later published in Der Gerichtstag, was implicitly aimed at his "brother" Kraus, and rejected language as a means to truth. After an ineptly comic evocation of the "brother", there follows a verbose tirade, in which this "thinker"'s obsession with language is likened to that of lawyers with the letter of the law, who ignore the suffering convicts. One of the more polished passages

reads:

"Ich tadle deine Philosophie, mein Bruder, weil sie
die Philosophie der Gerichtshöfe ist,
Sie ist dialektisch, forensisch, sie betet das Wort an
und die Unterscheidung der Worte.
Aber die Worte sind bedingter noch als die Dinge.
Die Dinge verstellen den Geist, die Worte verstellen
die Dinge, und der Geist der Worte
Ist wundersam und angenehm zu fassen in seinen Gefügen
und Reimen, aber eitel und trostlos für
die Leidenden."¹⁹⁾

Werfel claimed, with some justification, that the word was powerless in the real world, but he offered the equally unrealistic alternative that the meek, through suffering, would triumph over hardness and vanity. He advised his "brother" to cease judging and to start loving his fellow men, for the imperfection that separated them was not as great as the imperfection that united them. He saw the "brother"'s aggressiveness as an attempt to conceal weakness, and claimed that intellectual self-assertion would be his ruin.

That the satirist's view of language was necessarily extreme has been mentioned in Chapter One. Yet to ignore individual abuse in diagnosing the imperfection intrinsic in language was equally extreme, and in the context less justified. For Werfel's rejection of language in the pompous, imprecise, abstract terms of this poem exemplifies D.W. Schumann's criticism of Der Gerichtstag, that "precisely in the most diffuse and verbose book

he inveighs [̄.̄.̄] violently against the word".²⁰⁾ Kraus expressed his own distaste for the hollowness of the poem's "psychology" and language in a letter to Sidonie Nadherny of 1st June 1916.²¹⁾ In "Dorten" (Spr.34) he denied that the poem contained Sprachkritik, as "Elysisches" did.

In "Die Metaphysik des Drehs", Werfel reproached Kraus that his "Wortdienst" was mere "Götzendienst"²²⁾ and claimed that the reality of men and things was known to Kraus only through newspapers. This was certainly valid as a polemical point against the master of the Sprachglosse, but the Expressionist Werfel - without himself renouncing his rhetorical persona - was evidently condemning the editor of Die Fackel for having a persona at all, and demanding expression of the "real man" beneath the falseness of language. He called Kraus's poetry a product not of immediate experience, but of reason.¹⁷⁾

Kraus's concentration on language certainly limited his capacity for tolerance, but Werfel - whose own verse frequently evokes merely vicarious experience - was wrong to discount the intensity of Kraus's experience, which virulent rhetoric like the following amply demonstrates:

Ahnt er, dass die erreichte Menschenbrüderschaft
eine Schlaraffengemütlichkeit ist neben der furchtbar
zärtlichen Innung der Worte; und dass seine
Gefühlsamkeit um die Dinge ein Kinderspiel ist
neben Lust und Schmerz jener Mitwisserschaft,
welche die Anziehungskraft der Laute erlebt?
Und dass die Anziehungskraft der Leute in solchem

Stadium keine Ablenkung vermag? Hat je ein Voyeur der Menschenliebe in dieses Reich der Leidenschaften geschaut? [-] Es ist eben leichter, sich in die Lage eines Schiffsheizers, sogar in das Schicksal eines Dienstmädchens, das die Schlüssel fallen lässt, ja selbst in die Situation einer schwangeren Frau zu versetzen als in die ganz anderen Umstände, die bei meinem Schreiben vorwalten. (F.484,108)

It is as if Kraus were defending the most precious, personal experience against insensitive intrusion. The erotic "Innung der Worte" at the "Ursprung" is contrasted with the notion of "Ziel" in "erreichte Menschenbrüderschaft". Kraus also contrasts his own "Ahnung" of the mystery of language with Werfel's mere knowledge about "die vielen Dinge" of his environment. The references to the stoker, the maid and the pregnant woman are to Werfel's "An den Leser",²³⁾ "Das Malheur"²⁴⁾ and "Ich bin ja noch ein Kind"²⁵⁾ respectively.

v) Self, psychology and subjectivity

In his letter of November 1916 [Spr 31f.], Werfel had claimed that Kraus's "slips" in "Elysisches" were signs of instability, and that Kraus's self-hatred was one-sided. In reply, Kraus perhaps unwisely touched on the "origins" of Werfel's disharmony; namely, that he was one of a generation torn by hysterical self-hatred, which they tried to project into an outside enemy - in this case, Kraus.²⁶⁾

This "psychological" argument had less firm foundation than the literary ones, and Werfel was able to use it against Kraus. In "Die Metaphysik des Drehs", he reproached Kraus with hysteria and with making an issue of his words: it was Kraus, he said, who projected his self-hatred into others. This was, of course, an exaggeration. As outlined in Chapter One, there was a dualistic pattern in Kraus's division of public and private spheres; but far from being a source of complexes, the private sphere was the source of values for Kraus's public idealism.

Werfel criticized Kraus's need for constant self-vindication, his lack of self-sufficiency, his dependence on outside stimuli¹⁷⁾ and his intolerance:

"Für Sie gibt es gar kein wirkliches Du, denn all die Dus, die Ihnen erscheinen, sind entweder leere Puppen oder mit Ihrem eigenen Gegenspieler aufgefüllte Puppen."²²⁾

This notion seems to be borrowed from Rilke's essay "Puppen" (1914),²⁷⁾ where the doll - as opposed to the "Ding" - is seen as a pliable medium for the child's self-indulgent sublimation of its moods. Kraus was, indeed, intolerant, but not of "real opposition". It was Werfel's generation's lack of strength that disillusioned him. In 1921, replying to Werfel's polemic in Spiegelmensch, he declared Werfel unfit for individual treatment; torn as he was between love and

hatred, Werfel was "not responsible" for his actions. Kraus ironically related this weakness to Werfel's lyrical "innocence" (F.561,61), and regarded the case as a symptom of the larger evil of the publishing business (F.561,57).

The question of Kraus's possible reduction of opponents to mere puppets is more serious, but has partly been answered in Chapter One, in the distinctions between satirical "Anlässe" and polemical "Einzelfälle". In this light, although Kraus's claim (F.484,114) that, by not reprinting "Die Metaphysik des Drehs" in full, he was sparing Werfel from the fate suffered by Kerr in 1911 may be disputed, his summary rejection of individual points can be taken as a sign of reluctance to become involved in an unrewarding campaign, which was mentioned in Chapter One with regard to "Der Fall Jacobsohn" (F.686,54).

The differences between Kraus's real opponents and his presentation of them in other polemics, on the other hand, may largely be accounted for by the uncompromising moral and linguistic perspective in which he chose to see them. Any compromise in his depiction of the "Format des schlechten Objekts" served to throw the ethically harmful stature of the individual into relief. Caricature certainly served Kraus's exposition of the discrepancy between "Wesen" and "Geltung" to

this extent, but the notion that he filled empty puppets with the hated characteristics of his alter ego is itself less an observation from his polemics than a figment of Werfel's mind. The obsession of a tormented soul with a "Gegenspieler" is a theme that recurs in his work, from Die Versuchung (1913) to Spiegelmensch and after. That it was Werfel who was thus projecting himself is confirmed by his criticisms, at this time, of other writers for weaknesses akin to his own.²⁸⁾

There is a tendency for "psychoanalytical" arguments to descend to the level where anything can be proved from its opposite and "all too human" motives can always be found in others' activity. Kraus, who was sceptical of Freudian psychoanalysis, rejected Werfel's crude detection of complexes in him. Yet in 1914, without naming Werfel, he had equated a certain "innocence" with dishonesty. Although this is a moral rather than psychological verdict, it could only have been formulated since Freud's discovery of involuntary psychic mechanisms of deception. Nevertheless, the direct influence on Kraus's view of character was not Freud but Weininger, some of whose theories of ethics and psychology are directly applicable to the Werfel case, as will be seen in Part II.^{49a)}

vi) Kraus's answer and "Spiegelmensch"

After taking note of Werfel's polemic (F.462,68f), Kraus did not publish a full answer to it until October 1918. "Ich und das Ichbin" (F.484,93-114), written in February of that year, was Kraus's most substantial prose polemic against Werfel. It included textual criticism of Werfel's poetry and polemic - which he threatened to print in full (F.484,114) - and a discussion of his Weltanschauung and public image, as conveyed by a feuilleton and a publisher's blurb. The content of this polemic is discussed in Parts II and III.

In 1919 he was still "intending" to print Werfel's polemic, and declared that any of Werfel's articles or poems could serve to enact their author's suicide (F.514,16;VH 78). He found ammunition in Werfel's play Spiegelmensch (1920). The literary significance of this Expressionistic Wandlungsdrama is discussed at the end of this Chapter. Apart from this, the play's content had a biographical reference clear enough to justify Kraus's recognition of himself in the caricatured Spiegelmensch, the hero Thamal's alter ego.

There is a polemical note right from the first emergence of Spiegelmensch from the broken mirror, at which Thamal had fired in a fury of self-hatred. Spiegelmensch, the conceited and vain advocate of false

values, criticizes Thamal's self-effacement as an escapist pose.²⁹⁾ In Part II, in the scene "Terrasse des Palastes", the literary rivalry of Thamal and Spiegelmensch is reflected in the ecstasies of their admirers.³⁰⁾ There are various allusions, in themselves lacking satirical sting, which only take on the significance of caricature on a personal level, as distortions of facts about Kraus's activity and his personal relations. For example, in "Endlose Schnee-Ebene", when Spiegelmensch boasts that his aristocratic connections, "ein allerhöchstes Herz",³¹⁾ will serve his political ambitions, as a biographical reference it is a slur on Kraus's love for Sidonie Nadherny. Kraus's speech at Peter Altenberg's funeral in January 1919 (F.508,8f.) is the model for Spiegelmensch's arrogant speech for a "friend" in "Friedhof", where he asserts his superiority over the deceased and denounces Thamal.³²⁾ In Part II, in "Vor dem Vorhang", when Spiegelmensch writhes about on stage mimicking the sexual act which is taking place, behind the curtains, between Thamal and his wife to-be,³³⁾ the implication would seem to be that Kraus's erotic experience was second-hand. This, too, is a distortion, as well as an intended obscenity.

The pattern is repeated in the main polemic against Kraus, in "Hafen" in Part III. In his monologue, Spiegelmensch's arrogant claims to superiority and

indispensability are over-simplifications of Kraus's egotism, and this point, too, lacks satirical bite. The reproach of "Kollegialität"³⁴⁾ is wide of the mark, but closer to the truth are the jibes that he had "ein grosses Talent zum akustischen Spiegel"³⁵⁾ and was the "Cabarettier" of his "apokalyptischen Verkündigung".³⁵⁾ Also that his style combined pun and pathos³⁵⁾ is a valid point, borrowed from Max Brod's polemic.³⁶⁾ On the other hand, the joke about Kraus's turning gossip into a cosmic event and cosmic events into gossip³⁵⁾ - though "answering" Kraus's parodies of his "cosmic" clichés - is the reiteration of a journalistic platitude; and the joke about the title Die Fackel³⁷⁾ simply feeble. Worst of all, however, Werfel irredeemably lowers the level of his polemic by presenting Spiegelmensch as a flatulent "Fürzefänger" who looked people not in the face but in the behind.³⁵⁾

The vulgar and laboured caricature of Kraus not only contrasts with the pretentious conception and language of the play, but impresses upon one the possibility that it was, after all, Werfel who attacked dummies rather than real opponents. According to Kraus, Spiegelmensch was a "Mysterium, in dem zwischen den Rätseln der Menschennatur eben noch Raum für die Ranküne eines Weltfreunds bleibt" (F.561,63).

In the Magic Trilogy, Thamal destroys Spiegelmensch and liberates himself through voluntary death; in

reality, Werfel had committed the inevitable polemical suicide, without ridding himself of his opponent. Kraus first dismissed some of the malicious allusions as unrecognizable (F.561,62) and other "lies" as the sublimation of resentment (F.561,61); then he attempted to show the grotesqueness of the attacks by juxtaposing them, column to column, with an ecstatic tribute to him that Werfel had written for Der Brenner in 1913³⁸⁾ [F.568,35]. As proof of Werfel's apostasy this was decisive and yet futile - for, as the Harden case has shown, it was not a valid literary argument in itself simply to reveal an extreme change of personal sympathy. On the other hand, Kraus was exposing the uncontrolled extremes of Werfel's language, in love and in hatred; but a far subtler literary argument could be based on a juxtaposition of different passages of the play, like those parodied by Kraus in Literatur, oder Man wird doch da sehn at this time. Reacting to the vulgar allusion towards the end of Spiegelmensch's "solo",³⁵⁾ Kraus remarked that, of all Judases, Werfel had most lost the capacity to look him in the eyes (F.561,63).

Kraus did not seek confiscation of the book-edition, so as to let the "suicide" have its full effect (F.561,64); on the other hand, he threatened legal action against anyone who staged it without deleting the offensive passages (F.561,64). He thus isolated the literary aspect of the case by depriving Werfel of some

publicistic support.^{39a)} Spiegelmensch was given its première in Leipzig on 16th October 1921, and - according to the press reports that Kraus quoted [F.577,35ff.] - it enjoyed a mixed reception, despite a spectacular production.³⁹⁾ The allusion to Die Fackel was changed to the fictitious Der Drachen [F.577,37]. For the première in the Burgtheater on 22nd April 1922, the references were deleted altogether, after Kraus had repeated his threat about prosecution (F.595,42). This he saw as a minor triumph, and now wished that Werfel had only had the courage to give a performance of the monologue himself (F.595,45). When it was alleged that the deletion was for "artistic reasons" and did not weaken the play, Kraus commented that the latter effect proved the very lack of intrinsic artistic necessity in the play (F.595,48).

His answer to the Magical Trilogy was a Magical Operetta, Literatur, oder Man wird doch da sehn which he first recited in Vienna on 6th March 1921 (F.568,35f.) - thus pre-empting any polemical impact by Spiegelmensch. It was not a personal attack on Werfel, but a linguistic satire of the whole generation and its literary fashions. By putting the grotesque written jargon and the pretentious pseudo-philosophical, pseudo-psychological jargon into the mouths of authors or their admirers, this satire characterized the sham intelligentsia more directly than Die demolierte Litteratur had the previous generation.

The way this was achieved and its relevance to the literary polemic against Werfel are discussed in more detail at the end of the Chapter.

vii) Aftermath

Kraus's success, in Literatur, in placing Werfel within his social context as the representative figure of the new literary trade and in giving to the critique a viable, self-contained satirical form, made further full-scale polemicizing unnecessary. Werfel's drama Paulus unter den Juden (1925) - published in 1926 and staged in 1927 - did contain attacks on Kraus and what he stood for, but these were less conspicuously extrinsic to the context than the attacks in Spiegelmensch. In a brief gloss in May 1927, Kraus could regard the caricature of himself in the figure of the Rabbi Beschwörer quite sanguinely, and he treated some incongruous stage directions with mild amusement (F.759,106f.). In the same issue (F.759,103ff; WF 402ff.), he analysed Werfel's latest attack on him, the sonnet "Der Fanatiker". He restricted himself to a critique of the language and a factual correction of false impressions.

After this, Werfel was only occasionally mentioned in Die Fackel. Kraus's last attack, in February 1936, was directed against the successful author of Der Weg der Verheissung, which was to be made into a biblical film

in Hollywood (F.917,48ff.); and against the ecstatic reviewer of Max Reinhardt's film of A Midsummer Night's Dream (F.917,7ff.), which Kraus criticized.⁴⁰⁾

THE ETHICAL QUESTION

i) Admiration and love

For the "Rundfrage über Karl Kraus" in Der Brenner, Werfel related how "fate" had drawn his and Kraus's planets together: after seeing Kraus's epitaph for Annie Kalmar, he had dreamt of a stranger whom he loved painfully and into whose grave he jumped with a cry of both "unconscious ecstasy" and "histrionic delight"; "the following day" he had heard that poems of his had been accepted for Die Fackel; only a year later did he meet Kraus, who was identical to the stranger of his dream.³⁸⁾

E. Haueis⁴¹⁾ has attempted to justify Kraus's subsequent attacks on Werfel by showing the discrepancy between the facts (and dates) of Werfel's first acquaintance with Kraus and his romanticized version of the "mystical experience" in Der Brenner. In this light, Dr Haueis diagnoses Werfel's attitude to life as "ästhetizistisch" and "geniesserisch", an attitude which conflicted with Kraus's morally radical view of art, as expounded in "Heine und die Folgen".

Although this may be so, Dr Haueis's example is perhaps not the best. For the quasi-mystical stylization of everyday experience need not in itself be deemed suspect, however typical it is of Expressionist effusions and of the early Werfel's in particular. In

a certain context - as in Kraus's account of his relations with Harden (CM 58), or in Else Lasker-Schüler's whimsical sketches⁴²⁾ - such stylization might be a valid means of conveying an experience greater than the sum of the biographical data the poet manipulates. What, however, may be questioned, is the composition of this poetic experience itself. The combination of "unconscious ecstasy" and "histrionic delight" - plausible within a dream - is accepted by the author unexplained and untransformed, although the histrionic component might seem to cast doubt on the authenticity of the experience. It seems that the poet's love for at least this man was partly self-dramatization. As a parallel to the philanthropic pathos of Werfel's poetry, this might arouse some scepticism as to its sincerity. Yet in his retrospective account (F.484,96), Kraus, if anything, seems not to question Werfel's initial admiration, but plays it off against his subsequent apostasy.

What seems to have originally attracted the self-styled misanthrope Kraus to Werfel was precisely the naive optimism expressed in his poetry. Kraus's only comment on Der Weltfreund in 1911 was far more non-committal than his tributes to Lasker-Schüler:

In wessen Liebe die Welt so liebenswert wird, der
schafft dem Weltfeind eine frohe Stunde. (F.339,51)

In the Hiller case Werfel, as reader, was a responsible party. In his apology to Kraus, of 14th December

1913, he admitted his error and implored Kraus to forgive him and Wolff. He exhorted Kraus not to ignore their unequalled love and care for his work, which, he trusted, being sincere, should mean more to him than the ugly affair.⁴³⁾ This challenge was in the spirit of the appeals to the good in the world that at the time made Der Weltfreund appear so refreshing. Even so, to declare one's love and sincerity was no explanation of a serious error, which a devoted admirer should have avoided.

ii) "Scheinmenschentum"

The immediate cause of Kraus's break with Werfel in the spring of 1914 was that Werfel tactlessly spread a rumour about Rilke's "love for" Sidonie Nadherny. Baroness Nadherny, whom Kraus had met in 1913, was the inspiration of his own love poems, which began to appear in 1916, and he was, naturally, hurt by Werfel's unmotivated behaviour. Kraus avoided Werfel after his lecture in Prague on 4th April, but was ready to explain himself if Werfel approached him⁴⁴⁾ - this was his answer to a reproachful letter from Werfel.⁴⁵⁾ In a letter to Sidonie Nadherny of 7th April,⁴⁶⁾ Kraus uttered his contempt for Werfel, whose letter was "die Empörung eines Schwammes, dem man zugemutet hat, dass er Wasser durchlasse".

Publicly, Kraus's only reactions were to deplore Werfel's influence on other Prague poets (F.398,19), and,

without naming him, to hint at the unreliability of certain admirers (F.400,53) and to express his disdain more formally in several aphorisms which appeared in October 1915 (F.406,131; BWG 331). These aphorisms draw on terms like "Schwamm" and "Scheinmenschentum, das in der Reue nicht besser ist als in der Sünde"⁴⁷⁾ from Kraus's letters about Werfel to Sidonie Nadherny. While Werfel's conception of "Scheinwelt" and "Erscheinung" in Der Gerichtstag and Spiegelmensch was philosophical, derived from the Buddhist notion of Maya, Kraus's term "Scheinmensch" was a purely ethical condemnation of this weak character and his "human" philosophy.

A fact which has been ignored even in the most recent account⁴⁸⁾ is that Werfel's personal breach of confidence was a decisive factor in Kraus's change of attitude to him. Dr Haueis⁴⁹⁾ has advised against overestimating the importance of the "Klatschgeschichte"; however, although close examination reveals that Kraus did not act in revenge for the personal injury, the aphorisms and the letters express resentment not of Werfel's gossip itself, but of his gestures of penitence. His professed innocence becomes most dubious as part of a self-dramatization that is almost aggressive in its self-righteousness. In his letter to Kraus of 6th April 1914, his appeal to his own goodness becomes an attempt to discount the anticipated reproach:

"Ich kenne [-..] Ihr unerbittlich moralisches Gedächtnis, wenn es sich darum handelt, aus den niedrigen Taten eines Menschen die logische Kette zu machen, bin aber deshalb nur doppelt überzeugt, dass dieses Gedächtnis ebensowenig Art und Charakter eines Menschen vergessen kann. Ich bin Franz Werfel [!] und mein Wesen ist nachzulesen, und mögen tausend Tatsachen gegen mich ein System bilden, kann ich trotzdem nichts Gemeines getan haben. Wenn Sie nur einen Augenblick glauben, ich könnte eine Schweinerei, eine willentliche Bosheit begangen haben, erklären Sie auch meine Produktion, durch dieses Gefühl schon, für Lüge und Schwindel. Denn ich war's gewiss, dass auch Sie nicht meinen werden, dass Niedrigkeit und Hoheit in einem Herzen abwechseln können. [sehr richtig] Ich mag Unvorsichtigkeiten begangen haben, es mögen Irrtümer kolportiert worden sein, aber gerade deshalb hätten Sie mich zuerst, vor allen andern zur Rede stellen sollen. Das wäre meiner Ansicht nach Ihre Pflicht gewesen, denn ich glaube an die Versicherung Ihrer Sympathie, die Sie mir manchmal gaben. [-] Ich bin mir, wenn es sich, wie ich ahne, um die Ausserung über eine Dame handelt, die ich in Wien weitergab, des reinsten Herzens bewusst, ebenso aber auch des Versprechens, das Sie so gütig waren mir zu geben, als mich die Unvorsichtigkeit meines Klatsches bestürzt machte. Ich hoffe aber zuversichtlich, dass ich so viel wert bin, ehe diese Affäre Anderen als Kornfeld zu Ohren kommt [?], selbst interpelliert zu werden [-..]⁴⁵⁾

The underlining and exclamation- and question-marks were pencilled by Kraus on the manuscript. The sentence which provoked him to pencil in "sehr richtig" he later quoted [F.484,110], to imply the contrary to Werfel's

claim - namely that the nobility was belied by the baseness.

What is striking - more so than in the Hiller case - is Werfel's refusal to accept responsibility for the imprudent remark, while sensing that this is at issue, and his simultaneous indignation at Kraus's behaviour. This projection of his own guilt on the other person is a far more serious escape from the "facts" of the case than the aesthetic stylization of their relations in Der Brenner. It gives strength to the view that his polemical reproaches about Kraus's compensation for his own weaknesses by aggression against others were themselves a projection by Werfel of his own complexes. Furthermore, in seeing character as unrelated to its chance actions, Werfel is misapplying an aesthetic notion of harmony to a clearly ethical issue. This is quite foreign to Kraus's demand that an artist's character, namely his ethics, should be worthy of and one with his art. As this and the Hiller case show, Werfel's "humanity", in practice, amounted to moral vagueness and served as an emotional alibi for behaviour that fell short of a stricter ethic.^{49a)} In this light - that is, in the psychological context of its author's actions - the poet Werfel's doctrine of love and mercy becomes suspect.

In the more general context of wartime, too, Werfel's

appeals to human goodness might be seen as a grand gesture of self-delusion. The Expressionists' conception of a positive "new Man" and their pleas for change on the part of the individual and for universal brotherhood were problematically unrelated to the structure of the modern world, especially of a society ridden with war-profiteers. In 1918, Kraus criticized Werfel's message of goodwill as flattery for the heartless profiteers of a vast human tragedy:

Der Weltfreund, der diese Sehnsucht nicht unter
Flüchen vor der Welt bekennt, sondern ihr, wie sie
ist, umarmend, ins Ohr singt, dürfte ein Allerwelts-
freund sein. (F.484,98)

Kraus's contemporaries had no answer to this criticism, which is also a vindication of his own allegedly negative satire. His attempt to confront this world single-handed may have been vain, but he offered a more accurate diagnosis of the evils of the time than did the Expressionists. Even though, by the time Kraus made this comment, the "Weltfreund" had become more pessimistic, his radical rejection of reality in Der Gerichtstag is no more penetrating than was his earlier love. The metaphysical questioning of existence in the writings of Expressionists was blatantly contradicted by their commercial acceptance of the status quo for their writings.⁵¹⁾ Kraus went further, too, by implying, as early as 1914, that the emotional language of "brotherhood" was only too adaptable to the needs of literary advertising. The

implications of the emotionalism in Werfel's poetry itself are discussed in Part III.

iii) The jargon of publicity

In "Ich und das Ichbin", when Kraus used a review and a blurb - "to assist quotation and not as a substitute for the original text" (F.484,101) - he justified the procedure not only on the grounds that these sources complemented his impression of the poet, but because a writer received the publicity he deserved (F.484,104). Werfel had rejected the organs of publicity as deceptive and unreal;⁵⁰⁾ and if it had been Kraus's mission only to attack individuals, then his approach here would have been blatantly unfair and a confirmation of Werfel's claim that he depicted opponents falsely. Yet it is clear that his concern was with the publicity machine itself, which Werfel, the most successful and fashionable of the Expressionists, all too naively served.

Kraus's satirical note on the trivial verse of Prague writers (F.398,19f.) in April 1914 had been preceded, in the previous issue, by a general condemnation of the indiscriminate effusions of "Lyrikaster" and their hysterical reactions to him. This came at the end of nearly thirty pages of notes on the subject of literary publicity (F.395,19-46). He did not include Werfel explicitly, but in several allusions in 1914 he asserted

a paradoxical identity between "sincere but weak" and "insincere" admirers:

Nur schade, dass die Ehrlichen, wenns mir zu
peinlich wird, dieselben sind wie die Unehrliehen,
dass jene auch anders als nicht anders können und
dass die ehrliche wie die unehrliche Schwäche
dasselbe Feuilletonsgesicht trägt. (F.400,53)

This was a reflection of his disillusionment with Werfel. Another sign of it was his scepticism towards the goodness and innocence invoked in pseudo-religious analogies by certain mutual admirers. He remarked that these "Christs" were suspect until exposed as "Judases" (F.400,55); and, after quoting Theodor Haecker's polemic against "monistic optimism and vague pantheism" and the evils of the publishing business [F.400,57ff.], he declared that it was time these "agents of God", who infested the theatres and publishing-houses, were exposed as the "agents of the world" that they really were (F.400,60).

In asserting an identity between naive, weak characters and irresponsible "agents" Kraus might appear to have been venturing beyond the empirical realm of ethics onto the uncertain ground of character psychology. The assertion is more understandable, however, if seen in the context not only of his personal disillusionment but of the unprecedented publicity enjoyed by some of these heralds of brotherhood and goodness. For example, by 1922 Werfel's Wir sind had run to sixteen thousand.

In October 1916 a double number of Die Aktion⁵²⁾ was devoted entirely to Werfel; it included tributes to him by Kurt Pinthus and Otto Pick, both of which were evidently of the kind that Kraus had been condemning. Pick, for example, described Werfel's entry on the literary scene in 1911:

"Ein Wirbelwind war in unsere Ecke im Prager Café Arco gefahren, hatte uns die Literaturblätter aus den Händen gerissen; [] Die Köpfe drängten sich zusammen über den ersten Bürstenabzug des Weltfreund [] Und dann begann [] diese und jene Strophe, gesprochen-gedichtet vom Dichter, [] zu übertönen die Cafégeräusche. Und Werfel sprach, Werfel sang, Werfel wogte, Werfel wurde, nachdem er geworden."⁵³⁾

It was clearly a general ambition to "arrive" in this way, and the establishment of new publishing-houses, such as Kurt Wolff's, made it possible.

Yet the new publishers were not only well disposed towards the Expressionists, they advertised them in the very language that characterized their poetry, and even used the reviews of (and by) these poets to endorse the commodity. Common practice today, this was relatively new on the literary market of 1913/14. Kraus's attack of March 1914 had also been directed at the extravagant jargon of reviews and publishers' blurbs, which he related to the looseness of some Expressionists' lyrical idiom:

Ich halte es mit solchen, denen in Leipzig "neue Ausdrucksformen" nachgerühmt werden, so, dass ich sie mir vom Leib halte; denn sie sind sicher identisch mit jenen, die es sagen. Ich weiss, dass jeder, der heute eine Rezension schreibt, ein Gedicht machen kann, und umgekehrt. Es ist gehupft wie gesprungen, geurteilt wie gefühlt. (F.395,45f.)

Although there were cases, at this time, of dubious relations between - and even identity of - reviewer and reviewed in a single organ of publicity,⁵⁴⁾ Kraus was condemning the suspicious adaptability of a style. The impressionism of feuilleton writers, which he had criticized in "Heine und die Folgen", followed a decorative formula which could be applied to any subject; the ecstatic absolutes and superlatives of the Expressionists were transferable in the sense that they were common to the poetry and the criticism. What in the poetry was presented as a new "cosmic" Weltanschauung of universal brotherhood, became in the reviews the fashionable idiom for mutual recognition. Kraus's criticism of the lack of individuality in the poetry is discussed in Part III; as for the reviews, he made only the briefest of allusions to phrases applied to Schickele and Brod (F.395,46), and quoted few other examples.

To illustrate what it was he was criticizing, one could quote from the Kurt Wolff Verlag's advertisements,⁵⁵⁾ the dustcovers of Werfel's books or the advertising

supplements of Die weissen Blätter for 1913/14 - also published in Leipzig - which contained advertisements for and reviews of Werfel. The dustcover of Wir sind (third edition, 1917) displays a comment, already adopted by the advertisements in 1914, which compares Werfel to Goethe in his capacity to bear "der Erde Glück, der Erde Weh"; on the cover of the third edition of Einander (1917) Werfel's creation of a new hymnic verse-form is endorsed by Edgar Steiger as a "kosmische Notwendigkeit"; and the dustcover of the third edition of Der Weltfreund (1918) quotes a lyrical tribute to Werfel by the Hamburger Fremdenblatt:

"Er ist wirklich ein himmlisch Bestrahlter, ein wahrhaft Gesegneter. Soll man den Menschen noch mehr lieben als den Dichter? Man trinkt die Verse in sich wie einen milden herrlichen Wein oder wie eine ungeahnte Menschenliebe."

This to some extent explains Kraus's assertion that the "halbe Seele" of a good Expressionist fitted easier "in den Betrieb dieser neuen Welt" than an obviously commercial novelist (Spr 46). One must agree with Kraus about this dubious adoption of the Expressionists' lyrical emotionalism by reviewers and advertisers. It is, of course, not a question of any empirical identity between these and the poets, as in the case of Zech;⁵⁴⁾ Kraus's polemical assertion of an identity was his means of forcing apparently harmless poets to

accept the ethical implications of their successful style. Only from 1916 on did Kraus openly condemn Werfel for not dissociating himself firmly enough from this commercialism, from which he profited, and for his authorship of the emotional language which could be adapted and imitated so successfully by the "agents".

iv) Man and work

Such a criticism underlay the gloss "Der Atem der Weltgeschichte" (F.426,24), for example, as Werfel sensed. The performance of Werfel's Troerinnen had been greeted in the press as a historic event in the war, when Berliners could be unperturbed by news from outside. Kraus simply constructed a fictitious dialogue from the reviewer's clichés, in which Werfel's name is on the lips of Berlin philistines.

Kraus's general demand for authorial responsibility even after publication of a work was over-severe; yet as a reaction to the excesses of the reviewing media it might be justified. Here, however, he was implying no more than that Werfel had "arrived"; yet Werfel took it seriously. In his letter of 17th July 1916,⁵⁶⁾ he - quite justifiably - dissociated himself from "Reklamenotizen, Theaterfeuilletons, usw."; yet he went so far as to disown his completed work, and to challenge Kraus to attack him:

"Für mich ist alles zu Ende gebrachte schmerzlich und hassenswert und ich tue es aus meinem Gedächtnis und Gefühl. [---] Warum werfen Sie nicht mein Gedicht um? Warum packen Sie mich nicht selbst?"⁵⁶⁾

Once again, in professing his innocence more emphatically than the situation required, Werfel begs the question about it.

Even early in their relationship, while Werfel expressed his admiration and gratitude, as in his letter of 23rd May 1911, there was some disagreement on literary matters. Having printed three poems with minor emendations [F.321,31ff.], Kraus wanted to publish a single strophe of a poem by Werfel. Although the poet was overjoyed at Kraus's appreciation of the one strophe, he preferred to keep the poem intact:

"Den Wert einer eigenen Sache kann ich ja selbstverständlich nur aus dem Grund der Stunde, daraussie entstanden ist, beurteilen. So ist die schöne Erinnerung meist stärker als die Selbstkritik in der Lyrik. Ich begehe gewiss den Fehler, dass ich das für eine Einheit halte, was bloss einheitlich gefühlt wurde und weil ich durch oftmaliges Vordeklamieren in diesem Irrtum noch bestärkt werde, empfinde ich ein herausgerissenes Stück als dürftig, zweifelhaft und quälend."⁵⁷⁾

Here the young Werfel admits that it is the emotional associations rather than any intrinsic artistic quality of his verse that makes an impact. The impact of recital carried away not only the audience - as Pick recalled - but the poet himself, as he also admits in the poem

"An mein Pathos".⁵⁸⁾ The very quality which for Kraus raised the artist morally above all outside criteria and expectations, namely earnest self-criticism in the process of creation, Werfel admits to be his weak point. We must now examine the poetry and Kraus's assessment of it, to see to what extent the evasions of responsibility in the personal, ethical issue were matched by Werfel's emotionalism as a poet.

THE POETRY

i) Kraus's criticism

In "Ich und das Ichbin", Kraus ridiculed the endless dithyrambs of "An den Leser",²³⁾ where Werfel claimed to know the feelings of lonely harpists, shy governesses or nervous débutantes. He considered that "knowing the feeling" was no substitute for personal experience (F.484,93), and criticized the "boundlessness" not only of Werfel's feelings but also of his lines of verse, which "flowed out on all sides"; this verse was simply a "Gebrauchsanweisung für Nächstenliebe" (F.484,99).

Kraus quoted "Ich bin ja noch ein Kind"²⁵⁾ to expose the hollowness of this sympathizing:

"Ich bin gesund,
Und weiss noch nicht, wie Greise rosten.
Ich hielt mich nie an groben Pfosten
Wie Frauen in der schweren Stund!
[---]
Weiss nicht, wie sich Mütter die Augen aussticken,
Weiss nicht die Qual, wenn Kaiserinnen nicken."
[F.484,99]

He criticized the juxtaposition of "rusty" old people and "rough" posts and queried the exemplary function of the nodding empresses. Significantly, Werfel omitted the latter and emended the third line to

"Ich klammerte mich nie an Pfosten"⁵⁹⁾
in the 1927 edition of his poems, which contains several other emendations of passages criticized by Kraus.⁶⁰⁾

Kraus also quoted several rambling lines from "Das Malheur",²⁴⁾ which describes the calamity of a maid's dropping some dishes. Kraus emphasized an unfelicitous verbal echo in spaced type:

"Das Mädchen aber stand regungslos, wie in unnatürlichen
Schlaf gesenkt,
Krampfhaft die Arme zu einer rettenden Geste verrenkt.
Jedoch dem Mitleid der Gäste hatte sich scheues
Erstaunen zugesellt.
Denn sie sahen plötzlich Eine mitten in ein Schicksal
gestellt." /F.484,93/

Kraus commented that the lines contained as much poetry as the sympathetic housewife's report of the incident; they were

/.../ nichts anderes als die nebenbei gereimte psychologisch-adjektivische Prosa jedes beliebigen kleinen Literaten /.../ lyrischer Feuilletonismus, an die Lyrik zurückgegeben, die wieder mit gewollten, weil nicht anders gekonnten Prosaismen die Fülle der leersten Gesichte aufreicht, ein sprachliches Nebenher, das nun einmal die neue Art des Sehens und Fühlens darstellen soll, kurzum die Inhaltsangabe eines Werfel'schen Gedichts, wenn es nicht dieses selbst wäre. (F.484,94)

If this passage is reminiscent of "Heine und die Folgen" it might be taken as confirmation of Werfel's point that Kraus reduced all opponents to a formula. I have, indeed, already suggested that Kraus's strict linguistic perspective limited the scope of his reactions to literature; but this does not mean that Heine and Werfel are judged by the same formula, they are not

"leere Puppen". The correspondences in his critical terminology do not invalidate the criticism itself; for both Heine's imitators and the vogue of lyrical sympathizing inspired by Werfel were unindividual and stereotyped, and Kraus treated each as such. The testimony to a formative human experience, which Kraus saw in the artistic quality of a poem, was replaced by Werfel's "sympathy", which was a matter of content and not of poetic experience.

ii) Form and content

Kraus was here criticizing in Werfel what he had criticized Werfel's imitators in 1914 for. Werfel was, indeed, the model for a whole number of poets; this becomes clear on reading the works of other poets, particularly in the series Der Jüngste Tag. An example is Paul Kraft, among whose poems at this time is a "Lied des müden abgearbeiteten Grossstädtlers",⁶¹⁾ another is Gottfried Kölwel, whose "Die neunte Stunde", from his volume of poems published in March 1914, depicts weary shop-girls awaiting the saviour's call,⁶²⁾ and in whose "Die Liebe spricht"⁶³⁾ uncelebrated objects - a paving-stone, cab-horses, branches of a tree, a flag, a royal coach - alongside the archetypal figures of child, mother, father, king, and finally the all-embracing power of love, are given voice. The revue recalls Hofmannsthal, and the evocation of love in the shape of various phenomena

recalls Rilke and Werfel. The bulk of the poetry published in the first volumes of Die weissen Blätter (1913/14) was also in this manner. An example is M. Benemann's "Die Wissende",⁶⁴⁾ the optimism of which is established in the rhetorical formula of "knowing", borrowed from Werfel, and the lyrical image of the hand, borrowed from Rilke. In January 1914, Werfel's own poems "Der gute Mensch" and "Der Held",⁶⁵⁾ dedicated to Kraus, appeared in Die weissen Blätter, along with Max Brod's "Aus dem Zyklus: 'Lob des einfachen Lebens'".⁶⁶⁾ The latter typifies the versification of trivial, prosaic experience that Kraus criticized in 1914 by quoting a banal poem "Der Siebzehnjährige spricht" [F.398,19] and parodying⁶⁷⁾ the Prague school's presentation of banality in casual rhymed dithyrambs. This parody was simply the formlessness, triviality and sentimentality of "Das Malheur" taken ad absurdum, a localization of the "universal love" in its author's Sprachmilieu, the Jewish Prague that is evoked more obliquely in "Elysisches":

"[F-]

Aber wie ich nach Haus gekommen bin, Gott, war das
ein Jubel, meiner Mama standen im Aug'
die Thränen,

Sie hat mich sofort erkannt, was für ein Mensch ich
eigentlich bin, ich sang vor Seligkeit.

Zuerst wollte sie gar nicht mit der Sprache heraus,
sie rang mit sich, erst später that sie,
im Innersten jauchzend, erwähnen,

Dass zur Belohnung, weil ich so gut bestanden hab, wir
haben meine Lieblingsmehlspeis',
nämlich Buchteln heut'." (F.398,20)

Yet Kraus had originally praised the volume which
contained "Das Malheur", and had published poems of a
similar kind in Die Fackel, for example "Kindersonn-
tagsausflug"⁶⁸):

"Vom Kai steigt eine Brücke zu Dampfschiff und Boten.
Oh, Kindersonntagsausflug! Wie abenteuerlich kam mir
das alles vor.

Strahlender Fluss, Frühlingshimmel, Regattakähne,
Eisenbahnbrücke, Gerüste und Piloten,
Blauer Rauch in der Luft. Oh dünnes Gewebe, oh
schwacher Flor!" /F.321,31/

"/--/

Ich ging ans Ufer mit kleinen ganz unsicheren Schritten
Und hörte wie im Traume vom Restaurationsgarten her
die donnernde Militärmusik." /F.321,32/

This is a good example of the early Werfel's evocation
of a child's colourful, magical environment by
apostrophizing and enumerating the objects with which
he identifies. Despite the Whitmanesque effusions and
the almost self-parodistic rhyming of the otherwise
rambling lines, this six-strophe poem is a better
expression of exuberance than some printed by Kraus;
it contains more colourful detail and less overt
sentimentality than, say, "Die vielen Dinge" /F.321,31/
or "Der schöne strahlende Mensch" /F.321,33/. Indeed,
the charm of "Nächtliche Kahnfahrt" /F.326,37/ lies
in the rhythm as well as the subject-matter, but in

"Kindersonntagsausflug" it is the subject-matter alone which is alluring. As Professor Schumann remarks,⁶⁹⁾ "extensity" of subject-matter replaces "intensity" of poetic vision. This to some extent conveys the expansive feeling of the child who identifies with various manifestations of existence. According to Professor Schumann, "all these objects do not have their significance per se, as objects, but as symbols suggestive of something personal and human".⁷⁰⁾ Although Professor Schumann points to the comparable significance of childhood for Rilke, Werfel's objects are, in fact, less like Rilke's "Dinge" than like his "Puppen".²⁷⁾ That is, they lack the objectivity of "Kunst Dinge", which exist as poetic entities, once transformed by the poet's perception of them through a profound "achievement" of empathy; rather they remain objects of sympathy, loosely associated with the poet's memories and moods as he projects himself into them. The naive emotionalism in this fashionable "Umgänglichlichkeit mit Wort und Ding" (F.484,94), for which Kraus partly blamed Rilke, in fact lacks the formative power of Rilke's perception of "Dinge", as it does Kraus's erotic experience of language. This is confirmed by Werfel's development, which Kraus judged negatively as the "Aufschwung des Dichters aus dem Kinderpark in den Kosmos" (Spr 34). The gradual substitution of fellow beings for the apostrophized objects is accompanied by a loss of that immediacy

which the childhood motifs ⁻²⁶⁷⁻lent to the earlier poems.
Indeed, the philanthropic rhetoric which contributed
so much to Werfel's fame is the least convincing
element of his verse today.

Even part of one of the better poems of 1914 might
illustrate the lack of profound experience of humanity
behind Werfel's rhetoric. "Der gute Mensch" begins:

"Sein ist die Kraft, das Regiment der Sterne,
Er hält die Welt wie eine Nuss in Fäusten,
Unsterblich schlingt sich Lachen um sein Antlitz,
Krieg ist sein Wesen und Triumph sein Schritt.

Und wo er ist und seine Hände breitet,
Und wo sein Ruf tyrannisch niederdonnert,
Zerbricht das Ungerechte aller Schöpfung,
Und alle Dinge werden Gott und eins."⁷¹⁾

[--]

Werfel's vision lacks the formal accomplishment achieved
by Hofmannsthal in "Ein Traum von grosser Magie", where
the overcoming of physical dimensions by the omnipotent
"Magier" is illustrated in a sequence of supreme gestures
and echoed by a sonorous, allusive Wortmagie. The
power invoked by Werfel in lines one and four is
conventionalized in the image of the nut. Line three
is characteristically Expressionistic, in so far as
"Lachen", without the article and combined with
"schlingt sich um", is both abstract and dynamic, an
alien presence on the face; and almost typically the
image is diluted by "unsterblich", an unrelated absolute

which, however intentionally, is a substitute for precise perception. The second stanza is made even more hollow by the hyperbole and abstraction in lines two and three, so that the mystical affirmation in line four is poetically unsubstantiated, itself too generalized to be anything more than a formula.

What is really surprising is not Kraus's criticism of Werfel but its lateness, and, even, his initial sponsoring of him. To account for this, one may recall Werfel's "whirlwind" entry on the literary scene, and compare the ambivalent impact he also made on Kafka. Even Kafka, usually a good judge of literary authenticity, was confused and overwhelmed by Werfel's poetry - the effect was "ungeheuer".⁷²⁾ Apart from Werfel's apparently naive love for the world, what was it about this overwhelming, ambivalent phenomenon that at first attracted Kraus, but which also proved to be suspect? Professor Bauer⁷³⁾ sees Der Weltfreund as anticipating Kraus's own lyrical ideal "einer unversehrten Natur". This is inaccurate in so far as the poems published in Die Fackel are, if at all, a child's affirmation of the urban environment - which in Kraus's work is only ever satirized.

The gap left by Kraus's reticence on the subject of Werfel (before the polemic) may be filled by the gloss "Die Künstler" (F.324,6), which appeared at the

time of his publication of Werfel's poetry in 1911. In it he criticizes a cheap jingle about "die Wienerin" in the "Stadtpark". Both the theme and the borrowing of a traditional metre - here echoing the short iambic lines of Claudius's "Abendlied" - are comparable to features of Werfel's early poems. For example, Werfel's "Armer Student, süsse vornehme Frauen anbetend",⁷⁴⁾ adopts a dactylic metre from the West-Östlicher Divan⁷⁵⁾ to evoke the grace of an upper-class urban environment, in the details of which he identifies his infatuation. Both the metre and phrases like "Abendlich angeschwellt" were copied by Paul Kraft in his "Lied beim Aufwachen am Morgen".⁷⁶⁾ No doubt the facility of such imitation made Kraus both sceptical of Werfel's originality and himself adopt the metre in his poem "Jugend" of September 1917 (WiV 178ff.). Yet in 1911, Kraus criticized only the hackneyed, metaphysical, "Schillerian" references in which the jingle celebrated the Viennese woman's qualities. He brought it down to earth by suggesting more "physical" attributes, which could also improve the rhyme-scheme. At a time when he approved of Der Weltfreund, then, he had a mistrust of hollow absolutes, and a preference for traditional verse-forms and for the concrete objective correlative. As Werfel developed, the absolutes became more frequent and the objective correlatives less valid; yet this tendency already existed in Der Weltfreund and Wir sind,

and Kraus's acceptance of Werfel in 1911 seems almost inconsistent with the implications of his other literary satire at the time.

According to Kraus's definitions of originality and imitation, outlined in Chapter One, the overt difference between an original and an unoriginal work could be very small. It is understandable, therefore, that Kraus did not publicly equate him with his imitators, even though the rapid proliferation of verse like Werfel's must have helped to undermine his belief in Werfel's uniqueness and sincerity as a poet of human love. Logically, a lack of distinction between Werfel and his imitators would have been sufficient proof of his lack of originality, but not necessarily grounds for an attack on him. But a rejection of Werfel on these terms, without touching on the embarrassing personal dispute to bring ethical "proof", would have been inconsistent with Kraus's own belief in the necessary correspondence of "Gedicht" and "Charakter". It suited his polemical purpose to wait until he could ensnare Werfel on the more accessible literary issue, in "Dorten".

Yet the Werfel case in particular shows that Kraus's belief was at least also a tactical expedient, an equation that did not work both ways; that he only drew his conclusions about the false relation of Werfel's character and style retrospectively, after his discovery of Werfel's moral weakness. That this was a decisive

factor in his reassessment of the poet is quite clear from Kraus's letter to Sidonie Nadherny of 14th April 1915.⁴⁷⁾ Here he protests that Werfel's character, as revealed in the personal issue, is incompatible with his lyrical enumeration of colourful experience:

Der Fall zeigt beispielhaft, wie man sich vor dem Talent hüten muss, das ein ganzes Register der Schönheit beherrscht und selbst so hässlich ist. Hundertmal könnte so einer alle Herrlichkeiten des Parks von Janowitz "ausdrücken".⁴⁷⁾

This contains in nuce the connection between Kraus's ethical objections and his retrospective scepticism towards the poet's unconvincing pantheistic sympathy. The thesis of style and character, which up to 1914 failed him in his assessment of Werfel, forced him subsequently to take a more extreme line than the literary criticism undertaken in this section represents, for he had also to account for his own failure to see through the beauty Werfel invoked.

iii) Kraus's changed attitude and the
language thesis

In January 1917, Kraus alluded to the discrepancy between Werfel's character and work in three aphorisms (F.445,2; BWG 434), and made the point more openly in "Dorten":

Ich habe so lange nicht gewusst, ob seine Verse etwas taugen, bis ich gewusst habe, dass er nichts taugt. (Spr 41)

He discussed this central issue at some length in "Ich und das Ichbin". Here he developed the idea of the 1915 aphorism (BWG 332), quoted on page 5 , about the deceptiveness of poetic language if unrelated to its author's character and intention. He drastically modified his absolute language perspective:

Um zum Urteil über die sprachlich manifestierte, sprachlich verkleidete Unpersönlichkeit zu gelangen, hat es immer wieder des persönlichen Aufschlusses bedurft, und ich bekenne mich nicht nur dieser Methode der literarischen Urteilsbildung schuldig, sondern auch der Kurzsichtigkeit, die mir manch einen Vers schön erscheinen liess, ehe er mir eben das fragwürdige Gesicht zuwandte, das mir die Seele seines Autors offenbarte. Ein Gedicht ist so lange gut, bis man weiss, von wem es ist, und ich masse mir an, von sprachlichen Dingen so viel zu verstehen, dass ich den ganzen Menschen dazu brauche, um seinen Vers beurteilen zu können. Er ist zugleich gut und schlecht, und ehe man das zweite weiss, ist man gerne gewillt, das erste zu glauben. Denn eben das ist dieser Spielart gegeben, zu zeigen was sie nicht hat, und so hat auch sie teil an dem grossen Geheimnis der Sprache, die eben dort, wo nicht Wesen ist, umso mehr Schein zulässt. (F.484,110)

The admission of the complexities and deceptiveness of language would be convincing in itself; but in the context of this polemic it is problematic.

Since Werfel's development disillusioned him, one might have expected Kraus, in 1918, to criticize his

later work and to show his betrayal of earlier promise. Yet while he uncritically accepted Werfel's initial admiration as sincere, in order to condemn the later "fremdes Pathos" (F.484,96), he did not illustrate how this pathos had accompanied the personal betrayal. He did not mention any poems later than Wir sind, except for the polemical "Einem Denker". In other words, he questioned the merits of poems from the time before the betrayal, the very work that he had once accepted and sponsored. In his poem "Jugend" (WiV 178ff.) - so he admitted in 1921 (Spr 221) - he even conducted a "grausames Sprachexperiment" with Werfel's "Armer Student, süsse vornehme Frauen anbetend",⁷⁴⁾ one of the poems which had appeared in Die Fackel /F.339,48/. With this reassessment of the apparent genuineness of the early poetry as deceptive, as the mere "Stoff der Echtheit" (F.484,107), it would seem that Kraus was also undermining his own former position, his absolute authority in matters of literary authenticity. At the point where an admission of his error of judgement, of his mistaken trust in the integrity and promise of the ingenuous Werfel, seems to be called for, and where a comparison of the earlier "Kindheitserlebnis" and the later "fremdes Pathos" would be effective, Kraus's reaction is a paradoxical reassertion of his faith in language. His examples illustrate not the deceptiveness but the unequivocal mediocrity of the young Werfel;

yet he asserts that Werfel's work was the basis for his revised judgement:

Was ich persönlich vergelte, ist nie die Handlung oder Gesinnung, die den Charakter anders deuten liess, sondern einzig und allein das Gedicht. Dieses ist mir angetan. Die Handlung auch dann nicht, wenn sie mir angetan wäre. Das Gedicht aber lässt mich nicht verzeihen und vergessen, dass ich es früher anders angeschaut habe [..] (F.484,111)

This seems to be another "Dreh" on the part of Kraus, to cover the preceding statement, where he seemed to be denying his error and treating the case as confirmation of an insight that he had had all along. That this was not so has been shown in Section ii above; and this second statement, though a firm assertion of his literary approach, can be taken as a tacit admission that he had been wrong about Werfel and was having to correct his position. He was not concealing a purely moral approach to art, such as that proposed by Harden in Kampfgenosse Sudermann;⁷⁷⁾ he was asserting that the work of art could reveal the highest human qualities or the known lack of them and that only the arbiter of nuances could ultimately tell. Yet one should criticize Kraus not only for showing the wisdom of hindsight; where he admits the deceptiveness of language in its capacity for revealing character and yet continues to assert the equation of poem and

character on terms that suit him polemically, what had previously appeared as his absolute Weltanschauung now reveals its "fragwürdiges Gesicht". It was a convenient literary formula by which the satirist could administer his ruthless justice and which he applied, with subtle variations like the above, to predetermined targets. Kraus's reassertion of his conviction of a connection between man and work, when the evidence of the Werfel case was more complex than he could admit polemically, for once raises doubts as to his own intellectual integrity.

LANGUAGE AND TRADITION

i) Kraus's positive values

Kraus's failure as a critic of language and his attempts to vindicate himself - though they cast doubt on his absolute authority - do not invalidate his polemic against Werfel itself. This case shows better than most how even a critical position that is in itself dubious could be of functional value in the polemical context, as a means of focusing on the opponent's weaknesses and relating them to wider issues. Werfel's polemic - as traced in Part I - was "suicidal"; to the point where he made even Kraus's dubious hindsight appear a reasonable reaction. For example, Werfel was not merely inconsistent in adopting a linguistically stylized persona to reject language philosophically; in his polemic he even sneered at Kraus's appreciative interpretation of the word "leider" in Claudius's "Kriegslied" (Spr 36) and dismissed Kraus's reading as being a mere figment of his imagination.⁵⁰⁾ Kraus was then able to expose this scorn for the human properties of language on the part of a poet whose own ideal was supposed to be humanity:

Wenn ich Herrn Werfel sagte, dass, wer dem Wort
näher ist, auch den Menschen und den Dingen
näher ist; dass in der Claudius'schen Zeile
"'s ist leider Krieg", das "leider" den grössten
Komparativ von Leid bedeutet und dass davor alles
mitgemachte Leid der Werfel'schen Liebe wie ein

gemachtes Mitleid in Nichts vergeht[...]/ er würde
es nicht glauben [...] (F.484,113)

Even if Kraus's connotation were his own, the experience -
not only of language - which made such appreciation
possible belies Werfel's jibe.

As a positive counterpart to the successful Werfel
Kraus cited Franz Janowitz, a young Prague poet who was
killed at the front in 1917. Though it was evidently
due to Kraus that Kurt Wolff eventually published
Janowitz's poems,⁷⁸⁾ in the polemical context Kraus
did not quote any. Janowitz, he declared, had remained
at the "Ursprung", and what he had written on a postcard⁷⁹⁾
about the mystery of a vowel was enough to put Werfel
to shame (F.484,106f.). Kraus saw Janowitz in a timeless
perspective, as a man "in whom every fibre had been
genuine" (F.546,68), as an example of "wie zwischen
einem Gedicht und einem Mann kein Erdenrest bleibt,
aus dem der Erfolg wächst" (F.484,106). Here again,
literary appreciation was broadened and absorbed in an
ethical verdict. Janowitz's slim volume of poetry,
Auf der Erde (1919), contains some fine verse, but does
not bear the stamp of unrecognized genius. Like the
early Werfel, he uses traditional metre - his "Geliebtes
Lied"⁸⁰⁾ echoes Goethe's "An den Mond" - and he apostro-
phizes and identifies with objects of the natural world,
such as trees.⁸¹⁾ He also expresses emotions as
rhetorically as Werfel, if less pretentiously. Relatively,
then, Kraus's verdict seems to be accurate, but the

absolute terms of his comparison must again be questioned, as justifiable only in the polemical context.

The range of authors whom Kraus chose to contrast positively with Werfel demonstrates the eccentricity of his demand for authenticity as against accepted literary taste. Apart from Janowitz, Kraus mentioned Goethe and the Bohemian and poet Peter Altenberg, almost in the same context.

He declared his preference of Altenberg's miniatures of everyday life, "wo Herz und Laune zur Lyrik eines Worts verschweben", to Werfel's "Gefühlsplaudereien" (F.484,94) - a verdict based to a great extent on his extra-literary acquaintance with the dynamic personality of Altenberg, which is not fully embodied artistically in his very uneven work. Kraus's personal associations were evidently a major factor in his high estimation of the scattered but accurately felt nuances of Altenberg's sketches. Nevertheless, with these reservations about Kraus's absolute verdict again, one can appreciate his preference. For, although some of Werfel's poems⁸²⁾ recall Altenberg's affectionate vignettes,⁸³⁾ these are the fruit of a mature wisdom that gives to the pathos and whimsical humour a single authority, above any sentimentality.

Kraus's reference to the Euphorion episode in Faust seems rather incongruous in the context; he contrasted it, as "der Urgegensatz von Vätern und Söhnen", with the

less intense conflict in Werfel's "Vater und Sohn" (F.484,95f.). The contrast is more polemical than illuminating, and is an example of Kraus's "vengeance" against the "Neutöner" for their disrespect for the literary tradition. In his "Bekenntnis" (WiV 79) Kraus declared himself to be an Epigone in the positive, active sense of an avenger of language. His aspiration to this role is exemplified in his parodies of Werfel and in his reaction to Spiegelmensch in particular.

ii) "Spiegelmensch": synopsis

Werfel's "Magische Trilogie" is an Expressionist Stationendrama on the Faust theme. The hero Thamal's inner conflict is projected into an open duel between his two souls: his better self, the "Seins-Ich"; and Spiegelmensch, the "Scheins-Ich", a Mephistophelian advocate of the false "Spiegelwerte", power, fame and lust.

The first part, set in an oriental monastery, represents the realm of the spirit. Thamal, in his introversion and self-pity, fails to qualify for a higher spiritual existence. In the second part, he is led through the realm of human relations by Spiegelmensch, his alter ego and tempter. He indirectly kills his father after a quarrel; as a lover he betrays a friend and then abandons the woman he makes pregnant. He nearly

achieves his apotheosis - and his liberation from his despised companion - as prophet and saviour of a captive people, but at the height of success he succumbs to the temptation of being deified. He is immediately ruined, his earlier guilt is revealed and he becomes powerless. In the third part, the realm of "Spiegelwerte", Spiegelmensch becomes independent and dominates him. Only when Thamal learns that his child died deformed does he recognize his guilt, and his moral recovery begins. At his trial he is forced to judge himself, and he condemns himself to death for his crimes. Spiegelmensch loses his hold over him, and, failing to frustrate Thamal's resolve to kill himself, is destroyed by Thamal's voluntary death. This heals Thamal and qualifies him for the higher reality of contemplation.

iii) Language and parody

Bahr's acclamation of the play as the Austrian Faust provoked Kraus to contrast it with Goethe's work. He alluded to the "two souls" in Werfel's breast and detected traces of both Faust and Mephisto in one speech by Thamal (F.561,66). Kraus's mere detection of "sources" - which also included Peer Gynt and The Road to Damascus - is not entirely satisfactory as a criticism, since his conception of originality allowed creative borrowing. What he could well criticize was the failure to create a viable context in which to integrate the

"altes Wort", and he did, indeed, criticize the often incongruous mixture of Expressionistic word-coining and Goethean idiom and metre.

Kraus most effectively satirized these incongruous stylistic elements of Werfel's play in Literatur, which is partly a pastiche of Faust, Spiegelmensch and contemporary jargon of both "literary" and commercial spheres. He ridiculed coinings like "Vater-Säure"⁸⁴⁾ and "Rampenflaus".⁸⁵⁾ The latter was intended by Werfel to mean the falsehood and gossip ("Flausen") of the theatre, but itself was a "false singular" - "Flaus" being cognate with "fleece". The following passage shows how such pedantic glossing, along with fragmentary quotation from both sources, forms part of an independent parodistic dialogue. After Kraus's Spiegelmensch has delivered a long diatribe against the eclecticism of the Son, Johann Wolfgang - a caricature of the would-be Goethean Werfel - the latter pictures the applause for his own play, egged on by his admirers, who continue:

Die Bewunderer: Ob du am Kreuz stirbst, ob im Rampenflaus -
Spiegelmensch: Verzeihung (nur was für die Zwischenpausen):
es war ein falscher Singular von Flausen -
Der Sohn: - so wird am Ende -
Die Bewunderer: - ein Erfolg daraus.
Welch Schauspiel!
Spiegelmensch: Aber ach! ein Schauspiel
nur! (Dr 63)

The quotations from Faust, out of context, are an apt

satirical comment on Werfel in the new context.

Similarly, the breaking of a sentence between speakers - as in the scene from Faust II where Helena learns to rhyme - implicitly invokes the original against Werfel. This piecemeal announcement of the gospel of (Johann Wolfgang's) success formally establishes its predictability, which contrasts with the almost indifferent option of martyrdom or controversy as means of attaining it.

Where Werfel travestied the text of Faust, Kraus's satire took on the pathos of the avenger of literary tradition. For example, lines 682f. of Faust I refer to Faust's unused inheritance of equipment and learning:

"Was du ererbt von deinen Vätern hast,
erwirb's, um es zu besitzen."

Although this comes shortly before Faust's suicide attempt and is another expression of the frustration of his desire for genuine experience by material confines, the noble theme of "streben" is sounded in the word "erwirb'". Werfel's Spiegelmensch varies these lines, referring to a financial inheritance and introducing the Expressionist theme of self-liberation through parricide:

"Das Erbe, dem du nicht entgehen kannst,
ermord es, um es - zu besitzen!"⁸⁶⁾

Kraus's Spiegelmensch "avenges" this travesty in a sobre play on words:

Wie, Mord am Vater? Nicht doch, kein Gedanke,
da wehrt dir doch die so beschriene Schranke.
Gedankenmord am Vater? Vaternmord
bloss am Gedanken und ererbtem Wort! (Dr 59)

iv) "Magic" and dramatic change

R. Bauer,⁸⁷⁾ on the basis of Werfel's reference to Spiegelmensch as a "Zauberspiel" and his emphasizing of the Baroque elements in Expressionism,⁸⁸⁾ sees Kraus's criticisms of Werfel's eclecticism as part of his rejection of the Neo-Baroque aspirations of Werfel and Hofmannsthal. Both terms, "magic"⁸⁹⁾ and "Baroque",⁹⁰⁾ are too imprecisely applied to be helpful here. Speculation on Kraus's aversion to any Baroque elements in Werfel and Hofmannsthal obscures the main issue, language.

Kraus himself helped to revive interest in forgotten Baroque poets, he respected Raimund, the main exponent of the "Zauberspiel", and even his drastic condemnation of Grillparzer (F.679,81) confined itself to the "dilettante" language of plays whose theatrical impact he acknowledged. The self-styled Epigone Kraus himself drew on the Viennese popular tradition as well as the Classics; his own mixture of Hochdeutsch and dialect could be seen as eclectic, were it not for an inherent vitality and unity of purpose which makes his work convincing and even original. A similar vitality he found in Nestroy's figures, who, with their native wit, use language to penetrate the stock dramatic situations and social responses and thus establish their own independent existence. The linguistic deficiency of

Spiegelmensch was the main object of Kraus's criticisms. In Literatur these were supplemented by satires on the "Wortballungen" of other Expressionists (Dr 16f.), the pseudo-literary terminology of admirers, the mutual admiration of successful authors, and their subservience to the hidden power of the press, seen when the Schwarz-Drucker enters like a deus ex machina (Dr 53ff.).

Literatur has neither the scale nor the tragic perspective of Die letzten Tage der Menschheit; there is no would-be detached commentator, like the Nörgler, to pin down the ugly clichés and stereotyped grotesques with his pessimistic verdict. Kraus's Spiegelmensch is too ephemeral a figure to act as a moral counterbalance to the paper world he denounces. Rather, Literatur achieves a conscious banality and is thus a comment on the hollow pretentiousness of Spiegelmensch.

In a way typical of the Expressionist Ich-Drama, Spiegelmensch is undramatic and there are no real tensions between characters. Minor figures are either mere foils for the Ich or inevitable components of the allegorical tableaux. Thus Thamal's father represents the past, his wife the present and his child the future. More serious, the main figures are also too dependent on their allegorical significance; the conflict between Thamal and Spiegelmensch, which comes to life in their literary debates, in other situations appears as the

obvious polarity that it is, constructed to rehearse a rather conventional moral, in a "magical" context that would allow a solution impossible in reality.⁹¹⁾ Yet the final achievement of harmony is not convincing, because the initial split of the personality and Thamal's constant flight from himself are inadequately motivated, and because *Spiegelmensch* is too grotesque, the sensations he offers too illusory, to exert the power that they are shown to have over the inexplicably weak Thamal. Despite the discrepancy between rhetoric and action, the "magical" inner change in the hero is brought about by scenic and visual effects. Yet such theatricality is insufficient, without a tighter dramatic conflict - which, of course, Expressionist drama generally disdained, in the aspiration to universal significance through projections of subjectivity. The analysis leaves one with that same unsatisfactory combination we noted earlier, of the "histrionic" with uncritical emotionalism. Werfel himself claimed that his "magic" was a means "träumend zu wissen";⁹²⁾ but he was using it not merely to seek radical moral answers, but to pose questions that were no longer related to the structure of the real world - despite the superficial topicality of some scenes.

The lack of credibility of the characters weakens the serious moral effect of Spiegelmensch. By contrast, Kraus's puppet-like figures are appropriate to the

conventions of the operetta and suitable for populating the superficial "literary" milieu evoked in Literatur. An example is Kraus's parody of the father-son conflict. At first the sons reject their Jewish family background, with its commercialism, for the more esoteric regions of the literary scene (Dr 15). The appearance of Werfel's Spiegelmensch from the broken mirror is parodied when the son throws a coffee-cup at his father and "a Spiegelmensch" appears when it breaks. The conflict is only resolved, and Spiegelmensch destroyed, by the co-operation of the press - but he continues to haunt the cliques after his departure. Whereas in Werfel's play Thamal becomes a responsible and harmonious being, here Johann Wolfgang finds his salvation when his half-ego is reinforced by another half-ego, Erich Wolfgang,⁹³⁾ who is acclaimed as the new Mozart (Dr 64).

The motivation of the final reconciliation between fathers and sons is also true to the spirit of operetta:

Denn die Operette setzt eine Welt voraus, in der die Ursächlichkeit aufgehoben ist [-...] (CM 148)

[-...] eine Welt [-...], in der sich der Unsinn von selbst versteht und in der er nie die Reaktion der Vernunft herausfordert [-...] (CM 149)

The Magical Operetta ends with the father's recognition that literature can be a profitable business not only for his son but for himself (Dr 71). The "magic" in the play is not, as was Werfel's, a questionable borrowing

from a naive tradition of an earlier age to effect an ideal transformation independent of reality;⁹¹⁾ it is, on the contrary, Kraus's own satirical symbol for a very real power in the modern world - the "schwarze Magie"⁹⁴⁾ of the press and publishing, which transforms everything that it taints (with black printer's ink) into part of its own commercial, culturally destructive system. "Literature", like the press, is here recognized as a business, an unholy alliance of the printed word with the organization of vested commercial interests that it serves. The phoney, borrowed lyricism, like the press's diversionary postures as informant and educator, is a decorative package that sells the commodity and that turns the nonentity into a public figure overnight - while the language and the ideals it embodied are devalued in the process. For precisely the theatrical, "magic" self-fulfilment - like the lyrical pathos of brotherhood common to verse and reviews - obscured the real, commercial "Wesenswandel" and the mutual admiration that "das Unwesen, das die Wertlosen zu Autoren macht"⁸⁾ fostered. This was the justification of Kraus's parodies of Werfel's lofty aspirations, as in the absurd reconciliation, in Literatur, of the seemingly irreconcilable - of father with son, of commerce with literature.

Kraus's hostile concern with the press and publishing - rather than with "wirtschaftliche Zusammenhänge" - was a polemical exaggeration, unacceptable outright as a

diagnosis of the evil in the modern world. Yet the imaginative conception of his apocalyptic vision does not invalidate his recognition of a dangerous ritual of modern society, by which a false "image" is constructed to embellish the sources of power and the values allegedly represented are desecrated. Only relatively recently, since an awareness of media has been stimulated by Marshall McLuhan,⁹⁵⁾ has Kraus's diagnosis been vindicated.

C h a p t e r S i x

S T E F A N G E O R G E

I

BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

i) Preliminary

The remarkable feature of Kraus's polemic against George is that it did not properly begin until December 1928. Up to 1927, his only published¹⁾ comment on George himself was an insignificant aside in 1901 (F.79,21). Kraus's first and only published statement in favour of the George-Kreis appeared in 1913 (F.374,17f; LL 353ff). Here he quoted Friedrich Gundolf's comparison of George and Hofmannsthal from "Das Bild Georges"²⁾ at length and applauded the "erfreuliche Erledigung des Ästhetens Borchardt" (LL 353). He welcomed the increasing demand for "eine Klarstellung der kunstgewerblichen Talente, die durch zwei Jahrzehnte für Künstler gehalten wurden" (LL 353). Apart from the severe verdict on Hofmannsthal, Kraus's criticism may seem surprising in view of the correspondence of his later criticisms of George to those by Borchardt which had provoked Gundolf's polemics.³⁾ Yet Kraus was evidently not well informed about George or Borchardt, as his designation of Borchardt as an aesthete - evidently intended as a contrast to George - suggests. The main motive of his citation of Gundolf was their mutual opposition to Hofmannsthal.

The first sign of a change in Kraus's attitude to the George-Kreis was his note "Vom Niveau der Sprache" in 1921 (F.577,59-64), where he expressed his abhorrence of Nietzsche's literary and philosophical influence, but in a more summary manner than he had rejected Heine ten years before. After another long excerpt from Gundolf,⁴⁾ Kraus reproached its author with borrowing insights from "Heine und die Folgen". This was probably unjust, since he seems to have overlooked the more direct influence of George himself on Gundolf's view of language and on his criticism of Heine. For the first time, Kraus also alluded to the discrepancy between Gundolf's intellectual dishonesty and the "ceremonial of a religion whose priest he is" (F.577,64).

ii) Exemplary figures

By 1913, Kraus had met the publisher Kurt Wolff, who had contacts with the George-Kreis. Wolff has left an account⁵⁾ of Kraus's active interest in the Kreis and his fascination for and distant approval of George at that time. Thus Kraus pumped Wolff for information about their activities. Apparently his interest in the Kreis was reciprocated, particularly by Gundolf and Wolfskehl, who were enthusiastic about his work.

Wolff has summarized the qualities that Kraus and George, despite marked differences, had in common. They were perfectionists over the printing of their works

and were uncompromisingly strict in demanding integrity from their associates. They were incorruptible, utterly opposed to the decadence of the age and the pollution of Geist by commercialism. Neither made concessions to contemporary taste or compromised with the organs of publicity. They were isolationists, each naturally dominant in his respective intellectual or cultural environment. To this one might add that both had an unfortunate capacity for creating often hysterical enthusiasm for themselves among the younger generation. An example of the uncritical attitude they could generate is Wolff's final point - with which one might firmly beg to differ - namely, that they were both "absolutely right, intellectually and personally, in attitudes, behaviour and judgement". Nevertheless, the fact that both laid claim to such infallibility makes the confrontation all the more interesting.

The obvious differences between George and Kraus need no detailed exposition - the aloof aesthete, and even the stern prophet of Der Siebente Ring with his studied mythical stance, was a far cry from the invincible literary polemicist and Nestroy's satirical heir. Yet in the years preceding 1914, George had at least emerged from his aesthetic seclusion to denounce the age in his "Zeitgedichte"; and Kraus, despite his satirical involvement with the "Stoff des Tages", had assumed increasingly anti-rational, anti-democratic and even aesthetic attitudes as his artistic self-assurance

developed. This narrowing of the natural gulf between them was stopped by the war.

Kraus's poem of 1929, "Nach dreissig Jahren. Rückblick der Eitelkeit" (F.810,1-12; WiV 518-529), written in Shakespearean blank verse, is a review of his struggle against the abuses of the age. It ends with an expression of determination to continue his lonely struggle, to be an example to what humanity is left in this doomed age (WiV 529). He makes it clear that he has no illusions about the effectiveness of his struggle, about his place in the world or about the possibility of imposing his own values on it (WiV 518). In this he seems to be implicitly distancing himself from George's aspirations as a prophet, and in the fifth section, beginning "Nur noch ein zweites Beispiel kennt die Zeit", the contrast with George is made explicit.

He reproaches George with diverting society "in eine Rosenlaube" rather than confronting it. He attacks the empty ceremonial of the George-cult and the gullibility of a public that believes in revelation where it sees seven seals (WiV 527). He criticizes George for merely residing in the temple, "woraus es nie/zu treiben galt die Händler und die Wechsler" (WiV 527) - implying that his own active opposition is a sacred mission. Yet the difference is one of commitment in the artistic as well as in the social sense:

$\overline{\text{---}}$ Nie hat er
den Stoff, durchdringend bis zum Geist,
erlebt, erlitten, und er hat das Leid
des Kampfes sich erlassen wie der Welt,
die solche Abkehr ihm, solch ein Verzichten
aufs höchste dankt und für die Hieroglyphen,
die er in eingeräumter Ferne zeichnet,
ihn heiligspricht. $\overline{\text{---}}$ (WiV 526f.)

The public recognition alluded to here is discussed in the next section. That the overtly stylized persona of an aloof prophet was the sign of an incomplete commitment by the man to his vocation is a serious polemical point; but it needs more specific corroboration than the lofty rhetorical context of the poem allows. The poem - which can be taken as an answer to George's two prophetic "Zeitgedichte" in Der Siebente Ring⁶⁾ - instead outlines George's complacency in Kraus's own literary terms, "Ursprung" and "Ziel":

 Und der das Ziel noch vor dem Weg gefunden,
 er kam vom Ursprung nicht. $\overline{\text{---}}$ (WiV 527)

Again, the criticism implies an ideal to which Kraus himself aspired. To prove his own exemplary stature as against George's, he had not only to criticize but to fulfil himself artistically in the process.

iii) Public recognition

The reputations of both George and Kraus, despite their aloofness, grew throughout Europe in the 'twenties. There had been many editions of George's earlier works, many articles about him. In 1927 he received the

Goethe-Preis, and the publication of his Collected Works attracted even greater attention. The flood of articles, press reviews, special issues of periodicals, tributes, comparisons, dissertations and literary historical studies which this edition and George's sixtieth birthday in 1928 occasioned,⁷⁾ at last brought him within range of Kraus's publicistic criticism.

As part of a longer political "Rechenschaftsbericht" in December 1928, Kraus exposed the Viennese Arbeiter-Zeitung for deleting his name from a specific comparison, by F. Leschnitzer, of George's cultivation of language in isolation with his activity as both "Zeitkämpfer" and "Diener am Wort" (F.795,40-45). This dishonesty was an extreme case of the non-recognition of Kraus's work by all those who borrowed his ideas and insights in order to acclaim George's preservation of language from contemporary vulgarity. For the first time, the press had acknowledged his "eigensten Bestand an Wert oder Unwert", yet accredited it to George. The reason for this discrimination Kraus saw in George's abstention from the polemical, public commitment to his ideas that had earned him the "hatred of contemporaries". That, Kraus declared,

[/.../] das ist die Unredlichkeit, die mir diese Anbetungsorgie um den sechzigjährigen George zum Greuel macht und selbst den Respekt vor einem Dichterleben herabsetzt, das sich zeremoniös, aber in hoher Zucht vom Jahrmarkt abzusondern wusste und

dessen Ertrag vor dem allzu Gegenwärtigen doch ein ethisches Plus bedeutet hat. (F.795,4)

This was at once his first open tribute to George's ethical integrity as a literary figure and a retraction of it.

One of the offenders was Gundolf again, who, Kraus alleged, had omitted reference to him in a context that demanded it - namely, a tribute to George as the only German man of letters who had kept his integrity in the modern world [F.795,4f] and had upheld the values of language and Geist. Kraus was annoyed since - as he knew from Wolff⁵⁾ - Die Fackel had "long" served George and his Kreis in their study of language (F.795,4). The blatant omission might have been in accordance with the disciples' belief that their Master had no living equal; but Gundolf's possible apprenticeship to Die Fackel at the time of writing was shorter than Kraus thought, for the passage in question was from the book-edition of an essay of 1913.⁸⁾ There is certainly no evidence to justify his inclusion of George himself in the reproach; Wolff's account⁵⁾ does not mention George in connection with Gundolf's and Wolfskehl's interest in Kraus. Kraus blurred this distinction, and threatened to expose their borrowing of his insights as superficial and second-hand (F.795,5f.). It is possible, too, that Kraus thought George's formulations from "Über Dichtung" - which in fact date from 1894, but which appeared in a

second edition of Tage und Taten in 1925⁹⁾ - were influenced by his own ideas on language, since it is almost certain that he did not become acquainted with "Über Dichtung" until these years, as we shall see in Part II.

Another example of the publicity to which Kraus objected was Paul Kluckhohn's tribute, "Stephan /sic/ George. Zu seinem 60. Geburtstage", in the Wiener Neueste Nachrichten of 12th July, 1928. He quoted Kluckhohn's claim that George had needed to withdraw from the world for the sake of linguistic purism and had only "spoken again to his people in simpler language" once he was sure that his language could not be confused with commercial jargon or cliché /F.795,4/. Kraus's answer to this was an ultimatum:

Ich könnte - mit Ausnahme einiger unantastbar schönen Verse - diese Sicherheit zerstören, indem ich imstande wäre, gerade an den repräsentativsten Gebilden der Georgeschen Lyrik zwar nicht den Einfluss des Marktes, wohl aber des Klischees aufzuzeigen. (F.795,4)

In stark contrast to George's anniversary in 1928, the thirtieth anniversary of Die Fackel was not celebrated in the press.¹⁰⁾ Kraus himself marked the occasion, on 29th April, 1929, at his five-hundredth recital, by reading "Nach dreissig Jahren", at the beginning of which, in a fine piece of rhetoric, he reclaimed those of his achievements which the press had attributed to George (WiV 518).

In May 1930, Kraus repeated the ultimatum that one day, if "more profane issues" allowed him time, he would refute George's acclaimed poetic greatness "mit sprachkritischer Beweiskraft" (F.834,15). At the end of 1932, when "profane issues" were more urgent than ever, he chose as his departure-point George's translation of Shakespeare's Sonnets, once neglected (F.885,49f), but now (1931) republished in the Collected Works.¹¹⁾

Kraus's concern with it was an example of his repeatedly announced "Flucht in die geistigen Dinge" (F.845,3) in face of disastrous political developments. Almost simultaneous with his urgent political polemic, "Hüben und Drüben" (F.876,1ff.), was his polemic "Sakrileg an George oder Sühne an Shakespeare?" (F.885,45-64), which he read in four cities between 24th October and 15th November 1932 (F.885,13ff.).

KRAUS'S LITERARY CRITICISM

i) Knowledge of George's work

It is most probable that Kraus's interest in George had originally been attracted by the poet's stature rather than his work. A number of undated notes by Kraus, which almost certainly date from 1927 and 1928,¹²⁾ provide fairly reliable evidence that he was not very well versed in George's work, until these years at least. They include a copy, in Kraus's hand, of the stanza from Der Stern des Bundes¹³⁾ that he criticized in "Der Reim" (Spr 403f.) in 1927, and also long passages from Kluckhohn's article of 1928, copied in Kraus's hand. The other notes appear to date from this time.

Kluckhohn's is not a profound study, but a summary of George's development and major achievements. So the fact that Kraus, with scarcely any sarcastic underlining, copied down over one third of this (approximately) 1,260-word article - along with the fact that, on another sheet, he simply noted titles like "Stern des Bundes", "Jahr der Seele" and the first line "Komm in den totgesagten park und schau" - suggests that up to this time he lacked a broad knowledge of George's work. In addition, he copied Kluckhohn's quotation of "Die Spange"¹⁴⁾ and of strophes 1 and 3 of "Ihr meiner zeit genossen kanntet schon".⁶⁾ His unfamiliarity is confirmed by his copying of all four strophes of this

"Zeitgedicht" on another sheet.¹⁵⁾

On the other hand, it must be remembered that he did not consider it essential to have a thorough knowledge of the works of an author, since the value or otherwise of literary language could, in his view, be determined in the nuances of a brief excerpt. He never undertook a full-scale critique of George's original poetry. Here we can only infer the critical intention of his handwritten notes, which are almost exclusively quotations from George.

It appears that the content of the "Zeitgedichte" and of some of George's maxims "Über Dichtung" interested Kraus. Considering Kraus's view of poetic context as an intact, organic unity, one can appreciate why he copied the following:

"Der wert einer dichtung ist auch nicht bestimmt durch einen einzelnen wenn auch noch so glücklichen fund in zeile strofe oder grösseren abschnitt..die zusammenstellung, das verhältnis der einzelnen teile zueinander, die notwendige folge des einen aus dem andern kennzeichnet erst die hohe dichtung."⁹⁾

Yet "die hohe dichtung" is too aristocratic a term for Kraus, and George's stress on "zusammenstellung" evokes a more mechanical procedure than that "erotic adventure" to which Kraus claimed to expose himself in revising the form of his own poetry and prose.

ii) Rhyme

Most of Kraus's quotations¹²⁾ seem to be a record

of George's rhymes. Thus, in quoting the first couplet of "Wellen" from "Gezeiten",¹⁶⁾ he underlined the esoteric "zwiesel", which was rhymed with "kiesel". He singled out "Verschollen des traumes", one of the "Lieder" from Der Siebente Ring,¹⁷⁾ evidently for the impure rhymes "herabkunft"-"abgrund", "glutschwall"-"flutprall" and "schwurlaut"-"urlaub", as well as "mienen"-"ruh nun"-
ihnen" - Du nur" in the last stanza.

Yet in his essay "Der Reim" he took a different line of argument. There he quoted four lines of a poem from Der Stern des Bundes:

"Nachdem der kampf gekämpft das feld gewonnen
Der boden wieder schwoll für frische saat
Mit kränzen heimwärts zogen mann und maat:
Hat schon im schönsten gau das fest begonnen
/.../"¹³⁾

Kraus, rather pedantically, criticized the dependence of both perfects and imperfects on "nachdem", and saw the rhyme of "saat" with "maat" as pure, but unnatural:

/.../ welche Überraschung für die Saat, die doch
 von Natur höchstens auf Mahd gefasst wäre. /-/-/
 Und wie blinkt dieser Reim doch vor Reinheit! Ein
 ästhetisches Gesetz wäre dem Vorgang der Schöpfung,
 der im poetischen Leben kein anderer ist als im
 erotischen /.../, eben nicht aufzuzwingen. (Spr 403f.)

In accordance with his own belief in the value of resurrecting the "altes Wort", Kraus was here asserting that purity itself was inadequate as a criterion for rhymes; that rhyme-pairs had to be naturally suited to each other, erotically attracted, as it were, as they are

in the famous scene between Faust and Helena. For Kraus, the simplest, most familiar rhymes of the German language could be the greatest.

Kraus obviously objected to "bloss ein wortspiel" in the following maxim of George's, which he copied down:

"Reim ist bloss ein wortspiel wenn zwischen den durch den reim verbundenen worten keine innere verbindung besteht."⁹⁾

On the surface, the demand for an "innere verbindung" coincides with what Kraus demands in "Der Reim", when he states that, if a rhyme is not "von innen dazu angetan", it is "nichts als eine Schallverstärkung des Gedächtnisses" (Spr 358). However, closer investigation shows their views on the nature of this poetic bond to be markedly different. In 1894 George also declared:

"Reim ist ein teuer erkaufte spiel. hat ein künstler einmal zwei worte miteinander gereimt so ist eigentlich das spiel für ihn verbraucht und er soll es nie oder selten wiederholen."¹⁸⁾

George also avoided rhymes favoured by others. This practice was certainly a technical accomplishment in itself, but precisely the kind of aesthetic formula to which Kraus objected, since originality lay "zwischen den Worten". These rules of George's produced some pairs that abuse more obvious rhyme conventions and are scarcely elegant. An example is the rhyme of "filterung" with "erinnerung" from lines 10 and 12 of his translation of Shakespeare's Fifth Sonnet, which Kraus criticized (F.885,56).¹⁹⁾

Während bei ihr [...] zwischen Wesen und Sprache nichts unerfüllt und nichts einem irdischen Mass zugänglich bleibt, so dürfte die zeitliche Unnahbarkeit und Unantastbarkeit von Erscheinungen wie Rilke und George - mit Niveaukünstlern und Zeitgängern wie Hofmannsthal und Werfel nicht zu verwechseln - doch keinem kosmischen Mass erreichbar sein. (Spr 421)

At the beginning of "Sakrileg an George [7]", in another very complex formulation, Kraus again raised the question of George's stature and the public's awe for his apparent impenetrability. He also repeated his amazement that George's language was accepted with the same awe (F.885,45). Again blaming George for his publicity, he provisionally accounted for the awe and enthusiasm as a symptom of the general tendency in Central Europe towards subordination. George did, indeed, encourage enthusiasm excessively, albeit not in the general public but in his followers,²⁰⁾ who are notorious for

ignoring his weaknesses.

Whereas in his attack of 1928 he bore considerable resentment towards those who had ignored him, here Kraus gave authority to these criticisms in a fuller exposition of his literary argument. To Kraus, the greatest mystery of all was the acknowledgement of George's discipline - in what to him was "eine rein kunstgewerbliche Angelegenheit, die von einem aussergeistigen Willen bestimmt und mit beträchtlicher Folgerichtigkeit geführt wird"

(F.885,46) - as having value as poetic language. Here he was referring particularly to the graphic and orthographic elegance of George's work. He followed this by making more explicit his earlier acknowledgement and rejection of George's formal virtuosity. He was harsher than ever about this "tedious labour", and at the same time acknowledged some of the brilliant exceptions to George's severe rule:

Die versprengten lyrischen Zeilenwerte, dem Vorsatz zur Vereinfachung, zum Volksliedhaften entstammt, als dem immerhin vorstellbaren Erlebnis eines Verschnörkelten, eines sakral Ornamentierten - diese Stäubchen Goldes wiegen auf der Wage meines Sprachbewusstseins ja doch die massige Mühsal nicht auf, deren geistiger Inhalt und Sprachwert mich keineswegs als die Flucht aus der Zeit in die Ewigkeit überzeugt, aber durchaus als die Flucht eines Zeitgenossen ins Hieratistische, als die Ausflucht dessen, der vor der ewigen Gefahr der Sprache im sichern Hort des Kommerz- und Journalstils geborgen ist und von diesem Zustand durch gewisse Zeremonien ablenken möchte. (F.885,46)

Kraus rejected George's representative products: the "Stäubchen Goldes" were the exceptions, which proved that George's elegant formalism was not the necessary expression of his poetic experience. He gave no examples of these "unantastbar schönen Verse", as he had called the exceptions in 1928 (F.795,4); but among his handwritten excerpts¹²⁾ are two from Der Siebente Ring that indeed fit his description of 1932. One is the first strophe of "Kunfttag I";²¹⁾ the other is the first of the "Lieder":

"Dies ist ein lied
Für dich allein:
Von kindischem wännen
Von frommen tränen..
Durch morgengärten klingt es
Ein leichtbeschwingtes.
Nur dir allein
Möcht es ein lied
Das rühre sein."²²⁾

In copying four lines from "Was gelitten ist beschwichte", on the other hand, Kraus underlined "sende":

"Nun bestimmt die höhere sende
wie ich mich in dir vollende."²³⁾

"Sende" meant "sedge" or "heather" and in normal usage does not have the sense of "Sendung". In the four lines Kraus copied from

"So weit eröffne sich geheime kunde
Dass vollzahl mehr gilt als der teile tucht ∟.∟.∟"²⁴⁾

the word "tucht" is underlined, and the copy stops after the word "Tempeleis". This is the most laconic of all comments on George's cultivation of rare words. In the

case of "tucht" (meaning "strength"), George was artificially reviving a word that had been obsolete since the sixteenth century.²⁵⁾ This procedure was characteristic of his conscious striving for originality and unique expression in every part of his aesthetic domain. To Kraus it was the consistent realization of an "aussergeistigen Willen" (F.885,46); for in his view Geist was inherent in language, and such philological experiments had little to do with the poet's creative use of language.

In his opposition to contemporary values, Kraus's standard was the auctoritas²⁶⁾ of the literary language, the established, rich tradition, as whose interpreter he saw himself. George's norm, on the other hand, was vetustas;²⁶⁾ as the master of high style, he cultivated archaic and exquisite Sprachmaterial, and eradicated supposed banality. To Kraus, this inevitably appeared as the avoidance of a problematic confrontation with the contemporary language. He did not deny the possibility of a "flight into eternity" through art - that was, indeed, one dimension of his own idealism - but it could only be achieved by an artist whose experience of his medium was deeper and more comprehensive than George, with his all too exclusive formulae, dared to have. To what extent this categorical criticism is more than a part of the stylized antithesis that it was in "Nach dreissig Jahren" will be seen in the rest of this chapter.

The motif of flight from literary sterility into a decorative gesture aimed at diverting attention is familiar from Kraus's observations on Harden and Kerr. Precisely because George's language and persona were the extreme of self-stylization, Kraus sought to deflate it - as he had Harden's - and even to prove that the apparent originality was superficial, that the preciousness was akin to the "Kommerz- und Journalstil" of the day.²⁷⁾

The juxtaposition of George's and his own translations of Shakespeare's Sonnets indeed recalls the more light-hearted "Harden-Lexika". His critique of George's First Sonnet takes the form of a gloss, through which he reveals traces of commercialese in George's style. For example, in the first line

"Von schönsten wesen wünscht man einen spross"
he spaced "schönsten" for emphasis and commented:

"Von schönsten Wesen" gibt es nur in der Kommerz-
sprache; bei Artikeln hat der Superlativ keinen
Artikel: Schönste Wesen hier vorrätig. (F.885,54)

He then glossed the pretentious and idiosyncratic phrases of lines 6f.:

"/--/ Du nährst dein licht mit eignen wesens loh,
Machst aus dem überfluss die teure-zeit, /.../"
Des Wesens Loh und die Teure-Zeit: alles hat doch im
Kunstgewerbe Raum! (F.885,55)

The Baroque word "loh"²⁸⁾ is typical of George's archaisms. "Teure-zeit" is a poor rendering of "famine" in the context, and it certainly had strong commercial connotations,²⁹⁾ to which Kraus's gloss alludes. Such

misleading preciosity mars much of George's poetry, and Kraus's disrespect for it was as justified as his deflating of Harden's bombast. Yet just as in his polemic against Kerr and Wolff he had relied on a select minimum of stylistic evidence, so here the stylistic evidence of George's unoriginality was too scarce for the valid polemical point to become the basis for reliable literary conclusions.

To approach George's language at all, it is necessary to abandon preconceptions against which some of his idiosyncrasies would offend. Just as an acceptance of Kraus's absolute authority undermines the critic's objectivity, so with George's poetry. His followers could claim that the Master's will was a law unto itself, and created its own standards, which made it immune from outside criticism. Yet this argument is weakened the more creation involves factors beyond the sovereign will of the poet, as does verse translation, where the stimulus is a literary model with a quality and form of its own that have to be honoured. This was clearly one reason for Kraus's choice of George's Shakespeare translations as the focus of his literary polemic.

iv) The approach to Shakespeare

George's capacity as a linguist and translator has received considerable attention,³⁰⁾ and no general comments

need be added here. Kraus was moved to challenge George's acknowledged mastery as a verse translator, firstly, by a remark that he copied down from Kluckhohn's article:

"Seine Übersetzungen [̄.̄.] waren für ihn selbst letzten Endes nur Übungsarbeiten zur Schärfung und Verfeinerung seiner spärlichen Mittel."¹²⁾

Secondly, Richard Flatter, a more literal translator whom he had attacked,³¹⁾ sent him some translations of Shakespeare's Sonnets in October 1932, to show how much he had improved; for comparison he suggested the versions by George, Ludwig Fulda and Emil Ludwig.³²⁾

In reply to Flatter, Der Verlag der Fackel thanked him for the stimulus to a comparative study, from which a genuine "Nachdichtung" might emerge.³³⁾ Kraus compared Flatter's "korrekte Ernüchterung des Erlebnisinhaltes" to George's monstrosities and the platitudes of others;³³⁾ he acknowledged Flatter's honourable intention of salvaging at least part of Shakespeare in German, but he doubted his ability to create a poem.³³⁾ In the conviction that literal translation could not recreate poetry, Kraus asserted that Flatter's version contained more of him than of Shakespeare; he acknowledged the translator's theoretical insights, and suggested that in accordance with them Flatter should give up the practice. This, and "Sakrileg an George [̄.̄.], provoked a fierce polemic from Flatter.

In Kraus's view, even George was a "Verwörtlicher" (F.885,49) and not comparable to the unique poetic amalgam constituted by Schlegel and Tieck. The translations of the Sonnets, he said, showed most clearly the ideas of the educated public on poetry, verse and rhyme, and on what is plausible in language (F.885,48); far worse than the numerous violations of Shakespeare's dramas, they were among the blackest marks in German cultural history (F.885,47). Kraus therefore decided to enact sacrilege and vengeance - to confront George's Sonnets with his own "Nachdichtung". For this, he asserted, a knowledge of English was less essential than a knowledge of German, since he could infer the literal meaning from George and other versions. His authority was his faith in language and the conviction that he could do better (F.885,50).

v) "Nachdichtung"

In 1922/23 Kraus criticized Rilke's translation of Louise Labé's Second Sonnet as "Sachlyrik" (F.608,58); in his own version (F.474,82;WiV 242), with which he compared it, he had sought to preserve the pathos of the infatuated lover. In 1924 he juxtaposed his, Rilke's and Felix Grafe's translations (F.640,52f;Spr 159ff.), and remarked that his own attempt kept less closely to the original but removed some of the incongruities of the other versions. His translation is, indeed, the most

convincing, and his criticism reveals a great sensitivity to the properties of language involved in translation.

The Schlegel-Tieck translation of Shakespeare was one of the original masterpieces of the German language that inspired Kraus. As the essence of Wortdrama, it had a prominent place in the repertoire of Kraus's recitals, his "Theater der Dichtung". As did his revival of Nestroy and Offenbach, this involved him in considerable textual study. In 1926, in an essay entitled "Hexenszenen und anderes Grauen" (F.724,1-44;Spr 163-200), he criticized and compared translations of Hamlet, King Lear and Macbeth. He singles out Gundolf's version,³⁴⁾ in particular, as "ein standard work gewissenhafter Shakespeare-Verschandelung", a violation of the living text of Schlegel and Tieck (Spr 165). There follows a detailed and often sensitive analysis, by means of quotation and glossing, in which the original text serves as a weapon of vengeance against the offender. Kraus concludes that the scholar who is not a poet does more harm than the poet who is ignorant of the language of the original (Spr 195), and even admits his own ignorance of English (Spr 197). His dissatisfaction with existing translations led him to attempt his own "Nachdichtung" of Macbeth on the basis of other versions, and he later attempted this with other works not already satisfactorily rendered by Schlegel and Tieck.³⁵⁾ True translation, for Kraus, had to be a "Nachbildung der Vision, des Gedankens,

der Stimmungsfarbe mit den Mitteln der andern Sprache [̄.̄.]
auf die Gefahr hin, selbst das Vorstellungsmaterial
einer Wendung durch ein ganz anderes ersetzen zu müssen"
(Spr 200). He therefore asserted the poet's right to
render a particular Shakespearean term "durch das
wörtliche Gegenteil" (Spr 167).

In "Sakrileg an George oder Sühne an Shakespeare?", in his general criticism of the way existing translations trivialized the Sonnets, Kraus particularly condemned the reduction of the final couplet from a powerful summary to "ein Geklapper", "eine angehängte Sentenz" (F.885,47), the "widerliche Veräusserlichung des erotischen Problems" and the domestication, by lyrical nonentities, of

[-..] Shakespeare-Empfindungen, die in der Glut zwischen Jüngling und Dame kreuzen - Sehnsucht nach Erhaltung des männlichen Schönheitsbildes, Eifersucht, die das weibliche umloht - kurz das lebendige Chaos /[-..] (F.885,48)

This erotic vision shows his appreciation of the dramatic interplay of passions in the Sonnets, which was a more familiar characteristic of Shakespearean drama.

In this context he reiterated his ideal of "Nachdichtung" more fully:

Schöpferisch zu ersetzen, in das eigene Erlebnis zu versetzen. Es wäre ein Nachdichten, das durch doppelte Bindung sich mit weit grösserer Verantwort-

lichkeit zu beglaubigen hätte als das Dichten im eigenen Erlebnisraum; es wäre der Versuch, Gefühle und Gedanken so in jene des Nachführenden und in die der andern Sprache zu übertragen, so einzuschöpfen, dass der Eindruck zwingend werde, der Dichter hätte, in dieser Welt und Sprache lebend, nicht anders gedichtet. Es käme da auf die Kraft an, den Atem zu erhalten, die Lebensfülle zwischen den Worten und nicht deren Identität, die doch in der anderen Sprache eine andere Beziehung ergibt. (F.885,48f.)

It is both an admission of the problems confronting the translator of poetry and a summary of his vision of great poetry. The awareness of a "doppelte Bindung" and of the different "Erlebnisraum" suggests that Kraus's conception of poetic translation was compatible with the dualistic structure that inspired his own work. It remains to be seen whether his experience of the alien sphere of Shakespeare's Sonnets was direct enough for him to fulfil himself as he did in the interplay between his "public" satire or polemic and the "private" values of his lyrical and "erotic" experience.

THE RIVAL POETS AS TRANSLATORS

i) Polemic and content

Before entering on a close analysis and juxtaposition of Sonnets CXVI, I, V, VI, CL, CXXXV, CXXXVI, CXXVIII, VIII and LXXXI, Kraus made a general criticism of George's spelling and punctuation, to which he attributed the whole spell cast by him (F.885,50).

In glossing George's version of Sonnet V, he used the text as a weapon against its author. He emphasized the words "Saft dürr" in George's second quatrain

"Den sommer treibt die zeit die nimmer steht
Greulichem winter zu und tilgt ihn dort:
Saft dürr im frost und üppig laub verweht!
Schönheit vereist! Kahlheit an jedem ort!

and commented:

Saft dürr! George schildert den Winter mit Rufzeichen.
Er behält recht: Schönheit vereist! Kahlheit an
jedem Ort! (F.885,56)

He himself succeeded to some extent in preserving "die innere Süsse", as he said (F.885,56) alluding to George's last line; but he inevitably lost such images as "lusty leaves".

Where he did surpass George was in rendering Shakespeare's word-play, as in the "Will" Sonnets, CXXXV, CXXXVI, the rival versions of which he juxtaposed (F.885,59ff.). This was familiar ground for him, whereas George had always contemptuously excluded word-play from his poetic domain. Here Kraus complained that he gave

the game away by - for once - using capitals ("Will"), and also by not inflecting the accusative and dative of "Wille"; George was a "Wortspielverderber" (F.885,59). Kraus's tendency to depart from the original is compensated by his ability to recreate the spirit of Shakespeare's quibbles. Thus in the third quatrain of his CXXXV the word-play is supplemented by echoes of the rhymes within the line:

Du willst so viel, du gleichst darin dem Meer,
das alle Wasser fasst: so gleich ihm ganz;
die Willensfülle würde mein Begeh'r
noch mehren, noch ein Will' will Toleranz.³⁶⁾

He also turned the text to polemical advantage, after juxtaposing their versions of Sonnet VIII. The proverbial ending "Thou single wilt prove none" he rendered by "Steht einer einsam, stellt er keinen vor!" To end his recital, he used this as a polemical allusion to the question of stature, which in "Nach dreissig Jahren" had been expounded less tersely:

Das wäre freilich erst ein Problem, in welchem Fall
einer, der einsam steht, keinen vorstellt, und in
welchem Falle doch einen! (F.885,63)

There are other sonnets that could have served Kraus in his polemic, but he did not emphasize them. Sonnets LXXVI to LXXXVI, plus XXI - the "rival poet" series - as well as CI, are concerned with the distinctions between artificiality and true beauty or true poetry. For example, CI, line 6, reads:

"Truth needs no colour with his colour fixed";³⁷⁾

and the sentiments of Sonnet LXXVI were surely close to the heart of that regenerator of "das alte Wort", Kraus:

"Why with the time do I not glance aside
To new-found methods, and to compounds strange?
Why write I still all one, ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed,
That every word doth almost tell my name,
Showing their birth, and where they did proceed? (3-8)
[--] So all my best is dressing old words new,
Spending again what is already spent [..]" (11f.)

Yet he did not translate all such passages successfully.

In his mundane summary of lines 7 and 8, "every word" loses the very quality in question, the "erotic" element on which he elsewhere prided himself:

[..] wo jedes Wort schon auf den Autor weist,
an jedem gleich erkennbar wird sein Wille?

This is no improvement on the literal George:

"Dass fast aus jedem wort mein name scheine,
Die herkunft zeigend und wie es entstand?"

But where "all my best is dressing old words new", the difference between our rival poets is revealed both in theory and practice. George is unconvincing here:

"Mein bestes: altes wort in neuer zier:
Dies tu ich immer, ists auch schon getan." (11f.)

Kraus's alternative also has a different emphasis from the original, but at least this confession of faith in the familiar, unpretentious language of love gains a certain "new life" from the careful placing of precisely these simple ("old") words in the context:

[...] und leih ich alten Worten neues Leben,
so ist mein Lied das alte doch geblieben. (11f.)

George's "zier", while closer to "dressing", conveys more the rarified refinement at which he aimed, but which was often juxtaposed with a cliché like his line 12. Throughout the Sonnets, he used "zier" and its compounds inconsistently.³⁸⁾ The only example of this usage criticized by Kraus was George's coining "entzieren" in V, line 3, for Shakespeare's verb "unfair". However, provided one accepts "zier" as an equivalent of the epithet "fair", the coining itself is justified, precisely because "zier" has a special sense for George, which would not be conveyed by the normal "verunzieren". Although the implicit equation of the factitious "zier" with the natural beauty evoked by "fair" is quite alien to the spirit of Shakespeare's verse, Kraus did not argue this point.

ii) Detailed analysis: CXVI

("Let me not to the marriage of true minds")

George:

"Man spreche nicht bei treuer geister bund
Von hindernis! Liebe ist nicht mehr liebe
Die eine Änderung sah als Änderungs-grund
Und mit dem schiebenden willfährig schiebe.

O nein, sie ist ein immer fester turm
Der auf die wetter schaut und unberennbar.
Sie ist ein stern für jedes schiff im sturm:
Man misst den stand, doch ist sein wert unnennbar.

Lieb' ist nicht narr der zeit: ob rosen-mund
Und -wang auch kommt vor jene sichelhand..
Lieb' ändert nicht mit kurzer woch und stund,
Nein, sie hält aus bis an des grabes rand.

Ist dies irrtum der sich an mir bewies,
Hat nie ein mensch geliebt, nie schrieb ich dies."

Kraus's spacings [/F.885,53/] are underlined here. He criticized "treuer geister bund", because "geister" evokes "spirits", not "minds"; and he strongly objected to the verbs in the first quatrain: "ist" - "säh" - "schiebe". Such anomalies in the sequence of tenses, which are not infrequent in George's verse,³⁹⁾ exemplify the inconsistency of his aesthetic attitude to language. His categorical preference for rare usage and vocabulary led to the adoption of a verb inappropriate in the context, yet his sense of euphony made him disdain the more logical form "schöbe" for "schiebe" - which in Kraus's view was "unmöglich". The contrived combination "willfährig schiebe" is, indeed, scarcely a rendering of "bends with the remover to remove". "Bends" signifies a change of course, and "remove" the withdrawal of love, that is, inconstancy. "Schieben" has connotations far too physical not to be incongruous. On the other hand, the association of "schieben" with war-profiteers, which must have been uppermost in Kraus's mind, would not itself prove George's kinship with the commercial spirit of the age.

Arguing as he had done against "saat" and "maat" (Spr 403), Kraus objected that "woch und stund" was not

a poetic combination. It certainly is an inelegant rendering of "hours and weeks". Kraus's rather pedantic point was that "Stunde" could be subject to apocope ("Stund'") when combined with monosyllables like "Tag", "Jahr" or "Mond", but not with another apocope like "Woch".

When Kraus detected a deviation by George from the metrical pattern of lines 2 and 13, Flatter accused him of ignoring the possibility of "schwebende Betonung".⁴⁰⁾ Generally, this was untrue, of course. During the preceding decade in his essays and glosses on linguistic and poetic problems he had shown great insight into nuances of metre and rhythm, in defiance of rigid metricians.⁴¹⁾ He had concluded:

Was in einem Vers betont und was unbetont ist,
entscheidet nicht das Gewicht der Silbe als solcher,
sondern das Gewicht der Anschauung, das ihr in der
Zusammensetzung und vollends in der Verbindung der
Worte bleibt und vom Gedanken zuerkannt wird [^...^]
(Spr 377)

In other words, Kraus's criteria, for metre as for rhyme, were not rigid but depended on the quality of the context and the richness of associations. His general criticism of George was that he put "das gedanklich Unbetonte in die Hebung und das Betonte in die Senkung" (F.885,50), which forced the reader to misconstrue the idea in order to scan the line correctly. His pedantry over line 2 was a deliberate ploy to show George's inconsistency. Flatter argued that George had inserted

"mehr" to make up the metre.⁴²⁾ Yet, as Kraus indicated, this would produce "Liebé ist nicht mehr Liebe" - only a compromise with the demands of metre. "Schwebende Betonung" is too loosely applied by Flatter to serve more than to blur the issue of the reduncance of "mehr". Moreover, if it were placed on the first "Liebe", it would, if anything, mar the decisiveness of the preceding statement; if it were used on "-be ist nicht mehr" to avoid stressing either "ist" or "nicht", it would lose precisely the frank impact that is made by "Love is not love" whichever of its components is stressed. The simple fact that "Liebe" always has one syllable⁴³⁾ more than "love" makes it less variable in a metrical context. While Shakespeare's line can be given a variety of stresses without distorting the natural rhythm, "Liebe", with its naturally trochaic value, cannot be manipulated so freely without distortion. It can be reduced, by apocope, to "Lieb'", but this, too, is not a natural German equivalent, especially since it can never have the full vocal value of the English "love".⁴⁴⁾ This is a case where the translator must accept the intrinsic differences in the languages.

Kraus made his criticism of line 13 polemically convincing by an immediate improvement on George (F.885,53):

Ist Irrtum dies, der sich an mir bewies.

This internal rhyme, he claimed, would have been the only good rhyme in George's poem. Yet, he continued, it sounded hollow, because it rested on a misinterpretation.

He believed that the sense of George's couplet was that the poet would retract his vow if it prove erroneous. In Shakespeare's lines, he went on, the poet pledges his whole existence as a writer for the truth of his vow; that is, if the vow is false, the poet has "never written" anything. Flatter indignantly rejected this as a misinterpretation by Kraus.⁴⁰⁾ Kraus may, indeed, have defined "dies" too narrowly - as "vow" rather than "poem" - but by "vow" he of course meant the poetic statement, and not the "marriage" of line 1, as Flatter pedantically construed it,⁴²⁾ and the criticism is invalidated by Kraus's translation of the couplet. He was not misinterpreting but rather strictly interpreting George's version. This does contain, through the misleading emphasis on "dies", an antithetical balance which could imply a retraction:

"Ist dies irrtum [...] nie schrieb ich dies."

Kraus's own translation followed his criticism (F.885,54):

Nichts löst die Bande, die die Liebe bindet.
Sie wäre keine, könnte hin sie schwinden,
weil, was sie liebt, ihr einmal doch entschwindet;
und wäre sie nicht Grund, sich selbst zu gründen.

Sie steht und leuchtet wie der hohe Turm,
der Schiffe lenkt und leitet durch die Wetter,
der Schirmende, und ungebeugt vom Sturm,
der immer wartend unbedankte Retter.

Lieb' ist nicht Spott der Zeit, sei auch der Lippe,
die küssen konnte, Lieblichkeit dahin;
nicht endet sie durch jene Todeshippe.
Sie währt und wartet auf den Anbeginn.

Ist Wahrheit nicht, was hier durch mich wird kund,
dann schrieb ich nie, schwur Liebe nie ein Mund.

Flatter was not slow to point out the numerous deviations from the literal sense of the original.⁴⁵⁾

One must agree, for instance, that "Bande" does not render "marriage" and "impediments" accurately, and there is certainly no question of "dissolving" the marriage, for "impediments" are prior obstacles to it. Yet this point, and the insistence on "Ehebund" for "marriage", shows Flatter's concern for the letter of the original rather than its meaning. His criticism of Kraus's line 2 takes the demand for literalness to the absurd extreme of those critics of Luther's who rejected his insertion of the word "allein" where "sola" did not appear in the Vulgate.⁴⁶⁾ Flatter objected to "sie wäre keine"

because Shakespeare's text was "love is not love", not "is no love". This ignores that the articles and the negative pronoun have different word values in English and German. In English, "no love" would have an emotional, personal meaning absent from the matter-of-fact definition "not love". "Keine" in German, with its emphasis on a negative totality, frequently covers both meanings.

Although Flatter was right to criticize Kraus's "wäre" for weakening the definition "is not", this point is less crucial than the false emphasis that Kraus's "Bande" - "Liebe" - "bindet" produces. A coercive bond of love is not necessarily mutual and freely inspired,

a "marriage of true minds". The syntactical ambiguity of "sie wäre keine" - it could refer either to "Liebe" or to "Bande" - lends weight to this misconstruction, just as the emphasis on "dies" in George's couplet had been misleading. Flatter's other claim, that Kraus's first quatrain is remote from the original, can only be upheld with regard to the obscure and abstract line 4; the second halves of lines 2 and 3 are only marred by the hackneyed "einmal doch". In the quatrain as a whole, Kraus renders Shakespeare's variations on his theme by bald repetition.

Flatter reacted to Kraus's criticism of his "ornamental" rendering of "ever-fixed mark" in line 5 by repeating that Kraus was misconstruing Shakespeare.⁴⁵⁾ Without being as pedantic as Flatter, one must agree that in lines 7 and 8 Kraus has lost "star", "never shaken" and the "worth" - "height" contrast, for which he substitutes a sentimentalized, almost Pre-Raphaelite picture of chivalry. In lines 5 and 6, he has also departed from the original and used repetition and alliteration where, according to Flatter, "Shakespeare is terse".⁴⁵⁾ Such departure and compensation, however, is inevitable in verse translation, and is no mere self-indulgence. Indeed, the verb pairs "steht und leuchtet", "lenkt und leitet" convey stability and guidance formally; after the static, stressed monosyllables ("steht", "lenkt"), the "und" and the alliteration have reassuring

force, while the extra syllable in "leuchtet" and "leitet" indicates action from that secure basis. Only in conjunction with this impressive quartet of verbs can Kraus's "altes Wort", "der hohe Turm", aspire to the dignity of Shakespeare's "ever-fixed mark".

His departures in the third quatrain are less justified. Both the immediacy of the image "bending sickle" and the echo of line 4 in it are lost, and the "rosy lips and cheeks" are reduced to an unfelicitous piece of preciousness more in the manner of George: "der Lippe, die küssen konnte, Lieblichkeit". "But bears it out even to the edge of doom" becomes vague and obscure in "währt und wartet auf den Anbeginn"; any allusion in "Anbeginn" to Kraus's "Ursprung" is too tenuous to give the line significance.

The heaviness of Kraus's monosyllables "durch mich wird kund", in line 13, corresponds to Shakespeare's molossus: "upon me proved", in which the hesitance is increased by the juxtaposition of two nasals. So Kraus's arbitrary word order is not "ein Gewürge", as Flatter called it.⁴⁷⁾ Yet the notion of lovers' vows has a more Rococo flavour than Shakespeare's earnest passion. The most serious fault of all is Kraus's - and Flatter's⁴⁸⁾ - destruction of the rhetorical structure of this sonnet by the omission of the urgent appeal "Let me not [..] admit". In Shakespeare, this appeal and the couplet

form a framework by means of which the poet personally commits himself to the definitions of love, those secular Beatitudes, that he interposes.

iii) Departure from the original

Kraus was little concerned, then, with faithful reproduction of the text or even of its content. On occasions, he was able to fulfil his aim as "Nachdichter" by recreating the original not literally, by its German equivalent, but in substance. An example is his rendering of the second quatrain of Sonnet LXV,

"O how shall summer's honey breath hold out,
Against the wrackful siege of battering days /.../":

Wie soll sich Sommers holder Atem halten,
von der Gewalt des Sturmgewölks bedrängt,
die noch vermag den starren Fels zu spalten
und noch das stärkste Eisentor zersprengt? (5-8)

Kraus here follows George in omitting the article before "Sommers"; and "Sturmgewölk" - which contains both "siege" and the implied thunder - was also used by George in his poem "Der Krieg".^{48a)} Yet Kraus's innovation is the alliterative combination of "Gewalt" with "Sturmgewölk" and the echo in "bedrängt" of the unstressed "ge"- syllable. Sieges and thunder are thus reproduced vividly by the explosive consonants that "besiege" the soft sibilants and aspirates of line 5, whose "honey breath", the gentle alternations of

"i"-"ó"-"i"-"ó" and "á"-"(e)"-"á"-"(e)", is followed in line 6 by the more dynamic modulations of the stressed vowels "e"-"a"-"u"-"ø"-"g".⁴⁹⁾

More frequently, however, Kraus's departures from George and the original weakened both sense and texture. To illustrate the obvious hazards of his second-hand approach to the text, one could quote his mistranslation⁵⁰⁾ of the second quatrain of Sonnet LXXXVIII, ("/_../ Upon thy part I can set down a story/ Of faults concealed, wherein I am attainted/_../"). Here and in the next sonnet, the poet is proposing to blame himself publicly, to make his friend's forswearing of him appear justified. In Kraus's version, the "eye of scorn" (2), the motivating factor, is absent, which makes the friends' relations here incomprehensible:

Die eignen Schwächen kann ich mir nicht hehlen
und will sie zeigen dir mit offnem Sinn,
und kennst du all mein Fehlen und Verfehlen,
so wird dir mein Verlust gar zum Gewinn.

The open revealing of faults is an over-simplification, and "mein Verlust" is a distortion of "in losing me". An example of how Kraus's alternative could be bald and prosaic is the third quatrain of Sonnet LXXVII:

Look what thy memory cannot contain,
Commit to these waste banks, and thou shalt find
Those children nursed, delivered from thy brain,
To take a new acquaintance of thy mind."

George "delivers" these brain-children with "great" simplicity:

"[.] und einst siehst
Du diese kinder gross aus deinem hirn
Mit denen neu dein geist bekanntschaft schliesst."

It is doubtful whether Kraus's "waste banks" preserve
their memory:

[.] in diesen Blättern sollst du es verschliessen,
dass fremdgewordne Worte du nach Jahren
als deine Geisteskinder kannst begrüßen.

Sonnet LXXXI - with which Kraus concluded his
confrontation with George (F.885,63f.) - speculates on
the friend's immortality in verse after the poet's
death. Kraus merely referred to George's lines 12 and
14, without quoting the whole sonnet. In these lines -
"Wenn alle haucher dieser zeit verwesen" and "[.] Wo
hauch am meisten haucht: im menschenmund" - "hauch(en)"
has an unsavoury physical or vocal connotation and lacks
the vital association of "Atem"/"atmen", which would
correspond to Shakespeare's meaning. But Kraus's
partial quotation obscures a common feature of George's
verse, which this sonnet illustrates: how a single
stilted and unfelt phrase - here in an unpretentiously
faithful rendering - could mar the elegance of the whole.
Kraus's version is more homogeneous, but at the expense
of some of Shakespeare's nuances and conceits. For
example he, too, loses the contrast "common grave" -
"entombed in men's eyes".⁵¹⁾ So averse was he to George's
rendering of "breathers" that he omitted this passage
completely from his version, and improvised, rephrasing

line 9 and adding part of the idea of line 1 for line 12:

Ich setze dir mein Wort als Monument.

Such paraphrase is less monumental than it claims.

iv) Sense, syntax and unity

A very dubious characteristic of George's verse, particularly of these Sonnets, is his arbitrary omission of articles, inflections and conjunctions. Often, as a result of this, the grammatical values within a clause are not immediately clear. Sonnet XIV, line 13

- "Thy end is truth's and beauty's doom and death" -

becomes: "Dein tod ist treu und schönheits fall und schluss". "Schönheits" does not exist in German, and "treu", uninflected, appears to be an adjective - certainly not a preceding genitive. This makes nonsense of the line.

In his criticism of George's Sonnet CL(F.885,58), Kraus singled out line 8 for its incongruity, particularly within the metrical pattern:

"Woher nimmst du fürs schlechte wohlgestalt
Dass noch sogar im abhub deiner tat
Soviel gewähr von kunst ist und gewalt,
Mein geist dein schlimm mehr als jed gut bejaht?"

Even if one discounts⁵²⁾ Kraus's protest that "mehr" is unstressed, and reads the line as

"Mein geist dein schlimm//mehr als jed gut bejaht?"

the unnatural caesura adds to the obscurity created by

the word order and the ugly lack of inflections. A similar atrocity ("jed schön") mars one of George's masterpieces, Sonnet XVIII.

George's disdain for conjunctions had perhaps more far-reaching effects. Kraus, with his relative ignorance of English, did not emphasize this enough. The English sonnets were marked by a flowing quality, as other critics have noted.⁵³⁾ In aspiring to preserve the monosyllabic diction of the English, George increased the pauses in the flow of reasoning; by omitting conjunctions, he undermined the essential structure of the English sonnet. The result is that explanatory subordinate clauses are often detached from the logical syntactical framework, isolated by eccentric punctuation and given the status of main clauses, modified only by an apparently unmotivated subjunctive. An example of such omission, not mentioned by Kraus or other critics, is Sonnet LI. George omits "Thus can" (1), "when" (2), "why" (3), "then" (7), "though" (7), "then" (9), "therefore" (10), "but" (12), as well as "shall" (11), and mistranslates "since" (13). Thus lines 7f.,

"Then should I speed though mounted on the wind,
In winged speed no motion shall I know."

are travestied by the omission of the explanatory conjunctions. Their substitutes, "selbst" and "ich gäb", are misleading:

"Ich gäb die sporen selbst vom wind gejagt
Und stillstand fänd ich in beschwingter hast.
Dann hält kein pferd mit meiner sehnsucht schritt
Und sehnsucht soll - die vollster lieb entspross -

Wiehern, kein dumpfes fleisch, in glühendem ritt.

Aus lieb entschuldige liebe dann mein ross /.../(7-12)

The word-order of lines 10f., as of lines 3f and 6, is tortuous. Worst of all, the position of "wiehern" isolates it and gives it a wrong stress. The "race" of Shakespeare's lines is turned into a halting procession of afterthoughts.

Kraus, with his freer approach, here succeeds in restoring the "fiery race" of Shakespeare's desire:

Dann kann kein Ross mit meiner Sehnsucht mit,
und wiehern wird sie - echter Liebe Spross
ist sie, nicht dumpfes Fleisch - im Sturmesschritt.

Und Liebe so entschuld'gen mag mein Ross /.../

Kraus's epiphora ("wird sie" - "ist sie") and enjambement, which he substitutes for Shakespeare's appositional phrases, recreate the dramatic caesura after "Shall neigh" and the insistence of the molossus neigh/no dull flesh.... In the second quatrain, however, he follows George in rendering "then should I" - "shall I" by subjunctives. In the couplet, too,

"Since from thee going, he went willful slow,
Towards thee I'll run, and give him leave to go."

Kraus loses the balanced contrast of "he" and "I" and simply incorporates the gesture of leave-giving in a subjunctive ("Es bleibe faul"). Nevertheless, his sonnet has the flow of the original, and, in the first quatrain too, something of its impetuosity, in his variants:

"faulen Gaul" (1), "Bedarf's der Eile" (3). It is not

a serious weakness of Kraus's translation that, where Shakespeare varies "dull bearer", "poor beast", "no horse" and "my jade", he repeats "Gaul" twice and "Ross" twice; indeed, George, who attempts to render the variations, does not do justice to the irony.

One obvious aspect of Shakespeare's Sonnets is their cyclical nature - despite the time-honoured controversies over exact internal groupings. Some groups - such as I-XIX, the "marriage" sonnets - have a clear continuity; and within the "absence" sonnets, LI logically follows on L, with "Thus can". George's omission of conjunctions destroys the continuity. This was pointed out by Kraus, who summarized Sonnet V as "ein einfaches Landschaftsbild" and explained how this landscape was then applied to man in Sonnet VI, by means of the reference "Then" ("darum"), which George omits (F.885,56). George's alternative to the conjunction is misleading, too, if one takes it in the context of the poem as a whole. The poem begins:

"Sei nicht durch winters knorrige hand verdorrt
Dein lenz eh deinen duft ein filter fasst!"

It ends:

"Sei nicht selbstwillig: du bist viel zu hold
Für todesbeute und der würmer sold."

Kraus criticized the inconsistency of "sei nicht" - which he spaced . In both lines it has the weight of an imperative, although in line 1 it is supposed to be a subjunctive ("Es sei nicht") preceding the subject ("Dein Lenz").

A final, exceptional case, not mentioned by Kraus, where George's halting syntax was thoroughly effective is his reproduction of the "Stocken des Satzes" and "Hemmnisse des sprachlichen Flusses"⁵⁴⁾ in Sonnet CXXIX:

"Th' expense of spirit in a waste of shame
Is lust in action, and till action, lust
Is perjured, murd'rous, bloody full of blame,
Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust [...]"

Needless to say, many of the nuances which make up the rich "subliminal structures"⁵⁵⁾ of this sonnet - especially in the central lines - are untranslatable. Nevertheless, George has successfully reproduced the pattern of line 2 and the component epithets of lines 3f.:

"Verbrauch von geist in schändlicher verzehr
Ist lust in tat, und bis zur tat, ist lust
Meineidig, mörderisch, blutig, voll unehr,
Wild, tierisch, grausam, roh, des lugs bewusst.

In his masterly third quatrain, George repeats "wild" and "toll" as Shakespeare repeats "extreme" and "mad(e)", and imaginatively substitutes "Erlangt und im und beim erlangen" for Shakespeare's translacers⁵⁶⁾ "had" - "having" - "in quest to have". Even George's over-punctuation in line 12 is part of the near-symmetrical pattern of contrasts that characterizes the sonnet. Kraus's free rendering utterly dispels these antithetical tensions. Shakespeare's chiastic word-play in line 2 is replaced by mere repetition; his obsessive anaphora ("Past reason" - "Past reason") in the second quatrain is replaced by an unimpeded outburst of disillusionment; and

the masculine rhymes, which in Shakespeare and in George tighten the antithetical structure by inhibiting any superfluous rhythmic movement from line to line, are not part of Kraus's looser scheme.

IV

CONCLUSION

As this analysis shows, there was some justification in Flatter's criticism⁵⁷⁾ that Kraus emptied the sonnets of their content and their metaphorical density, and also in Borchardt's criticism⁵⁸⁾ of George's "Nebeneinanderstellen so hoher Produkte und des Schutts der Werkstatt". The lover of Shakespeare remains in a dilemma: George's priceless gems are mixed with monstrous blemishes, and the flowing diction, the at times authentic pathos of Kraus all too frequently becomes hollow and abstract.

Against George, Kraus was not simply pitting his own integrity against an ethically spurious personality; and there was not a profound literary justification in the publicistic dispute of 1928, as there had been in that aspect of the Werfel case. In taking the publicity as an "Anlass" for exposing the discrepancy between George's "Wesen" and his "Geltung", Kraus came near to trivializing the literary case against George himself. His polemic was also incomplete, being no doubt cut short in 1933, by the Nazi "Machtübernahme" and by George's death at the end of that year.

George's limitations are self-evident. His social aloofness and his exclusive view of art cannot be justified as an expedient, as the "inner emigration" after 1933 might be, and his imposition of his austere authority on both his followers and his medium amounted to an oversimplified, premature solution to complex realities. Yet in his literary analysis Kraus did not attempt to account

for how this self-assertion might be connected with the lack of artistic and social commitment that he had asserted in "Nach dreissig Jahren". In George's case, he did not insert the serious ethical component in his equation of man and work.

His authority for his "sacrilege against George" was that of the German language, and the poetic genius of the English language was his tertium comparationis. Yet for once the artistic component of his polemic - in the unfamiliar guise of serious poetry - fell short of his critical insights, and his to some extent justified attack on George became a sacrilege against Shakespeare too. In this, Kraus's authority reveals itself, too, as exclusive, severely limited as it was by the rigidity of his model. The revelatory power of the German language did not endow him with insight into languages. He failed to adapt the components of his dualistic pattern - his "public" activity and his "private" inspiration at the "Ursprung" of "language" - he failed to absorb Shakespeare fully into his "inner" sphere as his poetic authority against George. He himself failed to exemplify the commitment to two spheres that he demanded of the verse translator and missed in George; here Kraus himself fell short of the unity of man and work. Indeed, to apply the logic of his equation to him, one might note that the Sonnets, whose publication coincided

with the "Machtübernahme", contain preciousness otherwise rare in Kraus. They are a purely literary gesture, contrived at a moment in history that was not merely to make them strangely anachronistic, but, with a terrible vengeance, was to confirm Kraus's earlier apocalyptic prophecies and deprive the language satirist of his raison d'être. Yet the silence and resignation of 1933 inspired one of his greatest poems, which tragically bears witness to the powerlessness of his lifelong weapon, language, against the monstrous reality of the Third Reich:

Man frage nicht, was all die Zeit ich machte.
Ich bleibe stumm;
und sage nicht, warum.
Und Stille gibt es, da die Erde krachte.
Kein Wort, das traf;
man spricht nur aus dem Schlaf.
Und träumt von einer Sonne, welche lachte.
Es geht vorbei;
nachher war's einerlei.
Das Wort entschlief, als jene Welt erwachte.
(F.888,4)⁵⁹⁾

For once it would seem appropriate to use that form of hyperbolic comparison so favoured by Kraus in his more confident moments, and to say that these ten lines are of greater value and substance than all one hundred and fifty-four of Kraus's Sonnets.

References in the Notes to Kraus's works and to Die Fackel are according to the scheme set out on p.i. Abbreviations of current periodicals are those used by The Year's Work in Modern Languages. Periodicals are referred to by year and page no. unless pagination is not by annual volume; e.g. NRu,1914,1306 = Neue Rundschau, Berlin, vol.XXV(1914),p.1306. Details of all other works are given in full at the first mention. Where reference is made to a work already mentioned, it is reintroduced in the Notes to each subsequent chapter by means of its short title (and date and place of publication) only. Where more than one work by an author is mentioned within one chapter, each is reintroduced by a short title only.

Notes to Preface

1. P. Schick, Karl Kraus in Selbstzeugnissen und Bild-dokumenten, Reinbek, 1965, p.139.
2. C.J. Wagenknecht, Das Wortspiel bei Karl Kraus, Göttingen, 1965; P. Kipphoff, Der Aphorismus im Werk von Karl Kraus, Munich, 1961 (Diss.).
3. J. Stephan, Satire und Sprache. Zu dem Werk von Karl Kraus, Munich, 1964; A. Disch, Das gestaltete Wort. Die Idee der Dichtung im Werk von Karl Kraus, Zürich, 1969.
4. "Anleitung zur Schmähschrift anhand von Beispielen", in: StZ,1966, 331-344.

Notes to Preface (cont'd.):

5. M. Borries, Ein Angriff auf Heinrich Heine. Kritische Bemerkungen zu Karl Kraus, Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz, 1971, pp.97f.; her claim that Kraus's pacifism was a "gedankliche Abweichung" simply reveals the inadequacy of her definitions. His opposition to the war was not "progressive", but consistent both with his affirmation of "Ursprung" and "Natur", which war threatened, and with his pre-war cultural criticism, particularly of the press.
6. W. Iggers, Karl Kraus. A Viennese critic of the twentieth century, The Hague, 1967; a more journalistic summary of Kraus's "opinions" is H. Weigel's Karl Kraus, oder Die Macht der Ohnmacht. Versuch eines Motivenberichts zur Erhellung eines vielfachen Lebenswerks, Vienna, 1968.
7. Iggers, op,cit.,p.68.
8. W. Kraft, Karl Kraus. Beiträge zum Verständnis seines Werkes, Salzburg, 1956, pp.163-174;E. Haueis, Karl Kraus und der Expressionismus, Erlangen/Nuremberg, 1968 (Diss.),pp.52ff.; Borries, op.cit.
9. Of the noteworthy exceptions, both Haueis and Borries (cf. Note 5 above) use criteria not strictly appropriate to the case in point; Haueis draws on "Heine und die Folgen" (cf.Note 8 above) and then oversimplifies Kraus's view, in treating some Expressionists as "ästhetizistisch".

Notes to Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY

1. E.F. Timms, Language and the satirist in the work of Karl Kraus, Cambridge, 1967 (Diss.), pp.12f.
2. L. Liegler, Karl Kraus und sein Werk, Vienna, 1920, pp.333f., W. Kraft, Karl Kraus, Salzburg, 1956, pp.175-199, C. Kohn, Karl Kraus. Le polémiste et l'écrivain, défenseur des droits de l'individu, Paris, 1962, and J. Stephan, Satire und Sprache, Munich, 1964, have equated language and truth; W. Iggers, Karl Kraus, The Hague, 1967, has misconstrued the anti-systematic nature of his work. Some recent studies have been more discriminating; e.g. H.-J. Heringer, "Karl Kraus als Sprachkritiker", in: Msp, 1967, 256-262, distinguishes between the diachronic, atomistic and logical approaches; Timms, op.cit., p.210, sees language variously as "Symptom, cause, norm, remedy" and "refuge"; cf. also A. Disch, Das gestaltete Wort, Zürich, 1969, pp.54ff.
3. Its particular reference to Werfel is discussed in Chapter Five, Part III, Section iii.
4. This is akin to what Keats says about "negative capability" (The letters of John Keats, ed.H.E. Rollins, Cambridge [Mass.], 1958, vol.I [1814-1821], p.193): "[...] that is when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason [...]".
5. Heinrich Mann's conception of such achievement by a great man, in "Geist und Tat" (Essays, Hamburg,

Notes to Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY (cont'd.):

1960,p.12), is similar to Kraus's aphorism (BWG 321), but he stresses the "pauses": "Ihr ... braucht nicht zu wissen, wie es um die Mächtigen steht, und dass auch der Grösste nur in den Stunden gross ist, da er schafft; dass die Verehrung seiner Person eine leere Puppe trifft. Wieviel tote Zeit im Leben des grossen Mannes, da er sich ausgeleert und klein weiss. Wieviel Schwindel und gewaltsame Überhebung, um tagein tagaus zu vertreten, was er zuweilen war." In 1910, when he wrote this, Mann was a contributor to Die Fackel. Otto Weininger, the major intellectual influence on Kraus, also notes (Geschlecht und Charakter. Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung, Vienna/Leipzig, 4th.edition 1905,p.136) the periodicity of genius in "Zeiten, in denen er von sich nichts hält", as well as asserting (p.102f.) that every action, thought and "psychische Regung eines Menschen" contains "sein ganzes Wesen".

6. cf. Weininger's exclusive conception of ethics (op.cit.,p.206) as "Pflichten gegen sich selbst", "die psychische Tatsache der inneren Forderung, die viel mehr verlangt, als alle bürgerliche Gesittung je haben will". M. Borries, Ein Angriff auf Heinrich Heine, Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz, 1971, p.81, denies the self-criticism and speaks of the "dogmatisch verfestigte Glaubenshaltungen"

Notes to Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY (cont'd.):

which, certainly, did characterize the post-Nietzschean subjectivism of Kraus's generation; but to say "[...] statt durch Reflexion gewonnene rationale Erkenntnisse zu suchen, verkündet man Offenbarungen; subjektive Wertprinzipien werden mit Selbstverständlichkeit ins Überindividuelle transponiert [...]" is itself too tendencious and ignores the exemplary self-discipline and reflection demanded of the prophet of language. Kraus's aphoristic statements might lend themselves to misconstruction by the casual reader as "ins Überindividuelle transponiert" - this is discussed at the end of Chapter One - but they challenge the reader to abandon "rational" preconceptions and experience the knowledge of language itself, rather than something that is communicable "mit Selbstverständlichkeit". If we are to take it seriously, and not as careless, "selbstverständlich" jargon, Borries's formulation of the norm - as "seeking" what has already been "gewonnen" - is surely complacent and dogmatic.

7. cf. Liegler, op.cit., pp.9-53, and Timms, op.cit., pp.86-115, on the cultural background.
8. Kraus to Walden, n.d.; MS. in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, no. I.N.167.024.
9. Some critics discuss "Charakter" in its negative moral connotation only (cf. Borries, op.cit., pp.68ff.),

and dismiss inconsistencies, without a serious examination of what Kraus meant by "Einheit". An exception is Timms, who regards Kraus's "Ich" (op.cit.,p.333), and the "Nörgler" in Die letzten Tage der Menschheit (p.397), as a "set of values". The Kantian term "Persönlichkeit" Kraus borrowed from Weininger, op.cit.,pp.259f.: "Was dem Manne Wert und Zeitlosigkeit gibt, ist einzig und allein Persönlichkeit."

10. Kraft, op.cit.,p.83f., quotes from Weininger's chapter "Begabung und Gedächtnis" (op.cit.,pp. 145ff.) and refers to Kraus's "schaffendes Gedächtnis"; Disch, op.cit.,p.39, also emphasizes the importance of the creative "Medium der Erinnerung" for Kraus.
11. This is particularly true of the actor, who is visibly identified with his artistic persona; cf. Rilke's portrait of Eleonore Duse ("du Tragische") in Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge (Sämtliche Werke, Frankfurt, 1966, vol.VI, pp.923f.):
"Dir sollte dieser Beruf werden [..] eine Verkleidung, dicht und dauernd genug, um hinter ihr rückhaltlos elend zu sein [..] In allen Städten, wohin du kamst, beschrieben sie deine Gebärde; aber sie begriffen nicht, wie du, aussichtsloser von Tag zu Tag, immer wieder eine

Notes to Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY (cont'd.):

Dichtung vor dich hobst, ob sie dich berge. [-] Es kam dich an, ihnen dein Gesicht zu entreissen, an dem sie zehrten. Es kam dich an, du selber zu sein." Rilke's is a more poignant contrast between the persona and the private person than that in Kraus's aphorism (BWG 321) quoted on page 7.

12. As early as 1892, Kraus praised the highly literary verse of Hofmannsthal's Gestern for its "naturalness" and "grace"; cf. Chapter Two, Part I, Section iv.
13. Thus humanity for Kraus - although, as Borries, op.cit.,p.67, says, "eine ins Ewige projizierte übergeschichtliche Vorstellung" - is not simply a shallow, "unverbindlicher Programmsatz"; Kraus's "Menschlichkeit" can only be attained by superlative performance. Typical of the period is his association of humanity with intensity and vitality.
14. Timms, op.cit.,p.65.
15. Kraus to Sidonie Nadherny, 21/23.I.1922; transcript in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, file no.Jc.159.612, letter no. 330.
16. Kraus to Sidonie Nadherny, 15/16.XI.1919; file no. as Note 15, letter no.304. My underlining.
17. Weininger (op.cit.,p.167) claims both the timelessness of experience in the creative memory and (p.177) the independence of "der zeitlose Mensch [.] der die Geschichte schafft" from the "Kausalverkettung",

Notes to Chapter One: LANGUAGE AND PERSONALITY (cont'd.)

as the basis of the genius's values and authority. Disch, op.cit.,p.43, too, has noted that in the line "und was gewesen ist, bleibt immer" (WiV 70) "gewesen" does not refer to an empirical past.

18. cf. Kraus to S. Nadherny, as Note 16: "etwas [-..], dem ich mein Höchstes verdanke"; LL 137: "ich verdanke [-dem 'grotesken Roman'] mein Bestes".
19. cf. Disch, op.cit.,p.46, on the motifs of dream and chaos in Kraus.
20. op.cit.,p.37; "Sonntag" was first mentioned by Kraft, op.cit.,pp.239ff.
21. Borries, op.cit.,p.55(f.n.), in consciously divorcing Kraus's nature lyrics from his satire, overlooks this vital connection between the two spheres of Kraus's activity. It is a major error of interpretation to see these lyrics - composed simultaneously with Die letzten Tage der Menschheit - as "Gedichte, die jene spannungslose Ganzheitshypothese aufstellen, die das Grässliche nicht miteinzubeziehen wagt". Lyrics and war drama were products of the two poles of Kraus's experience. The tension that Borries misses can be felt not simply in the juxtaposition of satire and lyric in the war-issues of Die Fackel (e.g.F.462), but within both satire and lyric, and particularly in his correspondence with Sidonie Nadherny. E. Canetti seems to imply a similar criticism in his Der andere Prozess. Franz Kafkas Briefe an Felice,

Munich, 1969, p.67. Here, without specific mention of Kraus, he contrasts Kafka's inner experience of horror and suffering, which accompanied the external horrors of war, with the following case: "Wer meint, dass es ihm gegeben sei, seine innere Welt von der äusseren zu trennen, hat gar keine innere, von der etwas zu trennen wäre." An explicit criticism of the "chinesische Mauer" of Kraus's style, in another essay by Canetti (in: Auf-forderung zum Misstrauen, ed.O.Breicha/G.Fritsch, Salzburg, 1967,pp.438f.) - "Es ist kein Reich hinter dieser Mauer, sie selbst ist das Reich" - suggests that his point of contrast is, implicitly, Kraus. As such it is unfair, for the dualistic construct enabled the militant writer to revitalize his forces and reaffirm his values occasionally; it is unrealistic to expect such a writer to emulate the almost limitless psychological self-chastisement of Kafka.

22. Disch, op.cit.,p.83.

23. op.cit.,p.41.

24. A.Koestler, The act of creation, London, 1964, pp.121-166. Weininger's account (op.cit.,p.220) - "Aus der Idee des Ganzen heraus, in welcher der Genius fortwährend lebt, erkennt er den Sinn der Teile" - lacks the precision of Kraus's specific focus on language, on the creative act of prehension.

25. Kraus's conception of poetry was not simply Neo-Classical, as Heine critics imply. Borries (op.cit., p.77) ignores Kraus's model Nestroy and likens his "Gegenentwurf einer hohen Sprache" to George's. For Kraus, the "a priori Ganzheit" of language was, pace Borries (p.53), not uncomplicated and free of contradictions and dissonance, but included and absorbed them; the conventional framework, such as the rhyme, was brought to life by meaningful variation.
26. Disch, op.cit., pp.32-36; P. Kipphoff, Der Aphorismus im Werk von Karl Kraus, Munich, 1961, p.32, has - not quite precisely - argued that Kraus made no distinction between "Ursprung" and the past.
27. Timms, op.cit., p.20.
28. There is a long tradition of "organic" vocabulary in German literary criticism, particularly since the Romantics, for distinguishing "genius" from "mechanical virtuosity"; cf. J. Goth, Nietzsche und die Rhetorik, Tübingen, 1970, pp.3-12. Kraus did later modify his "organic" conception of poetic creation, in recognizing "dass ein Gedicht im höchsten Grade etwas ist, was 'gemacht' werden muss (es kommt von 'poiein')" (Spr 391).
29. Disch, op.cit., pp.5ff., states the problem painstakingly.
30. Borries, op.cit., pp.82ff., exaggerates the extent

to which Kraus's quotations were distortions of the texts quoted. Naturally his linguistic perspective gave the text an emphasis not intended by its author, but on the whole Kraus was most meticulous in reproducing texts accurately - e.g. the Kerr polemics in F.787.

31. cf. H. Lausberg, Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Einführung für Studierende der klassischen, romanischen, englischen und deutschen Philologie, Munich, 1967 (3rd edition), pp.122f., and Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft, Munich, 1960, p.398 (§805, "onomasiologische distinctio").
32. Kerr: "mechanische Gegensätzelei" /LL 212/, cf. Chapter Four, Part II, Section iv; Werfel: "Die Metaphysik des Drehs", in: Die Aktion, 1917, 124-128, cf. Chapter Five, Part I, Section iii.
33. G. Neumann, "Umkehrung und Ablenkung: Franz Kafkas gleitendes Paradox", in: DVLG, 1968, 705. The aphorism discussed on page 5 shows that they were not simply inversions of commonplaces.
34. M. Frisch, Tagebuch 1946-1949, Frankfurt, 1970, p.120 ("Beim Lesen").

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR

1. H. Bahr, Zur Kritik der Moderne. Gesammelte Aufsätze I. Reihe, Zürich, 1890, pp.59-79 ("Henrik Ibsen").
2. H. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus. Als II. Reihe von 'Zur Kritik der Moderne', Dresden/Leipzig, 1891, pp.173-184 ("Zola"). This refers mainly to La bête humaine.
3. cf. H. Kindermann, Herman Bahr. Ein Leben für das europäische Theater, Graz/Cologne, 1954, p.40.
4. Kindermann, op.cit., p.47.
5. The banquet marked Ibsen's attendance at the Burgtheater for the première of his Crown Pretenders; cf. H. Bahr, Selbstbildnis, Berlin, 1923, p.278; D. Daviau, "The friendship of Hermann Bahr and Arthur Schnitzler", in: Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, Spring 1966, 4f.
6. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, pp.1-6 ("Die Moderne").
7. Deutsche Zeitung, Vienna, No.7528(13.XII.1892).
8. "'Die Mutter'", in: Moderne Rundschau, Vienna, 1891, 75ff.; now in: H. von Hofmannsthal, Prosa I, Frankfurt a.M., 1957 (2nd edition), pp.15-21. Quotation from p.21.
9. Hofmannsthal, Prosa I, p.149 ("Gabriele d'Annunzio" I).
10. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, p.155.

11. P.G. Klussmann, Stefan George. Zum Selbstverständnis der Kunst und des Dichters in der Moderne, Bonn, 1961, p.4.
12. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, pp.93-100. Quotation from p.99.
13. Die Gesellschaft, Leipzig, 1892, 799-801.
14. "Karl Kraus und Hugo von Hofmannsthal", in: StZ, 1968, 147-163.
15. cf. F. Schlawe, Literarische Zeitschriften I (1885-1910), Stuttgart, 1965 (2nd edition), pp.20f.
16. Die Gesellschaft, 1892, 686.
17. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 650.
18. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 635.
19. Bahr, Zur Kritik der Moderne, pp.138-147 ("Die Krisis des Burgtheaters").
20. Deutsche Zeitung, 12/13.I.1893, p.5.
21. Deutsche Zeitung, 17.I.1893, p.5.
22. Deutsche Zeitung, 20.I.1893, p.6; quoted by Kraus, in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 628f.
23. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 629.
24. Die Gesellschaft, 1892, 1060-1064.
25. op.cit., 1893, pp.627-636; this quotation from pp.633f.
26. Bahr's flat rejection of Hauptmann's early plays at the time is glossed over by Kindermann (op.cit., p.45) as "involvement" in the "Kämpfe um Gerhart

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

- Hauptmann". By not dating Bahr's appreciation of Die Weber in 1904 or quoting its source (H. Bahr, Glossen zum Wiener Theater /1903-1906/, p.302f.), Kindermann (op.cit.,p.202) gives the false impression that this masterpiece was among Bahr's discoveries.
27. cf. Bahr's interviews on antisemitism in Die Deutsche Zeitung, March and April 1893.
 28. Deutsche Zeitung, 5.II.1893,p.4 and an apology on 12.II.1893,p.4, after the waiter complained.
 29. "Von Hermann Bahr und seiner Bücherei", in: Freie Bühne, Berlin, 1893, 82-89.
 30. Kraus to Arthur Schnitzler,22.I.1893; in: LK, 1970, 515.
 31. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 630.
 32. op.cit.,p.636.
 33. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, p.67.
 34. Liliencron to Kraus, 8.VI.1893; transcript in the Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, file no.Jb.163.329.
 35. R. Dehmel to Kraus, 14.VIII.1893 (transcript); file no. as per Note 34.
 36. R. Dehmel to Kraus, 8.VIII.1893 (transcript); file no. as per Note 34.
 37. G. Wunberg (Der frühe Hofmannsthal. Schizophrenie als dichterische Struktur, Stuttgart/Berlin/ Cologne/Mainz, 1965,p.22) uncritically infers from Kraus's successful attack in Die demolierte

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

Litteratur that Bahr's influence was bad, and, with no more evidence than the "number of letters" Hofmannsthal wrote to Bahr and "their daily conversations", he merely speculates (pp.22f.) about Bahr's influence on Hofmannsthal. The harm of Bahr's essay "Loris", which Wunberg mentions (p.121), did not lie in its effect on Loris himself; and to infer from Hofmannsthal's review of Die Mutter that he was receptive to Bahr's ideas, as Wunberg does, is to overlook both the detachment of the early Hofmannsthal and his tendency, in other essays of the period, to use the subject as a means of testing his own aesthetic and psychological responses, albeit in a detached, mature manner which Bahr lacked. This is not to deny an influence, merely to show the difficulty of proving one.

38. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 628 (footnote).
39. Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 109f.
40. Das Magazin für Litteratur, Berlin, 1893, pp.127f.
41. cf. H. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, Frankfurt a.M., 1894, pp.88f. ("Das junge Österreich"), who quoted in full two of the poems criticized by Kraus.
42. cf. Kraus to Schnitzler, 19.III.1893; in: LK, 1970, 516f.
43. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, pp.19-25.
44. H. Bahr, Renaissance. Neue Studien zur Kritik der

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

- Moderne, Berlin, 1897, pp.1-11.
45. LK, 1970, 523.
46. The quotation from Die Neue Freie Presse is reprinted in LK, 1970, 529f., in R. Urbach's notes to Kraus's letters and Schnitzler's Notes; Urbach, op.cit.,p.530, notes that the Faust quotation (I.Teil,line 2724: "Sind wir ein Spiel von jedem Druck der Luft?") was an allusion to the motto of Beer-Hoffmann's Novellen (1893).
47. K. Kraus, Die demolierte Litteratur, Vienna, 1899 (4th.edition), p.16.
48. op.cit.,p.18.
49. op.cit.,p.17.
50. e.g. Bahr's confession, evidently about the terse style of "Dora": "Das sind die kurzen Sätze. Ich kann nichts dafür", is alluded to in Kraus's letter to Schnitzler, 25.IV.1895 (in: LK, 1970, 522), and recurs in the stylistic parody in Die demolierte Litteratur, p.8.
51. Die demolierte Litteratur,p.6; this motif occurs at the end of "Zur Überwindung des Hermann Bahr" (in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 635).
52. op.cit.,p.36.
53. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, pp.101-117; quotation from p.115.

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

54. It is amazing that Bahr did not read Ernst Mach's Analyse der Empfindungen (1886) until a decade after his own major impressionistic essays. The enlarged 2nd edition of Mach's work appeared in 1900, and Bahr first mentioned reading it in "Das unrettbare Ich" (1903) and "Impressionismus"; cf. H. Bahr, Dialog vom Tragischen, Berlin, 1904, pp.79-101 and pp.102-114 respectively.
55. O. Walzel, Das Wortkunstwerk. Mittel seiner Erforschung, Leipzig, 1926, p.38.
56. H. Bahr, Russische Reise, Dresden/Leipzig, 1891, pp.20f.
57. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, pp.128-140.
58. H. Bahr, Bildung. Essays, Berlin, 1900, p.147.
59. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, p.29 ("Symbolisten").
60. Bahr, Selbstbildnis, p.234.
61. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, p.85; the metaphor seems to be inspired by Hofmannsthal's evocation of the wife of the infanticide in d'Annunzio's Innocente; cf. Hofmannsthal, Prosa I, p.153.
62. Neues Wiener Tagblatt, 28.IV.1900; reprinted in: H. Bahr, Premieren. Winter 1900 - Sommer 1901, Munich, 1902, p.138.
63. Die demolierte Litteratur, p.8.

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

64. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, pp.122-129.

The "silk" simile was ridiculed in "Zur Überwindung des Hermann Bahr" (in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 635), where Kraus qualified "Seide" with the relative clause: "die mir aber lieber ist".

65. Die demolierte Litteratur, p.10.

66. Neues Wiener Tagblatt, 1.II.1902; reprinted in:
H. Bahr, Rezensionen. Wiener Theater 1901 - 1903,
Berlin, 1903, p.207.

67. My underlining.

68. Bahr, Bildung, pp.145-151.

69. Bahr, Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, p.95.

70. Bahr, Zur Kritik der Moderne, p.250.

71. M. Borries, Ein Angriff auf Heinrich Heine,
Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz, 1971, condemns
Kraus's insistence on a strict relation of form
to content, but contradicts herself (p.63) by
defending Heine's "Stilbruch" as a suitable formal
rendering of his content. Borries bases her
criticism on the fact that the twentieth century
has confirmed the viability of Heine's mixed forms;
yet her argument about the historical relativity
of cultural and aesthetic values undermines her
assumption that the modern view is right.

72. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, p.26.

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

73. "Politics and the psyche in fin de siècle Vienna: Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal", in: American Historical Review, 1960/61, 930-946; quotation from p.935.
74. Printed in: E. Widder, Hermann Bahr. Sein Weg zum Glauben, Linz, 1963, in an appendix, pp.97f.
75. Bahr, Die Überwindung des Naturalismus, p.126.
76. Bahr, Inventur, Berlin, 1912, p.33.
77. "The misconception of Hermann Bahr as a 'Verwandlungskünstler'", in: GLL, 1957/58, 182-192.
78. Bahr, Inventur, Berlin, 1912, pp.126-131.
79. Bahr, Kriegsseggen, Munich, 1915; pp.9ff.
"ein heiliger Augenblick", pp.5ff. "das deutsche Wesen ist uns erschienen", p.24, "Enthusiasmus mit Disziplin". Kraus glossed this in F.706, 29-42 (UWz 317-329).
80. cf. G. Freudenberger, Hermann Bahrs Stellung zum Nationalismus und zum Österreichischen Staatsgedanken, Vienna, 1949 (Diss.), p.117.
81. H. Bahr, Kritik der Gegenwart, Augsburg, 1922, p.35.
82. For Bahr's "Vielseitigkeit", cf. Die demolierte Litteratur p.11; for Bahr's "Abgeklärtheit" and his chameleon nature, cf. F.15, 15.
83. Dedication to: Bahr, Renaissance.
84. Wiener Rundschau, 1896/97, 355f.
85. Kindermann, op.cit., pp.48f. and passim.
86. Bahr, Selbstbildnis, p.281.
87. Kindermann (op.cit., p.58) euphemistically

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (cont.)

- refers to Bahr's need to change his style on joining the Neues Wiener Tagblatt.
88. Kindermann (op.cit.,p.270) call's Bahr's book "nur ein augenblickliches Unmutszeichen".
89. Kindermann, op.cit.,p.216.
90. H. Bahr, Wiener Theater (1892-1898), Berlin, 1899, pp.12ff. and p.241.
91. Bahr, Wiener Theater, p.279.
92. Reinhardt's sacrifice of the text for visual effects - which Kraus constantly condemned - can be seen in the Hollywood film of A Mid Summer Night's Dream (1935), which Reinhardt directed.
93. Bahr, Bildung, p.230.
94. Bahr, Premieren, pp.198ff.; in the book there follow (pp.212-226) a number of critical reviews of the "Gastspiel", but the feuilleton of 21st. May is excluded.
95. At 4.2 florins per square metre, compared to 7 fl./sq.m. for the next plot.
- 95a. The house was to cost 50fl./sq.m. for a total of 120 sq.m.; cf. Olbrich's plans, exhibited in a J.M. Olbrich Exhibition at the Vienna Secession,1968.
96. A copy of the verdict (Wiener Landesgericht GZ Vr VII 194/00 Rote Zahl 252) is to be found in the Stadt-bibliothek, Vienna; it is in the papers of Kraus's Solicitor, Oskar Samek, on the Kerr case (file no.C.

- 148.073), attached to a letter dated 1.V.1928 from V. Fraenkl to Samek.
97. According to a letter of Kraus's to Annie Kalmar, February 1901, in the Stadtbibliothek, Vienna (MS. no. I.N.136.167), neither his five-hour opening speech nor his counsel's "brilliant peroration" was mentioned.
98. For example, of the total thirteen performances of Josephine, six fell on Sundays or public holidays, so that a reasonable attendance was assured, in addition to the solidarity shown by Bahr's fellow freemasons and critics with "Freiplätzen" (F.70,22).
99. The underlining corresponds to Kraus's "Sperrdruck".
100. The association of Liberal Journalists in Vienna.
101. Bahr, Rezensionen, p.61.
102. C. Bleibtreu to Kraus, 17.II.1901; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.167.631.
103. H. Bahr, Josephine, Berlin, 1913 (2nd edition), p.7; the "Vorwort" is dated 1898.
104. Kraus argued along similar lines in his attempt to expose Kerr's deal with Reinhardt; cf. Chapter Four, Part V, Section i (F.827,71). Kraus did not, as H. Nedomansky, Der Theaterkritiker Hermann Bahr, Vienna, 1949 (Diss.), p.42, believes, try to prove that the change took place once Josephine had been performed at the Volkstheater (Première on

Notes to Chapter Two: HERMANN BAHR (contd.)

23.XII.1897).

105. Bahr, Wiener Theater, p.86.
106. Kindermann, op.cit.,pp.139ff.
107. Bahr, Wiener Theater, p.224.
108. Deutsche Zeitung, 15.X.1893, /quoted and juxtaposed with the revised version in F.69,42/.
109. Bahr, Wiener Theater, p.211 /quoted and juxtaposed in F.69,40/; cf. Bahr's review of Schnitzler's Das Märchen (Wiener Theater, pp.242ff./F.69,44/), where Bahr praises actors suited to stupid roles.
110. Nedomansky, op.cit.,pp.148f.
111. Nedomansky op.cit.,p.42.
112. cf. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich, 1960,pp.43f.

1. In: Das Rendez-vous, Vienna, 3.IX.1892 (No.5,p.9);
 quoted by H. Weigel, Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1968, pp.23f.
2. Harden to Kraus, 11.II.1897; transcript in the
 Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, file no. Jb 163.329.
3. Kraus's requests in letters to Harden of 13.VII.1897,
 25.III.1899, 30.III.1899; MS. in the Bundesarchiv,
 Coblence, Harden's Nachlass, file no.62, folder 3.
 Harden's promises in letters to Kraus of 15.VII.1897,
 24.XII.1897, 1.IV.1899 [LL 124], 27/28.IV.1903;
 transcripts as per Note 2. It was therefore not
 simply Kraus's requests that were repeated. There
 is no evidence to support B.U. Weller's claim
 (Maximilian Harden und die "Zukunft", Bremen,1970,
 p.343) that "Harden [musste] strikt ablehnen" when
 Kraus asked for a mention.
4. Harden's requests in letters to Kraus of 24.XII.1897,
 7.IV.1898 and 2.VI.1898; transcripts as per Note 2.
 According to Harden [LL108], he turned down two
 submissions; Kraus (LL128) could only remember
 one refusal.
5. Harden to Kraus, 1.V.1903 [LL125].
6. Harden to Kraus, 15.VII.1897; cf.Note 3.
7. Kraus to Harden, 13.VII.1897 (cf.Note 3): "[...] wie
 wirft man sich in die Politik, wenn man für sie
 Interesse hat - ich meine: wie setzt man sich
 möglichst rasch in eine satirische Beziehung zu

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

ihr und ihren Männern?"

8. Harden to Kraus, 17.II.1899; transcript as per Note 2.
9. M. Harden, Apostata, Berlin, 1892, pp.4ff. ("Phrasien").
10. Harden to Ernestine Lothar, 5.X.1899; transcript in Harden's Nachlass. Claim repeated in 1908 [LL 107]. Weller (op.cit., p.345) contrasts Harden's critical remark to Frau Lothar with Kraus's admiration at the time; it would be more apt to contrast it with Harden's simultaneous encouragement of Kraus, or to compare his remark to her ("Mit K.K. haben Sie leider Recht") with his remark to Kraus, in a letter of 12.I.1899 ("Mit Lothar haben Sie recht"), or his boast to Kraus, in a letter of 5.V.1900, that he had answered Lothar "eisig ablehnend"; transcripts as per Note 2. Furthermore, the letter that Weller cites to prove Kraus's admiration dates not from this time but from 10.II.1898; cf. Note 113.
11. On choice of title, cf. Harden to Kraus, 12.I.1899 ("'Die F.': meinetwegen, wenn auch nicht originell. Aber es prägt sich ein"); on timing, cf. Harden to Kraus, 13.II.1899 and following letters; transcripts as per Note 2.
12. Harden to Ernestine Lothar, 9.VIII.1899; transcript in Harden's Nachlass. Harden to Kraus, 12.I.1899,

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

- in answer to Kraus's suggestion; cf.Note 11.
13. Harden to Kraus, 12.I.1899; cf.Note 11.
14. Die Zukunft, Berlin, 1.X.1892, vol.I,pp. 33-40 (quotation p.39). Die Zukunft is paginated by quarterly volume, therefore the 2nd year begins at vol.V,p.1; references will be abbreviated as follows: Zukunft,V,33 for Die Zukunft,vol.V.,p.33, and dates provided where necessary.
15. Zukunft,I,36
16. op.cit.,I,40.
17. op.cit.,I,33.
- 17a. cf.M.Harden, Literatur und Theater, Berlin, 1896, the opening of "Der Dichter der Finsterniss" (p.10), or of "Naturalismus" (p.163): "Als auf der Freien Bühne Arthur Fitzers verworrenes und kernkrankes Trauerspiel 'Von Gottes Gnaden' durch die Jämmerlichkeit der Darstellung dem anstandsgrenzenlosen Hohn des berliner Publikums überliefert worden war, da schrieb ein Kritiker [̄...̄]".
18. cf. Weller,op.cit.,pp.53ff. This explains Harden's search for an independent newspaper.
19. The relevant passage of the "private letter" of 7.IV.1899, which Weller quotes (op.cit.,p.344) as proof that Kraus privately promised to bear in mind the "wirtschaftliche Zusammenhänge", is no different from Kraus's published statement (F.2,16). In both,

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

- Kraus's concession to Harden is almost ironic, immediately qualified by the objections quoted here.
20. cf.Harden to Kraus, 11.II.1901, 14.II.1901 /LL 1307; transcripts as per Note 2.
 21. Harden to Bahr, 11.I.1901; transcript in Harden's Nachlass, file no.148, folder 2.
 22. cf.Harden's statement in 1908 /LL 1087; repeated in a letter to Bahr of 1.VI.1911 (transcript as per Note 21), where he exaggerated his active opposition to Kraus ("Ich habe mir die Krauslaus aufgebürdet"). There is no evidence whatsoever, in either his letters to Kraus or published statements, to support his claim that he had not concealed his disapproval of Kraus's campaign, or that he "took on" Kraus.
 23. This view, and its formulation, anticipated part of "Heine und die Folgen". F.136,18: "Ich bin nicht dafür, dass Räuberhöhlen von Portois & Fix decoriert werden, weil sonst Publicum und Polizei viel später, als erspriesslich, dahinter kommen, dass es Räuberhöhlen sind." UWM 193: "Aber warum werden Räuberhöhlen von Van de Velde eingerichtet? Nur deshalb, weil sonst ihr Zweck auf den ersten Blick kenntlich wäre und die Passanten sich nicht willig täglich zweimal die Taschen umkehren liessen."

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

24. In his letters to Kraus, Harden certainly agreed with the latter's complaints about Die Neue Freie Presse (e.g. Harden to Kraus, 3.III.1899: "Es ist schmachvoll, wie auch die N.Fr.Pr. heruntergekommen ist") and (on 12.V.1900) vehemently defended himself against the reproach that he had connections with the paper. This certainly changed in 1903. Yet to judge from the tone of some of his letters and his remarks on the press elsewhere, Harden's agreement on this point seems patronizing rather than genuine, and even the remark quoted above is a concession, not inconsistent with his letter in F.2.
25. Weller, op.cit., pp.129ff., argues that Harden attacked bourgeois society. He mentions particularly the article "Lex Heinze" of 17.III.1900 (Zukunft, XXX, 457-464), which is certainly a spirited attack on the legislation and ethics which threatened the freedom of the minority. Yet Harden's was not a total repudiation of bourgeois values, as Kraus's was to be. While admitting no personal prejudice against prostitution, which he sees as a necessary evil, Harden does not risk offending his readers' sensibilities by blatantly condoning it, as Kraus was to. While denouncing the lawmakers, he tries to reason with the educated bourgeoisie, to whom he

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

recommends further reading on the subject of prostitution. Kraus (F.36,13ff.) openly approved of Harden's second "Lex Heinze" article, of 24.III.1900.

26. Zukunft, XLVII,247.

27. Discussed by Kraus in "Der Fall Hervay" (SK 94-103) and "Der Hexenprozess von Leoben" (SK 104-121); by Harden in Zukunft, XLIX,179-186 (5.XI.1904, "Bellachinis Tochter").

28. Weller,op.cit.,p.347, claims that here Harden was "Gesellschaftskritiker. Nicht so Kraus, der in der Angeklagten zuallererst die Frau sah". Although Weller mentions that Kraus then attacked bourgeois ethics, his contrast, here, with Harden's "attack on the corruption of society" is misleading. For Harden, who undertook a sordidly detailed exposé of Frau von Hervay's past and present life, was adopting society's attitude to the woman, while Kraus was attacking this attitude. In doing so, Kraus defended the woman to a degree that he later regretted (SK 122ff.) - once she capitalized on the affair by selling her memoirs to the press.

29. Zukunft, XLIX,347-354 (10.XII.1904,"Panoptikum").

30. op.cit.,XLVIII,439/SK92.

31. op.cit.,XLVIII,441/SK91.

32. op.cit.,XLVIII,438.

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

33. op.cit., XLVIII, 500.
34. H.F. Young, Maximilian Harden. Censor Germaniae. The critic in opposition from Bismarck to the rise of Nazism, The Hague, 1959, pp.154ff.
35. J.C.G.Röhl, Germany without Bismarck: the crisis of government in the Second Reich (1890-1900), London, 1967, pp.271f.
36. Röhl, op.cit., pp.273f.
37. Repeated in Zukunft, LIX, 414.
38. H. Rogge, Holstein und Harden. Politisch-publizistisches Zusammenspiel zweier Aussenseiter des Wilhelminischen Reichs, Munich, 1959, pp.52-62 and 70f.; cf.Weller, op.cit., pp.161-203, esp.pp.164ff.
39. According to J. Haller, Philipp Eulenburg. The Kaiser's friend, London, n.d./[1930], vol.II, pp.147f. Rogge, op.cit., p.60, questions whether Eulenburg became politically harmless. Weller, who accepts (op.cit., p.161) that Eulenburg exerted a moderating influence on Wilhelm II, also suggests (p.169) that Harden's cryptic threats in Die Zukunft had made him resign in 1902.
40. cf.Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, Denkwürdigkeiten, ed. F. Curtius, Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1907/[1906], vol.II, p.497; cf.Rogge, op.cit., p.89.
41. Rogge, op.cit., pp.99-102.

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

42. cf. Zukunft, LIX, 50 (13.IV.1907, "Monte Carlino").
43. Once Eulenburg, along with the German delegate at Algeciras, was distinguished in April 1906 with the highest Order in the realm, the Black Eagle, Holstein concluded that the Prince had been involved in policy-making; cf. The Holstein Papers, ed. N. Rich/M.H. Fisher, Cambridge, 1955-1963, vol. IV (Correspondence, 1897-1909), p. 411.
44. This can be seen in their correspondence, Holstein Papers, vol. IV. Weller (op.cit., pp. 173ff) argues against Rogge's suggestion that Harden was somewhat influenced by Holstein. Weller (op.cit., p. 179) accepts that Harden did not make Eulenburg responsible for every evil in Germany as Holstein wanted him to; but in doing so he undermines his own attempted explanation of Harden's campaign as politically motivated, for he fails to account for the lengths to which Harden subsequently went to destroy Eulenburg; cf. Note 66.
45. Haller, op.cit., vol. II, pp. 150f.
46. op.cit., vol. II, pp. 171f. Eulenburg admitted as much at the second Moltke trial (cf. Rogge, op.cit., p. 259); Lecomte, according to Le matin (28.X.1907), hinted that Eulenburg's intervention caused the "exposure" and downfall of Holstein and the German

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

- capitulation; cf. Zukunft LXI,48, Harden claimed that Holstein had been denounced by "Paris and Liebenberg".
47. Zukunft,LVII,pp.265f.(17XI.1906,"Praeludium").
48. op.cit.,LVII,pp.281ff.(24.XI.1906,"Dies irae"); proof of the allegation is Moltke's letter to Eulenburg, I.III.1897, quoted by Röhl,op.cit.,p.30; cf. Holstein Papers IV,p.447(11.XI.1906,diary entry).
49. Harden to Holstein 28.II.1907, Holstein Papers IV,p.455.
50. Zukunft,LVIII,167(2.II.1907,"Symphonie"); op.cit., LIX,1-12("Wilhelm der Friedliche",6.IV.1907).
51. cf. Holstein Papers IV,p.459(Harden to Holstein, 21.IV.1907, on Eulenburg); op.cit.,p.460(Harden to Holstein, 23.IV.1907, on Lecomte).
52. Zukunft,LIX,118(27.IV.1907,"Roulette"). The other prince was Hohenau.
53. cf. Harden to Holstein,15.VI.1907,Holstein Papers, IV,p.484.
54. Quoted in Zukunft,LIX,424.
55. Zukunft,LIX,367-374(15.VI.1907,"Nur ein paar Worte") and again in LIX,406-425(22.VI.1907,"Die Freunde").
56. op.cit.,LXI,179-210(9.XI.1907,"Schlussvortrag") and LXI,257-269(23.XI.1907,"Der Prozess").
57. A memorandum from Bülow to Wilhelm II, dated 26.X.1907, demands that such "filthy abscesses" be

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

- cauterized; cf. Holstein Papers IV, p.501.
58. cf. Rogge, op.cit., p.167.
59. Harden to Holstein, 7.XII.1907 and 16.III.1908, Holstein Papers IV, p.507 and p.518 respectively.
60. According to Rogge, op.cit., p.274, he had it since November 1907; according to Weller, op.cit., pp.192ff., he hired a private detective to ferret out information about Eulenburg in his old haunts. Riedl, one of the key witnesses, had emerged at the time of the first Moltke trial.
61. cf. Harden to Bernstein, 19.I.1908 and 21.I.1908, quoted by Weller, op.cit., p.193; cf. also Holstein Papers IV, p.524, footnote to Holstein's letter to Harden of 4.IV.1908.
62. Harden to Holstein, 9.VII.1908; Holstein Papers IV, p.541.
63. Weller, op.cit., p.198, accepts Harden's view that the illness was simulated; Haller, op.cit., vol.I, p.XX, prints the police doctor's diagnosis.
64. Harden to Holstein, 1.X.1908; Holstein Papers IV, p.574.
65. Zukunft, LXI, 197.
66. Weller, op.cit., pp.188ff., claims that Harden had political material, but gives no evidence of it. He depicts Harden's relief at not having to prove the political case and only concentrating on the

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

homosexuality; yet he uncritically reiterates that the campaign was political and that Harden wanted to avoid a scandal. He refers to Harden's blackmail tactics simply as "pressure". In this context, Weller's acceptance of Kraus's criticism (p.202), only undermines his own arguments.

67. Zukunft, LIX, 418.

68. Zukunft, LIX, 374.

69. op.cit., LXI, 185/F.242, 367.

70. op.cit., LXI, 198.

71. cf. Weller, op.cit., p.202, who cites this as an extenuating factor.

72. Zukunft, LIX, 367/F.242, 457. Kraus's spaced type; cf. Note 66.

73. op.cit., LVII, 373/F.242, 327.

74. op.cit., LIX, 44/F.242, 347. For "Tout-Paris", cf. Grand Larousse encyclopédique, Paris, 1964, vol.X., p.420: "Ensemble des personnalités littéraires, artistiques, financières, politiques, etc., que leur notoriété, leur situation, leur position sociale, appellent à figurer dans toutes les manifestations mondaines de la capitale."

75. Zukunft, LXI, 193/F.242, 34f.7.

76. Rogge, op.cit., p.148, f.n.: Below was not in Eulenburg's circle, but was one of the "sanfte Schalmeybläser".

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

77. Zukunft, LXI, 192.
78. op.cit., LXIII, 239.
79. Harden to Holstein, 15.XI.1908, Holstein Papers IV, p.593.
80. Weller's view (op.cit., p.368), that the "unartikulierbarer Zwang" under which Harden lived was reflected in his language, his strained syntax, is rather too general a relation of style to character. Far more significant is the inflexibility in Harden's style of thought, which may possibly, indirectly, have been connected with his style of life.
81. op.cit., p.111.
82. Zukunft, XXXI, 49ff. (14.IV.1900, "Auferstehung").
83. op.cit., XLI, 49-64 (11.X.1902, "Zola").
84. Weller, op.cit., p.361.
85. op.cit., pp.369ff.
86. op.cit., p.362.
87. cf.op.cit., p.363, where Weller suggests that Harden wrote in a simpler manner for journals other than his own; his trial speeches (cf.Note 56), also relatively free of mannerisms, show him to have been a skilful orator.
88. Zukunft, LX, 121-136 (27.VII.1907, "Prozess Hau") and LX, 305-321 (31.VIII.1907, "Hau").
89. Weller, op.cit., pp.371ff.
90. op.cit., p.370.

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

91. Zukunft, LXIV, 237-249 (15.VIII.1908). The first reference (the page-long excerpt) is to p.238; the second (the two pages) to p.240 and p.246.
92. Young, op.cit., p.147.
93. M. Harden, Kampfgenosse Sudermann, Berlin, 1903, p.16.
94. Zukunft, LXXI, 407-422 (25.VI.1910, "Schoenebeck").
95. cf. D. Boorstin, The image: or what happened to the American dream, London, 1961; also V. Packard, The naked society, London, 1964.
96. Harden, Kampfgenosse Sudermann, p.6.
97. op.cit., p.26.
98. op.cit., p.29.
99. Zukunft, LIV, 170 (27.I.1906).
100. op.cit., LIV, 82ff., 86 (13.I.1906).
101. op.cit., LXIV, 162f. (1.VIII.1908).
102. H. Heine, Sämtliche Werke, ed. O. Walzel, Leipzig, 1910-1915, vol. 4, pp. 395f.
103. Zukunft, LXIV, 297 (28.VIII.1908).
104. cf. D. Jost, Literarischer Jugendstil, Stuttgart, 1969, p.48, notes the "prejudice" against the ornamentation of the period, which has blinded some critics to the complexity of the phenomenon. How much a part of the Jugendstil Harden's literary aspirations were would need a separate study.
105. O. Wilde, Intentions, 4th. edition, 1909, London, p.89

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

("Pen, pencil and poison").

106. Weller, op.cit., p.368, distinguishes "die absolute Verschränkung von Mann und Werk" in Harden, from "einer Kongruenz". This remark must be modified by the present findings on Harden's style. Weller (op.cit., p.358) concedes that Harden's preference for Suse and Salus was inconsistent with his literary policy.
107. C.J. Wagenknecht, Das Wortspiel bei Karl Kraus, Göttingen, 1965.
108. H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich, 1960, pp.319f. (§630, disiunctio) and pp.436f. (§§882-886, praeteritio).
109. R. Scheu, Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1909; quoted in: W. Kraft, Karl Kraus, Salzburg, 1956, p.102. At least there was no drop in circulation; cf. F. Schlawe, Literarische Zeitschriften, Stuttgart, vol.I, 1965, p.71, and vol.II, 1962, p.77.
110. Zukunft, LIX, 5 (6.IV.1907) / F.242.33.
111. op.cit., LX, 123f.
112. op.cit., CV, 41 (26.X.1918).
- 112a. Weller, op.cit., p.43.
- 112b. Weller's argument (op.cit., p.42) - "Die Bekanntschaft mit Bismarck war für Hardens ganzes Leben ein entscheidendes Ereignis. Er konnte sich rühmen, den alten Kanzler 'wirklich sehr gut gekannt zu haben'" -

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd)

seems to confirm Kraus's criticism.

113. Kraus to Harden, 10.II.1898; MS. as Note 3. Weller, op.cit., p.442, dates this letter wrongly as "Ende 1899". Harden's internment at that time would have prevented him from making the visit to Vienna which the letter mentions.
114. cf. A. Disch, Das gestaltete Wort, Zürich, 1969, p.39; cf. Chapter One, Note 10.
115. "Karlchen Miessnicks Hass und Liebe. Ein Kapitel der Päderastenmoral", under the pseudonym Tyll red., in Wiener Montags-Journal, 8.VI.1908, p.8. Weller, op.cit., p.443 (note 39) refers to Harden's letters to the editor, Bergmann, dated 13.V.1908 and 16.V.1908. The interview was on 7.VI.1908.
116. My speculation about an estrangement is based on the absence of extant correspondence, and of Harden's name from Die Fackel, between February 1901 and November 1902. While the latest of Kraus's extant letters dates from 27/28.IV.1903 - his sanguine reaction to Harden's Easter article in the Neue Freie Presse - and, according to Rogge (op.cit., p.V), Harden's widow destroyed "negative" correspondence from Kraus, the only extant answers from Harden after these dates are those positive remarks quoted in abridged form by Kraus /LL122-LL126/.
117. cf. Kraft, op.cit., pp.99ff. The intellectual influence

Notes to Chapter Three: MAXIMILIAN HARDEN (cont'd.)

- of Weininger in the formation of this vision is -
not thoroughly - investigated by Kraft (pp.73-94).
118. cf. Lausberg, op.cit., p.324 (§638, 1b, annominatio per
adjectionem, "unorganische Veränderung").
119. Rogge, op.cit., pp.406ff.
120. cf. K. Tucholsky, "Prozess Harden", in: Die Weltbühne,
Berlin, 1922, 641 (21.XII.1922), "reported" that the
assassins were defended by two counsels and a judge,
who heard their threadbare arguments with sympathy
and treated Harden's survival as an extenuating factor
for them. They were merely imprisoned, for a short
term.
121. From transcript of the peroration, of 13.XII.1922,
in the Preussisches Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Berlin,
in the papers of Elfriede Schmaltz.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR

1. Kerr's criticism appeared in the Breslauer Zeitung on 26.IX.1897 and is quoted in F.787,87. Kraus's letter was quoted by Kerr [F.787,10] and interpreted by Kraus in F.787, pp.39 and 87.
2. For Kerr's account, cf.F.787, pp.10 and 99-115. For Kraus's account,cf.F.787, pp.34, 38-41, 99-115 and 197.
3. The word was coined by Raimund in Der Barometermacher auf der Zauberinsel (Act I, Sc. ii, where Quecksilber refers to Lidi as "welch eine krudelschöne Person?") cf. F.76,24.
4. A. Kerr, Herr Sudermann, der D..Di...Dichter. Ein kritisches Vademecum, Berlin, 1903. M. Harden, Kampfgenosse Sudermann, Berlin, 1903.
5. A. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama, Berlin, 1917, vol.I, p.11.
6. S. Hoefert, Das Drama des Naturalismus, Stuttgart, 1968, p.85, mentions especially Kerr's "Über die Technik des realistischen Dramas" (1891); cf. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1917), vol.I,pp.425-445.
7. The quotation is from Kerr; quoted by G.F. Hering in his "Nachwort" to A. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama, Cologne/Berlin, 1954, p.597.
8. Hering, op.cit.
9. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1917), vol.I,p.10.
10. A. Kerr, Die Welt im Licht, Berlin, 1919-1920, vol.I, p.104.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

11. L. Spitzer, "Sprachmischung als Stilmittel und als Ausdruck der Klangphantasie", in: GRM, 1923, 193-216. Spitzer's study reveals the arbitrariness and subjectivity of Kerr's stylistic procedure.
12. Pan, ed. W. Herzog/P. Cassirer, Berlin, 1910/11, 289. Except where stated, all references are to this (first) year of its appearance. Dates are provided where necessary.
13. Pan, 221.
14. Pan, 220.
15. O. Walzel, Das Wortkunstwerk, Leipzig, 1926, p.38.
16. W. Huder, "Alfred Kerr. Ein deutscher Kritiker im Exil", in: SuF, 1966, 1262-79; quotation from p.1264.
17. Spitzer, op.cit., p.210.
18. Pan, 255.
19. Pan, 189f.
20. Pan, 321-326 (16.III.1911, "Nachlese"); quotation from p.324; reprinted in A. Kerr, Die Welt im Licht, Cologne/Berlin, 1961, pp.360-364.
21. Quoted by Hering, op.cit., p.598.
22. Quoted by Hering, op.cit., p.593.
23. Pan, 137-143 (1.I.1911).
24. Pan, 9 (1.XI.1910).
25. Pan, 8.
- 25a. cf. "Nachwort" to Kerr, Die Welt im Licht (1961), p.436, where F. Luft suggests that Kerr's travel sketches

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

- were themselves products of his desire to "escape" the artificial magic and formalized beauty of the theatrical world, after the end of the season.
26. Published in Pan, 96.
27. Pan, 181-188.
- 27a. Their literary value was endorsed by Dehmel, Hauptmann and Hofmannsthal in Pan, 591.
28. Pan, 217-223 ("Jagow, Flaubert, Pan"); reprinted in Kerr, Die Welt im Licht (1961), pp.352-356.
29. Pan, 285 ("Intermezzo").
30. Pan, 325.
31. Pan, 287-290 ("Vorletzter Brief an Jagow"); reprinted in Kerr, Die Welt im Licht (1961), pp.357-360.
32. Pan, 323.
33. Pan, 320.
34. Pan, 354.
35. O.A.H. Schmitz, "Der Fall Jagow. Ein offener Brief an Herrn Alfred Kerr", in: Die Schaubühne, Berlin, 1911, No.11; and an attack by H.H. Kahn in No.12 of same.
36. "Ein besserer Mitteleuropäer", in Die Aktion, 1911, 172ff. (27.III.1911).
37. Der Demokrat, 1.I.1911 /F.315,507.
38. Die Aktion, 1911, 242f. (10.IV.1911).
39. Pan, 421.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

40. Die Aktion, 1928,40 [LL201].
41. "Rundfrage über Alfred Kerr", in: Die Aktion, 1911,299f. (27.IV.1911),335ff.(1.V.1911),369ff. (8.V.1911),397ff.(15.V.1911),430ff.(22.V.1911), 619ff.(3.VII.1911).
- 41a. op.cit.,335: "Aller Hass und Neid der Schlechtweg-
gekommenen".
42. op.cit.,p.433.
43. op.cit.,p.335; a second attack by Brod, "Ein
mittelmässiger Kopf", in: Die Aktion, 622-625
(3.VII.1911), was dismissed in F.325,35f. after
fuller treatment.
44. [F.787,10,99], answered by Kraus (F.787,40,99ff.).
45. Pan, 289.
46. Pan, 321.
47. As reported by the Breslauer Morgen-Zeitung, 9.V.1911.
48. Pan, 485.
49. NRu, 1911,707.
50. Pan, 580f.
51. cf. Johann Fischarts Werke. Eine Auswahl, I,
Stuttgart, n.d. (ed. A. Hauffen, Deutsche National-
Literatur, XVIII,1),pp.173-197: "Notwendiger Kehrab
Auf aines vngehöbelten Neidigen Schandtichters
mutwilliges vnd Ehrwürdiges Spottgedicht", in which
Fischart calls his opponent
"Ainem Närrischen Lumpenschwetter,
Des Lands vnd der Stätt Ehrverletzer"(11.19ff.),

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

"Treckrüttler" (58), "Katverrörer" (59), "Oberster Mundpreiprobierer" (60), "Erzunflat" (381), "ain Teuflisch Schänder" (531). This he justified as follows:

" Ich mus die Mistflig Mistflig nennen
Damit man lehr jr art erkennen,
Ich mus aim solchen Grobian
Die sach grob geben zuverstahn." (ll.397ff.)

52. Pan, 643.

53. In October 1912 (F.357,52), he reprinted without comment a further attack on him, "Der kleine Anti-Schnitzler" by Theodor Reik, which had appeared in Pan (1911/12,1118) on 22.VIII.1912.

54. The relevant passage is quoted by H. Weigel, Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1968,p.142.

55. cf.F.649,79 and 118;F.686,28; F.717,47,etc.

56. "Aus dem Kriegsbuch eines Hirnwesens", in:
NRu, 1914,1308-1315.

56a. op.cit.,p.1312.

56b. op.cit.,p.1310.

56c. op.cit.,p.1308.

56d. op.cit.,p.1309.

56e. op.cit.,p.1311.

56f. op.cit.,p.1315.

57. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1917),vol.I (Das neue Drama),
p.XXI.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

58. Quoted by Huder, op.cit., p.1278.
59. This was confirmed by a quotation from the Neues Wiener Journal /F.806,367/.
60. According to Kraus's pleading of 15.X.1928, composed by his solicitor Laserstein, R.von Berry confirmed the number; copy of pleading in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, folder I.N.140.800.
61. Apart from the twenty quoted in Die Fackel, Kraus had another fifty-five copied by hand, by Heinrich Fischer among others; cf. Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, folder I.N.140.797, and the Kerr-file from Oskar Samek's papers, C.148.073, where some are attached to Fischer's letter to the Verlag Die Fackel of 31.V.1927. Among the Kerr poems included in the early volumes of J. Bab's anthology, Der Deutsche Krieg im Deutschen Gedicht, Berlin, 1914ff., are three not mentioned or recorded by Kraus. Pfemfert, in his polemic against Kerr (in: Die Aktion, 1928, 38-56), quotes six more not mentioned or recorded by Kraus. For this study I took a random sample from Der Tag - from the issues for early March 1915, a time when some writers had lost their initial enthusiasm - and discovered a further five.
62. In "Chronik" (in: Der Tag, 31.I.1915), he threatened: "we'll fetch the grain if they don't send it"; cf. "Rumänisch" (Der Tag, 24.III.1916) and "Bukarest"

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

(Der Tag, 12.IV.1916).

63. cf. Bekessy's falsification of a photo of Kraus /F.686,12f/ and assertion that Kraus's "resentment" of the world was because he was a hunchback (F.691,80).
64. In his pleading of 16.IX.1927, to explain the poem in his "Kriegsbuch" essay where, after mentioning France's being outvoted by Russia, he wished corns, scabies and anal rheumatism on "allen Führern bei der Deutschlandhetze", he emphasized that he had meant the leaders, not the peoples /F.787,14/; cf. A. Kerr, Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, Berlin, 1928, pp.205f.
65. An earlier gloss, "Ein andres Antlitz" (F.445,80f.), had printed the patriotic opinions of soldiers from a publisher's brochure on the writer Otto Ernst, as well as a photo from it, and had used the allusion to Schiller ("Ein andres Antlitz eh sie geschehn, ein anderes zeigt die vollbrachte Tat") to recall an earlier, very different photo of Ernst and to imply that his war guilt was discernible in his face. Kerr's beard is, perhaps, also to be taken symbolically - as his attempt to hide any noticeable signs of guilt. This is therefore a more justifiable physiognomical motif

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

- than the references to Kerr's mouth (cf. Note 55).
66. The jingle appeared on the cover of Bab's anthology, cf. Note 61.
67. Berliner Tageblatt, 24.IV.1926; it was adapted - and enlarged by a polemic against Kraus - for the book Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, (pp.191-216), where it was given the title "Das Glück in Paris". This is reprinted in Kerr, Die Welt im Licht (1961), pp.331-340.
68. Kerr, Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, p.208: "In die Überraschungen des Weltkrieges rief ich manches Wort, das ich heut nicht vertrete; doch ich vertrete, dass ich es damals rief." Kerr made a similar statement in his pleading of 21.IX.1928 /F.795,55/; but cp. Note 102.
69. cf. Caliban, "Feuchtes Element" (in: Der Tag, 6.III.1915), makes fun of the drunken crew of a French ammunition ship that sunk at Ostende after bad navigation; in the Kriegsalbum der Lustigen Blätter (1914), several cartoons depict the Russians as drunkards; on the cover of vol.XXIX, No.37 the cartoonist Trier depicts "der versoffene Russe" (drowning), and on p.9 of that issue F. Jüttner's cartoon "Tannenberg" symbolizes the capture of "90,000 Russians" as the trapping of a bear by means of "Masurian honey"; in vol.XXIX, No.42, p.10,

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

another cartoon by Trier makes the English and French remark that there is room for a million Russians in the Vistula; in a special military jubilee issue included in the Kriegsalbum der Lustigen Blätter for 1916, a gloss entitled "Ein Überschwemmter" rehearses the joke about Russians drowning in schnaps.

70. cf. H. Fischer's letter, attached to O. Samek's letter of 23.V.1927 to V. Fraenkl; MS.in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, Akten Samek, file C.148.073.
71. O. Samek to V. Fraenkl, 3.I.1927;C.148.073. The account here is largely based on the unpublished material in Samek's papers (C.148.073) and other documents in the Stadtbibliothek relating to Kerr. These are hereinafter referred to by file, folder or MS.No.only.
72. cf. Samek to Fraenkl,28.II.1927;C.148.073.
- 72a. Samek to Fraenkl,7.XI.1927;C.148.073.
73. cf. S.von Radecki to Kraus,3.II.1928, and Radecki to Samek,8.II.1928;C.148.073.
74. Reprimands in Samek's letter to Fraenkl,17.II.1928, and Verlag Die Fackel letter to Fraenkl,7.III.1928; C.148.073. The replacement was Botho Laserstein, an almost over-ardent admirer of Kraus; cf.Laserstein to Verlag Die Fackel, 7.IX.1928(I.N.140.799).

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

75. cf. pleading of 5.V.1927, composed by Kerr's solicitor W. Heine (I.N.140.799): "Der Beschuldigte /=Kerr/ spricht aber nicht von bestimmten wissentlich unwahren Behauptungen des Privatklägers und verwendet den Ausdruck "Verleumder" /.../ lediglich als übliche Bezeichnung für böartige Beleidigungen." Kerr later construed "Verleumder" as containing both implications /F.787,9/.
76. "Krätzerich" was in fact published in Kerr's book Caprichos, Berlin, 1926, p.167 (cf. F.743,66). Kerr sought to excuse this poem in his pleading /F.787,141/.
77. Kerr, Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, pp.205-216; Kraus did not check the reference, cf. F.795,78.
78. Kerr, op.cit., p.210.
79. StZ, 1966,331.
80. He had done so in the Berliner Tageblatt, 21.II.1924 /F.649,79/.
81. These points are made in Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, p.213 and pp.205ff. respectively.
82. Kerr, op.cit., p.206.
83. Kerr, op.cit., pp.211-214. He is referring to Kraus's "In dieser grossen Zeit" (Wg 10f.). Schalek was the prominent female war correspondent for the Neue Freie Presse.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

84. F. Hader, "Der Triumph des Thersites", in:
Tägliche Rundschau, 21.VIII.1927 /F.787,85/.
85. F. Reifferscheidt, "Reisebücher deutscher
Schriftsteller", in: Hochland, 1926/27,647
/F.787,86/.
86. A. Ehrenstein, Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1920.
87. Kerr's other allegations of plagiarism were borrowed:
that Die demolierte Litteratur contained plagiarisms
of Bahr, dates from the trial of 1901; that
Kraus's "Man lebt nicht einmal einmal" (BWG 178)
was a plagiarism from Rückert's Die Weisheit der
Brahmanen /F.787,150/, was first alleged by
G. Kulka in "Die Götze des Lachens", p.V, a
supplement to Ehrenstein's pamphlet (cf.Note 86);
it had been dismissed by Kraus, on the basis that
his own formulation was far more original than
Rückert's (F.552,22);cf.F.787,168.
88. The typing error was in the proof of the pleading
of 29.X.1927, a copy of which Kerr possessed; a
copy is attached to Samek's letter to Fraenkl of
4.XI.1927 (C.148.073). The error was corrected in
Die Fackel (F.787,67).
89. This was the finding of an investigation into the
case by a German anti-censorship committee (which
included Herbert Ihering); cf. Laserstein to

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

- Verlag Die Fackel, 28.III.1929 (I.N.140.799). Samek, in a letter to Laserstein of 11.X.1928 (C.148.073), queried the confusion - on which Kerr's case rested - of "Vermögensrecht", "Persönlichkeitsrecht" and "Zitierungsrecht".
90. Parts of this plaint are reprinted in F.795,55-57; a copy of it was enclosed in Laserstein's letter of 5.X.1928 (C.148.073).
91. cf. Samek to Laserstein, 11.X.1928 (C.148.073). Laserstein enthusiastically proposed publication of the poems in a small edition by a third party, so as to circumvent the copyright law; cf. Laserstein to Verlag Die Fackel, 13.XI.1928 (C.148.073) and to Kraus, 26.XI.1928 (I.N.140.799). The suggestion was not taken up.
92. As is mentioned in F.795,58f.; a copy of the verdict of the Copyright trial, dated 23.X.1928, is attached to Laserstein's letter to Verlag Die Fackel, 13.XI.1928 (C.148.073).
93. Samek to Laserstein, 16.XI.1928 (C.148.073).
94. Samek to Laserstein, 28.XI.1928 (C.148.073).
95. Laserstein to Kraus, 18.II.1929 (I.N.140.799).
96. "Brechts Copyright", in: Berliner Tageblatt, 3.V.1929; reprinted in: Kerr, Die Welt im Licht (1961), pp.367-370. Kerr made the allegation only

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

after the opera's success had defied his predictions and lukewarm criticism; cf. his review in Berliner Tageblatt, 1.IX.1928, reprinted in: Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1954), pp.169,173.

97. A.J. Harper, "Brecht and Villon: further thoughts on some Dreigroschenoper songs", in: FMLS, 1965, 191-194.
98. Kerr's reaction, cf. H. Fischer to Verlag Die Fackel, 14.IX.1928 (I.N.140.799); Wolff's reaction in three letters /F.795,82f.7, referring to Kraus's hunger for publicity.
99. Verlag Die Fackel to Laserstein, 16.XI.1928 (C.148.073).
100. cf. pleading of 25.X.1928, composed by the lawyer F. Cohn, and Laserstein's reply, dated 6.XI.1928; both in I.N.140.801.
101. "Krieg", in: Berliner Tageblatt, 26.I.1929 /F.806,397.
102. An example, not specifically mentioned by Kraus, is Kerr's confession, in Welt am Abend on 13.I.1931, under the title "Vergebliche Warnung", that he, a "Pazifist solange es geht", "mit dieser Losung in einem Teil des vierjährigen Schwindelkriegs wallungsmässig Irrtümer beging, die ich nicht wiederholen würde."; reprinted in A. Kerr, Die Diktatur des Hausknechts, Brussels, 1934, p.97.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

103. F. Pfemfert, "Der grosse Gegenspieler Wilhelms II. Mit Maximilian Harden während der letzten Tage seines Lebens", in: Prager Presse, 27.XI.1927, pp.3f.
104. In a letter to a Herr Steinthal, which was then sent anonymously to Kraus, (I.N.140.790) dated 24.X.1929, Kerr dismissed the notion of his "erkaufte Annahme" by the Tageblatt as one of Kraus's lies, and gave his own account of the affair.
105. The other witness was Elfried Schmaltz, a lifelong friend of Harden's. Her testimony is referred to in a letter of 30.IX.1928 from Laserstein to Kraus (I.N.140.801), according to which Harden, after meeting Reinhardt, said how the latter's "doubts" about Kerr had been dispelled by Wolff. She is again mentioned in a summary of the final verdict, by the lawyer Katz in a letter to Kraus dated 17.IX.1932 (I.N.140.801).
106. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1917), vol.II, p.6 ("Belanglosigkeit der Kunst").
107. op.cit., vol.V., p.138 ("Gretchen").
108. op.cit., vol.V. p.109.
109. Berliner Tageblatt, 21.X.1929: "Verfehlungen im einzelnen sind unabhängig von dem glänzend durchgehaltenen Ganzen"; reprinted in: Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1954), p.542.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

110. cf. anonymous typescript (I.N.140.761), the author of which is obviously Kraus.
111. In a review not mentioned by Kraus - of Dorothea Angermann, on 23.XI.1926 - Kerr explained his jubilee congratulations to Reinhardt by saying that circumstances had changed ("alles ist relativ"); cf. Kerr, Die Welt im Drama (1954), p.539.
112. "Hamlet", in: Berliner Tageblatt, 19.I.1920; "Zweite Hamlet-Besetzung", in: Berliner Tageblatt, 19.II.1920; both in I.N.140.761. The underlining in the quotations is Kraus's.
113. "Florian Geyer", in: Berliner Tageblatt, 6.I.1921 (I.N.140.761). The underlining in the quotation is Kraus's.
114. There is no record of it in the legal documents, and Pfemfert's "letter of congratulations" to Kraus, 6.XI.1929 (I.N.140.761), was no doubt ironic, for in it he also asks if Kraus will appeal.
115. E.F. Timms, Language and the satirist in the work of Karl Kraus, Cambridge, 1967, p.12; cf. Chapter One, Note 1.
116. cf. R. Nürnberg to Laserstein, 25.X.1929 (I.N.140.761). This is almost certainly the "Zuschrift" mentioned in F.827,72, which Kraus read out publicly on 30.IX.1929. The critics named were Dr H. Horkheimer and W.von Molo respectively.

Notes to Chapter Four: ALFRED KERR (contd.)

117. Attached to a letter from Laserstein to Samek,
4.III.1929 (C.148.073).
118. Verlag Die Fackel to Laserstein, 9.II.1929 (I.N.140.
761), reiterated in Laserstein's pleading of
1.III.1929; cf. Laserstein to Samek, 4.III.1929
(C.148.073).
119. Verdict, dated 21.I.1932, attached to Katz's
letter to Kraus of 17.IX.1932 (I.N.140.761).
120. B.U. Weller, Maximilian Harden und die "Zukunft",
Bremen, 1971, p.396, Note 109, claims that Harden's
allegation was upheld at the second trial, but
gives no evidence.
121. "Beleidigungen dürfen auf der Stelle erwidert werden"
("Noch immer Herr Kraus und Das Rassentimentferkel").
The latest version extant is the second proof;
all MS. and proofs are to be found in file Jb 163.
495 in the Stadtbibliothek, Vienna.
122. W. Hausenstein, "Wiener Tagebuch(II)", in: NRu,
1932, 633-659, relevant passage, p.647.

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL

1. cf. P. Raabe, "Franz Kafka und der Expressionismus", in ZDP, 1967, 168; cf. K. Krolop, "Ein Manifest der 'Prager Schule'", in: PhP, 1964, 333f.
2. F.309,4; F.313,36. Brod was among the admirers whom Kraus rejected; cf. Brod to Kraus, 2.VII.1907, MS. in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.137.985.
3. Raabe, op.cit., p.167, has noted such ambitions in Kafka's contemporaries.
4. cf. Die Aktion, 1911, 1426.
5. cf. Werfel to Kraus, 27.VI.1912. MS. in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.140.810.
6. cf. Wolff to Kraus, 20.II.1913 and 8.X.1913; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.143.304 and 143.310 respectively. The de luxe edition, with illustrations by Kokoschka, was suggested by Adolf Loos.
7. K. Hiller, Die Weisheit der Langenweile, Leipzig, 1913, p.221; Kraus quoted the passage in his letter to Wolff of 9.XII.1913 (cf. note 8), to which Hiller's letter is attached.
8. Kraus to Wolff, 9.XII.1913; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.172.741; printed in: K. Wolff, Briefwechsel eines Verlegers. 1911-1963, Frankfurt a.M., 1966, pp.123-127. On numerous occasions Kraus refused to appear alongside authors of whom he disapproved (e.g. VH 12; VH 182) and sometimes exerted a veto on them, as later in the case of

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

- Haas; cf. P. Schick, Karl Kraus, Reinbek, 1965, p.133.
9. Wolff to Kraus, 14.XII.1913; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.143.314; also: Wolff, Briefwechsel, p.127f.
10. The arrangement was mentioned by Wolff to Kraus in a letter of 18.XII.1915 (Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.143.303). There is in fact a gap in the extant correspondence, from 23.III.1914 to 9.X.1915.
11. Wolff to Kraus, 19.III.1921; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.143.328; also: Wolff, Briefwechsel, p.135. In a letter to Werfel, 15.XI.1920 (in: Wolff, Briefwechsel, p.342), Wolff expressed his disapproval of the polemic without insisting on its deletion. In retrospect, Wolff admitted his moral failure; cf.K. Wolff, Bücher, Autoren, Abenteuer. Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen eines Verlegers, Berlin, 1965,p.97.
12. F. Werfel, Wir sind, Leipzig, 1917 (3rd edition), pp.31f.; also: F. Werfel, Das lyrische Werk, ed. A.D. Klarmann, Frankfurt a.M.,1967,p.86.
13. The only one of this series, at that time, to be printed by "Drugulin in Leipzig" - to which "Elysisches" alludes - was Werfel's Gesänge aus den drei Reichen. Ausgewählte Gedichte (1917); cf. facsimile reprint of Der Jüngste Tag. Die Bücherei einer Epoche, ed. H. Schöffler, Frankfurt

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

a.M., 1970.

14. Indeed, it is an old device; the rhymes are in the manner of travesties by Heine and his followers. An example already discussed are Kerr's satires in Chapter Four, Part I, Section iv.
15. Die Aktion, 1917, 124-128.
16. Die Aktion, 1917, 126.
17. Die Aktion, 1917, 125.
18. Die Aktion, 1917, 124.
19. NRu, 1916, 821f; F. Werfel, Der Gerichtstag, Leipzig, 1919, pp.257ff.; also: Werfel, Das lyrische Werk, pp.292ff.
20. D.W. Schumann, "The development of Werfel's Lebensgefühl as reflected in his poetry", in: GR, 1931, 45.
21. Kraus to Sidonie Nadherny, 1,VI.1916; transcript in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, Jc 159.612.
22. Die Aktion, 1917, 127.
23. F. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, Leipzig, 1918 (3rd edition), p.109; also: Werfel, Das lyrische Werk, p.62.
24. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, p.67; Das lyrische Werk, p.42.
25. Werfel, Wir sind, pp.91ff; Das lyrische Werk, p.116. The rhyme "rosten"- "Pfoften" derives from George's Das Jahr der Seele, Gesamtausgabe der Werke, vol.IV, Berlin, 1928, p.20, where it is more appropriate.

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

26. cf. "Den Zwiespältigen" (F.445,148;WiV 76).
27. R.M. Rilke, Sämtliche Werke, Frankfurt a.M., 1966, vol.VI, 1063-1074. The essay appeared in Die weissen Blätter in March 1914, 635-642. For an interpretation cf. A. Stephens, "Rilke's essay 'Puppen' and the problem of the divided self", GLL, 1968/69,302-315.
28. cf. Werfel to G.H. Meyer, 13.VIII.1915 (in: Wolff, Briefwechsel,pp.106f.), where he criticizes Hasenclever, aware of his own weaknesses; cf. Werfel to Wolff, 2.IX.1919 (in: Wolff, Briefwechsel, p.332), where he attacks Becher and observes:
"Das moderne Verlagswesen ist leider überrumpelt durch eine Meute mit Jugend, Menschlichkeit und verhurten Phrasen auftrumpfender Halb- und Nichtskönner".
29. F. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, Munich, 1920,p.32;
also: Werfel, Dramen, ed.A.D.K. Klarmann, Frankfurt a.M.,1959, vol.I.,p.152.
30. Werfel, Spiegelmensch,p.67; Dramen I, p.170.
R. Bauer, "Kraus contra Werfel: Eine nicht nur literarische Fehde" (in: Sprache und Bekenntnis, Sonderband des Literaturwissenschaftlichen Jahrbuchs /Festschrift Kunisch/, Berlin, 1971,pp.315-335), sees this as satire(p.325); cf.Note 28, for Werfel's criticism of jargon.

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

31. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, pp.158f.; Dramen I, 215f.
32. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, pp.170f.; Dramen I, pp.221f.
Kraus saw another reference (Spiegelmensch, p.187;
Dramen I, p.230) as a possible slur (F.561,62).
33. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.90; Dramen I, p.182.
34. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, pp.187f.; Dramen I, pp.229f.
35. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.189; Dramen I, p.231.
36. Die Aktion, 1911, 336.
37. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.189: "Das erste ist, ich
gründe ...eine Zeitschrift und nenne sie: Die
Leuchte? Nein! Der Kerzenstumpf? Nein! Die
Fackel? Ja!"
38. "Rundfrage über Karl Kraus", in: Der Brenner, 1913,
934f; republished, Innsbruck, 1917, pp.36ff.
39. A. Viviani, Das Drama des Expressionismus. Kommentar
zu einer Epoche, Munich, 1970, p.148, says the
production - which she dates at 15th October -
caused a controversy; J. Willett, Expressionism,
London 1970, p.157, says that the play made little
or no impression on stage.
- 39a. Werfel's urgent desire for this very support, for
the universal success of both play and book, is
expressed in his letter to Wolff of 27.X.1920,
quoted by M. Durzak, "Dokumente des Expressionismus:
Das Kurt Wolff-Archiv", in: Euphorion, 1966, 367.
40. cf. Chapter Two, Note 92.
41. E. Haueis, Karl Kraus und der Expressionismus,

42. cf. G.J. Carr, "Zu den Briefen Else Lasker-Schüllers an Karl Kraus", in: LK, 1970, 551f. The poetess used "affected" stylization of her friends and emotional experience, to create "mythical" figures with which to populate her poetic "cosmos". A further example of justified distortion is her tribute to Kraus in Der Brenner, 1913, 837f.:
"Ein gütiger Pater mit Pranken, ein grosser Kater,
gestiefelte Papstfüsse, die den Kuss erwarten.
Manchmal nimmt sein Gesicht die Katzenform
eines Dalai-Lama an [. . .]". Her experience is as subjective as Werfel's, but at least she distills it by means of Wortmagie, into an affectionate, obviously fictional sketch.

43. Werfel to Kraus, 14.XII.1913; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.140.814.

44. cf. Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.140.819: an undated telegram from Kraus to Werfel, a draft of which is incorporated into his letter to Sidonie Nadherny of 7.IV.1914(cf.note 46).

45. Werfel to Kraus, 6.IV.1914; Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.140.815.

46. Kraus to Sidonie Nadherny, 7.IV.1914; transcript in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, Jc 159.613.

47. Kraus to Sidonie Nadherny, 14.IV.1915; transcript

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

- in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, Jc 159.612.
48. Bauer, op.cit.
49. Haueis, op.cit.,p.100.
- 49a. cf. O. Weininger, Geschlecht und Charakter, Vienna/Leipzig, 1905,p.229, makes a clear distinction between sympathy, which is a mere emotion like pride and shame, and the positive ethical act; op.cit.,p.264, he outlines the psychological context for the female's escape from responsibility and penitence through forgetting, in terms that anticipate the Werfel case; indeed, the "moralisches Gedächtnis" that Werfel ascribes to Kraus clearly has its precedent in Weininger's conception, op.cit., p.193: "Das Gedächtnis ist ferner schon deshalb moralisch, weil es allein die Reue ermöglicht". It was Werfel's false "Reue" that infuriated Kraus in 1914.
50. Die Aktion, 1917, 128.
51. cf. Haueis, op.cit.,pp.150ff., who discusses Kraus's comments in F.521,79. Of Werfel's immediate literary contemporaries, only Kafka and Trakl can be said to have exemplified both genius and integrity, in their painful lives. That their austere pessimism both inhibited their worldly ambitions in the realm of publicity and inspired the most powerful of literary visions is a coincidence so striking that it is only surprising that Kraus did not take such

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

terrible unity of man and work as a point of contrast with the optimistic, successful Werfel.

52. Die Aktion, 1916, 581-606 (nos.43/44).
53. Die Aktion, 1916, 605 ("Erinnerungen an den Winter 1911/12"). Pick's syntax here might have "inspired" Kraus's evocation of the Jewish milieu in "Elysisches" and "Dorten".
54. The supplements to Die weissen Blätter, 1913/14, pp.69f., contain a review of Franz Blei's Landfahrer und Abenteuerer by "R.G.", followed immediately by two reviews by Blei. Kraus knew these, since (F.395,19f) he quoted Blei's polemic against Theodor Haecker from pp.92ff. of these supplements. In Die Aktion, 1913, Paul Zech - who according to E. Lohner (in: Expressionismus. Gestalten einer literarischen Bewegung, ed. H. Friedmann/O.Mann, Heidelberg, 1956, p.65) is concerned in his poetry with the "Ich-Du-Beziehung" - reviewed his own poems, under the pseudonym Paul Robert, calling the technique "ungeheuer raffiniert und selbständig"; cf. Die Aktion, 1913, 615-620 and 973f., op.cit., 1914, 376.
55. cf. Die Aktion, 11.VI.1913 (back cover), for Hasenclever; op.cit., 25.VI.1913, for Werfel; op.cit., 25.X.1915, a large advertisement for Werfel, with quoted opinions.
56. Werfel to Kraus, 17.VII.1916; Stadtbibliothek,

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

Vienna, I.N.140.817.

57. Werfel to Kraus, 23.V.1911; Stadtbibliothek,
Vienna, I.N.140.807.

58. Quoted by K. Wagenbach, Franz Kafka. Eine Biographie
seiner Jugend. 1883-1912, Bern, 1958, p.89.

59. F. Werfel, Gedichte, Vienna, 1927, p.161.

60. Another example, criticized by Kraus (F.484,100),
is the end of "Ich bin ja noch ein Kind". In
Wir sind it reads:

"Du auch, Wort, prassle auf, das ich in Ahnung
brauche!

Geuss unverzehrbar Dich durchs All: Wir sind!"

In Werfel, Gedichte, p.162, it becomes:

"Dann, Wort, dann prassle auf, das ich in Ahnung
brauche,

Flamm unverzehrbar Dich durchs All: Wir sind!"

In "Die Musik, auf dem Wasser geboren", Kraus
criticized (F.608,38) the line

"Nachtstarr steinten Paläste" (Werfel, Das
Lyrische Werk, p.338).

In view of contemporary distortions of language,
Kraus suggested that it could equally have been a
misprint for "Nachtstarr steilten Paläste". In
fact, in Werfel, Gedichte, p.358, this became
"Nachtsteil starrten Paläste". Kraus's criticisms,
in these cases, did have some positive effect.

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

61. P. Kraft, Gedichte, Leipzig, 1915, p.6.
62. G. Kölwel, Gesänge gegen den Tod, Leipzig, 1914, p.42.
63. op.cit., pp.43ff.
64. Die weissen Blätter, 1913/14, 682.
65. op.cit., 437 and 436 respectively.
66. op.cit., 464-467.
67. Only in view of Kraus's ability to document a reality often so grotesque as to outstrip his satiric invention need one draw on an undated letter from Werfel to Else Lasker-Schüler (Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.140.818), to confirm that this was a parody. Werfel's letter dates from April 1914, since it also mentions Kraus's "consulting with others instead of with me", i.e. the same reproach that he makes direct to Kraus on 6.IV.1914; cf.Note 45.
68. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, pp.15f.; Das lyrische Werk, pp.16f. The text quoted keeps the variants as in Die Fackel. Werfel had "Quai" for "Kai", "Treppe" for "Brücke", "Booten" for "Boten".
69. Schumann, op.cit., p.30.
70. Schumann, op.cit., pp.28f.
71. F. Werfel, Einander, Leipzig, 1917 (3rd edition), p.14; Das lyrische Werk, p.144.
72. cf. F. Kafka, Briefe an Felice und andere Korrespondenz aus der Verlobungszeit, Frankfurt a.M./New York,

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

- 1967, p.178, letter of 12.XII.1912; op.cit., pp.280f.,
letter of 1/2.II.1913.
73. Bauer, op.cit., p.317.
74. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, p.32; Das lyrische Werk,
p.25.
75. cf. "Phänomen" and "Zwiespalt" from the "Buch des
Sängers", "Wie ich so ehrlich war" from the "Buch
der Betrachtungen"; also, of course, the end of
Faust II.
76. P. Kraft, op.cit., p.21; which begins "Morgendlich
angeschmiegt".
77. M. Harden, op.cit., p.29; cf. Chapter Three, Note 93.
78. Kraus's encouragement of Franz Janowitz as a poet
is evident from the latter's reply to him of
19.VIII.1917, (Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.167.585);
Franz's reluctance to publish is mentioned by Otto
Janowitz to Kraus, 20.VII.1917 (I.N.145.478);
Wolff's delay in publishing the poems is mentioned
by Otto Janowitz to Kraus, 3.I.1920 (I.N.145.525).
1000 copies were printed.
79. Postcard from F. Janowitz to Kraus, 6.IV.1917,
Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.162.488; the vowel was
the "u" in the final lines of Kraus's "Als Bobby
starb" (F.454,64; WiV 100).
80. F. Janowitz, Auf der Erde, Munich, 1919, p.17.
81. Janowitz, op.cit., p.36 ("Bäume"), p.35 ("Der Winterbaum").

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

82. cf. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, p.24; Das lyrische Werk, p.20, the poem "Verliebte Frühe", where the "treue Lampe" shines on the beloved's shoulders. Werfel, Der Weltfreund, p.25; Das lyrische Werk, p.21, the poem "Ich spreche einen Namen aus", is an elaboration on the beloved's name.
83. cf. P. Altenberg, Auswahl aus seinen Büchern, ed. K. Kraus, Vienna, 1932, pp.69ff. ("Theater-Abend") describes a poodle's "Sehnsucht" for his mistress.
84. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.49; Dramen I, p.161. Parodied by Kraus in Dr 14.
85. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.214; Dramen I, p.245.
86. Werfel, Spiegelmensch, p.64; Dramen I, p.168.
87. Bauer, op.cit., p.324.
88. Werfel, "Theater. Aus einem noch unveröffentlichten dramaturgischen Buche über das Zauberspiel Spiegelmensch", in: NRu, 1921, 571.
89. Bauer makes no distinction between the relatively naive "magic" techniques of Raimund, whose allegories were still part of an intact tradition, and Grillparzer's adoption of elements of this tradition for the purposes of stylization and "Bildlichkeit"; cf. F. Grillparzer, Der Traum ein Leben, ed. W.E. Yates, Cambridge, 1968, p.14. Werfel's "magic" is even farther removed from the tradition.

Notes to Chapter Five: FRANZ WERFEL (contd.)

90. R. Brinkmann, Expressionismus. Forschungs-Probleme 1952-1960, Stuttgart, 1961, p.11, has warned against the use of "Neo-Baroque" to describe Expressionism.
91. According to a statement by Werfel quoted by A. Soergel, Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Im Banne des Expressionismus, Leipzig, 1925, pp.493ff.
92. Werfel, op.cit., in: NRu, 1921, 575.
93. A caricature of Erich Wolfgang Korngold (1897-1957), who as a youth received much publicity through his father, who was a music critic.
94. Mentioned, but not explained, by Bauer, op.cit., p.334.
95. cf. McLuhan hot and cool, ed. G.E. Stearn, Harmondsworth, 1968; D. Boorstin, The image, London, 1961.

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE

1. An early, undated pencil note by Kraus, purported to be from 1901, contains a cryptic reference to George's "Grössenwahn"; MS. in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.176.667. M. Rychner, Arachne. Aufsätze zur Literatur, Zürich, 1957, p.141f. ("Karl Kraus und die Sprache"), reports that in 1924 Kraus remarked upon a poem by George in a Viennese newspaper: "Schön - obwohl es von George ist".
2. Jahrbuch für die geistige Bewegung, ed. F. Gundolf/F. Wolters, Berlin, 1910, 33-37.
3. cf. R. Borchardt, Reden, Stuttgart, n.d., pp.45-103 ("Rede über Hofmannsthal"); Prosa, Stuttgart, 1957, vol.I, pp.258-294 ("Der Siebente Ring"); Prosa I, pp.435-468 ("Intermezzo"); cf. W. Kraft, "Rudolf Borchardt und Stefan George", in: NRu, 1956, 473-490. C.J. Wagenknecht, Das Wortspiel bei Karl Kraus, Göttingen, 1965, p.81 (f.n.), refers to this correspondence between Kraus's and Borchardt's criticisms; there is, however, no evidence that Kraus knew Borchardt's essays. Not even Kraus's second-hand reference to them in "Der Lächler" (1921; UW232) is proof of this. Kraus's remark, in 1913, appeared 3 years after Gundolf's ^{article} and even longer after Borchardt's, and has little bearing on Borchardt's criticisms of George.

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

4. F. Gundolf, George, Berlin, 1920, pp. 10ff.
5. K. Wolff, Autoren, Bücher, Abenteuer, Berlin, 1965, pp. 81f.
6. S. George, Der Siebente Ring (Gesamtausgabe der Werke, vols VI/VII), Berlin, 1931, p. 6 ("Ihr meiner zeit genossen kanntet schon") and pp. 32f. ("Ich euch gewissen, ich euch stimme dringe"). This edition is here abbreviated to: Werke, with vol. and page number. In all quotations from George, the punctuation mark . is rendered by a comma.
7. G.P. Landmann, Stefan George und sein Kreis. Eine Bibliographie, Hamburg, 1960, pp. 139-154, lists the most important items - 150 for the years 1927/28 - with the comment (p. 144) that it is neither possible nor necessary to list them all, for there was "nobody who did not contribute".
8. F. Gundolf, Dichter und Helden, Heidelberg, 1921, pp. 68-71 ("Stefan George in unserer Zeit", 1913).
9. S. George, Tage und Taten. Aufzeichnungen und Skizzen, Berlin, 1925; the first edition of this had been printed privately; the maxims originally appeared in Blätter für die Kunst, II/4, 1894. cf. Werke XVII, Berlin, 1929, p. 85.
10. Except a newspaper in Czernowitz and one in Prague; cf. F. 806, 69.
11. S. George, Shakespeares Sonnette. Umdichtung, Werke XII, Berlin, 1931. The 1909 edition had its third

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

impression in 1921. Here all quotations are by sonnet and line numbers.

12. MS. in Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, I.N.173.345.
13. S. George, Der Stern des Bundes, Werke VIII, Berlin, 1928, p.111.
14. S. George, Hymnen, Pilgerfahrten, Algabal, Werke II, Berlin, 1928, p.83.
15. Other verse copied down by Kraus includes:
The first strophe of the second "Zeitgedicht"
(cf.Note 6); 3 lines of "An Gundolf" from
Der Siebente Ring, Werke VI/VII, p.187; 2 lines
from the epigram to "H.H." from: S. George, Das
Jahr der Seele, Werke IV, Berlin, 1928, p.79.
16. George, Der Siebente Ring, Werke VI/VII, p.91.
17. op.cit., p.183.
18. Blätter für die Kunst, II/2(1894)p.35.
19. Further examples from Shakespeares Sonnette of the
rhyming of unstressed syllables:
LXXVI, 2-4 : "änderung" - "fertigung";
XCIII, 5-7 : "blick" - "chronik";
CXVIII, 2-4 : "reizt die zung" - "reinigung".
20. As early as 24.XII.1892 George desired "eine jugend
wie sie sich hier allmählich um uns bildet die
preist und jubelt und genießt (was wir vor
allem wünschen)."; cf. Landmann, op.cit., pp.25f.
21. George, Der Siebente Ring, Werke VI/VII, p.96.

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

22. op.cit.,p.157.
23. George, Der Stern des Bundes, Werke VIII,p.59.
24. op.cit.,p.101.
25. Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, 1952,vol.XI(I.Abt., II.Teil).
26. cf. H. Lausberg, Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich, 1967,p.45; Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik, Munich, 1960,pp.254ff.(§§465-468).
27. M. Winkler, Stefan George, Stuttgart, 1970,p.66, mentions that George was a reader of Die Zukunft.
28. cf. Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, 1885, vol.VI.
The latest source given for "der loh" is Opitz.
"Die lohe" existed figuratively after the 16th century, and even into the 19th century.
29. cf. Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, 1935,vol.XI(I.Abt. I.Teil), under theure (3), notes: "der in folge von misswachs herrschende mangel und hohe preis der lebensmittel ('theurezeit'), hungersnot".
Under theuer (I,2a) examples are given from 16th century.
30. cf. F. Hoffmann, "Stefan Georges Übertragung der Shakespeare-Sonette", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 1956,146-156; P. Lieser, "Fremdsprachige Übertragung als Nachgestaltung und Neuschöpfung", in: Stefan George. Lehrzeit und Meisterschaft. Gedenkschrift, Bingen, 1968,p.84;

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

- R.B. Farrell, Stefan Georges Beziehungen zur englischen Dichtung, Berlin, 1937; O.Marx, "Stefan George in seinen Übertragungen englischer Dichtung", in: CP, 1967, LXXVII,5-35; E. Salin, Um Stefan George, Bad Godesberg, 1948,pp.108-114.
31. In December 1930 (F.845,4), he had criticized Flatter's Measure for Measure.
32. This whole episode is related by Flatter, and parts of the correspondence printed, in his Karl Kraus als Nachdichter. Eine sprachkritische Untersuchung, Vienna, 1934,pp.4-13. The volume also contains those of Flatter's translations which are relevant (pp.12,14f.,18,40). For the purposes of this study, the translations by Lachmann (1820), Bodenstedt (1862), Emil Ludwig (1923), as well as Flatter's (1934), have been consulted; cf. Bibliography.
33. cf. Flatter, op.cit.,pp.9f. W.Jost, "Stilkrise der deutschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung", in: DVLG, 1961, 1-43, has in the main confirmed Kraus's criticisms of the sonnet translations, by a comparative study concerned chiefly with Flatter's translations of the plays.
34. F. Gundolf, Shakespeare in deutscher Sprache, vol.IX, Berlin,1914 (Hamlet, Macbeth, König Lear).
35. Shakespeares Dramen. Für Hörer und Leser bearbeitet,

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

- teilweise sprachlich erneuert von Karl Kraus, 2 vols., Vienna, 1934/35.
36. Shakespeares Sonette. Nachdichtung von Karl Kraus (Vienna, 1934; new edition: Munich, 1964) Here all quotations are by sonnet and line numbers.
37. Text according to the New Cambridge Edition: Shakespeare's Sonnets, ed. J. Dover Wilson, Cambridge, 1966. Quotations by sonnet and line numbers.
38. In Sonnet V it means "fair"; in XXI "zier" means "ornament"; in LXVIII "zierat" means ornament; in LXXVIII "verzieren" and "zier" mean "grace", which in LXXIX is rendered by "strich"; in CLI "geziert mit dieser zier" stands for the sexually charged trope "proud of this pride". Furthermore, in LXXVII "schmuck" is used to translate "beauty".
39. cf. Das Jahr der Seele, Werke IV, p.25: "Mir ist als ob ein blick im dunkel glimme"; S. George, Der Teppich des Lebens und die Lieder von Traum und Tod, mit einem Vorspiel, Werke V, p.42: "Und lächelt ihm dem erste fruchte trieben".
40. Flatter, op.cit., p.16.
41. cf. F.572, 53-60 (Spr 82-90), "Eine Richtigstellung"; F.551, 7-13 (Spr 364-370), "Druckfehler"; F.527, 31-46 (Spr 371-387), "Schicksal der Silbe".
42. Flatter, op.cit., p.17.

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

43. English usage abounds in more monosyllabic words than German. In Sonnet CXVI, there are 80 monosyllabic to 26 multisyllabic words; in George's translation the proportion is 75 to 28; in Kraus's, 71 to 35.
44. "liebe ist nicht mehr liebe" has a quite different vocal value $\text{[i̯-(ě)- ʏ-ʏ-ē-i-(ě)]}$ from "love is not love" [ʊ - i - ɔ - ɔ] .
45. Flatter, op.cit.,pp.23ff.
46. cf. Luther, Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimar, 1883ff., vol. XXX,pt.2,pp.627ff. ("Ein Sendbrief von Dolmetschen und Fürbitte der Heiligen"). Romans, III,28(Vulgate): "arbitramur hominem iustificari ex fide absque operibus legis."; Luther: "Wir halten/das der mensch gerecht werde on des gesetzs werck/ allein durch den glauben."; cf. A.V.: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."
47. Flatter, op.cit.,p.30.
48. Flatter's first lines read:
"Den Ehebund, der treue Seelen bindet,
Nichts kann ihn hindern! [̄-̄] "
George, too, loses the continuity by making "let me"(1) impersonal ("Man spreche").
- 48a. S. George, Das neue Reich, Werke IX, Berlin, 1928, p.27. Kraus knew the poem, since he quoted a line from it in his notes (cf.Note 12). According to

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

Grimm, "sturmgewölk" and "sturmgewalt" recur in works of the Romantics; "gewölk" also recurs in Schlegel's translation of Shakespeare.

49. George, too, sought to translate meaning into sound, as in his rendering of "bootless cries" (XXIX) by the vowel modulations in "bewein allein mein ausgestossnen-los", mentioned by Hoffmann, op.cit., pp.151f.; the example quoted by Farrell, op.cit., p.216, is far less accomplished; he sees "Chor-trümmer kahl" as a close reproduction of the vocal quality of "bare ruined choirs" in Sonnet LXXIII.
50. Other defects, also not mentioned by Flatter: CXV,7 Kraus mistranslated "tan" as "bleichen"; XCIV,7 ("They are the lords and owners of their faces") is translated by George: "Der darf sein gut als herr und eigner haben"; Kraus misunderstood this usage, and wrote: "der darf als eigner Herr in Hoheit schalten", thus destroying the subversive irony of the English.
51. Even George does not reproduce this contrast. His "alltagsgrab" indicates his contempt for the "Alltag" rather than a contrast with a more illustrious tomb; "in aller menschen blick gesenkt" does not convey the latter, and even evokes a false association ("blick gesenkt").

Notes to Chapter Six: STEFAN GEORGE (contd.)

52. As Flatter, op.cit.,p.33 did.
53. Farrell, op.cit.,p.214 ("das Gepräge eines fortschreitenden Räsonnierens"); R. Germer, "Shakespeares Sonette als Sprachkunstwerke", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft (West), 1965,260 ("die drei Quartette fliessen wie ein Strom dem abschliessenden Reimpaar zu"); Marx,op.cit.,pp.19ff., notes a curve, from exposition to a passionate climax and then a conclusion, which George did not always reproduce.
54. Hoffmann, op.cit.,p.154.
55. cf.I.A. Richards, "Jakobson's Shakespeare. The subliminal structures of a sonnet", in: TLS, 28.V.1970,589f. He gives an account of Roman Jakobson's findings.
56. The term is, according to Richards (cf.Note 55), George Puttenham's.
57. Flatter, op.cit.,p.47.
58. Borchardt, Prosa I, 281f.
59. For interpretations, cf. W. Kraft, Karl Kraus, Salzburg, 1956,pp.305-311; K. Krolow, "Bertolt Brecht und Karl Kraus", in: PhP, 1961,208-215.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

A very few works have been excluded from the Bibliography: those standard works, particularly outside the period of study, of which common knowledge can be assumed, e.g. Goethe, Luther, etc., and/or those works or authors mentioned only incidentally in the text or Notes. This applies, too, to well-known modern authors; e.g. Hauptmann is not listed, while only specific works by Hofmannsthal, Rilke and Kafka appear, as relevant. Newspapers and periodicals that appear in isolated references are listed under the individual article, if at all; only those studied in some depth, e.g. Die Aktion, are listed separately. Current periodicals are abbreviated as in The Year's Work in Modern Languages; for periodicals not covered in this way the place of publication is given at the first mention within each section. The Bibliography does not include the considerable amount of unpublished material consulted, details of which are given separately in the Notes; therefore neither Professor Jaray's indispensable name- and subject-index to Die Fackel (a microfilm of which is in the British Museum, Mic.A.1051-54) nor Kraus's unpublished polemic of 1932 against Kerr (cf. Chapter Four, Note 121) is listed. The Bibliography is in Sections:

- I: A. Kraus, Works; B. Kraus, Secondary literature (general);
 C. General (historical, social, cultural) background, on Vienna, Yiddish, the modern period and its literary problems;
 D. Theoretical background, including primary sources consulted for Chapter One and generally.
- II: E. Hermann Bahr and contemporaries, fin de siècle Vienna and Jugendstil (inc. Hofmannsthal, Schnitzler);

- F. Maximilian Harden, the polemics and their political (and, to a lesser extent, literary - e.g. Wedekind) background;
- G. Alfred Kerr and related polemics (e.g. Die Aktion), literature of and on World War I;
- H. Franz Werfel, Expressionism, other Expressionists and writers from Prague;
- I. Stefan George, Shakespeare translation.

Works mentioned in I (A,B,C or D) are not mentioned in individual sections (E,F,G,H,I) in II.

I

A. KRAUS: WORKS (excluding Shakespeare translations)

a. Articles and pamphlets 1892-1899:

- Kraus, K. "Gestern. Studie in einem Akt von Theophil Morren", in: Die Gesellschaft, ed. M.G.Conrad, Leipzig, 1892,799ff.
- " "Das Burgtheater und die letzte Saison", in: Die Gesellschaft, 1892,1060-1064.
- " "Wiener Brief", in: Die Gesellschaft, 1892,1506-1510.
- " "Arthur Schnitzler: Anatol", in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893,109f.
- " "Zur Überwindung des Hermann Bahr", in; Die Gesellschaft, 1893,627-636.
- " "Über Prag nach Berlin Theaterbrief", in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893,647-650.
- " "Die Unterhosen. Ein Censurstückchen in zwei Aufzügen", in: Die Gesellschaft, 1893, 1609-1612.

- " "Vom Wiener Kunsthorizont und dem Raimundtheater",
in: Die Gesellschaft, 1894,383-387.
- " "Wiener Lyriker", in: Das Magazin für Litteratur,
ed. O. Neumann-Hofer, Berlin, 1893,127f.
- " "Litterarische Chronik. Wiener Theater", in: Das
Magazin für Litteratur, 1893,209,260f.,324f.,357f.,
422 and 466f.
- " "Litterarische Neuigkeiten.Wiener Dichter", in:
Das Magazin für Litteratur, 1893,293f.
- " "Litterarische Chronik. Wiener Lyriker", in: Das
Magazin für Litteratur, 1893,499f.
- " "Wiener Autoren", in: Das Magazin für Litteratur,
1893,813f.
- /Crêpe de Chine/ "Affairen", in: Liebelei, ed. R.von
Brockdorff/R.Strauss, Vienna, 1896,38ff.
- " "Gänsefüßchen", in: Liebelei, 1896,62ff.
- " "Chronique", in: Liebelei, 1896,107ff, 156-159 and
206f.
- K. "Raimund-Theater", in: Liebelei, 1896,83f.
- Kraus,K. "Chronik", in: Wiener Rundschau, ed. R. Strauss, Vienna,
1896/97, 274-276, 474,477 and 315f.
- " "Tschaperl", in: Wiener Rundschau, 1896/97,354-357.
- " "Der Gegenwartsschauspieler", in: Wiener Rundschau,
1896/97,511-515.
- " "Ischler Brief", in: Wiener Rundschau, 1896/97,712f.
- " "Raimund-Theater", in: Wiener Rundschau,1896/97,914.
- " "Wiener Brief", in: Breslauer Zeitung, Breslau,
18.IV.1897 and 21.XI.1897.
- " Die demolierte Litteratur, Vienna, 1899 (4th. ed.).

- b. Die Fackel, ed. K.Kraus, Vienna, 1899-1936 (Nos.1-922).
- c. Kraus,K. Werke, ed. H.Fischer:
- vol. I, Die Dritte Walpurgisnacht, Munich, 1952.
- vol. II, Die Sprache, Munich, 1962 (4th. ed.).
- vol. III, Beim Wort genommen,Munich, 1965 (2nd.ed.).
- vol. IV, Widerschein der Fackel. Glossen, Munich
1956 (2nd .ed.).
- vol. V, Die letzten Tage der Menschheit. Tragödie in
fünf Akten mit Vorspiel und Epilog, Munich,1957.
- vol. VI, Literatur und Lüge,Munich, 1958.
- vol. VII, Worte in Versen,Munich, 1959.
- vol. VIII, Untergang der Welt durch schwarze Magie,
Munich, 1960.
- vol. IX, Unsterblicher Witz, Munich, 1961.
- Vol. X, Mit vorzüglicher Hochachtung. Briefe des Verlags
der Fackel, Munich, 1962.
- vol. XI, Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität, Munich/Vienna,
n.d. [1963].
- vol. XII, Die chinesische Mauer, Munich/Vienna, 1964.
- vol. XIII, Weltgericht,Munich/Vienna, n.d. [1965].
- vol. XIV, Dramen, Munich/Vienna, 1967.

B. SECONDARY LITERATURE ON KRAUS (general)

- Adorno, T.W. Noten zur Literatur, Frankfurt a.M., 1965, vol.III,
pp.57-82 ("Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität. Zum 11.
Band der Werke von Karl Kraus").
- [anon.] "Satirist in the modern world", in: TLS,1953,293ff.
- " "The great outsider", in: TLS, 1967,85.
- Arntzen,H. "Exkurs über Karl Kraus", in:
Deutsche Literatur im-20. Jahrhundert. Strukturen

- B. (cont'd) und Gestalten, ed. H.Friedmann/O.Mann, Heidelberg,
Arntzen, H. 1961 (4th.ed.), vol.I, pp244-255.
- " "Nachricht von der Satire", in: NRu, 1963, 561-576.
- Benjamin, W. Illuminationen. Ausgewählte Schriften, ed. S.Unseld,
Frankfurt a.M., 1961, pp.374-408 ("Karl Kraus").
- " Einbahnstrasse, Frankfurt a.M., 1955, pp.74ff.
("Kriegerdenkmal: Karl Kraus").
- Bondy, F. "Karl Kraus und die Nachwelt", in: ExLibris,
Zürich, 1947, pp.5ff.
- Borries, M. Ein Angriff auf Heinrich Heine. Kritische
Bemerkungen zu Karl Kraus, Stuttgart/Berlin/
Cologne/Mainz, 1971.
- Brock-Sulzer, E. "Karl Kraus als Stilkritiker", in: Trivium,
Zürich, 1945, 300-315.
- " "Karl Kraus und das Theater", in: Akz, 1956, 503-509.
- " "Spruch und Widerspruch. Über Karl Kraus als
Aphoristiker", in: Hochland, Munich, 1955/56, 563-567.
- Busch, G. "Der sprachliche Weltentwurf", in: Akz, 1955, 494-502.
- " "Die fragwürdige Karl Kraus-Renaissance", in:
Forum, Vienna, 1959, 155ff.
- Canetti, E. "Schule des Widerstandes", in: Aufforderung zum
Misstrauen. Literatur, Bildende Kunst, Musik in
Österreich seit 1945, ed. O.Breicha/G.Fritsch,
Salzburg, 1967, pp.432-441.
- Cysarz, H. "Glossen zu Karl Kraus. Bei Gelegenheit einer
neuen Monographie", in: Modern Austrian Literature,
Binghamton (N.Y.), Summer, 1970, 43-47.
- Daviau, D.G. "Language and morality in Karl Kraus's Die
letzten Tage der Menschheit", in: MLQ, 1961, 46-54.

B. (cont'd)

- David, C. "Karl Kraus et Else Lasker-Schüler", in: EG, 1960, 364-368.
- Disch, A. Das gestaltete Wort. Die Idee der Dichtung im Werk von Karl Kraus, Zürich, 1969.
- Dürrenmatt, F. Theaterschriften und Reden, Zürich, 1966, pp. 247-250 ("Die dritte Walpurgisnacht").
- Engelmann, P. Dem Andenken an Karl Kraus. Eine Sammlung, ed. E. Benyoetz, Vienna, 1967 (2nd ed.).
- Field, F. The Last Days of Mankind: Karl Kraus and his Vienna, London, 1967.
- Fischer, E. Von Grillparzer zu Kafka, Vienna, 1962, pp. 209-228 ("Karl Kraus").
- Fischer, H. Karl Kraus und die Jugend, Vienna, 1934.
- " "Abschiedsworte am Grabe", in: Forum, Vienna, 1956, 220.
- " "Erinnerungen an Karl Kraus zum 25. Todestag", in: Forum, 1961, 225-228.
- Ginsberg, E. "Karl Kraus und die Schauspieler", in: Forum, 1961, 229.
- Habe, H. "Karl Kraus und die Folgen. Zum 25. Todestag eines Sprachlehrers", in: Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung, 9.VI.1961.
- Hahn, H. H. Karl Kraus und das Theater, Vienna, 1947 (Disg.).
- " "Karl Kraus und das Theater", in: WiZ, 1956, II/6, 17-20.
- Hänsel, L. "Karl Kraus. Zum 60. Geburtstag", in: WiZ, 1956, II/6, 8-16.
- Hartl, E. "Weltgericht vor dem Sprachtribunal", in: WiZ, 1956, II/6, 1-7.

B. (cont'd.)

- Hartl,E. "Was soll eine Karl Kraus-Gesellschaft?", in:
Forum,1956,226f.
- " "Karl Kraus-Glosse",in: WiZ, 1957,III/1, 43f.
- " "Lebenslanger Anlass für Karl Kraus", in: Die Presse,Vienna,29/30.VI.1968, supplement "120 Jahre Die Presse", p.XVII.
- " "Das Ja und Nein zu Karl Kraus: anlässlich der Monographie Hans Weigels",in: LK,1968,247f.
- " "Verblendete Hellseher und Schwarzseher, Überlegungen zu den Gegnern von Karl Kraus", in: LK, 1970,3-14.
- Hatvani,P. "Versuch über Karl Kraus", in: LK,1967,269-278.
- Heidemann,C. Satirische und polemische Formen in der Publizistik von Karl Kraus, Berlin,1958(Diss.).
- Heller,E. "Satiriker, Dichter,Erzieher seiner Zeit", in: Hamburger Akademische Rundschau, 1947,244-250.
- " The disinherited mind, Cambridge,1952,pp.183-201 ("Karl Kraus: The Last Days of Mankind").
- " "Beim Aphorismus genommen", in: Forum,1956,217-220.
- Heringer,H.-J. "Karl Kraus als Sprachkritiker",in: Msp, 1967, 256-262.
- Hohoff,C. "Glanz und Elend des Karl Kraus",in: M, 1968,563-566.
- Iggers,W. Karl Kraus. A Viennese critic of the twentieth century,The Hague,1967.
- Thering,H. Von Reinhardt bis Brecht. Vier Jahrzehnte Theater und Film, Berlin, 1958-1961.
- Jenaczek,F. Zeittafeln zur "Fackel". Themen-Ziele-Probleme, Gräfelfing,1965.

B. (cont'd.)

- Jenaczek, F. "Zuzumuten und zuzutrauen. Anlässlich des 85. Geburtstags von Karl Kraus", in: Stifter-Jahrbuch, Gräfelfing, 1959, 265-272.
- " "Protest", in: LK, 1970, 15-21.
- Kann, H. "Erinnerungen an Karl Kraus", in: National-Zeitung, Basel, 22.IV.1944.
- Kerry, O. Karl Kraus-Bibliographie, Vienna, 1954.
- " Karl Kraus-Bibliographie. Mit einem Register der Aphorismen, Gedichte, Glossen und Satiren, Munich, 1970.
- Kipphoff, P. Der Aphorismus im Werk von Karl Kraus, Munich, 1961 (Diss.).
- Kohn, C. "Bert Brecht, Karl Kraus et le Kraus-Archiv", in: EG, 1956, 342-348.
- " Karl Kraus. Le polémiste et l'écrivain, défenseur des droits de l'individu, Paris, 1962.
- Kohn, H. Karl Kraus - Arthur Schnitzler - Otto Weininger. Aus dem jüdischen Wien der Jahrhundertwende, Tübingen, 1962.
- Kraft, W. "Karl Kraus", in: M, 1951, 101-115.
- " Karl Kraus. Eine Einführung in sein Werk und eine Auswahl, Wiesbaden, 1952.
- " Karl Kraus. Beiträge zum Verständnis seines Werkes, Salzburg, 1956.
- " "Henri Rochefort und Karl Kraus", in: Forum, 1959, 157-160 and 186-189.
- " "Es war einmal ein Mann. Über Die Dritte Walpurgisnacht", in: M, 1968, 926-935.

B. (cont'd.)

- Krebs, H. Der Friedensgedanke im Werke von Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1952 (Diss.).
- Krolop, K. "Bertolt Brecht und Karl Kraus", in: PhP, 1961, 95-112 and 203-230.
- Kubasta, E. Karl Kraus als Lyriker, Vienna, 1950 (Diss.).
- Leschnitzer, F. "Der Fall Karl Kraus", in: NDL, 1956, IV/X1, 59-82.
- Liegler, L. Karl Kraus und sein Werk, Vienna 1920.
- Matt, P. von "Stufen der Forschung zu Thomas Mann und Karl Kraus", in: SchwM, 1967, 1050-1053.
- Menczer, B. "Karl Kraus and the struggle against the modern gnostics", in: The Dublin Review, London, 1950, No. 450, 32-52.
- Mühlher, R. "Karl Kraus und das Burgtheater vor 1890", in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur, Graz, 1966, 298-307.
- Muschg, W. Von Trakl zu Brecht. Dichter des Expressionismus, Munich, 1961, pp. 174-197 ("Karl Kraus").
- Musil, R. Tagebücher, Aphorismen, Essays und Reden, Hamburg, 1955.
- Pfeiffer, J. "Biespiel für Satire: Karl Kraus", in: Deutsche Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert, ed. H. Friedmann/O. Mann, Heidelberg, 1959 (3rd. ed.), pp. 411-426.
- Raddatz, F. J. "Die Asketin Naphta oder Die Polemik des Juste Milieu", in: StZ, 1966, 269-277.
- " "Der blinde Seher", in: M, 1968, 517-532.
- Radecki, S. von Wie ich glaube, Olten/Cologne, 1953, pp. 11-45 ("Karl Kraus und die Sprache"; "Erinnerungen an Karl Kraus").

B. (cont'd).

- Radecki, S. von Im Vorübergehen, Munich, 1959, pp. 197-214 ("Vorschlag für den Nobelpreis 1926")
- " Gesichtspunkte, Olten/Cologne, 1964, pp. 89-93
("Über Karl Kraus 'Worte in Versen'").
- Rollett, E. "Karl Kraus", in: J.W. Nagl/J. Zeidler/E. Castle (ed.), Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte.
Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn, Vienna, 1937, vol. IV, pp. 1909-1930.
- Rühmkorf, P. "Die soziale Stellung des Reims. Karl Kraus, oder die Grenzen der Wesensbeschwörung", in: Grüsse.
Heinrich Wolfheim zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. K. Schröter, Frankfurt a.M., 1965, pp. 103-111.
- "Rundfrage über Karl Kraus", ed. L. von Ficker, in:
Der Brenner, Innsbruck, 1913, III/18-20; republished
[Brenner-Verlag] Innsbruck, 1917.
- Rychner, M. Arachne. Aufsätze zur Literatur, Zürich, 1957, pp. 107-143 ("Karl Kraus"; "Karl Kraus und die Sprache").
- " "Ein Brief des neunzehnjährigen Karl Kraus",
in: Forum, 1959, 150ff.
- Schalk, F. "Karl Kraus und die Satire. Bemerkungen über die Neuauflage der Gesammelten Werke Karl Kraus",
in: Euph, 1959, 195-218.
- " Review in: Euph, 1959, 223-226.
- Scheichl, S. "Publikationen des Auslands über Karl Kraus",
in: LK, 1970, 557-560.

B. (cont'd.)

- Scheichl, S. "Politik und Ursprung. Über Karl Kraus' Verhältnis zur Politik", in: WoW, 1972, 43-51.
- Schick, P. "Zu den Briefen Karl Kraus' an Alfred von Berger", in: Das Silberboot, Salzburg, 1951, 122-128.
- " "Der Satiriker und der Tod. Versuch einer typologischen Deutung", in: Festschrift zum hundertjährigen Bestehen der Wiener Stadtbibliothek, Vienna, 1956, pp.200-231.
- " "Zeitgebundene Satire?", in: Forum, 1956, 221f.
- " "Karl Kraus. Der Satiriker und die Zeit", in: EG, 1957, 240-249.
- " Karl Kraus in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten, Reinbek, 1965.
- Snell, M. "Karl Kraus's Die letzten Tage der Menschheit. An analysis", in: FMLS, 1968, 234-247.
- Soergel, A./Hohoff, C. Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart, Düsseldorf, 1961, vol.I, pp.494-510 ("Karl Kraus").
- Spalter, M. Brecht's tradition, Baltimore, 1967, pp.137-155 ("Karl Kraus").
- Sperber, M. "Nach Jahr und Tag . Zum 25. Todestag", in: Forum, 1961, 230.
- Stephan, J. Satire und Sprache. Zu dem Werk von Karl Kraus, Munich, 1964.
- Stern, J.P. "Karl Kraus's vision of language", in: MLR, 1966, 71-84.

B. (cont'd.)

- Sternbach-Gärtner, L. "Bertolt Brecht und Karl Kraus", in:
NDL, 1956, 158f.
- " " "Karl Kraus und Frankreich", in: Hochland,
1955/56, 594-597.
- " " "Neue Kraus-Dokumente", in: NDL, 1956,
IV/9, 162f.
- " " "Die letzten Tage der Menschheit und das
Theater von Bertolt Brecht", in: DRu, 1958,
836-842.
- " " "Mechtilde Lichnowsky und Karl Kraus", in:
Forum, Vienna, 1958, 324ff.
- " " "Karl Kraus als Lyriker. Zur ersten
Gesamtausgabe aller Gedichte und Epigramme",
in: DRu, 1960, 48-62.
- " " "Karl Kraus und das expressionistische
Theater", in: Worte und Werte. Bruno Markwardt
zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. G. Erdmann/A. Eichstaedt,
Berlin, 1961, pp. 398-409.
- Stimmen über Karl Kraus zum 60. Geburtstag, Vienna, 1934.
- Thieberger, R. "A propos d'une correspondance inédite de
Karl Kraus (avec Karl Thieme)", in: EG, 1966,
225-234.
- Timms, E.F. Review in: MLR, 1968, 1014-1017.
- " " "Language and the satirist in the work of
Karl Kraus, Cambridge, 1967 (Diss.).
- Torberg, F. "Ist Karl Kraus vorlesbar? Helmut Qualtinger
und Die letzten Tage der Menschheit", in: Forum,
1963, 301.

B. (cont'd.)

- Torberg, F. "Das Wort gegen die Bühne. Zur szenischen Uraufführung der Letzten Tage der Menschheit", in: Forum, 1964, 383ff.
- " "Als die ersten Fackel-Hefte erschienen", in: LK, 1970, 531-545.
- Uhlig, H. "Vom Pathos der Syntax. Über Karl Kraus und gegen seine Lobredner", in: Akz, 1955, 489-494.
- Viertel, B. "Die 25 Jahre der Fackel", in: Die Komödie. Blätter des Lustspielhauses, Berlin, 1924.
- " Karl Kraus zum 50. Geburtstag, Vienna, 1924.
- " Dichtungen und Dokumente, Munich, 1956, pp. 203-280 ("Karl Kraus. Ein Charakter und die Zeit").
- " "Karl Kraus. Der Warner", in: Der Abend, Vienna, 26.IV.1949.
- Wagenknecht, C.J. "Karl Kraus. Kunst als Verschwörung", in: Prisma, Göttingen, June/July 1961, 28f.
- " Das Wortspiel bei Karl Kraus, Göttingen, 1965.
- " "Kein Standardwerk über Karl Kraus. Zur deutschen Ausgabe des Buchs von Caroline Kohn", in: WW, 1968, 33-37.
- Weigel, H. "Texte der Kriegs-Fackel", in: LK, 1968, 25-33.
- " Karl Kraus oder Die Macht der Ohnmacht. Versuch eines Motivenberichts zur Erhellung eines vielfachen Lebenswerks, Vienna, 1968.
- Williams, C.P. Austrian politics and literature, 1914-1938, Cambridge, 1968 (Diss.), pp. 195-245 ("Karl Kraus: the absolute satirist").

B. (cont'd.)

Zohn, H. "Krausiana", in: Modern Austrian Literature,
Summer 1970, 25-35.

C. GENERAL BACKGROUND: historical, social, cultural; Vienna;
modern literature

Barea, I. Vienna, legend and reality, London, 1966.

Borries, A. Selbstzeugnisse des deutschen Judentums
von (ed). 1870-1945, Frankfurt a.M., 1962.

Friedrich, H. Die Struktur der modernen Lyrik. Von Baudelaire
bis zur Gegenwart, Reinbek, 1964 (7th.ed.).

Gray, R.D. The German tradition in literature 1871-1945,
Cambridge, 1965.

Haacke, W. "Ferdinand Klünberger, der Theaterreferent der
Österreichischen Tragödie", in: LK, 1971, 22-29.

Hamburger, M. Reason and energy. Studies in German literature,
London, 1957.

" From prophesy to exorcism, London, 1965.

Heller, E. The disinherited mind, Cambridge, 1952.

Klünberger, F. Spiegelungen, ed. R. Holzer, Graz/Vienna, 1960.

Landmann, S. Jiddisch. Abenteuer einer Sprache, Munich, 1965
(2nd. ed.).

Magill, C.P. "Austrian comedy", in: GLL, 1950/51, 31-41.

Nestroy, J. Gesammelte Werke, ed. O. Rommel, Vienna, 1966
(3rd.ed.).

Muschg, W. Die Zerstörung der deutschen Literatur, Bern, 1958.

Pross, H. (ed.) Dokumente zur deutschen Politik 1806-1870,
Frankfurt, a.M., 1959.

" Die Zerstörung der deutschen Politik. Dokumente
1870-1933, Frankfurt a.M., 1959.

C. (cont'd.)

- Raimund, F. Sämtliche Werke, ed.F.Schreyvogel, Munich, 1960.
- Schlawe, F. Literarische Zeitschriften (1885-1910) and (1910-1933), 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1965 (2nd. ed.) and 1962 respectively.
- Schlücking, L.L. Soziologie der literarischen Geschmacksbildung, Bern/Munich, 1961 (3rd.ed.).
- Steiner, G. Language and silence. Essays 1958-1966, London, 1967.
- Spitzer, D. Hereinspaziert ins alte Wien. Heiter-satirisches aus der Donau-Monarchie, ed.H.Hakel, Munich, 1970.
- Steed, H.W. The Hapsburg Monarchy, London, 1919 (4th.ed.).
- " Through thirty years. 1892-1922. A personal narrative, London, 1924.
- Williams, C.P. Austrian politics and literature. 1914-1938, Cambridge, 1968 (Diss.).
- Williams, R. Culture and society 1780-1950, Harmondsworth, 1963.
- " The long revolution, Harmondsworth, 1965.
- Wolf, S.A. Jiddisches Wörterbuch. Wortschatz des deutschen Grundbestandes der jiddischen Sprache, Mannheim, 1962.
- Zweig, S. Die Welt von gestern. Erinnerungen eines Europäers, Stockholm, 1947.
- D. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: criticism, method; including primary sources consulted for Chapter One.
- Babilas, W. Tradition und Interpretation. Gedanken zur philologischen Methode, Munich, 1961.

D. (cont'd.)

- Ball, P.M. "Sincerity: the rise and fall of a critical term",
in: MLR, 1964, 1-11.
- Bausinger, H. "Schwierigkeiten bei der Untersuchung von
Trivialliteratur", in: WW, 1963, 204-215.
- Behrmann, A. Einführung in die Analyse von Prosatexten,
Stuttgart, 1968 (2nd. ed.).
- " Einführung in die Analyse von Verstexten,
Stuttgart, 1970.
- Canetti, E. Der andere Prozess. Kafkas Briefe an Felice,
Munich, 1969.
- Deschner, K. Kitsch, Konvention, Kunst. Eine literarische
Streitschrift, Munich, 1962.
- Freud, S. Gesammelte Werke (chronologisch geordnet),
ed. A. Freud, London, 1940/1941, vol. VI (Der Witz
und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten) and vol.
IV (Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens).
- Frisch, M. Tagebuch. 1946-1949, Frankfurt a.M., 1970.
- Goth, J. Nietzsche und die Rhetorik, Tübingen, 1970.
- Hartog, P. "Kultur" as a symbol in peace and in war", in:
Sociological Review, 1938, 317-345.
- Keats, J. The letters of John Keats, ed. H.E. Rollins,
vol. I, Cambridge (Mass.), 1958.
- Killy, W. Deutscher Kitsch. Ein Versuch mit Beispielen,
Göttingen, 1970 (6th. ed.).
- Koestler, A. The act of creation, London, 1964.
- Lausberg, H. Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grund-
legung der Literaturwissenschaft, Munich, 1960.
- " Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine

D. (cont'd.)

- Lausberg, H. Einführung für Studierende der klassischen, romanischen, englischen und deutschen Philologie, Munich, 1967 (3rd.ed.).
- Mann, H. Der Untertan, Hamburg, 1958.
- " Essays, Hamburg, 1960.
- Mayer, H. (ed.) Deutsche Literaturkritik im 20. Jahrhundert, Stuttgart, 1965.
- Neumann, G. "Umkehrung und Ablenkung: Franz Kafkas 'Gleitendes Paradox'", in: DVLG, 1968, 702-744.
- Riha, K. "Schmäh von Rechts", in: StZ, 1966, 301.
- Rilke, R.M. Sämtliche Werke, vol. VI, Frankfurt, 1966 (inc. Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge).
- Rommel, O. "Die wissenschaftlichen Bemühungen um die Analyse des Komischen", in: DVLG, 1943, 161-195.
- Stern, J.P. Lichtenberg. A doctrine of scattered occasions, reconstructed from his aphorisms and reflections, London, 1963.
- Valéry, P. Oeuvres, vol. I, Paris, 1957, pp. 1340-1358 ("Premier leçon du cours de poétique".)
- Weininger, O. Geschlecht und Charakter. Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung, Vienna/Leipzig, 1905 (4th.ed.).
- Wilkinson, E.M. "Schiller and the Gutenberg Galaxy. A question of appropriate contexts", in: GLL, 1964/65, 309-318.
- Wilkinson, E.M./Willoughby, L.A. "'The whole man' in Schiller's theory of culture and society. On the virtue of a plurality of models", in: Essays in German Language, Culture and Society, ed. S.S. Praver/

D. (cont'd)

R.H. Thomas/L.Forster, London, 1969, pp.
177-210.

II

E. FIN DE SIECLE literature, etc., Vienna, "Jugendstil";
HERMANN BAHR and contemporaries.

- Altenberg, P. Auswahl aus seinen Büchern, ed. K. Kraus,
Vienna, 1932.
- Arntzen, H. "Karl Kraus und Hugo von Hofmannsthal", in:
StZ, 1968, 147-163.
- Bahr, H. Zur Kritik der Moderne. Gesammelte Aufsätze,
I. Reihe, Zürich, 1890.
- " Russische Reise, Dresden/Leipzig, 1891.
- " Die Überwindung des Naturalismus. Als II. Reihe
von 'Zur Kritik der Moderne', Dresden/Leipzig,
1891.
- " Die Mutter, Berlin, 1891 (3rd.ed.).
- " Dora, Berlin, 1893.
- " Studien zur Kritik der Moderne, Frankfurt a.M.,
1894.
- " Renaissance. Neue Studien zur Kritik der Moderne,
Berlin, 1897.
- " Josephine, Berlin, 1913 (2nd.ed.).
- " Das Tschaperl, Berlin, 1898.
- " Wiener Theater (1892-1898), Berlin, 1899.
- " Der Franzl. 5 Bilder eines guten Mannes, Berlin/
Cologne/Leipzig, n.d.
- " Bildung. Essays, Berlin, 1900.
- " Premieren. Winter 1900 - Sommer 1901, Munich, 1902.

E. (cont'd.)

- Bahr, H. Rezensionen. Wiener Theater 1901 - 1903, Berlin, 1903.
- " Dialog vom Tragischen, Berlin, 1904.
- " Der Meister, Berlin, 1904.
- " Glossen zum Wiener Theater (1903 - 1906), Berlin, 1907.
- " Wien, Stuttgart, 1907.
- " Das Konzert, Berlin, 1909 (4th.ed.).
- " Inventur, Berlin, 1912.
- " Das Hermann-Bahr-Buch, Berlin, 1913.
- " Kriegssegens, Munich, 1915.
- " Expressionismus, Munich, 1920 (5th.ed.).
- " Kritik der Gegenwart, Augsburg, 1922.
- " Selbstbildnis, Berlin, 1923.
- " Zur Überwindung des Naturalismus. Theoretische Schriften 1887-1904, ed.G.Wunberg, Stuttgart, 1968.
- Bleibtreu, C. Schicksal, Berlin, 1888.
- Breicha, O./
Fritsch, G.(ed.) Finale und Auftakt. Wien 1898-1914.
Literatur - Bildende Kunst - Musik, Salzburg, 1964.
- Broch, H. Dichten und Erkennen. Essays, vol.I, Zürich, 1955, pp.43-181 ("Hofmannsthal und seine Zeit").
- Cohn, H. "Loris, die frühen Essays des jungen Hofmannsthal", in: PMLA, 1948, 1294-1313.
- Daviau, D.G. "The misconception of Hermann Bahr as a 'Verwandlungskünstler'", in: GLL, 1957/58, 182-192.
- " "Hermann Bahr's Nachlass", in: Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, Binghamton (N.Y.), Fall 1963, 4-27.

E. (cont'd.)

- Daviau, D.G. "The friendship of Hermann Bahr and Arthur Schnitzler", in: Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, Spring, 1966, 4-36.
- Deutsche Zeitung, Vienna, 1892-1894.
- Dörmann, F. Tuberosen. Ausgewählte Verse, Vienna/Berlin, 1920.
- Freudenberger, G. Hermann Bahrs Stellung zum Nationalismus und zum Österreichischen Staatsgedanken, Vienna, 1949 (Diss.).
- Hermant, J. "Jugendstil. Ein Forschungsbericht (1918-1962)", in: DVLG, 1964, 70-110 and 273-315.
- Hermant, J. (ed.) Lyrik des Jugendstils, Stuttgart, 1964.
- Himmel, H. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal und Karl Kraus", in: Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur, Graz, 1966, 551-565.
- Hirsch, R. "Brief an die Redaktion", in: LK, 1970, 546-548;
"Eine Korrektur zu Heft 49, S. 548 und ein Hinweis", in: LK, 1970, 632 / Unpublished letters of Hofmannsthal's (to Bahr), and Kraus's review of Der Tor und der Tod (1894) 7.
- Hofmannsthal, H. von Gedichte. Lyrische Dramen, Frankfurt a.M., 1946.
" Prosa, vol. I, Frankfurt a.M., 1957 (2nd.ed.).
" Briefe (1890-1901), Berlin, 1935.
" Briefe an Marie Herzfeld, ed. H. Weber, Heidelberg, 1967.
- Hofmannsthal, H. von/Schnitzler, A. Briefwechsel, ed. T. Nickl/H. Schnitzler, Frankfurt a.M., 1964.
- Hollaender, F. "Von Hermann Bahr und seiner Bücherei", in: Freie

E. (cont'd.)

- Hollaender, F. Bühne, Berlin, 1893,82-89.
- Jackson, H. The eighteen nineties. A review of art and ideas at the close of the nineteenth century, Harmondsworth, 1950.
- Jost, D. Literarischer Jugendstil, Stuttgart, 1969.
- Kindermann, H. Hermann Bahr. Ein Leben für das europäische Theater, Graz/Cologne, 1954.
- " Theatergeschichte Europas, vol.VIII (Naturalismus und Impressionismus, I: Deutschland, Österreich, Schweiz), Salzburg, 1968.
- Klawiter, R.J. "Peter Altenberg und das 'Junge Wien'" in: Modern Austrian Literature, Binghamton (N.Y.), Winter, 1968.
- Klotz, V. "Jugendstil in der Lyrik", in: Akz, 1957, 26-34.
- Klussmann, P.G. Stefan George. Zum Selbstverständnis der Kunst und des Dichters in der Moderne, Bonn, 1961.
- Mach, E. Die Analyse der Empfindungen und das Verhältnis des Physischen zum Psychischen, Jena, 1919 (8th.ed.).
- Mahler-Werfel, A. Mein Leben, Frankfurt a.M., 1960.
- Mühlher, R. (ed.) Dichtung aus Österreich. Prosa, vol.II, Vienna/Munich, 1969.
- Nagl, J.W./Zeidler, J./Castle, E. (ed.), Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn, vol.IV (1890-1918), Vienna, 1937, pp.1649-1930 ("Jung-Österreich und Jung-Wien").
- Nedomansky, H. Der Theaterkritiker Hermann Bahr, Vienna, 1949 (Diss.).
- Perl, W.H. "Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal und Andrian in Jung-Wien", in: Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler

E. (cont'd.)

- Perl, W.H. Research Association, Fall, 1966, 22-26.
- Prodinger, C. Hermann Bahr und seine Zeitkritik, Innsbruck, 1962 (Diss.).
- Reichert, H.W. "Schnitzler and Jung-Wien", in: Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, Fall, 1966, 27-32.
- Rieder, H. Geburt der Moderne. Wiener Kunst um 1900, Graz/Vienna, 1964.
- Ruprecht, E. (ed.) Literarische Manifeste des Naturalismus 1880-1892, Stuttgart, 1962.
- Ruprecht, E./
Bänsch, D. (ed.) Literarische Manifeste der Jahrhundertwende 1890-1910, Stuttgart, 1970.
- Schäfer, H.D. "Peter Altenberg und die Wiener Belle Epoque", in: LK, 1968, 383-390.
- Schaukal, R. von Musik der ruhenden Welt, ed. W. Alt, Graz/Vienna, 1960.
- Schnitzler, A. Gesammelte Werke in zwei Abteilungen, Berlin, 1913/14.
- Schorschke, C. "Politics and the psyche in fin de siècle Vienna: Schnitzler and Hofmannsthal", in: American Historical Review, 1960/61, 930-946.
- Soergel, A./
Hohoff, C. Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart, Düsseldorf, 1961, vol. I, pp. 418-510 ("Das Junge Wien").
- Swales, M. Arthur Schnitzler: A critical study, London, 1971.
- Urbach, R. "Karl Kraus und Arthur Schnitzler: eine Dokumentation", in: LK, 1970, 513-530. [Kraus's letters to Schnitzler and Schnitzler's Notes on

E. (cont'd.).

- Urbach, R. Kraus.]
- Walzel, O. Das Wortkunstwerk. Mittel seiner Erforschung,
Leipzig, 1926.
- Weber, E. "Eine frühe Rezension von Karl Kraus:
Hofmannsthals Gestern", in: Hofmannsthal-
Blätter, Heidelberg, 1970, I/5, 346-355.
- Widder, E. Hermann Bahr. Sein Weg zum Glauben, Linz,
1963.
- Wunberg, G. Der frühe Hofmannsthal. Schizophrenie als
dichterische Struktur, Stuttgart/Berlin/
Cologne/Mainz, 1965.
- Die Zeit, ed. I. Singer/H. Bahr/H. Kanner, Vienna, 1894-1899.

F. MAXIMILIAN HARDEN; EULENBURG AFFAIR and its background

- Balfour, M. The Kaiser and his times, London, 1964.
- Baumont, M. L'affaire Eulenburg et les origines de la
guerre mondiale, Paris, 1933.
- Boorstin, D. The image: or what happened to the American
dream?, London, 1961.
- Dawson, W.H. The German Empire 1867-1914, London, 1919,
vol. II.
- Freund, F. Maximilian Harden, der Vaterlandsretter,
Berlin/Leipzig, 1908.
- Haller, J. Philipp Eulenburg. The Kaiser's friend,
London, n.d. [1930]
- Harden, M. Apostata, 2 vols., Berlin, 1892.
- " Literatur und Theater, Berlin, 1896.
- " Kampfgenosse Sudermann, Berlin, 1903.

F. (cont'd.)

- Harden, M.(ed.) Die Zukunft, Berlin, 1892 and 1900-1910.
- Herrmand, J. "Jugendstil", see E.
- Herrmand, J.(ed.) Lyrik des Jugendstils, see E.
- Hirschfeld, M. Sexualpsychologie und Volkspsychologie. Eine epikritische Studie zum Harden-Prozess, Leipzig, 1908.
- Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, C. zu Denkwürdigkeiten, ed. F.Curtius, Stuttgart/Leipzig, 1907, vol. II.
- Holstein, F.von The Holstein Papers, ed.N.Rich/M.H.Fisher, Cambridge, 1963, vol.IV(Correspondence 1897-1909)
- Jost, D. Literarischer Jugendstil, see E.
- Klotz, V. "Jugendstil in der Lyrik", see E.
- Kotowski, G./Pöls, W./Ritter, G.A. (ed.) Das Wilhelminische Deutschland. Stimmen der Zeitgenossen, Frankfurt a.M., 1965.
- Mühsam, E. "Karl Kraus. Die Erledigung eines Nachrufs", in: Morgen, Berlin, 1908, 241ff.
- Packard, V. The naked society, Harmondsworth, 1966.
- Rogge, H. Holstein und Harden. Politisch-publizistisches Zusammenspiel zweier Aussenseiter des Wilhelminischen Reichs, Munich, 1959.
- Röhl, J.C.G. Germany without Bismarck: the crisis of government in the Second Reich (1890-1900), London, 1967.
- Schwerte, H. "Deutsche Literatur im Wilhelminischen Zeitalter", in: WW, 1964, 254-270.
- Tucholsky, K. "Der Prozess Harden", in: Die Weltbühne, Berlin, 1922, 638-645.

F. (cont'd.)

- /Tyll red./ "Karlchen Miessnicks Hass und Liebe. Ein Kapitel der Päderastenmoral", in: Wiener Montags-Journal, 8.VI.1908, No. 1374, p. 8.
- /Various/ "Maximilian Harden", in: Morgen, Berlin, 1907, 849-854.
- Wedekind, F. Gesammelte Werke, Munich, 1924, vols. II-V.
- " Der verummte Herr. Briefe Frank Wedekinds aus den Jahren 1881-1917, ed. W. Rasch, Munich, 1967.
- Weller, B.U. Maximilian Harden und die "Zukunft", Bremen, 1970.
- Wilde, O. Intentions, London 1909 (4th. ed.).
- Young, H.F. Maximilian Harden: Censor Germaniae. The critic in opposition from Bismarck to the rise of Nazism, The Hague, 1959.

G. ALFRED KERR, AND RELATED POLEMICS; OTHER LITERATURE OF AND ON WORLD WAR I

- Die Aktion, ed. F. Pfemfert, Berlin, 1911-1918. /Facsimile reprint, ed. P. Raabe, Stuttgart/Munich, 1961-67.
- Bab, J. (ed.) Der Deutsche Krieg im Deutschen Gedicht, Berlin, 1914 ff.
- Ehrenstein, A. Karl Kraus, Vienna, 1920.
- Epstein, M. "Kerr und Kraus" and "Die Fackel", in: Das blaue Heft, ed. M. Epstein, Berlin, 1928, 569f. and 769ff. respectively.
- Fischart, J. Werke. Eine Auswahl, ed. A. Hauffen, vol. I, Stuttgart, n.d. /Deutsche National-Literatur, XVIII, I.

G. (cont'd.)

- Goblot, G. "Gottlieb", in Mercure de France, Paris, 1930,594-611.
- Gruber, H. "'Neue Sachlichkeit' and the World War", in: GLL, 1966/57,138-149.
- Harden, M. Kampfgenosse Sudermann, see F.
- Harper, A.J. "Brecht and Villon: Further thoughts on some Dreigroschenoper songs", in FMLS, 1965,191-194.
- Heidorn, G. Monopole - Presse - Krieg. Die Rolle der Presse bei der Vorbereitung des ersten Weltkrieges, Berlin, 1960.
- Hirschbach,F.D. "Alfred Kerr als Lieder- und Operndichter", in: WW, 1967,165-173.
- Hoefert, S. Das Drama des Naturalismus, Stuttgart,1968.
- Huder, W. "Alfred Kerr. Ein deutscher Kritiker im Exil", in: SuF, 1966,1262-1279.
- Kerr, A. Herr Sudermann, der D..Di...Dichter. Ein kritisches Vademecum, Berlin, 1903.
- " "Aus dem Kriegsbuch eines Hirnwesens", in: NRu, 1914,1308-1315.
- " "Bleibt unverwirrt", in: Zeit-Echo. Ein Kriegs-Tagebuch der Künstler, Munich,1914,41f.
- " Die Welt im Drama, Berlin, 1917.
- " Die Welt im Licht, Berlin, 1919/20.
- " Caprichos, Berlin, 1926.
- " Es sei wie es wolle, es war doch so schön, Berlin, 1928.
- " Was wird aus Deutschlands Theater? Dramaturgie

G. (cont'd)

- Kerr, A. der späten Zeit, Berlin, 1932.
- " Die Diktatur des Hausknechts, Brussels, 1934.
- " Die Welt im Drama, ed.G.F.Hering, Cologne/Berlin, 1954.
- " Die Welt im Licht, ed.F.Luft, Cologne/Berlin, 1961.
- Kindermann, H. Theatergeschichte Europas, vol. VIII, see E.
- Kirnig, H. Alfred Kerr - Alfred Polgar. Ein Vergleich, Vienna, 1950 (Diss.).
- Kocmata, K.F. Karl Kraus, der Krieg und die Helden der Feder, Vienna, 1916.
- " Karl Kraus, der Krieg und die Ausgeräucherten, Vienna, 1919.
- Kriegsalbum der Lustigen Blätter, Berlin, 1914 and 1916.
- Kriegsalmanach 1915, Leipzig [Insel-Verlag], 1915.
- Kulka, G. "Die Götze des Lachens", supplement to A. Ehrenstein, Karl Kraus, see above.
- Pan, ed.W.Herzog/P.Cassirer, Berlin 1910-1912.
- Pfemfert, F. "Der grosse Gegenspieler Wilhelms II. Mit Maximilian Harden während der letzten Tage seines Lebens", in: Prager Presse, 27.XI.1927, pp.3f.
- " "Die Glanznummer deutscher Konjunkturjournalistik: Herr Alfred Kerr, der sich als Klowen bei Scherl auch 'Gottlieb' und 'Peter' nannte", in: Die Aktion, 1928,38-56.
- " "Die Theodor Wolff und Alfred Kerr aus grosser Zeit verleumden", in: Die Aktion, 1928,172-178.

- Pfemfert, F. "Kleiner Briefkasten", in: Die Aktion, 1929, 109-114.
- Raabe, P. (ed.) Ich schneide die Zeit aus. Expressionismus und Politik in Pfemferts "Die Aktion" 1911-1918, Munich, 1964.
- Schröter, K. "Chauvinism and its tradition: German writers and the outbreak of the First World War", in: GR, 1968, 120-135.
- Schweikart, A. "Notizen zu den Einflüssen Heinrich Heines auf die Lyrik von Kerr, Klabund, Tucholsky und Erich Kästner", in: Heine-Jahrbuch, Hamburg, 1969, 69-107.
- Spitzer, L. "Sprachmischung als Stilmittel und als Ausdruck der Klangphantasie", in: GRM, 1923, 193-216.
- Der Tag Berlin, March 1915.
- Walzel, O. Das Wortkunstwerk. Mittel seiner Erforschung, see E.
- Weller, B.U. Maximilian Harden und die "Zukunft", see F.
- Zimmermann, H.-D. "Anleitung zur Schmähschrift anhand von Beispielen", in: StZ, 1966, 331-344.
- H. FRANZ WERFEL; EXPRESSIONISM; KRAUS'S RELATIONS WITH EXPRESSIONISTS AND WRITERS FROM PRAGUE
- Die Aktion see G.
- Altenberg, P. see E.
- [anon] "Die Verführung der Worte. Ein Gespräch über Karl Kraus", in: Die Selbstwehr, Prague, 4.V. 1917, pp. 3-6.
- Bahr, H. Expressionismus, see E.

H. (cont'd.)

- Basil, O. Georg Trakl in Selbstzeugnissen und Bild-
dokumenten, Reinbek, 1965.
- Bauer, R. "Kraus contra Werfel. Eine nicht nur
literarische Fehde", in: Sprache und
Bekenntnis. Sonderband des Literaturwissen-
schaftlichen Jahrbuchs (Festschrift Kunisch),
Berlin, 1971, pp.315-335.
- Becher, J. Verbrüderung, Gedichte, Leipzig, 1916.
- Benn, G. (ed.) Lyrik des expressionistischen Jahrzehnts.
Von den wegbereitern bis zum Dada, Munich, 1966.
- Binder, H. Motiv und Gestaltung bei Franz Kafka, Bonn, 1966.
pp.17-25 ("Kafkas Verhältnis zu Karl Kraus").
- Boldt, P. Junge Pferde! Junge Pferde!, Leipzig, 1914.
- Boorstin, D. The image, see F.
- Brezina, O. Hymnen, tr.O.Pick, Leipzig, 1913.
- Brinkmann, R. Expressionismus-Probleme. Forschung 1952-1960,
Stuttgart, 1962.
- Brod, M. "Jules Laforgue", in: J. Laforgue, Pierrot,
der Spassvogel, tr.M.Brod, Berlin/Stuttgart/
Leipzig, n.d. [1908], pp.5-20.
- " "Wie ich Franz Werfel entdeckte", in:
Prager Montagsblatt, 27.XII.1937, p.58.
- " Streitbares Leben. Autobiographie, Munich, 1960.
- " Über Franz Kafka, Frankfurt a.M., 1966.
- " Der Prager Kreis, Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/
Mainz, 1966.
- Carr, G.J. "Zu den Briefen Else Lasker-Schüllers an
Karl Kraus", in: LK, 1970, 549-556.

H. (cont'd.)

- Dankner, L. Schalome. Eine Tragödie, Vienna, 1924.
- Denkler, H. Einakter und kleine Dramen des Expressionismus, Stuttgart, 1968.
- Durzak, M. "Dokumente des Expressionismus: Das Kurt Wolff-Archiv," in: Euph, 1966, 337-369.
- Edschmid, K. Lebendiger Expressionismus. Auseinandersetzungen, Gestalten, Erinnerungen, Frankfurt a.M./Berlin, 1964.
- " (ed.) Briefe der Expressionisten, Frankfurt a.M./Berlin, 1964.
- Engerth, R. Im Schatten des Hradschin. Kafka und sein Kreis, Graz/Vienna/Cologne, 1965.
- Foltin, L.B. (ed.) Franz Werfel. 1890-1945, Pittsburgh, 1961.
- Foltin, L.B./Heinen, H. "Franz Werfel's 'Als mich dein Wandeln an den Tod verzückte'", in: Modern Austrian Literature, Binghamton (N.Y.) Summer, 1970, 62-70.
- Friedmann, H./Mann, O. (ed.) Expressionismus. Gestalten einer literarischen Bewegung, Heidelberg, 1956.
- George, S. Gesamtausgabe der Werke, see I (below).
- Grillparzer, F. Der Traum ein Leben, ed. W.E. Yates, Cambridge, 1968.
- Groos, A. "Die Grenze des Zumutbaren. Über die Aufrichtigkeit und Schamlosigkeit zeitgenössischer Memoiren", in: Rheinischer Merkur, 10.XI.1961, No. 46, pp. 10f.
- Haas, W. Die Literarische Welt. Erinnerungen, Munich, 1957.
- Hahn, H.H. "Harald Brüller und Ekkehard Meyer", in: LK, 1968, 425-428.
- Harden, M. Kampfgenosse Sudermann, see F.
- Hasenclever, W. Das unendliche Gespräch. Eine nächtliche Szene,

H. (cont'd)

- Hasenclever, W. Leipzig, n.d./[1913].
- Hasenclever, W. Der Sohn, Leipzig, 1917.
- Haueis, E. Karl Kraus und der Expressionismus, Erlangen/
Nuremberg, 1968 (Diss.).
- Heselhaus, C. (ed.) Die Lyrik des Expressionismus. Voraussetzungen,
Ergebnisse und Grenzen, Nachwirkungen, Tübingen,
1956.
- Jammes, F. Die Gebete der Demut, tr.E.Stadler, Leipzig, 1913.
- Janowitz, F. Auf der Erde, Munich, 1919.
- Der Jüngste Tag. Die Blücherei einer Epoche, 2 vols., [facsimile
reprint], ed. H.Schöffler, Frankfurt a.M., 1970.
- Kafka, F. Briefe 1902-1924, ed.M.Brod, New York/Frankfurt
a.M., 1958.
- " Briefe an Felice und andere Korrespondenz aus
der Verlobungszeit, ed.E.Heller/J.Born, New York/
Frankfurt a.M., 1967.
- Kölwel, G. Gesänge gegen den Tod, Leipzig, 1914.
- Kraft, P. Gedichte, Leipzig, 1915.
- Kraft, W. Franz Kafka. Durchdringung und Geheimnis,
Frankfurt a.M., 1968, pp.199-208 ("Exkurs über
Karl Kraus").
- Krolop, K. "Ein Manifest der 'Prager Schule'", in: PhP,
1964, 329-335.
- " "Zur Geschichte und Vorgeschichte der Prager
Literatur", in: LK, 1966, No.2, 1-15.
- Lasker-Schüler, E. Sämtliche Gedichte, ed. F.Kemp, Munich, 1966.
- " Briefe an Karl Kraus, ed.A.Gehlhoff-Claes, Cologne/
Berlin, n.d. [1959].

- Lotz, E.W. Wolkenüberflaggt. Gedichte, Leipzig, 1917.
- Mahler-Werfel, A. Mein Leben, Frankfurt a.M., 1960. see E.
- Nemeth, A. Kafka, ou le mystère juif, tr.V.Hintz, Paris, 1947, pp.160-167.
- Pinthus, K. (ed.) Menschheitsdämmerung. Ein Dokument des Expressionismus, Hamburg, 1959.
- Polacek, J. "Egon Erwin Kisch über Karl Kraus", in: LK, 1970, 21-36.
- Politzer, H. "Prague and the origins of Rainer Maria Rilke, Franz Kafka and Franz Werfel", in: MLQ, 1955, 49-62.
- " (ed.) Das Kafka-Buch. Eine innere Biographie in Selbstzeugnissen, Frankfurt a.M., 1965.
- Raabe, P. "Franz Kafka und der Expressionismus", in: ZDP, 1967, 161-175.
- " (ed.) Ich schneide die Zeit aus, see G.
- Rasch, W. "Was ist Expressionismus?", in: Akz, 1956, 368-373.
- Reich, W. Kurt Wolff 1887-1963, Frankfurt a.M., 1963.
- Reichert, H.W. "The feud between Franz Werfel and Karl Kraus", in: Kentucky Foreign Language Quarterly. Lexington, 1957, 146-149.
- Rilke, R.M. Sämtliche Werke, Frankfurt a.M., 1966, vol.VI, pp. 1063-1074 ("Puppen").
- Rubiner, L. Das himmlische Licht, Leipzig, 1916.
- Schumann, D.W. "The development of Werfel's 'Lebensgefühl' as reflected in his poetry", in: GR, 1931, 27-53.
- " "Enumerative style and its significance in Whitman,

H. (cont'd.)

- Schumann, D.W. Rilke and Werfel", in: MLQ, 1942,171-204.
- Soergel, A. Dichtung und Dichter der Zeit. Eine Schilderung der deutschen Literatur der letzten Jahrzehnte. Neue Folge. Im Banne des Expressionismus, Leipzig, 1925.
- Specht, R. Franz Werfel. Versuch einer Zeitspiegelung, Vienna, 1926.
- Stearn, G.F.(ed.) McLuhan hot and cool. A primer for the understanding of and a critical symposium with responses by McLuhan, Harmondsworth, 1968.
- Stephens, A. "Rilke's essay 'Puppen' and the problem of the divided self", in: GLL, 1968/69,302-315.
- Trakl, G. Dichtungen und Briefe, ed. W.Killy/H.Szklenar, Salzburg, 1969.
- Viviani, A. Das Drama des Expressionismus. Kommentar zu einer Epoche, Munich, 1970.
- Die weissen Blätter, ed. R. Schickele, Leipzig, 1913/14.
- Wagenbach, K. Franz Kafka. Eine Biographie seiner Jugend. 1883-1912, Bern, 1958.
- Werfel, F. "Karl Kraus. Eine Erklärung", in: Die Selbstwehr, Prague, 15.V.1917.
- " "Theater. Aus einem noch unveröffentlichten dramaturgischen Buche über das Zauberspiel Spiegelmensch", in: NRu, 1921,571-577.
- " Der Weltfreund, Leipzig, 1918 (3rd.ed.).
- " Wir sind, Leipzig, 1917 (3rd.ed.).
- " Einander, Leipzig, 1917 (3rd.ed.).

- Werfel, F. Gesänge aus den drei Reichen. Ausgewählte Gedichte, Leipzig, 1917.
- " Der Gerichtstag, Leipzig, 1919.
- " Spiegelmensch. Magische Trilogie, Munich, 1920.
- " Gedichte, Vienna, 1927.
- " Dramatische Dichtungen, Vienna, 1929.
- " Dramen, ed. A.D. Klarmann, Frankfurt a.M., 1959, vol. I.
- " Das lyrische Werk, ed. A.D. Klarmann, Frankfurt a.M., 1967.
- Willetts, J. Expressionism, London 1970.
- Wittner, V. "Erinnerungen an Franz Werfel", in: National-Zeitung, Basel, 30.VIII.1945.
- Wolff, K. Autoren, Bücher, Abenteuer. Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen eines Verlegers, Berlin, 1965.
- " Briefwechsel eines Verlegers. 1911-1963, ed. B.Zeller/E.Olten, Frankfurt a.M., 1966.
- I. STEFAN GEORGE; SHAKESPEARE
- Blätter für die Kunst, ed. C.A. Klein, Berlin, vol. II, 1894/95.
- Boehrer, R. (ed.) Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal, Munich/Düsseldorf, 1953 (2nd.ed.).
- Borchardt, R. Reden, Stuttgart, n.d.
- " Prosa, vol. I, Stuttgart, 1957.
- Bruneder, H. "Wandel des Georgebildes seit 1930", in: DVLG, 1954, 248-267.
- Farrell, R.B. Stefan George's Beziehungen zur englischen Dichtung, Berlin, 1937.

I. (cont'd.)

- Flatter, R. Karl Kraus als Nachdichter. Eine sprachkritische Untersuchung, Vienna, 1933.
- George, S. Gesamtausgabe der Werke, Endgültige Fassung, 18 vols., Berlin, 1927-1934.
- Germer, R. "Shakespeares Sonette als Sprachkunstwerke", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West, Heidelberg, 1965, 248-263.
- Goldsmith, U.K. "The growth of Stefan George's reputation 1890-1900", in: GLL, 1959/60, 241-247.
- Gundolf, F. George, Berlin, 1920.
- " Dichter und Helden, Heidelberg, 1921.
- Hermant, J. "Jugendstil", see E.
- Heuer, H. "Bericht über in- und ausländisches Schrifttum", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West, 1967, 305f.
- Hoffmann, F. "Stefan Georges Übertragung der Shakespeare-Sonette", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, Heidelberg, 1956, 148-156.
- Jahrbuch für die geistige Bewegung, ed. F. Gundolf/F. Wolters, Berlin, 1910 ff.
- Jost, W. "Stilkrise der deutschen Shakespeare-Übersetzung", in: DVLG, 1961, 1-43.
- Josten, W. "Schwierigkeiten der Shakespeare-Übersetzung", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 1956, 168-174.
- Kachler, K.G. "Weshalb immer noch die Shakespeare-Übersetzungen der Romantiker vorzuziehen sind", in: Jahrbuch

- Kachler, K.G. der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft,
1956,90-95.
- Kluckhohn, P. "Stephan George. Zu seinem 60. Geburtstage",
in: Wiener Neueste Nachrichten, 12.VII.1928.
- Klussmann, P.G. Stefan George, see E.
- Korninger, S. "Shakespeare und seine deutschen Übersetzer",
in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft,
1956,19-44.
- Kraft, W. "Rudolf Borchardt und Stefan George", in: NRu,
1956,473-490.
- Kraus, Konrad "George als Wortgestalter", in: Wissenschaftliche
Beihefte zur Zeitschrift des deutschen
Sprachvereins, Brunswick, 1937, VII/49, 4-19,
[In Landmann's bibliography, see below, author
is given as Karl Kraus].
- Landmann, G.P. Stefan George und sein Kreis. Eine Bibliographie,
Hamburg, 1960.
- " (ed.) Der George-Kreis. Eine Auswahl aus seinen
Schriften, Cologne/Berlin, 1965.
- Lever, J.W. The Elizabethan love sonnet, London, 1956.
- Lieser, P. "Fremdsprachliche Übertragung als Nachgestaltung
und Neuschöpfung", in: Stefan George. Lehrzeit und
Meisterschaft, Gedenk- und Feierschrift zum 100.
Geburtstag des Dichters, ed. Stefan George-
Gymnasium, Bingen, 1968, pp.73-96.
- Marx, O. "Stefan George in seinen Übertragungen englischer
Dichtung", in: CP, 1967, LXXVII, 5-35.
- Musiol, M. "Shakespeare in German: The modern period", in:

- Musiol, M. DJ, 1963/64,104-109.
- Lüdeke, H. "Gundolf, Flatter und Shakespeares Macbeth",
in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft,
1956,110-127.
- Richards, I.A. "Jakobson's Shakespeare: The subliminal
structures of a sonnet", in: TLS, 1970,589f.
- Salin, E. Um Stefan George, Bad Godesberg, 1948.
- Schaller, R. "Gedanken zur Übertragung Shakespeares in
unsere Sprache", in: Jahrbuch der Deutschen
Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 1956,157-167.
- Shakespeare, W. Sonnets, ed. J. Dover Wilson, Cambridge, 1966.
- " Shakespeare in deutscher Sprache, tr. F.Gundolf,
vol.IX, Berlin, 1914.
- " Shakespeare's Sonnette Übersetzt von K.Lachmann,
Berlin,1820.
- " William Shakespeare's Sonette in deutscher
Nachbildung von F. Bodenstedt, 1862.
- " Shakespeares Sonnette. Umdichtung von S.George
(1909),vol.XII of Gesamtausgabe der Werke, see
above.
- " Shakespeares Sonette, Deutsch von E. Ludwig,
Berlin, 1923.
- " Shakespeares Sonette. Nachdichtung von K. Kraus,
(1934), Munich, 1964.
- " Shakespeare's Sonnets, Deutsch von R. Flatter,
Vienna, 1934.
- Stricker, K. "Deutsche Shakespeare-Übersetzungen im letzten
Jahrhundert (etwa 1860-1950)", in: Jahrbuch der

I. (cont'd.)

- Stricker, K. Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 1956, 45-89.
- Winkler, M. Stefan George, Stuttgart, 1970.
- Wolff, K. Bücher, Autoren, Abenteuer, see H.
- Wolters, F. Stefan George und die Blätter für die Kunst,
Deutsche Geistesgeschichte seit 1890, Berlin, 1930.