

VOLUME 51 NUMBER 2 SUMMER 2018

Journal of Austrian Studies

EDITORS

Hillary Hope Herzog, University of Kentucky

Todd Herzog, University of Cincinnati

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Joseph W. Moser, West Chester University

BUSINESS MANAGER

Katherine Arens, University of Texas–Austin

PUBLISHED BY

The University of Nebraska Press

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Journal of Austrian Studies (ISSN 2165-669X) is published quarterly by the University of Nebraska Press. For current subscription rates please see our website: www.nebraskapress.unl.edu.

If ordering by mail, please make checks payable to the University of Nebraska Press and send to

The University of Nebraska Press
1111 Lincoln Mall
Lincoln NE 68588-0630
Telephone: 402-472-8536

SUBMISSIONS

Send submissions to the editor at journalofaustrianstudies@gmail.com. Original manuscripts in English or German not submitted or published elsewhere are welcome. Send manuscripts as a Microsoft Word .doc file or as a Rich Text File (.rtf). Manuscripts should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages including notes and must conform to the current MLA style and the Modern Austrian Literature stylesheet. For more on submissions visit www.journal-of-austrian-studies.org. Book and film reviews are assigned; unsolicited reviews are not accepted. Potential reviewers should write to the book review editor at josephwmoser@gmail.com.

All inquiries on subscription, change of address, advertising, and other business communications should be sent to the University of Nebraska Press.

Copyright © 2018 Austrian Studies Association
All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America

If you would like to reprint material from *Journal of Austrian Studies*, please query for permission using our online form, located under the Journals menu heading on our website: www.nebraskapress.unl.edu.

Journal of Austrian Studies is available online through Project Muse at <http://muse.jhu.edu>.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in *Academic Search Complete*, *Academic Search Elite*, *Academic Search Premier*, *Humanities International Complete*, *Humanities International Index*, *Humanities Source*, *Literary Reference Center*, *Literary Reference Center Plus*, *Literary Reference Center Main*, *Emerging Sources Citation Index*, IBZ, and IBR.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Katherine Arens, University of Texas-Austin

Thomas Ballhausen, Film Archiv Austria

Steven Beller, Independent Scholar–Washington D.C.

Dieter Binder, Universität Graz

Diana Cordileone, Point Loma Nazarene University

Robert Dassanowsky, Colorado State University–Colorado Springs

Daniel Gilfillan, Arizona State University

Christina Guenther, Bowling Green State University

Susanne Hochreiter, Univesität Wien

Vincent Kling, LaSalle University

Martin Liebscher, University College London

Dagmar Lorenz, University of Illinois–Chicago

David Luft, Oregon State University

Imke Meyer, University of Illinois–Chicago

Oliver Speck, Virginia Commonwealth University

Heidi Schlipphacke, University of Illinois–Chicago

Janet Stewart, University of Aberdeen

Gregor Thuswaldner, North Park University

Executive Council of the Austrian Studies Association

PRESIDENT

Craig Decker, Bates College

VICE PRESIDENT

Gregor Thuswaldner, North Park University

PAST PRESIDENT

Imke Meyer, University of Illinois–Chicago

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE

Michael Burri, University of Pennsylvania

Alyson Fiddler, Lancaster University

Jennifer Good, Baylor University

Anita McChesney, Texas Tech University

Brigitte Prutti, University of Washington–Seattle

Oliver C. Speck, Virginia Commonwealth University

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER

Christian J. Ebner, Austrian Cultural Forum New York

EDITORS

Hillary Hope Herzog, University of Kentucky

Todd Herzog, University of Cincinnati

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Joseph W. Moser, West Chester University

BUSINESS MANAGER

Katherine Arens, University of Texas–Austin

FUNDRAISING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Robert Dassanowsky, University of Colorado–Colorado Springs

Honorary Members of the Austrian Studies Association

Established in 2013, Honorary Membership in the ASA is given to leading creative figures in Austrian culture and the arts in gratitude for their enduring and influential work. Nominations are ongoing.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Ruth Beckermann

VALIE EXPORT

Lilian Faschinger

Paul Harather

Josef Haslinger

Peter Henisch

Elfriede Jelinek

Barbara Neuwirth

Hans Raimund

Peter Rosei

Goetz Spielmann

Peter Tscherkassky

HONORARY MUSEUM DIRECTOR MEMBERS

Matti Bunzl, Wien Museum, Vienna

Agnes Husslein-Arco, Leopold Museum, Vienna
(formerly Belvedere Museum)

WOMEN IN GERMAN YEARBOOK is becoming

FEMINIST GERMAN STUDIES

The official journal of the Coalition of Women in German is changing its name, but not its focus. It will continue to present a wide range of feminist approaches to all aspects of German literature, culture, and language. Watch for the new title coming Fall 2018.

Members of the Coalition of Women in German receive the journal as a benefit of membership. For more information, visit womeningerman.org.

Feminist German Studies/Women in German Yearbook is available online through Project MUSE and JSTOR. Both offer free access via library subscriptions. Read it at bit.ly/WIGY_MUSE or bit.ly/WIGY_JSTOR.

For subscriptions or back issues:
nebraskapress.unl.edu or 402-472-8536

UNIVERSITY OF
NEBRASKA  P R E S S

Articles

- 1 A Marital *Ausgleich*: The Affair of Emperor
 Franz Joseph I and Anna Nahowski
 CHARLOTTE ERWIN

Between 1875 and 1888 Emperor Franz Joseph conducted an affair with a young Viennese woman, Anna Nahowski. The only record of this alliance is two diaries written by Anna in the period from about 1894 to 1921. The documents have been published but have not been analyzed or even properly acknowledged by Habsburg scholars, although the rumor of the imperial parentage of Anna's daughter Helene, later the wife of the composer Alban Berg, has occupied Berg scholars. The diaries reveal new details about the emperor's private life as well as depicting the conflicts and complexities that faced Anna as she tried to maintain a balance between her roles as mistress, wife, and mother. This article evaluates the relationship of the Emperor and Anna Nahowski from her perspective and examines the issue of spousal abuse in Anna's marriage.

- 31 Museums and Museality: Celebrating the
 150th Anniversary of Vienna's Ringstrasse
 RENATA SCHELLENBERG

This article investigates the history, tradition, and social relevance of Vienna's Ringstrasse on its 150th anniversary. It examines the complex provenance and development of this modern urban city project, arguing that it espouses museality as an inherent trait. As such, this paper pays special attention to the two museums that were constructed as part of the original Ringstrasse project and that continue to exist to this day, highlighting the anniversary exhibits organized by Vienna's Kunsthistorisches and Naturhistorisches Museums.

51 Writing Empire: An Approach to Joseph Roth by
Using the Political Theory of Herfried Münkler

CHRISTINE MAGERSKI

This paper analyzes the ways in which literature and political theory react to the downfall of an empire. The aim is to show that Roth's novel *Das falsche Gewicht*, when analyzed with Herfried Münkler's theory of empire, proves to be a highly instructive literary representation of the contingency of literary orders as well as political ones. Between an imperial and a post-imperial situation lies the disintegration of an empire: a process enabling an acute observer—in this instance, Joseph Roth—to recognize the order of the imperial space as well as its borders. In his novels, Roth captures the logic of imperial domination with remarkable analytic precision. When one reads Roth with a view toward one of the central problems in scholarly as well as literary discourses on empire—the problem of center and periphery—it becomes obvious that both literature and political theory hinge upon the balance between them.

73 Intertextuality as Power: Rosa Mayreder's Response
to Goethe's *Faust* and the Cult of Male Genius

RUXANDRA LOOFT

This article positions Rosa Mayreder's Faustian tale *Anda Renata, ein Mysterium in zwei Teilen und zwölf Bildern* within a canon of female Faust narratives and explores what it means for a nineteenth-century female writer to "write back" to one of Germany's most revered and widely read authors, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. I argue that Mayreder employs intertextuality as a strategic tool of resistance while writing and operating within a male-dominated literary landscape that relegates women's writings to the periphery. Using Stephanie Hilger and Audre Lorde to frame my theoretical arguments, I explore how Mayreder "writes back" to the male-dominated canon and how her work fits into feminist narratives from the early nineteenth century through today.

Reviews

89 Jürgen Hillesheim, *Die Wanderung ins "nunc stans":
Wilhelm Müllers und Franz Schuberts Die Winterreise*

ANDREW B.B. HAMILTON

91 Luke Gartlan, *A Career of Japan: Baron Raimund
von Stillfried and Early Yokohama Photography*

KATHERINE ARENS

- 93 Falk Strehlow, *Denkverläufe im Vergleich. Goethe und Kleist, Kafka und Brecht*
HELGA W. KRAFT
- 96 Günter Schütt, *Karl Kraus und sein Verhältnis zum (Ost-)Judentum*
MARTIN HAINZ
- 99 Hugo Bettauer, *The Blue Stain: A Novel of a Racial Outcast*
ADAM J. TOTH
- 101 Vreni Amsler, *Veza Canetti im Kontext des Austromarxismus*
SAMUEL J. KESSLER
- 103 Günter Bischof and Hans Petschar, *The Marshall Plan—Saving Europe Rebuilding Austria: The European Recovery Program—The ERP Fund—The Austrian Marshall Plan Foundation*
LAURA A. DETRE
- 106 Pia Janke and Teresa Kovacs, Hrsg., *Schreiben als Widerstand. Elfriede Jelinek & Herta Müller. Diskurse.Kontexte.Impulse*
IRINA HRON
- 108 Mirjam Bitter, *Gedächtnis und Geschlecht: Darstellungen in der neueren jüdischen Literatur in Deutschland, Österreich und Italien*
CHRISTINA GUENTHER
- 112 Michael Boehringer, Allison Cattell, and Belinda Kleinhans, eds., *Belief Systems in Austrian Literature, Thought, and Culture*
VINCENT KLING
- 114 Cathy S. Gelbin and Sander L. Gilman, *Cosmopolitanisms and the Jews*
DAGMAR C. G. LORENZ
- 117 Herbert Zeman, ed., *Bio-Bibliographisches Lexikon der Literatur Österreichs. Vol. 2 (Bi–C)*
VINCENT KLING
- 119 John Zilcosky, *Uncanny Encounters: Literature, Psychoanalysis, and the End of Alterity*
KATHERINE ARENS

- 121 Franz Grafl, *Imaginiertes Österreich: Erzählung und Diskurs im internationalen Film*
JOSEPH W. MOSER
- 123 Michael Köhlmeier, *Idyll with Drowning Dog & Madalyn*
JENS KLENNER

A Marital *Ausgleich*

The Affair of Emperor Franz Joseph I and Anna Nahowski

Charlotte Erwin

For fourteen years, from 1875 to 1888, Emperor Franz Joseph engaged in an affair with a young Viennese woman, Anna Nahowski. What is known about the relationship comes almost entirely from two lengthy diaries written by Anna, who referred to her accounts as *Tagebücher*, although they resemble informal memoirs more than daybooks. The extraordinary tale of the diaries begins with a chance encounter in Schönbrunn Park between the emperor and Anna, aged sixteen and recently married, and then chronicles the long liaison that ensued. During this period, Anna divorced, remarried, and bore five children.¹

Habsburg historians have either ignored Anna Nahowski or dismissed her as of no importance, even as they devote much ink to the emperor's later favorite, Katharina Schratt (Hamann 18).² At a minimum, Anna's account of her affair with the emperor offers personal, even intimate details about him from an authentic, contemporary source. However, this essay will focus on Anna herself. In the end, it is her story that is unique: a rendition of her singular experience that she titled simply "Meine Erlebnisse." How best to characterize this experience? In viewing it against the background of the Austrian women's movement of that era—in which she took no conscious part—one sees Anna recounting on her own terms a common crisis that beset many bourgeois women of her time and place. This crisis was extensively treated in both the theoretical and fictional work of feminists such as Irma Troll-Borostyáni, Rosa Mayreder, and Grete Meisel-Hess (Anderson 1992, 145–92; Thorsen 6–7). It is in essence one of sexual identity. Anna lived in a sexual battleground, and the fundamental questions of the diaries therefore

become: *Who has control of my sexuality?* and *Who am I, as a consequence?* Unique to Anna's case is the emperor's part in it. Her anomalous situation created a power relationship unlikely to be replicated elsewhere. Yet Franz Joseph was not a tyrant in love; he is revealed in the diaries to be a rather simple man who disliked conflict with women. When Anna did challenge him—there are some detailed instances in the diaries—both he and she behaved as normal, sparring lovers. More problematic was Anna's second husband, Franz Nahowski, who abused her sexually during the period of her relations with the emperor. Her choice to live in an open—or perhaps better stated, double—marriage had seriously negative consequences. Although she attempted to establish a framework, an *Ausgleich* or compromise that would sustain both relationships, how could she, without adequate rules and safeguards, maintain an equilibrium necessary to her psychological and physical well-being?

From her position of conflict, Anna spoke out, violating entrenched social norms that expected a woman to remain passive in marriage and in relation to men in general. She was not an educated woman, nor did she have any intellectual or literary pretensions. Nonetheless, after the conclusion of her affair with the emperor, she composed just shy of three hundred pages of what might be understood as a tell-all—or almost “all”—confession that was plainly intended to be read by posterity. Though in many ways naive and certainly unpolished, the diaries more than effectively plumb the depths of Anna's ordeal. In the terms of her contemporary, the well-known feminist Rosa Mayreder, they provide striking witness to a process that was recognized at the time as central to achieving female autonomy: “Female development consists of the woman transforming herself from an object into a subject, from a thing into a person” (Mayreder 2009, 77). Through the writing of her diaries, Anna Nahowski attempted to elevate herself from sexual object to the central agent in her own life's story.

The contours of Anna's identity crisis emerge mainly through her diary narratives, but the physical and temporal character of the diaries themselves offers additional evidence for her dilemma and her struggle to write about it. We will therefore first examine and compare the diaries from both a material and a historical perspective. The narrative concerning the emperor will then be evaluated with a view to its authenticity and its revelatory character concerning Anna's impasse. As a coda to that story, the matter of the paternity of Anna's children's will be addressed. It was rumored that her two youngest

children were fathered by the emperor, but the diaries make it clear that her youngest, her son Frank, could not have been the emperor's child. The diaries do not return a clear verdict on her youngest daughter Helene's paternity, but a number of clues give the impression that Anna herself wished and perhaps even believed the emperor to be the father. Helene later married the Viennese composer Alban Berg. In 1923 Anna Nahowski gave her diaries not to her children but to Alban Berg for safekeeping.

The Diaries: Historical and Physical Evidence

The Nahowski diary manuscripts, in two separate bound volumes, are today part of the Alban Berg papers in the Austrian National Library's Music Division.³ Helene Berg made a special testamentary disposition concerning her mother's diaries in a codicil to her last will not long before her death on August 30, 1976, with instructions that they be kept sealed until three years after her death (Szmolyan 175).⁴ The Austrian National Library catalogued them as "Tagebücher," volumes 1 and 2, and those designations will be maintained here as Diary 1 and Diary 2. As will be seen, the assigned numbering does not reflect a true chronological sequence.

The diaries were first made public in 1986 in an edition of Diary 1 only—without even a reference to the existence of Diary 2—under the editorship of Friedrich Saathen with the title *Anna Nahowski und Kaiser Franz Joseph: Aufzeichnungen*. This edition appears to take for granted that Diary 1 is an "official version" and that Diary 2 may accordingly be dispensed with. A second, more recent edition containing both diaries was published by Herwig Knaus in 2012. It conflates the contents of the two diaries, with text segments drastically reordered to achieve, as the editor argues, a straightforward chronology. In fact, a convincing timeline is still elusive, since approximately half of Diary 2 is undated. The result is a slim gain compared to the complete loss of identity of the individual diaries, which creates a bar to understanding their temporal relationship and the author's process in writing them.⁵ The title of Knaus's edition is also misleading: *Anna Nahowski & Kaiser Franz Joseph: Ihr Leben, ihre Liebe, ihre Kinder*, the problem being *ihre Kinder*, which clearly must be read as "their children"—children, plural. Contrary to an assertion in an earlier biography of Alban Berg that Helene Berg was the natural daughter of Emperor Franz Joseph (Knaus and Sinkovicz 40), in the diary edition Knaus relegates this important topic to an endnote (Knaus 358, note 149) in

which he states that the emperor's paternity is doubtful based on dates given in the diaries, a judgment that both is debatable and contradicts his title. In the earlier edition, Saathen addresses the question of Helene Berg's paternity but concludes that the diary—speaking of Diary 1 only—offers “not even the slightest hint” that the emperor could have been Helene's father (Saathen 12). This judgment is so peremptory as to cast doubt on Saathen's entire view of the relationship. There is also the question of Anna's other children, about whom Knaus, despite his finger-pointing title, has even less to say than about Helene. Both of these faulty editions have done little to explain Anna Nahowski in the context of her life's crisis; in fact they militate against such an understanding.

Precisely when Anna began to write her diary accounts is difficult to establish, but she clearly started the process after her final contact with the emperor, which occurred in December of 1888. A *terminus post quem* of 1894 can be established by the renaming of Anna's street in that year; in the diaries it has the new name, Maxingstrasse. It is possible that the diaries were started somewhat later, possibly as late as 1900. The concluding dates are more certain, for Diary 1, 1902, and for Diary 2, 1921, the latter including a small amount of material from the post-affair period. Even without consideration of their narrative content, it is evident that the two diaries' chronology is at least partially interwoven. Anna herself cross-references between the two diaries, referring near the end of Diary 1 to Diary 2, which she calls “a second book” in what appears to be a postscript to future readers: “What I wrote down here has been composed in brief. Memories of happy hours as well as sad things from my marriage I wrote down briefly in a second book” (Saathen 151).⁶ Reciprocally, Diary 2 refers to Diary 1 as “*das Tagebuch*” (Knaus 168). Clearly Anna worked on the two diaries for some period in tandem. The years from 1902 to 1921 are chronicled—sporadically—only in Diary 2.

The after-the-fact composition of the diaries inevitably leads to questions about possible inaccuracy or distortion. If the authenticity, meaning the simple truthfulness, of Anna's story were to be questioned—and neither of the editors of the diary editions does so, despite the time lag between events and their recording—the existence of two related but not identical versions logically tends to support the fundamental veracity of Anna's tale. There is additional corroborating evidence for the truth of her revelations. The diary volumes in the Austrian National Library contain a number of insertions that provide ancillary documentation. Foremost among these are two original

Mein Vater starb sehr früh
 als ich noch nicht 13 Jahre zählte.
 Von 9 Kindern blieben mir
 ich u. noch 2 jüngere Töchter
 aber Leben. fünf Kinder u.
 einen Onkelstar hat der Tod der
 fünf erreicht. Mein ältester Br.
 der starb mit 22 Jahren als ich
 noch nicht 10 Jahre zählte, deshalb
 hatte ich mich immer als Kind
 die größte Angst vor dem Tode.
 Als ich 14½ Jahre alt war hatte
 meine Mutter mir bereits einen
 Mann bestimmt den ich heiraten
 sollte.
 15. Februar 1874 hat sich Johann
 Heindrich verheiratet. Ein Wiener
 Brauereibesitzer von Neubrunn.

Figure 1. Diary 1 opening page. Image courtesy of the Musiksammlung, Austrian National Library.

letters, one identified by Herwig Knaus to be from the emperor concerning a position for Franz Nahowski. The second is the undated letter from Baron Fridrich von Mayr received by Anna, according to Diary 1, on March 10, 1889. This was a summons to an interview in the Hofburg in which the affair would be formally terminated and Anna would sign an oath of silence.⁷

Contrasting features of Diaries 1 and 2 afford compelling insight into the formation of Anna's resolve to write down her experience, as well as for the development of her narrative voice over the course of her writing. While the two diaries tell the same general story, they are neither strictly parallel nor chronologically sequential, rather they produce together a layered tale. Diary 1's publication in 1986 confirmed its priority as a supposed official version, and it is indisputably the more finished, the more rounded account, both in its structure and in its physical appearance: it is neatly and carefully copied out in black ink in a dedicated, high-quality leather-bound notebook, with title and date, "Meine Erlebnisse von Jahre 1875 angefangen." In contrast, Diary 2 is untitled, largely undated, disjointed in its early stages, partially written in pencil and overwritten in green ink.⁸ Furthermore, some pages have been excised from the notebook at the beginning, which suggests that the notebook itself—a utilitarian, linen-bound volume—had previously been used for some other purpose. If Diary 1 is intended to be a finished product, then Diary 2 functions logically as a first draft.

The interpretation of the diaries as first and second drafts, strongly supported by the physical characteristics of the two volumes, becomes even more secure when differences in style, tone and narrative structure are considered. Diary 1's account is generally less spontaneous, with greater attention given to chronology and facts. Diary 2, despite its messier character, is all the more revealing for its unexpurgated, experimental approach. Much but not all of the material of Diary 2 is carried over into Diary 1, so that some original content may be found there only, for example parts of the record on Nahowski's sexual abuse. The same is true of Diary 1: significant material there does not appear in Diary 2, most notably the bookend accounts of her first meeting with the emperor and her dismissal by his agent, Baron Mayr. A telling point of commonality occurs at the opening of both diaries in that almost the same sentence launches both accounts. It concerns not the emperor but the death of Anna's father when she was twelve years old. Despite the titular starting date in Diary 1 of 1875, which is when she met the emperor, Anna instinctively goes back even further in time in her narrative to the first crisis in her life from which all others flowed, the death of her father in 1871, which left her unprotected.

Diary 1, opening lines:

My father died very early, when I was not yet 13 years old. Of 9 children, only I and 2 younger sisters survived. Five brothers and a sister

were snatched away by death. My oldest brother died at 22 years old when I was not yet 10, therefore as a child I had the greatest fear of dying. When I was 14½ years old my mother chose for me the man I was to marry.

Diary 2, opening lines:

Father dead, I'm 13, Mother carries on the business. We have a house servant, for whom most likely things had earlier been better, for I often hear him singing opera. This person looks at me strangely whenever I meet him, which embarrasses me. I said to him: Rudolf, if you stare at me like this I'll tell Mother. He turns red and says: Don't be angry, I have my thoughts. So—what then? I can only imagine you at the side of a high officer. Nonsense, I say, and hop down the stairs.

The opening paragraphs illustrate well both the parallelism and the divergence in tone and focus between the two diaries. Diary 1's opening is factual, while Diary 2 veers off into an emotionally driven tale of an early admirer that on the surface does not seem to proceed from the initial sentence about Anna's father's death. In fact, the anecdote of the house servant does point to the emperor, the "high officer," who will figure in Anna's life, but this foreshadowing cannot be clear to the first-time reader. Also not obvious but important in context is the implication that Anna easily attracted men, a theme that pervades the diaries but is more salient in Diary 2. While Diary 1 proceeds quickly from the opening to a description of the first meeting with the emperor, Diary 2 treats the emperor obliquely, at first. The narrative wanders among loosely linked, undated segments that circle around an encounter with the emperor but never quite explain it. He is a shadowy figure who lurks amid anecdotes about other people, usually ill-conducted men, in addition to the house servant; the family doctor, Dr. Scholz, who when called in to treat her kisses her feet; the lascivious *Hofjäger* from Schönbrunn, Josef Wania, and his wife; and eventually the philandering Franz Nahowski, whom she will later marry. In Diary 2 Anna is plainly wrestling with how to present her experiences, searching for a means of getting to the heart of her story and committing it to paper in a forthright manner. In her social circle, sexuality was viewed, in the words of Stefan Zweig, as "an anarchic and therefore disruptive force" and "any form of extra-marital free love offended bourgeois 'decency'" (Zweig 90). In this context, the subtext of the opening

of Diary 2 remains deeply revealing: it demonstrates the degree to which Anna's sexuality was an issue in her life reaching back to puberty. That she did not know how to manage her sexual attractiveness—much less how to write about it—is apparent early in Diary 2 by her unadorned admission: “It is so embarrassing to me that so many fall in love with me” (Knaus 26).

Diary 2 illustrates most clearly Anna's subjective voice, and to ignore it is to miss critically important information on her state of mind when she began the diary project. Early Austrian feminists are explicit on the value of the subjective, of lived experience and the play of the imagination in their writings (Anderson 198–99). Diary 2's opening lines are intuitive, groping, mildly chaotic, and certainly self-dramatizing. It takes about half of Diary 2 for Anna to reach a place of unvarnished candor. The turning point is triggered by the undeniably erotic dimension of her relationship with the emperor, which can no longer be hidden. To this point she has not yet admitted to any physical contact. She now describes quite abruptly an intimate exchange in the Schönbrunn Tirolergarten involving the removal of an item of her clothing, her leggings:

Now he says: if you would take off your leggings [*Beinkleid*]. Undo the band, I say. So, it's knotted he says. Rip it. He tears through it with both hands, says that's really strong. I receive a push so that I have to grab on to him, then we laugh. The emperor kisses so much and so hard, my chin is red and burning. We go. (Knaus 64)⁹

Having revealed this much, Anna plunges ahead into more explicitly sexual revelations, shortly thereafter detailing her premarital submission to Franz Nahowski in February of 1882, the first date recorded in Diary 2. From this point on, the narrative voice becomes both more forceful and more emotionally unfettered concerning the conflict the author is experiencing in her position between two men. Her husband, Nahowski, becomes more prominent in the story, along with veiled and not-so-veiled indications of her suffering at his hands. The awareness of her identity crisis has taken hold, as has also her desire to tell the truth about her sexual life. Nonetheless, some of the most explicit and disturbing portions of Diary 2 are suppressed in Diary 1, as we shall see.

Anna and Franz Joseph: The Double Marriage

Anna Nahowski was born Anna Nowak in Vienna on June 18, 1859. Her father, Franz Nowak, ran a successful basket and wickerwork manufacturing busi-



Figure 2. Anna Nahowski. Image courtesy of the Musiksammlung, Austrian National Library.

ness in Vienna's city center. The family lived in the sixth district, Mariahilf, where Anna was married on January 30, 1875, to Johann Nepomuk Heuduck, a manufacturer of silk products. The bride was fifteen, her husband twenty-three. In the following June, Anna entered into the liaison with Emperor Franz Joseph. The diaries give certain facts about the start of the relationship, but some key points about it must be inferred. The first of these is her motivation in consenting to the alliance. Friedrich Saathen puts her in a box when he paints her as the "süßes Wiener Mädl," a type of girl Arthur Schnitzler made notorious in his dramas of the 1890s.¹⁰ These pretty, sexually accessible girls from Vienna's lower-middle or working classes were, according to Schnitzler's memoir of his youth, easily available, emotionally pliable, and

readily dispensable (Schnitzler 92–94). Such typecasting of Anna is undoubtedly an oversimplification. She understood early in her marriage that she was the victim of a social standard that viewed marriage primarily as an economic relation. This view was common to the Austrian *Gründerzeit* of the mid-nineteenth century, as Janik and Toulmin have pointed out:

Bourgeois marriages were arranged as if they were first and foremost business mergers rather than affairs of the heart. In Old Vienna, one could truly say, with Marx, that “the bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.” (42, 279n32)

Seen in this light, Anna’s capitulation to the emperor appears less a matter of sexual adventure à la Schnitzler than a realization that her coercive marriage of less than six months was a violation of a young woman’s sexual integrity. Her husband, Heuduck, was dissolute, unreliable, and unaffectionate, a compulsive gambler who fell steadily into debt and finally bankruptcy. The marriage ended in a divorce after four years.¹¹ Anna became a mother at the age of seventeen. She bore Heuduck two children: a son, who died after two months, and a daughter, Carola, born in December 1877.

Anna’s rebellion against her marriage took the form of early morning walks to Schönbrunn, about two and a half miles from her home.¹² In an attempt to explain why a respectable middle-class young woman would have reason to be in Schönbrunn Park at six in the morning, Erich Alban Berg, Alban Berg’s nephew, later stated that Anna assisted in deliveries of wares from her father’s business to Schönbrunn and met the emperor in the course of this activity (Berg, *Als der Adler noch zwei Köpfe hatte* 155). This is patently false, since her father was by this time dead, and it also obscures the real motivation for Anna’s walks. In her diary she conveys her feelings about Heuduck’s moral complicity in her behavior:

My husband is a great scoundrel, a card player who cares nothing about his young wife. Oh what tears this marriage has cost me! . . . My husband’s frivolity progresses. He urges me to amuse myself so that I can’t make any reproaches against him. (Saathen 32, Knaus 17–18)

Anna’s account of the first meeting with the emperor, in company of her maid, Karoline Lechner, known as “Lini,” is given in Diary 1 under the date of June 8 (this account is absent in Diary 2). The scene is rendered with a certain dramatic zest:

At 6 in the morning we were in the park and met an officer who on seeing me stared at me in amazement, couldn't look at me enough and kept turning towards me. My maid said this is the emperor. Really, I asked, and the blood drained from my heart. The emperor upon whom I must have made a great impression tried to meet me from all possible sides. In the beginning I was pleased and considered it a chance event, and since I had never seen him before, I could now see him quite closely, which made me blush. Then I realized that he was in fact following me, this went so far that he advanced on me certainly a dozen times, then turned around and followed me, I hurried on as much as I could, it rained, but this didn't hinder him. I hurried to the Jägerhaus under the assumption that if I went through the gate to the path to the Jägerhaus, I would be safe from him, he wouldn't dare follow me that far. I hurry in, am far ahead of my maid, run down a section of the path like a school child, and then stop to breathe. I look back for Lini and see—O horrors—also the emperor. So I run again, still I hear his step always closer, now he is just behind me. Then from the opposite direction comes a palace guard, I am saved, the emperor disappears. (Saathen 41–42, Knaus 18)

Anna may be disingenuous about not recognizing the emperor, although this is not certain. An explanation for the emperor's fascination with her was later offered by Frau Wania, the wife of the Schönbrunn *Hoffjäger*, who told Anna that she looked like Empress Elisabeth when she was young (Knaus 30). In this passage, Anna's narrative style may also show certain embellishments in imitation of the popular literature commonly read by young women of the time, as for example can be seen in the phrases "the blood drained from my heart" and "O horrors." But the account, while also bearing some resemblance to melodrama, is convincing: the rain, the breathless running, the attempt to seek safety in the Jägerhaus, a popular destination at the western edge of the park.¹³ Anna's professed desire to escape the encounter may have been a later justification, but it appears realistic in view of the overwhelming phenomenon of being chased by the emperor. She was to prove vulnerable to the attention shown by this all-powerful man. Thus, although intent on self-assertion in the face of her marital misery, Anna fell into the trap of both a class and power relation that in most ways deprived her of her desired independence. But this she did not yet see in June of 1875.

After the first meeting, Anna records doubts about the propriety of continuing to walk to Schönbrunn. Those whom she told about her adventure had mixed reactions. Her mother was at first adamantly against any further meetings with the emperor. The family doctor, Scholz, knew enough to issue a warning, which ran, in Anna's rendering, "Believe me, you are on a bad road, the higher-ups [*die Grossen*] are ungrateful, you will be sorry." Anna's sister-in-law—Heuduck's sister—surprisingly encouraged her, saying that "every princess would envy you" (Knaus 23). After weighing these conflicting views, Anna made her bold decision to break with her upbringing and engage with a man outside her marriage and as far outside of her class as could be.

After the first fraught encounter, the meetings became less tense. The emperor no longer dogged Anna's steps but continued to cross her path frequently, to salute her but then to go on. It was not until June 24—"my happiest day!"—that the emperor spoke to her, asking her where she lived and if she took a walk every day. He met her again the next day and asked her to come again the following day. By June 25, two and a half weeks after the first encounter, an understanding between the emperor and Anna had been reached.

Anna was ecstatic, because the emperor treated her so kindly:

I could have embraced the whole world, I was so happy! The difference was so striking. My husband, who never noticed me, never had a friendly word for me, for whom I simply wasn't there, and here how kind, how attentive the emperor was, what pains he took to see me. (Saathen 44, Knaus 25)

For this much happiness, she was willing to allow him certain liberties, but she also seems to have held back according to a self-imposed standard. This passage from *Diary 1* is dated July 15, when the emperor took her into the walled *Tirolergarten*:

He led me to a bench we sat down, he didn't tire of admiring and kissing me, became more and more passionate, I became afraid here alone with him and asked him to let me out again. He reassured me, nothing would happen to me and begged me, please let me, I am so happy! He said these were his happiest hours but I remained firm begged him with upraised hands to take me back out, he sighed and refastened the chain which he had taken from my neck and closed the back of my dress. He said goodbye for a longer time. (Saathen 45, Knaus 26)

It is clear from the diaries that, for the first three years, the meetings continued to be seasonal and were restricted to Schönbrunn Park. Intimacy seems limited to kissing, fondling, and admiring. The emperor's life followed a largely unvarying routine. Every summer he moved his residence from the Hofburg to Schönbrunn Palace. The summer season normally began in June, sometimes in May, and stretched into the early fall. The emperor unfailingly took at least one month of the summer with his immediate family at Bad Ischl, where he celebrated his birthday on August 18. September brought military maneuvers, which marked the official end of the summer season. In some years the emperor stayed on at Schönbrunn into October. Under this system, Anna remained largely happy. It was a fairy tale, she wrote, but like all fairy tales she feared that it would come to an end. In June of 1876, at the one-year mark, the emperor gives her a large envelope of money "to arrange our relationship." This is the first mention of an exchange of money, and the emperor continues to give Anna substantial sums on a yearly basis. They see each other often during the allotted months, and Anna gives birth to two children fathered by Heuduck, both conceived in the winter months. The crisis with her husband comes in early 1878 when Anna's mother, the architect of her marriage, finally intervenes to throw him out of the house, and the divorce is finalized a year later. In May Anna moves to a summer residence in the suburb of Hetzendorf at Schönbrunner Allee 8. Today in Meidling, the location is near the southeastern perimeter wall of Schönbrunn Park. Anna was to occupy this house for seven summers.

The Hetzendorf house, which is no longer standing, was important both logistically and sentimentally as the place where without doubt the inevitable physical consummation of the relationship came about. The emperor trusted Anna enough to come to the house despite the security risk. Anna later drew a large plan of the house with surroundings, complete with annotations and directional arrows pointing to Schönbrunn and various other landmarks that date the diagram after 1892.¹⁴ This document is now one of the inserts to Diary 1 and was plainly intended as additional evidence for the conduct of the affair. It shows to what degree Anna had assumed the generalship for the affair, mastering the Schönbrunn geography and how it could best be used to facilitate clandestine meetings. The emperor, insisting on secrecy, relied heavily on Anna's discretion.

While Anna superintended many of the logistics, the emperor normally set the date and time of the meetings, usually in the early morning. Diary 1 gi-

ves a full account of his first visit to the Hetzendorf house, which took place on October 8, 1878. When Anna first broached the possibility of a visit to her new residence in late May, he was “decidedly against it.” The subject was raised again by Anna at the end of September, and the emperor agreed to consider it. In the following days he reconnoitered the house while on maneuvers. The date was set, the hour 4 a.m. He didn’t come. Anna sulked for eight days, then went over to Schönbrunn Park, where she found the emperor waiting. He admitted that he had not dared come, but Anna finally persuaded him, and a new date was set. But the emperor had some new conditions:

At parting he held me back and said: If I come, you’ll take off the bothersome corset. If you wish, I won’t put it on. Better yet, he continued, if you are really fond of me, wait for me in bed. For me this was going too far, with him especially I wanted to be virtuous [*standhaft*], didn’t want to be blamed for anything of that sort [*mir derartiges nicht zu schulden kommen lassen*]. Never, no, I would have to be completely certain, unconditionally. I became embarrassed, I couldn’t immediately answer. Then I said, that won’t work, Majesty, I have to open the door for you. After a long back and forth, he declared himself satisfied. (Saathen 56–57, Knaus 55–56)

This passage provides a provocative view of Anna’s conception of her virtue—she routinely uses the word *standhaft* to refer to remaining virtuous—which did not preclude going to bed with the emperor but did require that he be the one to initiate that event. He did finally appear at 4:30 a.m., and Anna let him in. But he was in a great state of agitation, she reports, and clearly suspected that he might be ambushed (Saathen 58, Knaus 56). No intimate details from this meeting are recorded, and she did not see the emperor again in 1878. The following year was marked by routine visits to the Hetzendorf house and the relationship intensified to the point of a sexual consummation if that had not already happened, it is logical to conclude. But Anna remains decorously silent on this point, and there is nothing further in Diary 1 that sheds light on this matter. Later diary passages imply both yes and no. A passage from about six months later provides a strong hint that Anna was now more emotionally enmeshed in the relationship and at the same time more anxious about it. As a divorced woman with a child, she was vulnerable: “I know that sooner or later there will come an end and he’ll forget me. So I live on in this uncertainty, this doubt, a life full of sadness and care. Today rejoicing as high as the sky,

tomorrow as gloomy as death.” At this critical time in Anna’s relationship with the emperor, she unexpectedly met Franz Joseph Nahowski.

Nahowski’s family origins were in the province of Galicia, where he was baptized on November 20, 1849, in the town of Biala, now in Poland. When he came to Vienna is not known, but when Anna Heuduck met him in the summer of 1879 he was employed by the Austrian Southern Railway in an administrative capacity. During the first year of their acquaintance, as she was falling passionately in love with him, her inner conflict concerning the emperor sharpened. Nahowski, a tall, handsome man, proved himself to be both a womanizer and a jealous suitor. Writing about this first year of her involvement with Nahowski, she is unusually explicit about her moral position, which now appears conservative:

The summer [1879] passed, winter came, we were more and more in love each day. But I stayed virtuous, I never forgot myself, and no matter how passionate he became, I knew how to control him. For over a year I stayed virtuous though it often came to serious quarreling. He couldn’t understand me, and blamed me unfairly for infidelity. My God, I couldn’t do anything else. I grant the emperor nothing and can grant him nothing as well. (Saathen 67, Knaus 57)

The passage makes it fairly certain that Nahowski knew about the relationship with the emperor well before his marriage to Anna. Anna’s defense is that she gives in to neither of them. This is the first insight into what became for her a morally construed position of fairness. The two men were to receive equal measure. It was two more years before Anna gave in sexually to Nahowski, although there is some inconsistency in the dates surrounding this event. Despite her growing passion for him, she stubbornly continued to see the emperor. They meet at the Hetzendorf house in the summers of 1880 and 1881, where he visits “very often,” while Nahowski hovers in the background. Anna now begins to doubt her ability to manage her two lovers. The exalted sexual identity integral to her affair with the emperor is slipping away. She is in a state of conflict and feels out of control:

My love for Nahowski has taken me like a severe sickness. I am torn away from my happiness—divided. I want to be free of this love, it poisons me, it clouds my senses, he makes me a slave to his passion! But I am still proud, virtuous, sure of myself and my position. But how, how will this end? (Knaus 57)

In 1881 Nahowski is transferred to Nabresina (today Aurisina) near Trieste, but he returns to Vienna on February 2, 1882. This ominous date is triply underlined in Diary 1. On the twenty-first—likewise triply underlined—she can no longer resist him. Both diaries recount the event, but Diary 2 is more explicit:

Nahowski back since February 2, 1882. Our love is like a madness. We both suffer. To love someone like Nahowski—and stay virtuous—since 1879, no woman could have done this.—The unlucky day, February 21, came. Broken, worn down, almost unconscious I sink into his arms, “Do what you will with me.” Oh, the awakening—how it shakes me in the frost. We think again and are ashamed. Nahowski kneels at my feet, covers me with kisses, begs for pardon, cries like a child. Thank you my only love, my wife, from whom no one can tear me away—. Now I am completely under his spell, I can’t go back, we must marry. (Knaus 101)

The sexual awakening she experienced with Nahowski led quickly to a sense of despair. “Slave to passion,” “madness,” and “sickness” express her growing desperation. She was trapped. Her social and financial status, but even more important her sense of self-worth, depended on the emperor. But she cannot give up Nahowski, and following her capitulation to him, Anna discovers that she is pregnant. The child, her second daughter, to be named Anna, will be born the following January. But summer comes again, and Anna receives visits from the emperor. The marriage to Nahowski stalls over bureaucratic matters. The emperor says he will continue to visit as long as she is not married, and he brings her an envelope with the impressive sum of 50,000 Gulden.

After the receipt of this generous gift, Anna begins to consider purchasing either the Hetzendorf house or another one in the vicinity of Schönbrunn. Her intentions confirm her devotion to the emperor despite the situation with Nahowski. As a divorcée Anna had to look outside the Catholic Church for what she termed a “Klausenburger marriage.” The term refers to the city in Hungary, today Cluj in Romania, which was the seat of the Protestant Reformed Church. This denomination, based on Calvinist principles, permitted remarriage following conversion of both partners to Protestantism.¹⁵ It took two years to complete all of the required steps and to procure the necessary papers. Finally, on May 28, 1884, Anna married Franz

Nahowski in Pressburg (now Bratislava). Anna was pregnant again before the wedding but miscarried.

For most of the summer following her marriage Anna meets the emperor in Schönbrunn Park, and she eventually raises the question of renewed visits to the Hetzendorf house, which she now owns. At first he demurs, but she brings him around. They can breakfast and sit and smoke where it's dry, she tells him, on days when her husband is at work. The emperor finally agrees and comes on September 8. They then settle on a visit date of October 12, which will be the last meeting in 1884. While there is nothing sexually explicit in the account of this visit, Anna became aware that she was pregnant some weeks afterwards. If the child, her third daughter Helene, was indeed fathered by the emperor, as her mother wished to believe, it was on this occasion that Helene was conceived.

Just months before Helene's birth, the Nahowski family moved into the house in Hietzing, at today's Maxingstrasse 46 (formerly Hetzendorferstrasse), where Anna was to spend the rest of her life. The house lies directly across the street from Maxing Park along the Tirolergarten boundary wall where a small green door penetrates the wall at a discreet point just out of sight of the street. Using this door, the emperor was to visit Anna for the remaining years of their relationship. During renovations to the house, a secret door in the guise of a blind window was set into the southern wall of the house. The Maxingstrasse house still stands. The secret door, to which the emperor was rumored to have a golden key, has been removed (Berg, *Der unverbesserliche Romantiker* 169–70, 177).

The diary accounts of the last four years, from early in 1885 through December 1888, are marked by both a continuing warmth between old lovers and an increasing sense of foreboding on Anna's part that the end is near. The visits shift to Maxingstrasse, where the emperor first comes on April 20, 1885, in the early hours. Just behind the secret door and up two steps, Anna has prepared a special surprise, a *Ritterzimmer*, which is decorated with "all kinds of weapons, lances, shields and armaments." The emperor declares himself pleased by the new house and kneels at her feet and kisses her hand; breakfast follows (Saathen 94, Knaus 140). The level of domestic intimacy achieved in the relationship—an intimacy known to be lacking in the emperor's marriage to Elisabeth—is poignantly illustrated in another incident in the diaries, one that also gives an indirect but illuminating view into bedroom activities. This involves the mundane matter of the emperor's underwear. He always dressed

in a military uniform and had many of these for various occasions. But the condition of his underclothes, as Anna relates, was surprisingly shabby:

Whenever I help him with dressing he says: Don't look too much at my clothes, everything is very shabby and old, I wear my clothes 20 and 30 years. . . . When he stands at the mirror, he says it's really a scandal, I look like a beggar. . . . Once I made him aware that his wool underwear [*Wollunterleibchen*] had a hole next to a patch. He said: the underwear can't be replaced, there is not a second set in the entire world. I found an agent who would take the underwear with him to England because he thought he might find another [set] there. The underwear came back alone. I comforted him with the remark that it could be patched again. (Saathen 118, Knaus 183, 187)¹⁶

In the last two years Anna and the emperor's affair began its slow unraveling. In 1886, the name of Katharina Schrott is first mentioned in the diaries. Franz Joseph's relations with Schrott are well documented. He had seen and admired her at the Burgtheater as early as 1883, but in the spring of 1886 Empress Elisabeth brought her husband and the actress together. A warm friendship ensued, one that included the empress herself and her younger daughter, Marie Valerie. The first of many letters Franz Joseph wrote to Schrott is dated May 23, 1886, and it was accompanied by the gift of an emerald ring. Nonetheless some claim that the relationship remained platonic (Hamann 78).¹⁷

Anna first heard of Schrott from the local grapevine. At first she didn't believe it, but a trip to the theater to observe the interaction furtively convinced her that something was afoot. Meanwhile the emperor's visits to her had fallen off. She finally confronted him after spotting him walking in Schönbrunn Park with Schrott:

Pfui, I cried, and a shudder ran through me, who knows where you come from, maybe a half hour ago you were kissing someone else. You can calm yourself, I don't kiss anyone. Who tells me that it isn't so. Maybe you met Schrott in Schönbrunn and now are visiting me, thinking it all comes out in the wash. He began to laugh! With a quick movement he grabbed me and held me tight with an iron grip. Any attempt to free myself was in vain. He pulled me with force to my bed, covering my angry face with kisses. (Saathen 128, 137, Knaus 197–98)

Now it was Anna's turn to be jealous, and she was, desperately so. In her own mind, she had been betrayed again. Her devotion to the emperor had not been enough, he had strayed. Still, in the last year, 1888, the emperor was not ready to give Anna up, although he came less often and she confided to her diary that things were not the same between them. The last visit occurred on December 29. Anna writes that they did not then know that it was the last time they would meet. The crisis that abruptly ended things was the suicide of Crown Prince Rudolf in Mayerling on January 29, 1889. If Franz Joseph's weakness for women and his elaborate chivalry made it difficult for him to break off the relationship, a family and imperial tragedy of this magnitude drove a wedge right through it. Anna's worst fears were realized: the emperor disappeared without a word of farewell or token of gratitude. But she was not forgotten. On March 11, Nahowski is called away on false pretenses, and a mysterious messenger delivers a letter summoning Anna to the Hofburg. From this point on in *Diary 1* (but not in *Diary 2*, *Diary 1* has taken over this piece of the story) Anna gives a factual account of what happened subsequently. She arrives at the Hofburg on the Thursday, March 14, at one o'clock, and goes into the office of Baron Mayr, the author of the secret letter. He comes straight to the point: the emperor wishes to give her a gift, the amount of which she is herself to determine, and which is to be of the same amount that she has formerly received. She reports that she hitherto received 100,000 Gulden. Not possible, the Baron cries. It's true, ask him yourself, she says. Then let's say 50,000 for each of your three children, the Baron replies. And then, according to *Diary 1*:

Please, I said, and I think he must have seen in my face the discomfort and misery this fencing around caused me. Make the second hundred complete. Quickly deciding, he said yes, good, stood up, went to a large 3-door strongbox took out two packets of a thousand and was visibly pleased to escape so cheaply. (Saathen 142–44, Knaus 206–08)

Baron Mayr then required Anna to write out a dictated message concerning the gift and her continued silence. She records the words of the oath in her diary: "I herewith state that today I have received 200,000 fl. from His Majesty the Emperor. I further swear that, concerning my acquaintance with His Majesty, I will at all times remain silent. Anna Nahowski, Vienna, 14. March

1889” (Saathen 144, Knaus 207–08). Anna states in both diaries that she gives the parting gift to her husband, but in Diary 1 she adds in a businesslike aside that she retained 50,000 Gulden for herself, which she invested at 4 percent. The emotional disaster she experienced finds its voice in Diary 2:

The secret magic, the fairy tale, vanished! Everything is like it is with other people—and I am no longer I. . . . I am so depressed and frightened—can’t weep, can only think; think—night—finally dream, the whole night. And I say “No more” a hundred times! (Knaus 208–09)

“I am no longer I.” The powerful, magical identity Anna had as the emperor’s mistress has finally been stripped from her. In its place, she was left with her broken marriage to Franz Nahowski.

Nahowski’s position concerning the emperor is never made explicit by Anna, but it must be inferred that he knew about her connection from the start and acquiesced in it. For him more than for Anna, money was the compensating factor. After they were married, Anna turned the financial gifts from the emperor over to him, but although this may have been the agreement, it was not enough to bring him to a full accommodation. He kept out of the way physically when the emperor visited, but how this was managed is not explained. His emotions simmered continually and periodically boiled over. He himself engaged in affairs both before and after his marriage while Anna stubbornly continued to see the emperor. The marriage became increasingly painful and humiliating. In Diary 2 Anna delivers a searing *cri de coeur*:

Can anyone tell me how, why everything has come to this! How happy I would have been if I had never known Nahowski! High and mighty, proud, an emperor at my feet, I cared nothing for everyone else who pursued me. I was healthy, fresh, happy. Today? Sick from this terrible love, no longer any will, subjugated to him, fearful that everything I do will be wrong, that he sees infidelity in everything that I do or think or say! . . . Can anyone tell me what this love for Nahowski is? Madness, unhappiness, debasement. I can no longer raise myself up out of the dust. I have nothing more to be proud of! Whatever money I receive is taken from me. He says: “Money in the hands of a young woman is poison!” I let everything happen to me because he wills it. (Knaus 144)

The diaries become more and more concerned with Nahowski's violent behavior. A number of passages mark a turn toward serious psychological and physical abuse. The following passage from Diary 1 provides persuasive evidence:

How my husband has tormented me beggars all description. With his jealousy he persecuted me terribly. Daily there were unnerving scenes, frustration upon frustration, then he left the house to seek out his friends and over beer and wine to forget the double marriage [*eheliche Zwiestigkeit*]. I wept my eyes red, and if he came home drunk, which often happened, then I screamed aloud with pain and thought how will this end! (Saathen 101–02, Knaus 156)

Nahowski's sexual aggressiveness is even more emphatically borne out by Diary 2, from which the following passage is hard to misconstrue:

I have no peace, not if I'm sick, not if I'm pregnant. I have thought of consulting a doctor but I'm too ashamed. If I don't consent, he accuses me of infidelity, takes his hat and goes to his friends in the wine bar. Having to do his will daily 1 to 3 times sends my nerves to the dogs. (Knaus 122)

Anna had, in the context of her bid for an open marriage, been reduced to her husband's sex slave. What today would be understood as spousal abuse, specifically spousal rape, would not be recognized as such for many years (Renzetti 114).¹⁸ It is likely that Nahowski's sexual demands and accompanying violence caused Anna to miscarry. The above-quoted passage from Diary 2 is framed by the following frightening account:

My husband torments me with his jealousy, torments and persecutes me with his lovemaking. . . . On this 4th of April [1884] after such an act I am swimming in blood. Quickly Grohmann [the midwife] and Dr. Reith. . . . Anxiously I look at Grohmann, is this the end of me, I asked. Frau Grohmann, if I am in danger, bring me the children. She comforts me, everything will be all right. Reith has to perform an intervention to free the fetus and placenta. Oh he is rough, tears ran down both cheeks but I didn't make a sound. . . . I needed 3 weeks to recover, Nahowski is completely broken. He kneels repeatedly at my bed, he begs me for forgiveness, kisses my hands and weeps. I am so weak, my hand strokes him again and again over his head, how inesca-

pable is this love to which I have fallen victim. . . . What I have taken on myself, that I must bear—no one can help me. (Knaus 122, 124)

The above passages concerning the abuse and miscarriage are suppressed in Diary 1, which notes only the bare details of the miscarriage, and there is no mention of Nahowski at all. Anna had another miscarriage in July of 1888, and it is also noted in both diaries. Nahowski's sexual obsession convinced Herwig Knaus that the emperor had little chance to father Anna's child (Knaus 358n149). Concerning the record of sexual abuse in the diaries, neither editor, Knaus or Saathen, has anything to say.

Anna came to reflect on her failed marital *Ausgleich* late in the diaries, and Diary 2 remains the locus of most of her introspective writing, especially its concluding pages, which serve as a coda to both diaries. Tying up loose ends for the years between 1902 and 1921, she reflects for the last time on her dilemma—a love for and a fidelity to two men:

Am I wicked? Yes, I love both of them—but how? Is my love for the emperor like the love for a father? No and a thousand times no. I have experienced and lived through the blessedness of an untainted love. I never knew jealousy until the time when the empress forced the emperor and Valerie to take up with Schratt. . . . God is my witness, and I swear by the life of my children, I have only loved these two men. (Knaus 144–45)

Anna's position, then, was that she could and did love two men and that this did not make her a bad woman. But she came to realize that in pursuing this view of a double marriage she paid a high price. She knew that the emperor would leave her at some point, but she was bitterly jealous of Katharina Schratt and angry at him for his supposed infidelity. (The emperor's infidelity to his own wife does not enter into Anna's thinking.) But far worse was the punishment exacted by her husband, Nahowski, and her eventual estrangement from him. What Anna was left with, as she tells her reader at the close of Diary 2, is first, her children, and second, her memories—the diaries.

Anna's Children and the Question of Paternity

As has been noted, among her four surviving children, Anna's third daughter, Helene, is the only one who could have been fathered by the emperor based

on the diaries' chronology. Although Friedrich Saathen called into question her reliability on dates, there is evidence that Anna could be surprisingly accurate, even after a lapse of time. The library of the Alban-Berg-Stiftung in Vienna has preserved annotated calendars kept by Anna from the years 1885, 1887, and 1888. Many of the markings are illegible or are simply underlinings, but the last year, 1888, is the clearest, and from there dates can be matched successfully with many of those recorded in Diary 1.¹⁹ Anna speaks truthfully when she says in Diary 1 that she kept calendars to aid in managing the emperor's visits (Saathen 111, 121).²⁰

Helene Nahowski was born on July 29, 1885, forty-one weeks and three days after the emperor's last recorded visit of 1884, on October 12. A conception could have occurred up to five days following this date, putting the gestation period calculated from conception under forty-one weeks. While this pregnancy is longer than average, it is within statistical limits, and medical opinion confirms that it is not out of the question.²¹ Thus the possibility of the emperor's fatherhood cannot absolutely be excluded based on Anna's chronology, the negative assumptions by Knaus and Saathen notwithstanding. In honor of the emperor and perhaps as a clue to his paternity, Anna chose her daughter's name in relation to the emperor's birthday, August 18, which is St. Helena's Day. Concerning Anna's last surviving child, her son Frank, he was born twelve months after Anna and the emperor parted company. He was named for the emperor, Franz Joseph, but this was coincidentally his father's name. Even if Helene's imperial parentage is a fiction, its possibility became part of Anna's search for her lost identity. Through Helene she would not only perpetuate her elevated sexual role, she would (as she saw it) pass on the emperor's genes entwined with hers. Though far removed from any thought of eugenics, in her imagination Anna would fulfill the hallowed role of motherhood, celebrated by many early feminists as a true calling, on the highest level.²²

Although the question of Helene's paternity cannot be resolved without DNA testing, the very possibility that she was the emperor's daughter played both into Anna's fairy-tale romance and, somewhat more prosaically, into Helene's life and later marriage to Alban Berg. The rumor of the imperial fatherhood was too tantalizing to be ignored by the Bergs' social circle, especially Alma Mahler, widow of the composer Gustav Mahler, who was much given to intrigue. Her close friend, the conductor Bruno Walter, made a statement in 1946 in the journal *Der Turm* that Helene was the natural daughter of Emperor Franz Joseph. In response to the article, Helene Berg

made her only known public statement concerning her parentage, in which she categorically denied being the emperor's daughter and requested a correction from the editors, which was printed in the subsequent issue.²³ It is still a matter of debate what Helene really believed; she may have held different views at different times.

In 1923 Anna Nahowski decided to make the contents of her diaries known, and she chose to show them first to her son-in-law Alban Berg. While this decision may have been an act of simple trust in a family where there was little of this commodity, it may also have been a statement about Helene Berg's paternity. Upon reading Diary 1, Berg wrote to his wife:

Yesterday evening Mama gave me that certain diary. It's extremely interesting, and it reads like a novel involving three characters—Mama, the emperor, Papa—that couldn't have been conceived even by the boldest imagination. I have read few things that have affected me so. I read non-stop until midnight and couldn't sleep afterward for a long time. I don't know why Mama won't show it *to you*. Except for one or two erotic pages out of some 200, there is nothing that would offend you. On the contrary, there are countless things that clarify the whole situation. (A. Berg, *Briefwechsel III*, 306, 6 April 1923)

By "clarify the whole situation," Berg may be referring to Helene's strained relations with her father, Nahowski. Shortly afterwards Anna showed him Diary 2, which he reports in a subsequent letter to Helene (*Briefwechsel III*, 326, 11 April 1923). Sometime prior to her death on March 23, 1931, Anna Nahowski made a formal gift of the two diaries to Alban Berg, requiring him to sign the sealed package, inscribed "Eigentum Alban Berg Zur Aufbewahrung übernehmen," at the time of the gift. He took possession of it shortly after her death.

Within a few years of their mother's death, Helene's two sisters raised the question of publication of the diaries, most likely with an eye to financial gain. As the only competent male in the Nahowski family, Berg was at this time charged with dealing with the numerous business and financial matters of his wife's family.²⁴ In a letter to his sister-in-law Carola on March 3, 1934, he gave his firm opinion that the diary—he mentions one only—should not be published, especially in the hostile political environment of that moment. Alban Berg died not long after writing this letter, on December 24, 1935, after which the diaries became the property of Helene Berg. She too was opposed

to their publication. Writing to Alma Mahler over a decade later, she said the following:

You ask what I am doing with my mother's diaries. I cannot bring myself to lay open to the public this great, shocking [*erschütternde*] experience of her earthly life and all the family relationships. What for? I could never be happy over this potential financial advantage! (Mahler-Werfel 543–44, 31 August 1948)

In calling her mother's experiences "shocking," Helene had understood, perhaps better than her husband, the crisis of her mother's life.

Anna Nahowski fled an early state of sexual subjugation—a coercive marriage at the age of fifteen—only to subordinate herself to a supremely powerful man, Emperor Franz Joseph. Subsequently aroused to an irresistible erotic passion by a domineering man, she fell again into an even more damaging subjugation in her second marriage. In her sexual life Anna was mired in a conflicted state between subservience and rebellion, a war zone in which her sexual integrity and fulfillment in love were the ultimate victims. Fundamentally her dilemma mirrored in real terms the intellectual conflict of feminist icon Rosa Mayreder. Commenting on Mayreder's own imbalance between theory and experience as expressed in her diaries, Harriet Anderson describes her as caught between "the image of the new Eve," the self-determined woman, and the traditional self-sacrificing woman whose suffering for love is a replacement for a life lived under social sanctions, that is, a life of sexual choice (Mayreder 24).

Anna Nahowski's diaries lay bare the vulnerability of an ordinary woman seeking sexual autonomy at a time when sexuality was viewed as a dangerous force best contained, for women at least, by an early marriage. Anna had the dubious fortune of attracting the attention of Emperor Franz Joseph, which raised her socially and financially to the upper middle class, at the same time allowing her to construct for herself a semi-fictional sexual identity of choice. When she remarried for love, she attempted to create an equitable double marriage—her *Ausgleich*—but instead became captive to the sexual abuse of her ostensibly compliant but fundamentally brutal husband. After chronicling the loss of her sexual identity both as mistress and as abused wife, she confessed that it was the extinction, not the fulfillment of love, that had set her free.

After 15 years I am healed. After many struggles and backslidings, finally free [*erlöst*]. If he [Nahowski] had treated me better, with more affection, I would never have reached this point. Concerning all that I had to endure, I will remain silent. I am completely indifferent to him. (Knaus 301)

Her consolation, she wrote, was her children and her memories. Concerning the latter, she had not, after all, remained silent, and that achievement was in itself also a kind of freedom. In Mayreder's terms, through the diary writing she had moved from object to subject of her own life. As to posterity, Anna left that decision to the next generation. Her daughter Helene Berg, after years of soul-searching, embraced her mother's legacy and the imperative to pass it on. One hundred years after Anna first met Emperor Franz Joseph in Schönbrunn Park, Helene took the critical last step of releasing the diaries to public scrutiny.

Charlotte Erwin holds a PhD in musicology from Yale University and has taught at UCLA, the University of Southern California, and Occidental College. In 2009 she became head of the Archives and Special Collections at the California Institute of Technology (Caltech). Research on her doctoral work on the opera *Ariadne auf Naxos* by Richard Strauss was conducted at the University of Munich under a DAAD grant. She has published on Strauss, Ernst Toch, as well as other Austrian and German composers. She has also lectured and published on history of science and on archival topics. Her current project is a biography of Alban Berg in collaboration with her husband, Bryan R. Simms.

Notes

1. In addition to five live births, Anna reports in the diaries two miscarriages and a late stillbirth.
2. Brigitte Hamann engages briefly with Anna in her edition of the letters of Franz Joseph to Katharina Schratt, calling her relationship with the emperor an "armselige Beziehung." Other recent biographers of Franz Joseph gloss lightly over Anna Nahowski or make inaccurate remarks about her. Alan Palmer's one-paragraph treatment of her in his biography, for instance, contains several factual errors (220). Andrew Wheatcroft gives Anna one sentence (276), and Jean-Paul Bled's 1992 biography of Franz Joseph omits any mention of her.

3. Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.2490. Digital copies of the diaries are accessible online through the Library catalog under the title *Meine Erlebnisse von Jahre 1875 angefangen: Tagebücher*. Additional manuscript sources from the Austrian National Library consulted for this article are the following: from the Musiksammlung, Alban Berg papers: F21.Berg.1130, 2490, 1609, 1613, and 1615; and from the Kartensammlung: Schönbrunn Map MGI 511.

4. The original text to the *Nachtrag* to Helene Berg's will, January 23, 1976, may be found in the Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.1609/2.

5. Additional confusion in the Knaus edition lurks in the interpolation of calendar-related material, such as newspaper clippings of the time and some miscellaneous text, some of which is run in typographically—inadvertently, one assumes—with the diary text. In one instance this involves the capture of one of Friedrich Saathen's 1986 interlinear commentaries directly into the diary text. The offending text, which occurs in Knaus on page 187 and in Saathen on page 118, concerns Anna's observation on the bad state of the emperor's underclothes. Saathen comments: "So kurios das Histörchen klingen mag: es hat sich in Hofkreisen herumgesprochen, dass neue Kleidungsstücke den Kaiser sehr verunsicherten und er deshalb abgetragene vorzog."

6. This passage from Diary 1, on folio 105 recto, is omitted in Knaus without explanation, but it is important for the dating of the two diaries. Direct quotations from the diaries are given in the author's translation, which attempts to convey Anna's tone and style as faithfully as possible. Diary passages are cited to both the Saathen and Knaus editions for Diary 1 and to the Knaus edition for Diary 2. Where only the Saathen edition is cited, there is an omission of a Diary 1 passage in Knaus.

7. These two undated letters are published, partly in facsimile, in Knaus's edition, 172–73, 204–05. The originals are in the Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.2490.

8. Anna Nahowski used green ink as her ordinary, day-to-day writing medium for many years. A large portion of her correspondence is produced with green ink. See especially Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.1130.

9. Men also wore *Beinkleider*. A *Beinkleid* was akin to leggings or long underwear.

10. The character of the *süßes Mädl* appears most famously in Schnitzler's play *Reigen* (1897) but also in *Anatol* (1893) and *Liebelei* (1895). Concerning Schnitzler and the coining of the term *süßes Mädl*, see also Gay.

11. The divorce was finalized on February 11, 1879, per the *Scheidungsurteil* in the Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.1615/8. Newspaper notices about Heuduck's bankruptcies can be found in the *Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung*, 10 August 1875, and the *Neue freie Presse*, 20 April 1877.

12. Heuduck's business and residence was in Vienna's seventh district, Neubau, at Hermandgasse 2, according to *Lehmann's allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1875.

13. The Jägerhaus of Anna's day no longer stands. It has been incorporated into the site of what is now the Schönbrunn Meierei. A map of Schönbrunn Park from 1868 shows it to have been located in the crook of the western perimeter wall just at the south end of the Tirolergarten and bordering the small district referred to as Maxing, now part of Hietzing. See Austrian National Library, Kartensammlung Map MGI 511. All of Anna's dates for the

first month, June 1875, are accurate for the day of the week and for her reporting on rain. Corroborating weather information may be found in the *Neue freie Presse*.

14. The Hetzendorf house plan is reproduced in Knaus, p. 49, but it is too small to be legible. For the date of the plan, see Knaus 353n51. The plan uses Anna's signature green ink, and the directional arrows are drawn in pink pencil. Original in Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.2490.

15. Klausenburg (Cluj) was the capital of an independent Transylvania up until the *Ausgleich* of 1867 when the province became part of Austria-Hungary. Remarriage through the Reformed Church was legally valid in Austria-Hungary. This remarriage was also known as a "Siebenbürgische Ehe." See "Siebenbürgische Ehe" in Meyers Großes Konversations-Lexikon, Band 18 (Leipzig 1909).

16. Concerning this passage, see note 4.

17. A telling letter, often cited, was written by the emperor to Katharina Schrott on February 14, 1888, in answer to a proposal from her—not extant—in which she offered to become his mistress. He writes: "Unser Verhältnis muss auch künftig das Gleiche sein, wie bisher, wenn es dauern soll und das soll es denn es macht mich ja so glücklich."

18. See Renzetti 111–132. Until as recently as 1977, it was legally impossible in the United States for a woman to be raped by her husband.

19. The three surviving calendar volumes from 1885, 1887, and 1888 resemble an almanac and are titled *Neue Krakauer Schreib-Kalendar*. In 1885 there are tiny annotations in ink, scarcely legible, on specific days; for example, one reads "K. Besuch Frühstück." Some dates are simply underlined. On 29 July "Helenens Geburt" is noted. The year 1887 shows many fewer entries, more often just an underline; 1888 continues with underlined dates, but on a facing blank page Anna has made notes referring to specific visits on specific days: (April) 4, 13, 17, 18, 19, 27 ("Besuch Mittag"); similarly for June 1, 30; July 9, 17; August 28; September 1, 8 ("Besuch Frühstück"), 10, 28; October 12 ("letzte früh Besuch Kaffee"), 25 ("Nachmittag Besuch"); November 21 ("Nachmittag ½ 2 Uhr Besuch"); and December 27 ("Nachmittag Besuch").

20. Anna writes in Diary 1: "Since he comes less often I need the help of the calendar so that we'll be in agreement [1886]. . . . Visit of the emperor on March 13 [1887]. As he was leaving he asked: do you have a calendar handy? I brought one and he confirmed the next visit for April 4. Visit on April 4 received. More looking at the calendar, and he confirms April 27." The author is indebted to Dr. Regina Busch of the Alban-Berg-Stiftung for discovery of Anna's calendars.

21. On the timing of conception, see Wilcox et al. Concerning length of gestation, see Jukic et al. The author is indebted to the following clinicians for their advice concerning timing of conception and length of gestation, pregnancy, and intimate partner abuse: Paul Bodnar, MD; Begum Ozel, MD; Allison Parelman, PhD.

22. On the place of eugenics and liberated motherhood in the feminist movement, see Anderson, *Utopian Feminism* 181–92, which includes an analysis of Meisel-Hess's *Die sexuelle Krise* (1909).

23. See Walter. Alma Mahler claims that Helene was the daughter of the emperor in her memoir *And the Bridge Is Love* (1958, 141) and again in *Mein Leben* (1963, 171). Theodor

Adorno makes the same claim in his essay, “In Memory of Alban Berg” (written in 1955 but published in 1984, 506–07); also Erich Alban Berg in *Der unverbesserliche Romantiker* (1985, 173); and Soma Morgenstern in *Alban Berg und seine Idole: Erinnerungen und Briefe* (1999, 111–14). Referring to Walter’s article, Helene Berg wrote to the editor of *Der Turm*: “Ich bitte Sie gütigst richtig zu stellen, dass die Behauptung darin, ich sei eine natürliche Tochter Kaiser Franz Josefs ein Irrtum ist und nicht den Tatsachen entspricht.” A carbon copy of this note can be found in the Austrian National Library, F21.Berg.1622/13. The correction was printed in *Der Turm*, vol. 2, no. 5–6 as follows: “Frau Alban Berg bittet uns um die Mitteilung, dass die in Bruno Walters Artikel (Heft 3/4) verzeichnete Behauptung, sie sei eine natürliche Tochter Franz Josefs, nicht den Tatsachen entspricht.”

24. Franz Nahowski died in 1925. His son Frank was mentally incompetent, diagnosed with schizophrenia. Anna’s other son-in-law, Arthur Lebert, husband of her daughter Anna, died in 1929 of tuberculosis.

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor. “Im Gedächtnis an Alban Berg.” *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 18. Suhrkamp, 1984 [1955].
- Allgemeine Österreichische Gerichtszeitung*, 10 August 1875. *Austrian National Library*, ANNO, <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=aog&datum=18750810&zoom=33>.
- Anderson, Harriet. *Utopian Feminism*. Yale University Press, 1992.
- Austrian National Library, manuscript holdings:
 Musiksammlung: Alban Berg papers: F21.Berg.1130, 2490, 1609, 1613, 1615.
 Kartensammlung: Map MGI 511
- Berg, Alban, and Helene Berg. *Briefwechsel Alban Berg–Helene Berg: Gesamtausgabe, Teil III, 1920–1935*. Edited by Herwig Knaus and Thomas Leibnitz. Florian Noetzel Verlag, 2014.
- Berg, Erich Alban. *Als der Adler noch zwei Köpfe hatte: Ein Florilegium*. Verlag Styria, 1980.
 ———. *Der unverbesserliche Romantiker: Alban Berg 1885–1935*. Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1985.
- Bled, Jean-Paul. *Franz Joseph*. Translated by Teresa Bridgeman. Blackwell, 1992. French edition: *François-Joseph*, 1987.
- Burghauptmannschaft Österreich. *Generalsanierung Kammermeierei im Fasangarten von Schönbrunn: Geschichte, 2009*. <http://www.burghauptmannschaft.at/uploads/690.909-kammermeierei-generalsanierung.pdf>.
- Gay, Peter. “Sex and Longing in Old Vienna.” Bookend. *New York Times*, 11 July 1999. *New York Times Archive*, <https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/books/99/07/11/bookend/bookend.html>.
- Hamann, Brigitte. *Meine liebe Freundin! Die Briefe Kaiser Franz Josefs an Katharina Schrratt*. Verlag Carl Ueberreuter, 1992.
- Janik, Alan, and Stephen Toulmin. *Wittgenstein’s Vienna*. Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- Jucic, A. M., et al. “Length of Human Pregnancy and Contributors to Its Natural Variation.” *Human Reproduction*, vol. 28, no. 10, 6 August 2013, pp. 2848–55.

- Knaus, Herwig, ed. *Anna Nahowski und Kaiser Franz Josef: Ihr Leben, ihre Liebe, ihre Kinder*. Löcker Verlag, 2012.
- Knaus, Herwig, and William Sinkovicz. *Alban Berg*. Residenz Verlag, 2008.
- Lehmann's allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1875. *Wienbibliothek digital*, <https://www.digital.wienbibliothek.at/periodical/structure/70614>.
- Mahler-Werfel, Alma. *And the Bridge Is Love*. Harcourt, Brace, 1958.
- . "Immer wieder werden mich thätige Geister verlocken": *Alma Mahler-Werfels Briefe an Alban Berg und seine Frau*. Edited by Martina Steiger. Seifert Verlag, 2008.
- . *Mein Leben*. Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1963.
- Mayreder, Rosa. *Gender and Culture*. Translated by Pamela S. Saur. Riverside: Ariadne Press, 2009. Original edition: *Geschlecht und Kultur*, 1923.
- . *Rosa Mayreder Tagebücher, 1873–1937*. Edited by Harriet Anderson. Insel Verlag, 1988.
- Meyers Grosses Konversations-Lexikon*. Leipzig, 1909.
- Morgenstern, Soma. *Alban Berg und seine Idole: Erinnerungen und Briefe*. Edited by Ingolf Schulte. Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 1999.
- Neue Freie Presse*. Daily section "Meteorologische Beobachtungen" June 1875, 20 April 1877. *Austrian National Library, ANNO*, <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=nfp&datum=18770420>.
- Neue Krakauer Schreib-Kalendar* 1885, 1887, 1888. Alban-Berg-Stiftung Collection.
- Österreichische Zeitung für Verwaltung*, vol. 25, no. 7, 18 February 1892, pp. 31–32. *Austrian National Library, ANNO*, <http://anno.onb.ac.at/cgi-content/anno?aid=ozv&datum=18920218>.
- Palmer, Alan. *Twilight of the Habsburgs: The Life and Times of Emperor Francis Joseph*. Atlantic Monthly Press, 1994.
- Renzetti, Claire M., et al. *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*. 2nd ed. Sage, 2011.
- Saathen, Friedrich, ed. *Anna Nahowski und Kaiser Franz Joseph: Aufzeichnungen*. Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1986.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. *My Youth in Vienna*. Translated by Catherine Hutter. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970. Original edition: *Jugend in Wien*, 1968.
- Szmolyan, Walter. "Helene Bergs Vermächtnis." *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, vol. 32, no. 4, April 1977, pp. 169–79.
- Thorsen, Helga. "Regarding the Voices of Literary Modernism: Grete Meisel-Hess's 'Die Stimme: Roman in Blättern.'" *Modern Austrian Literature*, vol. 44, nos. 3–4, 2011, pp. 1–18.
- Walter, Bruno. "Von Wien nach Kalifornien." *Der Turm: Monatsschrift für Österreichische Kultur*, vol. 2, nos. 3–4, 1946, pp. 114–20.
- Wheatcroft, Andrew. *The Habsburgs: Embodying Empire*. Penguin, 1996.
- Wilcox, Allen J., et al. "Timing of Sexual Intercourse in Relation to Ovulation." *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 333, no. 23, 7 December 1995, pp. 1517–21.
- Zweig, Stefan. *The World of Yesterday*. Translated by Anthea Bell. University of Nebraska Press, 2013.

Museums and Museality

Celebrating the 150th Anniversary of Vienna's Ringstrasse

Renata Schellenberg

The Ringstrasse, Vienna's most prominent city boulevard, celebrated its 150th anniversary in 2015. Celebrations pertaining to the planning, construction, and development of this famous urban promenade had been organized throughout the year in the city, with many museums in particular capitalizing on the appeal of the anniversary by planning special exhibitions to honor the sociocultural relevance of the Ringstrasse in Vienna's history. Participating in these civic events were two prime museums that were constructed as part of the original Ringstrasse project and that were located on the very premises being feted: the Naturhistorisches Museum and the Kunsthistorisches Museum. This essay explores the history and activities of these two museum complexes within this key anniversary year and within the context of the Ringstrasse itself and queries whether museums designed as integral components of such a large and intricate collective urban project can in fact be used to reflect on their own history and to commemorate self-critically on their placement within the community. Notions of museality, heritage, and historical remembrance are investigated in view of the presumed clout of cultural authority state museums have been traditionally prescribed and which they are understood to have within a modern urban setting.

As is well known, the construction of the Ringstrasse was a regimented affair famously mandated and implemented by the emperor himself. Driven by a desire to modernize his capital, Franz Joseph I ordered the removal of the city's medieval walls, thereby figuratively and physically breaking with the past and opening the city to the outside world, transforming its traditional urban space into an appealing European metropolis.¹ According to the wording

of the 1857 imperial edict, the historical insularity of the city was to be systematically replaced with a conscious and deliberate act of modernization, one that would help Vienna grow past its original core to include different socio-cultural influences and spaces, an expansion that would propel the city into new interactions and future growth. The success of the boulevard project was to be determined by the evident functionality of the Ringstrasse, a street that, according to the emperor, bespoke the lives of Vienna's people, and which was designed, ostensibly, to meet their needs: "Auf die Herstellung öffentlicher Gebäude . . . ist Bedacht zu nehmen und sind die hiezu zu bestimmtem Plätze unter genauer Angabe des Flächen-Ausmaßes zu bezeichnen" (1). This imperial mandate of urban modernization in itself is not terribly unusual. When compared to European counterparts and other metropolises, this plan seems indeed appropriate, if not somewhat overdue, for many capitals had begun decommissioning their medieval walls almost a century earlier and had open city promenades in place by the mid-1800s (Lawrence 355–56). How this urban renewal was implemented in Vienna does, however, warrant further scrutiny, as it not only illustrates the deliberate use of material means to achieve abstract political aims—highlighting the intricate relationship that exists between materiality and power—but also exposes the connections society develops with the objects in their immediate vicinity, one that is perceptual, and therefore almost entirely personal, in nature.

Since its inception, the Ringstrasse was envisioned as the means to map the process of modernization taking place, creating a liminal, but manifestly visible, space in the very center of the city that showed the progress of the emperor's urban planning and betterment. In doing so, the street became a deliberate display of a larger, more abstract, sociopolitical decision-making process and a form of open narrative that convincingly relayed state objectives to the general public. Imperial involvement in the project gave the project a special, if not sacred, meaning, investing the entire Ringstrasse with an intent that exceeded the objectives of architectural design alone. It is important to recognize this point, for despite the social intentions underlying the project and the seemingly modern approach to urban planning, the development of the Ringstrasse was and remained a project inseparable from the personality of the emperor himself, bearing therefore a more complex sociocultural message than is perhaps immediately obvious. This point has been well elaborated in critical literature and has produced scores of opinions on the relationship that existed between the ruling imperial house and its capital city.² The choice to

implement this mandate in such a monumental fashion is, however, a separate issue, for it speaks to a methodology of utilizing the materiality of the city infrastructure's to make this point known, bringing to light a determination to make this progress visible on a grand, immutable scale. Moreover, as this paper argues, it seeks to achieve these aims by employing a representative display strategy that is not architectural but rather museological, in nature, one that is usually reserved for objects within a controlled modern museum space.

The sheer scale of the Ringstrasse would seem to dispute the notion that this project could be reduced to the tenets of museological theory and be associated with the confines of a museum space in the first place. Among the many diverse definitions of the museum,³ there is an overriding expectation of visibility, i.e. making the matter on display conspicuous and discernible to a viewing public. As Susan Dudley has observed, museums are essentially "ocularcentric" as they are perceived through the sense of sight by visitors and their displays should, therefore, be considered elements of visual, rather than material, culture (8). The Ringstrasse is demonstrably such an observable spectacle because its buildings provide a distinct urban pageantry that captivates the attention and imagination of the audience through a carefully constructed and visually striking appearance. Its design is, moreover, meant to appeal to a personal visual analysis and to be assessed through the immediacy of the individual optic lens, appealing thus primarily to subjective perception. Its physicality is used to create this impression and to have a cognitive impact on the individual as s/he perceives the immensity and beauty of the project. As Corrine Kratz and Ivan Karp explain, comprehension of the museum institution can indeed be broadened by loosening its connection to physical location and, as a consequence, its institutional purpose is better understood through what it does, rather than where it is and what it may contain. They consequently see the museum as a social technology, "a set of museological practices . . . a combination of curatorial knowledge, display practices intended to inform or inspire" (4). Through its scope and indisputable aesthetic effect the Ringstrasse seems to act in precisely such a fashion, as it too initiates a particular type of relationship with the public, one that is predicated on the presumption of creating high culture and proud citizenship, while, more generally, instilling a sense of approbation of what is being shown.

Because of its direct association with the imperial edict, the Ringstrasse had a patent representative role that competed with all other aspects of its urban purpose. It was imbued with a meaning that exceeded the physical

bounds of the object itself. From the very beginning, there was a decreed intentionality underlying the construction of the Ringstrasse that sought to manipulate the visible structure of the street, using it as a means with which to bolster overall governance and imperial rule. Built in such a manner, it had both a symbolic and functional structure, and it calculatingly oscillated in purpose between imperial mandate and the practicalities of day-to-day life, perpetually connoting two different messages to the public. On the one hand, the structures of the Ringstrasse were intended to enhance the quality of urban life for the people of Vienna. This objective was made manifest through the many beautiful civic and private buildings built on the surface of the street (Schorske 27–62) and the explicit focus given to the content of that life through the building of public institutions, an architectural validation of sorts for the activities and interests of city dwellers. On the other hand, the aesthetically pleasing appearance of the street was also utilized as an amenity to impress the public, a construct connoting cultural sophistication and a carefully construed vision of Vienna to the outside observer. The edifices, together with their decorate facades and elaborate entrances and the trees encircling the road, were presented as an imposing, self-sustaining unit, elements that exist in harmonious interaction with each other. Gathered together in this way they denoted the essential spirit of a modern, multifarious, and functioning urban city, embodying, rather than merely representing, the anticipated imperial values of the Ringstrasse project.

There was, consequently, an implicit performativity accompanying this ostentatious urban planning that was intended for visible consumption and that was devised with an impressionable audience in mind. Public reception and their assumed agreement with the directive of the project was an integral component of its overall constitution. The Ringstrasse buildings were constructed with the intention of eliciting affirmative civic engagement from the public, while monopolizing public attention to stimulate awareness of the imperial mandate. This was done by instilling aesthetic appreciation for the project and by encouraging popular recognition of the cultural value this assembly of buildings has for the city. The Ringstrasse was presented as veritable cultural capital, an investment in the beautification and betterment of the city, but it was also positioned as a venture that sought to improve the lives of the people who viewed it. In other words, the iconic street structures imparted an image of proud citizenship to the public, performing a function that invigorated the project's purpose past physical presence alone. The en-

tire street was to be understood as an interactive, dynamic unit, a deliberate composite structure in which the external features complement each other, acting together, and collectively, to communicate a more subtle message of governance. The implicit relationship that exists between the visible and invisible aspects of the street is a phenomenon that has been studied closely in the museum context, where material objects are regularly regarded as constituents that connote deeper meaning and impart knowledge. In order to grasp this more substantive role of the object, one does have to be open to understanding the message the material objects seeks to convey, as Susan Pearce explains:

The meaning of the object lies not wholly in the piece itself, nor wholly in its realization, but somewhere between the two. The object only takes on life or significance when the viewer carries out his realization, and this is dependent partly upon his disposition and experience, and partly upon the content of the object which works upon him. It is this interplay which creates meaning. (26)

There are, of course, other perspectives on this. Some critics have focused solely on the visibility of the Ringstrasse and see its complex, composite nature as existing (and ending) within the structure itself. They regard the street as an elaborate *Gesamtkunstwerk*, deeming the external intricate structure of the boulevard, with its sprawl and diversity, an inherently unified piece of art. Barbara Dmytrasz, for example, defines the street primarily as a “Prachtstraße,” a street of splendor, and understands the Ringstrasse project to be a complex visual entity that must be viewed as a physical aggregate rather than in terms of individual buildings or sections. However, while the complementary, mutually fulfilling nature of its external structures is certainly a matter worthy of consideration—affirming the prominence such large-scale cultural artifacts occupy in day-to-day life—what is interesting here is the very *assumption* that the street could be viewed as a piece of art at all, for this point disputes the practical purpose attributed to it by the emperor himself. Interpreting the Ringstrasse as a deliberately constructed *Gesamtkunstwerk* is a somewhat problematic approach, as it raises questions that challenge the pragmatic applicability of the project. The *Gesamtkunstwerk* designation, namely, explicitly contests almost all practical possibilities of the Ringstrasse by attributing idealistic qualities to this city project that conflict with its very efficacy and urban value. And rather significantly, by affiliating it with an ae-

sthetic framework, such a designation renders the Ringstrasse a practically redundant structure, reducing its primary purpose to connoting beauty and visual appeasement ahead of a functional and more progressive civic agenda.

Understanding the Ringstrasse as an object of art does underscore the assumed agency such projects have in larger society, in addition to the obvious impact they have on matters of culture. Critics like Alfred Gell have written extensively on the presumed anthropology of the art object, exploring the role it has in the external physical world and on the human subject who perceives it. As he argues, it is impossible to separate the experience of the art object from the greater social processes that surround it (3), as the two are strongly interconnected. Sandra Dudley, on the other hand, has investigated the general effect material objects have on human social life and maintains that objects (in museums and elsewhere) have “perceptual and ontological qualities” (1) in addition to mere physical presence. As such, they should be considered in terms of the interactive relationships they build with the people around them rather than solely in terms of their visibility. As Dudley suggests, the visual appearance of objects, however magnificent this may be, is a mere veneer that introduces a myriad of other possible connections, which ought to encourage a more profound investigation of the object itself. In the end, both of these critical perspectives recognize the presence material culture plays in day-to-day life and validate the role material items play in our general understanding of culture, thereby affirming the so-called material turn as a suitable means with which to make sense of the outside world.⁴

The museal identity ascribed to the buildings of the Ringstrasse, as argued within this essay, is most discernible through its conventional architectural style. Historicism corroborates the theatrical character of the Ringstrasse by displaying a cultural allegiance with inherent conservatism and tradition, exposing, as it were, a set of recognizable values that are adhered to, but that are also performed through conventional architectural forms. As it has been well documented elsewhere, avant-garde ideas were not part of the Ringstrasse project, and during its construction there was never any plan to break with architectural custom, nor was there desire to truly revolutionize the design of a historically traditional European city.⁵ Rather than embracing the possibility of urban innovation and engaging with current trends in architectural design, the many architects of the Ringstrasse shaped the boulevard according to a model of preexisting standards, constructing buildings in already recognizable architectural styles. The narrative of urban renovation was therefore

carefully regulated and rested on known values, emphasizing quite starkly the visibility of established and safe historical precedent. It is important to stress what is perhaps an obvious point here, for despite its apparent beauty and architectural harmony—and the imposing cultural stature it assumed within the public sphere—nothing was original of the Ringstrasse. Having been modeled on existing historical structures, every building on the street had a template elsewhere, thereby replicating and importing outside creativity, rather than manifesting its own. The array of Ringstrasse buildings recreated those familiar styles for the public, posing and displaying these architectural styles on Vienna's new boulevard, thereby merely parading a selection of buildings for the public to absorb and view.

Note critic Russell Belk's definition of collecting, which seems to affirm the point that, theoretically at least, the Ringstrasse buildings do constitute a type of collection, based on the selective nature of their construction and presentation. He writes: "We take collecting to be the selective, active, and longitudinal acquisition, possession and disposition of an interrelated set of differentiated objects . . . that contribute to and derive extraordinary meaning from the entity . . . that this set is perceived to constitute" (179). With its assembly of buildings, the Ringstrasse represents precisely such a conceptually unified and contrived "set," despite the patent diversification of styles visible and the contribution made by many different talented architects who helped build individual portions of the street. The dynamic assembly of buildings gives the street its specific cultural identity while also assigning it special social value, particularly when compared to other buildings or other areas in the city. Moreover, with its emphasis on preexisting forms of architecture, the Ringstrasse assumes stewardship and preservation of certain styles of building, replicating these objects for posterity, thereby acting in line with the customary conservation tactics of a museum complex. By preserving these vestiges of the past, the entire street is dedicated to the past and given the purpose of holding historic memory for the citizens of Vienna. This grand commemorative function was not just an aesthetic feat for the city, for it also signaled a decisive rejection of contemporaneity, imposing a filtered mode of seeing Vienna that suggested a strong predilection for the past. This managed and regulated way of seeing is consistent with exhibition strategies used in museums, where such control contributes to an intended "museum effect" (Alpers 25), facilitating the delivery of a specific message organizers of the

exhibit may have, information they intentionally implement through the display of objects they present to the public.

Historicism did help organize the street by asserting set norms to the project and by establishing chronological parameters that conclusively identified the street to the viewing public. With its stringent focus on historical precedent, the Ringstrasse openly prioritized the past to the present, enforcing sanitized preservation ahead of innovation to citizens. In doing this alone, it effectively designated those buildings museum objects, configuring these structures within a contrived context that was subject to particular rules and control. These buildings were not only removed from the effects of time; they were isolated within the demarcated space of the Ringstrasse and were officially designated as somehow special and distinct when compared to other civic buildings in Vienna. This collection of carefully selected buildings in the very center of Vienna had a pronounced presence and created a public space that appeared not to be subject to time, imposing, instead, a controlled view of the city panorama that was not contestable, nor indeed malleable, to public opinion. These types of authoritative arrangements are common practice within a traditional museum context, in which curators manipulate the settings of the space to set a standard of comprehension for the visitor. As Stephanie Moser explains, all aspects of the display environment play a part in presenting a collection and should be acknowledged accordingly, for they create a “system of meaning” for the visitor (30), asserting a pre-selected, socially condoned narrative to the public. This system of control rests on securing a perception that reliably communicates intent of the exhibition to the public. Transferring this entire museum methodology to an urban open setting is a bold undertaking, to say the least, and it carries enormous social ramifications that extend past the aesthetic appearance of the street, a consideration that is impossible to overlook.

The historicist approach in Vienna was indeed heavily criticized for its unimaginative aestheticism and its social short-sightedness. Prominent contemporary architects such as Adolf Loos rejected the design of the Ringstrasse entirely, objecting to the construction of this prime city boulevard in such a derivative and inefficient manner. In 1912, when a large portion of the construction had already been completed, and its effects became obvious to the public, Loos devised an alternate sketch for the Ringstrasse that amended its apparent shortfalls and that, architecturally, connected Vienna in a better way with its suburbs. On the sketch he repositioned key public

spaces in order to accentuate the possibility for urban fluidity and mobility and to encourage proper social integration. Significantly, in one part of his design of the Ringstrasse he combined the construction of a train station with that of a harbor, acknowledging the expanding nature of Vienna, facilitating the practical needs that accompany the influx of new people into the very core of the city. His design directly contradicted the implicit museal qualities of the project as it emphasized increased mobility and constant change. Loos was a social critic as well and strenuously objected to the ostentatious appearance of the bourgeois residences that were constructed along the Ringstrasse. He considered them too rich in both appearance and cost and deemed them inaccessible to the average citizen of Vienna. He concluded that their construction was ultimately anti-bourgeois in nature, for, in his view, they were clearly built to accommodate an aristocratic, rather than bourgeois, lifestyle. He recognized this point as early as 1898 and published “Die Potemkin’sche Stadt,” a caustic critique of the project in the secessionist journal *Ver Sacrum*. In this article he compared the Ringstrasse to a Potemkin village, a fake and vacuous structure built to impress and dazzle, rather than to serve any real residential purpose (15–17).

The emphasis placed on the visibility, rather than mere practicality, of the new street design was an issue raised by architect Otto Wagner. He disputed the modern character of the project in his short treatise *Moderne Architektur: Seinen Schülern ein Führer auf diesem Kunstgebiete*. Wagner analyzed the intentions of the project, noting that it reinforced the centrality of a traditional inner city core, doing little to extend Vienna past its original parameters. He was right. The Ringstrasse merely encircled the old city core, demarcating a space where old and new parts of the city meet, but in doing so it in fact kept these two spheres separate, creating a border between the authentic center of the city and its ever-growing suburbs. Rather than facilitating connections between peripheries of the city and its center, the Ringstrasse clearly enforced the existing split between the two, noting in splendid fashion the stark social difference existing in various parts of the city. By maintaining the old social order in this way, the street was engaged not only in a representation of traditional values but in the act of representation itself, making public the political and social priorities of its imperial patron. Using the construction of the grandiose Ringstrasse structures to do this signifies a willful use of materiality to achieve this political aim, highlighting the importance objects

play in communicating values, quite literally building a convincing and self-evident narrative of its own social relevance.

However, while this museal quality may be a secondary asset to many of the edifices along this street, attributing additional purpose to their intended civic roles, the Kunsthistorisches Museum and the Naturhistorisches Museum were Ringstrasse buildings that were originally constructed as museums and that have operated in that role since opening to the public in 1889 and 1891, respectively. There is no ambiguity about their civic purpose and the role they were meant to play in Vienna's revamped city landscape. The traditional museum mandate of preserving and maintaining objects had been inscribed into their fabric since the day they opened and was a central aspect of their original construction.⁶ The physical presence of the buildings did, however, suggest a special status within Vienna's inner core. Even today, the location of these museums is rather exclusive, when compared to other Ringstrasse structures, for both edifices were constructed in a coveted location in the immediate vicinity of the Imperial palace in the Burgring section of the boulevard. This part of the Ringstrasse included the Hofburg, the royal residence that prominently asserted the imperial presence in Vienna, making it clear that the city was the empire's capital and a focal point of government power. In fact, this part of the Ringstrasse was originally intended to be built as a veritable *Kaiserforum*, a structure recreating the spectacle of historical grandeur of an actual imperial urban space, and it was modeled closely after the imperial forum in Rome. In its initial design, this imperial forum was meant to intersect the Ringstrasse, disrupting the momentum of the street with a set of classical arches that would connect one side of the street with the other. Its structure was meant to have a distinct impact on the boulevard by crossing the Ringstrasse, marking the dominance of imperial power within the city in an unmistakable fashion. The emperor, however, lost interest in the project following the death of his wife and never saw the full implementation of its architectural design. There have been discussions about the state and future appearance of this space, with many critics asking whether this presentational project should be adapted to current concerns and finally completed in present-day Vienna.⁷

It remains a significant fact that these two museums were constructed as part of this planned monumental imperial forum, because this placement does speak to the relevance these institutions held for the emperor and to the overall importance museum culture was to have in Vienna's renovated and

modernized civic life. In contrast to other civic institutions on the Ringstrasse, built apart from the Hofburg and designed as seemingly independent projects to suit the everyday urban needs of Vienna's citizens, these two museums were presented as tightly interconnected to the imperial residence itself. Most obvious is the fact that they were not built on neutral city space but in immediate relation to the imperial residence, a space that carried symbolic and heightened worth. Their proximity to the imperial dwelling can be partially explained in view of the provenance of the collections, as the items displayed in the museum were mostly the property of the imperial family and were thus possessions bearing personal meaning for members within that family. Some of the family's art collection had been moved from the Hofburg previously and had been displayed apart from the imperial residence earlier, when the Gemäldegalerie at the Belvedere opened in 1780, using a former summer palace to display these artifacts to the public. The construction of the Ringstrasse museum complex centered the imperial collection firmly within the inner city core, bringing the imperial fine art and natural science collections together for the first time to be seen by the public. In the end, that the museums were so tightly connected to the Hofburg does grant the entire museum project a degree of cultural authority and an aura of special social significance. Their privileged placement signals not only direct interest from the emperor himself, but it also strongly suggests that these institutions were selected as key mediators in implementing a decisive program of establishing a national cultural identity.

Most critics agree that the placement of museums within modern urban centers is customarily seen as a marker of good public government. Museums are deemed important components of a progressive city landscape and can be used by those in power to spread the impression of government service and civic well-being. As Susan Ashley explains, museums act as "agents of hegemony" for the state, by espousing and enacting current values of state authority while persuasively communicating this message through their displays to the general public. Due to their outreach capacity and recognized place within the community, they can consequently act as a potent authority in matters of identity formation, nationalism, and social inclusion (5–6). They provide a viable and highly visible model to emulate. Carol Duncan has written on the presumed social influence of traditional state museums, noting that "public institutions make the state look good" by making it appear "concerned about the education and inner lives of its citizens" (282). By focusing so concertedly

on the mental processes of its citizens and openly encouraging a thoughtful engagement with the physical items on display, as an institution the museum is particularly valuable within society, as it becomes “a powerful transformer” within society, for it converts “displays of material wealth and social status into displays of spiritual wealth” (283). Through its display of material culture, it offers a firm, visible directive as to a proper, state-condoned, way of viewing the world, providing a viable model for what Tony Bennett has termed, “civic seeing,” the acceptance of a socially accepted set of values. The ramifications of museum observation and museum visitation thereby exceed sociocultural parameters alone, as the museum can be used as a viable political tool in its own right.

In present-day Vienna both the Naturhistorisches Museum and the Kunsthistorisches Museum continue to be presented as important civic institutions and operate as an essential part of the city’s diverse cultural offerings. When viewing a map of modern-day Vienna, it remains clear that they were constructed to convey centrality and to assert architectural dominance, when compared with other civic structures along the Ringstrasse. In addition to their privileged location on the boulevard, the museums were created in duplicate, quite literally occupying double the space other buildings were given for a singular purpose. Both buildings were furthermore constructed in identical style and appear as mirror images of each other, reflecting a singular relationship with the public. The museums were built directly across from each other to enforce this binary impression, constructed in the same neo-Renaissance style, which lends both buildings historical decorum and the semblance of architectural harmony and unity. To the casual observer, the museums appear thus identical in appearance, despite their separate focus and despite the conspicuous differences in the assembly and nature of their collections. This mirror effect may well be intended to connote a basic reciprocal relationship between the two museums, encouraging the visitor to see them as matching institutions that operate in unison in society. Constructed as apparent counterparts, the museums do impart the impression that they should be seen and visited together, a physical configuration that implies a common civic mandate to educate and inform the public with the items that have been put on display. Knowledge generation and reflection is thus embedded as a core objective in the very structure of both institutions. It is of course interesting to note that with the equity of their construction and presentation, no clear priority was given to either display, and within this

public context collections of nature are deemed as valuable and as museologically worthy as the collection of art. By not prioritizing one collection over the other, the visitor's attention is directed to the institution of the museum itself and its heightened value within Vienna's urban context.

The two museums manifestly differ in the content of their displays, but historically speaking, they also have very different geneses. The natural history museum was constructed to house collections of natural specimens belonging to the imperial family, which emperor Franz I Stephan (1708–1765) began to accumulate in the 1750s. After his death the collections were bequeathed to the state and were continuously expanded to gradually include discoveries made by various explorers as well as the findings accumulated in Habsburg expeditions during the nineteenth century. They were also consciously diversified to encompass animal and botanical species and made to represent a more comprehensive collection of natural phenomena. The ever-expanding nature of these collections necessitated the eventual move from the Hofburg to a more suitable location, so the reason to build a separate museum space to house and display these items was partially practical in nature. Although dedicated to the display of nature and a space in which the presentation of science was to dominate, the Naturhistorisches Museum did not entirely dismiss an artistic environment in which to display its objects. For example, in addition to mimicking in structure and appearance the art museum located across the way, the natural history museum deliberately integrated the work of some of the leading artists of the age in its interior in order to make its own message of display more cogent. It included work from artists such as Hans Cannon, Viktor Stauffer, Johannes Benk, and Viktor Tilgner, who created statues and painted murals within the museum itself, presenting the visitor with a formidable impression of the display space, one that was distinctly separate from the presentation of the collection of natural specimens (Jovanovic-Kruspel and Schumacher 143–55).

The imperial art collection was, however, assembled in an entirely different manner. Initially dispersed among various locations, some artifacts were kept in the Hofburg, but many had been housed since 1776 in the Belvedere, a baroque leisure palace and former imperial summer residence situated away from the Hofburg. Under the reign of Joseph II (1741–1790) the Belvedere adopted an enlightenment policy of educating the public and began allowing outside visitors access to its holdings in 1781. The newly constructed Kunsthistorisches Museum combined the collections of the

Belvedere with those still housed in the Hofburg, merging the art collections and exhibiting them together under one roof. The new museum, moreover, adopted a distinctly liberal access policy, opening its doors to the general public and allowing unprecedented public viewings of the imperial collection. The change in access to view the imperial collection signaled an important transition in the public perception and understanding of these items, for it highlighted these collected objects as cultural state property, rather than as personal belongings alone. In addition, the building facilitated public viewings by spatially organizing the collections and by labeling rooms according to the type of collection they contained, demonstrating, yet again, the capability of architecture to support the message of art that it houses, by organizing and physically facilitating a better viewing of the items on display. Through this architectural design, the imperial collection was made comprehensible to the visiting public, who could now view the items on display as independent artifacts with epistemological value. This design made this point explicit supporting better public viewings of the art collection by promoting better accessibility and a coherent orientation through the monumental museum.

With the Kunsthistorisches Museum and the Naturhistorisches Museum there is a concentrated effort given to a cogent display of objects, and this intention is manifested in the architectural design of the edifices. In both cases the layout of the building attempts to complement the collections, facilitating, but also managing, through its very blueprint the visitor's experience of the museum. The architecture is adapted to suit the purpose of better access and to underscore an epistemological purpose, guiding the edification of the public, an aim that is inherent to both institutions. Not surprisingly, both museums shared the same principal architect, Gottfried Semper, who was commissioned to design the Ringstrasse's imperial forum as well as the *Burgtheater*. Semper, a German architect, had an established professional pedigree by the time of the museums' construction and was well known due to previous international projects such as the construction of the Dresden State Opera in 1838. Semper's background in the architectural design of theaters seems particularly fitting here, and it does appear rather congruous to the dramatic spirit of the Ringstrasse construction itself. However, what made Semper's professional involvement even better suited to this grandiose project was his specific background in architectural theory. Throughout his career Semper wrote extensively about architectural design, elaborating on the sociocultural purpose of construction while seeking a strong theoretical

justification for the activity itself. He believed that buildings should be understood as composite structures that coexist in unison with a larger moral principle and that they should connote more than their physical structure alone. In short, he appeared to be the perfect architect for this portion of the Ringstrasse project, because his personal philosophy in architectural design overlapped rather closely with the intentions of the project itself.

Semper's notion of a building as a composite structure, a multifarious matrix of various influences and purposes, seems oddly suited to the Ringstrasse project, for it too was permeated with multiple objectives that were in turn abstract and concrete. Moreover, Semper's understanding of architecture included a dimension of social interaction, in which he saw architecture as an active agent, an element that was shaped by, but could also shape, the ideas of those it surrounded. In his 1854 treatise "Die Vier Elemente der Baukunst" Semper wrote: "Soll aber nicht die Baukunst, gleich der Natur, ihrer grossen Lehrerin, zwar ihren Stoff nach den durch sie bedungenen Gesetzen wählen und verwenden, aber Form und Ausdruck ihrer Gebilde nicht von ihm, sondern von den Ideen abhängig machen, welche in ihm wohnen" (54). Architecture, according to Semper, is always subject to larger philosophical principles and should therefore offer more to the observer than the visible structure itself, becoming thereby, in his words "der Ausdruck der Idee des Bauwerkes" (54). Another point that affirms Semper as a particularly suitable architect for the Ringstrasse project is his historicist view of architecture, which valorized the need to situate the structure in a clearly designated historical epoch, tracing its provenance and appearance from a verified and already established point. Semper was prescriptive in his views and eventually published (1860–63) a large treatise with which he intended to create a guide for future artists entitled *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten oder Praktische Ästhetik*.

Considering their role, history, and prominent placement on the Ringstrasse, both the Naturhistorisches and the Kunsthistorisches Museums celebrated the 2015 anniversary year in a seemingly subdued and simple fashion. Rather than creating an exhibit out of extraneous elements that would have been assembled and organized by special curators for this momentous occasion, both buildings used materials already present on their premises to mark the significance of the anniversary and bring attention back to the street itself. They were not attempting to renegotiate popular perceptions of the project,

nor were they using their considerable influence as museums to reinterpret the importance of the Ringstrasse for the contemporary community they serve. Instead, they participated in official commemorations by deliberately reasserting the traditional collective prominence of the Ringstrasse and by directing their efforts toward a reaffirmation of its original communal character. By not engaging in undue self-importance, both of these prominent museums reminded the public of their historically supportive role within this large civic project, positing their own institutional existence as secondary in importance to the overall scheme of the Ringstrasse. With their choice of special exhibit they were, moreover, self-consciously designating their own museum space as an active component of the larger unit of the Ringstrasse, mediating through their very structures an essential belonging to its rich history, while also exhibiting a continued identification with intentionality of this turn-of-the-century project.

In the case of the Naturhistorisches Museum in the mineralogical room (Saal 1) there was a small and rather unobtrusive display of types of rock, a mineralogical collection of specimens that highlighted the material with which the original building was built. The emphasis on the individual materials of construction highlighted the notion of the building as a composite structure that merges and combines many materials to exist. This display made the observer focus on the physicality of the edifice by understanding it as a factual construct and as a feat of architectural design. There was a distinct educational perspective at play that permeated the exhibit as well. The items were organized and individually labeled in such a fashion that the observer could learn more about the natural materials used in the overall construction of the museum and thus view the exhibit as an integral part of the larger context of display of natural items. This type of presentation was harmonious with the display of the larger room these items were located in, as they appeared to be presented as complementary scientific specimens that the visitor can see on any general visitation of the museum. More explicit anniversary celebrations were made by the museum through the implementation of a radically different perspective onto its public museum space, with special outdoor rooftop viewings of the Ringstrasse taking place from the top of the Naturhistorisches Museum itself. With this type of tour visitors were reminded that the museum is a physical structure imbued with unambiguous external meaning but, more importantly, that this institution fits within a more comprehensive architectural context that cannot be ignored.

The Kunsthistorisches Museum also moved the ritual of commemoration outside, removing the anniversary celebrations almost entirely from the confines of its elaborate interior. Throughout the 2015 summer season it organized tours of the building, which were designed in such a fashion that the building was viewed primarily from the outside and within the context of the Ringstrasse complex, the emphasis being on a visitation of the entire site, rather than on the picture gallery alone. This tour deliberately distanced the building from its own formidable reputation by altering the perception that the building must be experienced solely in terms of its famous art collection. This type of managed display consciously distanced the visitor from the museum's reputation as a prime European art museum and instead refocused the visitor's attention on the historical provenance of the edifice, reminding the public of the national historical significance of the building in which these items are housed. This type of tour directed the visitor to engage with the spectacle of the anniversary, an experience that could be only attained in view of the museum's full significance for the collective inner core of Vienna's city center. Much like its counterpart across the street, the Kunsthistorisches Museum deliberately contextualized the anniversary within this larger physical urban context, integrating the significance of the chronological year within the greater history of Vienna itself.

The restrained program of commemoration adopted by both of these museums in the 2015 anniversary year seemed to be motivated by a desire to affirm the original sociocultural relevance of the Ringstrasse project for Vienna's urban culture. They marked the anniversary in a decidedly self-effacing way, by directing attention away from their own displays and by emphasizing the interconnected complementary nature of the larger Ringstrasse context, highlighting its known historic identity, the value of which was recognized to surpass the purpose of either institution. Rather than asserting self-importance and proclaiming contemporary institutional dominance in the rich cultural landscape of present-day Vienna, both museums marked the anniversary by openly committing to a continued common association with the past that validated the original idea of the project, engaging thereby in a practice that coalesced their individual purpose into a singular and, ultimately, larger historical cause. In doing so, they did not present anything new or different, nor did they attempt to reassess their own perspective of the past. Instead they were acting in exemplary, if traditional, museum fashion, documenting a cultural heritage and the passage of time,

preserving a notion of history that will serve the public's memory and that, in time, will contribute to a better understanding of the historical importance of this anniversary year.

Renata Schellenberg is associate professor of German at Mount Allison University, Canada. She specializes in German literature and culture of the long eighteenth century with a particular interest in scientific literacy and material culture. She has published on such key authors of the period as Goethe, Herder, and Alexander von Humboldt and has coedited a volume of essays on the interplay of text and visual culture at this time. In 2016 she published a book on commemorative culture in postwar Croatia (Peter Lang). She is currently completing a monograph on museum culture in post-Enlightenment Germanophone Europe.

Notes

1. This decision was made public in the *Wiener Zeitung* where a letter from Franz Josef to his minister of the interior, Alexander von Bach, was republished. The emperor famously stated: "Es ist mein Wille, daß die Erweiterung der inneren Stadt Wien mit Rücksicht auf eine entsprechende Verbindung derselben mit den Vorstädten ehemöglichst in Angriff genommen und hiebei auch auf die Regulirung und Verschönerung Meiner Residenz-und Reichshauptstadt Bedacht genommen werde" (1).

2. There are numerous studies that have investigated and elaborated upon this theme; see, for example, Ingrao.

3. The Merriam Webster dictionary offers a succinct definition of *museum* that limits it to the physicality of display and that maintains that it is "a building in which interesting and valuable things (such as paintings and sculptures or scientific or historical objects) are collected and shown to the public." www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/museum.

4. Material turn scholarship investigates the agency of material objects in society and the impact this has. It explores an object-oriented sociology and the materiality of knowledge; see Bennett and Joyce.

5. For recent assessments on the architectural aims of the Ringstrasse, see Fogarassy.

6. The definition of a museum is, of course, always changing in line with other developments in society. The current professional definition of *museum*, according to the statute of the International Council of Museums is "a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of a society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment." www.icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition.

7. On the history and contemporary status of the imperial forum, see Gottfried.

Works Cited

- Alpers, Svetlana. "The Museum as a Way of Seeing." *Exhibiting Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Levine, Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991, pp. 25–33.
- Ashley, Susan. "State Authority and the Public Sphere: Ideas on the Changing Role of the Museum as a Canadian Social Institution." *Museum and Society*, vol. 3, no.1, 2005, pp. 5–17.
- Belk, Russell et al. "Collecting in a Consumer Culture." *Highways and Buyways: Naturalistic Research from the Consumer Behavior from the Consumer Behavior Odyssey*, edited by Russell Belk, Association for Consumer Research, pp. 178–215.
- Bennett, Tony. "Civic Seeing: Museums and the Organization of Seeing." *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Susan Macdonald, Blackwell, 2016, pp. 263–82.
- Bennett, Tony, and Patrick Joyce. *Material Powers: Cultural Studies, History, and the Material Turn*. Routledge, 2010.
- Dmytrasz, Barbara. *Die Ringstraße: Eine Europäische Bauidee*. Amalthea, 2014.
- Dudley, Sandra. "Museum Materialities: Objects, Sense and Feeling." *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, and Interpretations*, edited by Sandra Dudley, Routledge, 2010, pp. 1–19.
- Duncan, Carol. "Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship." *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, edited by Susan M. Pearce, Routledge, 1994, pp. 278–87.
- Fogarassy, Alfred, ed. *Die Wiener Ringstraße: Das Buch*. Hatje Cantz, 2015.
- Franz, Joseph I. *Wiener Zeitung* 296. 25 December 1857, pp. 1–2.
- Gell, Alfred. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Gottfried, Margaret. *Das Wiener Kaiserforum: Utopien zwischen Hofburg und Museumsquartier*. Böhlau, 2001.
- Ingrao, Charles. *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618–1815*. Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Jovanovic-Kruspel, Stefanie, and Alice Schumacher. *Das Naturhistorische Museum: Baugeschichte, Konzeption & Architektur*. Verlag des Naturhistorischen Museums Wien, 2014.
- Kratz, Corinna A., and Ivan Karp. "Introduction: Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations." *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, edited by Ivan Karp et al., Duke UP, 2006, pp. 1–34.
- Lawrence, Henry W. "Origins of the Tree-Lined Boulevard." *Geographical Review*, vol. 78, no. 4, 1988, pp. 355–74.
- Loos, Adolf. "Die Potemkin'sche Stadt." *Ver Sacrum*, vol. 7, 1898, pp. 15–17.
- Moser, Stephanie. "The Devil is in the Detail: Museum Display and the Creation of Knowledge." *Museum Anthropology*, vol. 33, no.1, 2010, pp. 22–32.
- Pearce, Susan. "Objects as Meaning; or Narrating the Past." *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, edited by Susan M. Pearce, Routledge, 1994, pp. 19–30.
- Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. Cambridge UP, 1981.

Semper, Gottfried. *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten oder Praktische Ästhetik. Ein Handbuch für Techniker, Künstler und Kunstfreunde.* Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1860.

———. *Die Vier Elemente der Baukunst. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Baukunde.* Braunschweig: Druck und Verlag von Freidrich Viehweg und Sohn, 1851.

Wagner, Otto. *Moderne Architektur: Seinen Schülern ein Führer auf diesem Kunstgebiete.* Schroll, 1902.

Writing Empire

*An Approach to Joseph Roth by Using the
Political Theory of Herfried Münkler*

Christine Magerski

Empire and Political Theory

According to Herfried Münkler, our post-imperial cultural imaginary is insufficient because it focuses mainly on the imperial center. What is missing is the periphery, or rather the interaction between the center and the periphery. According to Münkler, the logic of world domination reveals itself only through a perspective encompassing both the center and the periphery.¹ What has been largely lacking in traditional scholarly discussions of empires is precisely this kind of joint perspective. Until very recently, such research mainly focused on reforms or revolutions that were possible in European imperial spaces and entirely neglected the process of empire-building itself as well as salient aspects of the periphery into which empires spread. The political and economic peripheries of empires have been discussed sparingly, and the process of empire-building has been treated solely as emanating from the imperial center in the direction of the periphery. To put it in Münkler's terms, scholarly discussions have focused only on push factors of imperial centers and disregarded their pull factors (Münkler 39). Münkler puts the interdependence of the center and periphery in concrete terms by juxtaposing the expansion of influence emanating from the center in the direction of the periphery with a pulling force from the periphery itself, which also significantly contributes to the expansion of the domains of imperial influence (Münkler 21).

The crucial change in perspective proposed by Münkler has already been realized in the literary work of Joseph Roth. "Das Wesen Österreichs," as Roth wrote in 1938, "ist nicht Zentrum, sondern Peripherie" (Roth, *Die*

Kapuzinergruft 19). As I shall point out in detail, using Roth's novel *Das falsche Gewicht* as an example, the ways in which literature and political theory react to the downfall of an empire are strikingly similar. Analyzed with Münkler's theory of empire, Roth's narrative of a former artillery officer who becomes the surveyor of weights and measures on the outermost periphery of the Austro-Hungarian empire proves to be a highly instructive representation of the contingency of literary as well as political orders. Writing in exile from a post-imperial situation, Roth thematized the disintegration of an empire he had known all too well—from Galicia as its outermost periphery to the center Vienna and back. Reading Roth with a view toward one of the central problems in scholarly as well as literary discourses on empire—the problem of center and periphery—it becomes evident that Roth captures the logic of the fallen empire with remarkable analytic precision. Forging a link between the political theory of Münkler and the literature of Roth in this case, therefore, seems more than justified.

In so doing, it would be advisable to draw upon Niklas Luhmann's theory of society. In a way that sheds light on the notions of "Zentrum und Peripherie," Luhmann differentiates among four kinds of social distinction: the distinction between similar but non-hierarchical segments such as clans, families, villages, etc.; the distinction between the center and periphery, i.e. territorially unequal segments; the stratificatory distinction between socially unequal segments; and the functional distinction between systems that are equal in their inequality (politics, science, economy). The difference between the center and periphery we are interested in arises, according to Luhmann's theory, from the distinction between the centers themselves. The difference is, so to speak, at home in the center. Consequently, there cannot be a periphery without the center (*Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 663–78). Although this may sound trivial at first, Luhmann accompanies his argument with an additional remark that anticipates Münkler's problem of the center and periphery. Luhmann suggests that just as there is no periphery without the center, so too there can be no center without the periphery. After all it is the center, with all its accomplishments and distinctions, that is more dependent on this binary than the periphery itself. While the periphery can retain its segmentary distinctions and hence survive even without the center (though not *as* periphery), the structural characteristics of the center depend exclusively on maintaining the difference between them. If the periphery can survive even without the center, as Luhmann argues it can, then the following

question arises: How can we explain the pulling force that aids the influence of the center? Or in other words: Wherein lies the power of the center to draw the periphery to itself? Münkler's answer to this question is that the power arises from the economic and cultural attractiveness of centers, as is clear in cases involving imperial structures in which the number of people who want to be a part of them exceeds the number of those who do not. Such an attractiveness presupposes a consensus between center and periphery over some general ideas—a consensus that is by no means self-evident, especially when we consider various segmentary and territorial differences between the center and its periphery. Could we imagine a situation in which the periphery ignores the culture and economy of the center or does not find them attractive? Why is this highly unlikely? Luhmann identifies three good reasons behind this power of the center. First, the center is defined by its borders, which are, in principle, established by the center itself, irrespective of the fraying contacts of the periphery with its neighbors. As a consequence, it is the center that opens up questions of inclusion and possibilities of relation and belonging in the first place. Second, all relevant decisions, not only those regarding borders but also those concerning necessary military defense are made in the center. For the periphery, this is a question of war and peace. From the perspective of the periphery, these are two very real and tangible sources of imperial power.

With the third reason underlying imperial power, we enter the realm of the symbolic. Namely, the center develops a particularly based and yet universal semantics. Here we encounter a paradox that will follow us throughout this entire article: The paradox lies in the process of standardizing perception and communication that ends with a certain consensus over general ideas. Semantics developed in the center expand so quickly and get so widely accepted that its all-encompassing influence renders its very particular origin almost invisible. Concern for semantics introduced by Luhmann into the discussion on the center and periphery leads us away from the level of action to the level of communication—and with serious consequences. The power of the symbolic is so strong that it renders real sources of power or even, in part, corrects them. From the perspective of semantics, an empire is not so much a specific area under the sway of political power and influence but rather a naturalized byproduct of historic communicational possibilities (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 670). This sounds less harsh and relativizes difficult questions about military invention and establishing borders. If we choo-

se to understand it as a by-product of communication possibilities, then an empire should be defined precisely in terms of an absence of strictly delineated borders. Instead of borders, we can define empires in terms of horizons, which both designate attainable goals and vary with them. An empire is therefore a communicational horizon of meaning—a realm in which bureaucratic elites can communicate.

The notion of an absent border is also present in Münkler's theory. Münkler speaks of a peculiar situation on the border of empires, describing them as half-porous, loose networks that decrease the formal stability of empires but also contribute to their flexibility. Following Münkler's line of argument, imperial borders are nothing other than different levels of power and influence. For him, Luhmann's horizons of meaning tend to fade as we move away from the center and approach the periphery. With increasing distance from the center, the level of integration decreases and the binding legal and palpable political influences emanating from the politics of the center weaken (Münkler 17). This decrease in power is especially interesting for our current topic, because we can observe it in the example of Roth's bureaucrat, who is commissioned by the center to measure the weight and balance of the empire's power on the periphery. Before we turn our attention to the problems with balance encountered by Eibenschütz, Roth's bureaucratic surveyor of weights and measures, we must first critically assess the Danube monarchy with the help of the theory of empire.

The Center/Periphery Problem and the Danube Monarchy

The first thing that comes to the fore when we approach the Habsburg monarchy with the theory of empire in mind is that Münkler does not classify it as a world empire. Despite its impressive duration, due to its insufficient territorial expansion Münkler categorizes it only as a Central-European great empire and addresses it only peripherally. Nevertheless, problems we nowadays encounter in Central and Eastern Europe, that is in the former Habsburg zone of influence, can be understood as paradigmatic examples of a post-imperial situation. In addition to that, Münkler refers to the Habsburg monarchy when he underscores the relevance of the problem of the center and periphery and criticizes the general belief that a description of imperial logic has to start from an empire's multiethnic or multinational character. He considers the latter to be especially problematic, because it is defined trivially

and politically: whether an empire will have national and ethnic difference and whether this difference will be accepted or suppressed is decided by the center. This is evident precisely in the case of the Habsburg monarchy, where, according to the census of 1910, Austrian-Germans amounted to only 24 percent of the general population (Münkler 29).

In order to approach the Habsburg monarchy from a theoretical perspective, we will once again draw on Luhmann. According to his theory, great empires can combine two different models of inequality: one concerning center and periphery and another concerning social stratification. We speak of stratification when a society is organized as a hierarchy inasmuch as order without hierarchy can scarcely be imagined (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 679). In this respect, the difference between the center and periphery reinforces social stratification in the center. The binary opposition between the center and periphery enables a more complex social hierarchy in the center, because an imperial center usually abounds in much more internally complex and regionally far-reaching relations than the periphery. Complexity in the center goes hand in hand with the development of bureaucracy. Luhmann refers to this elaborated form of difference between the center and periphery as “bureaucratic empires” (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 670). Since in such models of order bureaucratic rule conceals social inequality, they are usually very stable and can be easily handed down over long periods of time. This applies especially to the Danube monarchy. Consequently, the Habsburg monarchy is understood as a bureaucratic form of rule in which bureaucracy is superimposed onto real social differences, such that order without hierarchy is well-nigh unimaginable. In this respect, the Danube monarchy owes its long-term duration to a benefit gleaned from, as Luhmann suggests, the combination of difference between the center and periphery on the one hand and stratification on the other. Interestingly, Luhmann traces this benefit back to the fact that both the contemporary as well as historic perception of the monarchy focuses on the powerful appeal of this unitary form of bureaucratic rule. Not only is this unitary form of bureaucratic rule based on a unitary and universal semantics, it also produces one at the same time. Descriptions of empire that are blinded by its appeal include both the center and periphery but territorialize inequalities. In so doing, they create a unity of difference by means of an imagined spatial order. Nowadays, we read them as a paradox unfolding in the imperial space (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 676). This is particularly true in

the case of describing the Danube monarchy, because this semi-great empire appears to have had an extremely contradictory structure. Furthermore, close inspection reveals that it was an empire in which ambivalence was literally cultivated. As shown by Hans-Christian Maner, from the eighteenth century until its decline, reflections on state design were a fundamental phenomenon in the Habsburg monarchy. In these reflections, “das Zentrum-Peripherie-Modell” is one of the most frequently used modes of explanation (Maner, *Galizien* 11). As the development of the Habsburg multinational state clearly shows, notions of the center and periphery were not treated as rigid concepts.

When we look at Galicia, the region where Roth was born and spent his childhood, we are dealing with a territory designed by Habsburg policies—a territory whose conception depended both on the imperial center and on local governors and military officials. The concept is, in itself, already contradictory. After the acquisition of new territories the Habsburgs did try with utmost care to integrate the new area into their empire. The goal of the “Einrichtungswerk Galizien” was to abolish the Polish federal state, establish central administration as found in other countries connected to the monarchy, and develop Galicia into a model of new political order (Maner, “Zum Problem der Kolonisierung Galiziens” 153). The keywords were: modernization, standardization, and uniformity of models. However, Maner argues that in the case of annexing Galicia Vienna adopted “jene ambivalenten Positionen hinsichtlich der Funktion des neuen Gebietes” (153), which repeatedly came to the fore during the nineteenth century. Consequently, centralistic management led to bureaucratization and overregulation, which in turn led to decreasing support for the existing distribution of power and resources in various regions, ultimately exposing the headquarters to the danger of losing its role as center.

As the politics of the center were ambivalent, so too was the image of the periphery, especially the image of the border region, Galicia. As Maner notes, Galicia was not seen as an integral part of the empire but a buffer and transfer zone with a potential for correcting borders. Based on historical newspaper reports, Maner reconstructs the image of a strange region plagued by fires, murders, suicides and other violent crimes. Just as the Viennese political public in the late nineteenth century learned about Galicia not only as a land far away from the center but also as a “Land der ‘zur Regel gewordenen Unregelmäßigkeiten’” (Maner, “Zum Problem der Kolonisierung Galiziens” 221), readers in the early twenty-first century learn about it in the same way.

Another aspect that significantly helped shape this image was the study *Das Elend Galiziens in Ziffern und das Programm der energischen Entwicklung der Volkswirtschaft* by the Polish economist, engineer, businessman, Stanisław Szczepanowski, who was also member of both the Austrian and Polish parliaments. *Das Elend Galiziens* was published in 1888, six years prior to the birth of Moses Joseph Roth. The study, a sensation upon its publication, laments Galicia's low work efficiency, high population density, above-average proportion of farmers, low literacy rate, poor nutrition, high susceptibility to diseases and epidemics, a strikingly high rate of liquor consumption and short life expectancy. In addition to that, the study also notes the tendency for the already small group of intellectuals to not use their education for the progress of the country but instead to dream of official positions and use different forms of patronage to beg for them in Vienna (Klanska, "Facetten des galizischen Elends" 57–77).

An image of misery indeed, but the periphery does not completely live up to it. Szczepanowski's program did not remain without consequences in the center. At least Józef Buszko presents a somewhat different image in his 1978 study on the transformation of social structures in Galicia between 1900 and 1914 (Buszko 27–34). In other words: Corresponding to the ambivalent politics of the center is an ambivalent situation on the periphery and, as we shall see, a no less ambiguous position for its inhabitants—including Joseph Roth and his surveyor of weights and measures. Let us start with Roth.

Between the Center and the Periphery: Joseph Roth

"Vergessen Sie nicht," says Roth in 1936, in a letter to Stefan Zweig, "daß ich seit meiner finsternen Kindheit zur Helligkeit empor stöhne" (*Briefe 1911–1939* 227). How difficult his childhood on the outer periphery actually was is as disputed as the region itself.² On account of his ethnicity, Roth can undoubtedly be assigned to those socially marginal groups that are, according to Münkler, useful in mastering vast empires (Münkler 43; Rozenblit 19). However, just the fact that Roth went to the K.u.K. Kronprinz Rudolf Grammar School is enough to undermine the image of a difficult childhood. As is known, Roth decided to study in Vienna, where he wanted to start a career at the university and thus leave behind the decreasing level of integration on the periphery. In Roth's case, what Szczepanowski referred to as the dream of intellectuals on the periphery about a position in the center did not fail because of Roth's

ethnicity but rather because of the war, which brought with it the end of the great empire. Not only was the war lost but also the empire that had existed for centuries. As is also known, for Roth the empire's defeat led to a flight with a tragic ending. In 1936, he writes to Zweig from Paris in sheer desperation: "Was soll ich denn tun, wenn nicht Bücher schreiben? Ich kann nicht einmal mehr einrücken, alt und krank, der einzige Beruf, den ich jemals hatte. Schulden, Gespenster, Entbehrung [. . .]. Und hinter mir, welch ein Leben!" (*Briefe 1911–1939* 451). Three years later his life came to an end, a life that he began in Brody with the name Moses Joseph Roth. As a child he was called "Muniu Faktisch" because he would finish all his sentences with opinionated flair by saying, "Das ist faktisch" (Lunzer and Lunzer-Talos 11).

Be that as it may, when it comes to his self-representation, Roth did not always keep to the facts. He was, nevertheless, a keen observer, who saw himself as such. This is evident in a three-part travelogue about his journey through Galicia, which was published in November 1924 in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and in which Roth even omits mentioning how well he knows the country. In this description of the empire, the boundary between the diagnosis of the present condition and of the past is blurred, especially when Roth, a son of a Jewish merchant who wanted to make a living in the center as a university professor, speaks of the periphery's bad reputation, poverty, and backwardness and connects them to the high number of merchants, bureaucratic, and military officials. Even after the disintegration of the empire, Roth still territorializes inequalities and establishes a unity of difference. There are still reverberations of this semantics. With Luhmann, we can read this report as a paradox unfolding itself in and disappearing into space (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 676). What is missing is the splendor. With the change of perspective from the periphery to the center and the ensuing collapse of unitary spatial order, the author, who denies his familiarity with Galicia, loses not only the unitary semantics but also his faith in it. In the 1930s, Roth assuredly lost all faith in any kind of guiding concept handed down by tradition. There was no more reason for objectivity. One year after the letter in which he wrote to Zweig about debt, specters, and deprivation, Roth wrote the novel *Das falsche Gewicht* (*Weights and Measures*). It very likely contained materials that Roth had wanted to use for his autobiographical text about childhood with the title "Erdbeeren" (Strawberries). With the story about the surveyor of weights and measures, Roth narrates not only his childhood

but also the entire experience of the border. Instead of a childhood on the periphery that has been stripped of imperial splendor, we are dealing with a dubious attempt by one man to master the center, weights and measures, balance, and the dilemma of order in the border area.

Let us take a closer look at this literary discourse on empire. “Die Strahlen der habsburgischen Sonne,” Roth writes in *Radetzky*, “reichten nach dem Osten bis zur Grenze des russischen Zaren.” Es war eine “kalte Sonne [. . .], aber es war eine Sonne” (Roth 1976: 625). The rays of the Habsburg sun that Roth aims at Zlotogrod do not bring any warmth to the inhabitants of the surveyor’s territory. Yet, for a reader versed in theory, they all the more illuminate the situation at the border of a great empire, the most striking feature of which is a form of rule reinforced by bureaucracy concealing social inequalities. Roth allows the inhabitants of the little town on the periphery all to enjoy the same freedom, as long as bureaucrats and civil servants are well off. His dwellers on the border manage to survive on the good will of a dubious aristocracy, occasional smuggling, and miracles. While in reality legal institutions and penal systems existed on the periphery, Roth presents a legal vacuum, perpetuated in equal measure by a military dominated by the aristocracy and by a gendarmerie and civil service completely subordinated to the Ministry of War. Not only is the strict functioning of imperial organs essential for the maintenance of public order, but also their occasional and deliberate loss of control. Only at certain times does Roth turn a blind eye. Only at certain times does he allow the loosening of order, thus creating those half-porous borders, which are, according to theory, partially constitutive of great empires.

In Roth’s text, the decision concerning when and how control will be relaxed always remains at the discretion of power instances. The low level of control, for Luhmann an important feature of peripheries, is for Roth at the center of the peculiar border situation. In his “atmosphärisch dichte(m) Roman aus dem Osten” (Lunzer and Lunzer-Talos 44), Roth works through precisely those structural problems of the empire that have been discussed by theory: problems of diffusion and control (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 672). And control is important, especially in one of the border regions characterized by privileges related to free trade. If we once again follow Münkler’s line of argument, then the control of trade is one of the sources of imperial power and cannot easily be separated from the control of

territories (Münkler 24). Roth sends his surveyor of weights and measures to the outermost periphery of the empire precisely so he can exercise this control on behalf of the center.

**Between the Periphery and the Center:
Eibenschütz, Surveyor of Weights and Measures**

“Es war einmal im Bezirk Zlotograd ein Eichmeister, der hieß Anselm Eibenschütz. Seine Aufgabe bestand darin, die Maße und die Gewichte der Kaufleute im ganzen Bezirk zu prüfen” (Roth, *Das falsche Gewicht* 5; hereafter *DfG*). This is the fairy-tale beginning of a story about a surveyor, who performs his function in the company of a gendarmerie sergeant in full armor. The reader thereby learns that the state wants to make clear that it will, if necessary, punish counterfeiterers by force. But when does this become necessary? The scenery in which Roth drops his surveyor complies with the center’s idea of seedy border towns. The only glimmers of light are the Count’s castle and the military, which are closely intertwined. The function of the gendarmerie may be considered controversial. Although there is a court, a prison, lawyers, and tax offices, there is no need to show proof of one’s identity. Whether the right man has been arrested or whether one pays taxes or not is irrelevant. “Hauptsache war, dass die Beamten zu leben hatten. Sie lebten von Bestechungen. Deshalb kam niemand ins Gefängnis. Deshalb zahlte niemand Steuern. Deshalb hatte niemand Papiere” (*DfG* 13). Such obscure conditions are further complicated by the fact that Eibenschütz takes up his post under unfavorable conditions. Previously, he was a firework-maker in a Bosnian garrison and had difficulties writing a letter to a municipality. It is also relevant that he had a right to a proper post in the civil service, but for the sake of his wife, he chose this one instead: the post of a municipal civil servant, who is paid by the state.

In the novel, such details can be found in parentheses, which are atypical for fairy tales. However, they are of great importance for our topic because they point to a highly controversial personnel decision, a decision made in the center. The narrator portrays this official status, which places Eibenschütz between the center and periphery, as very painful for him, especially when his wife cheats on him with his clerk. It is at this time that the surveyor especially regrets not being directly subordinated to the state. The narrator ascribes the ensuing decision solely to Eibenschütz and decides to let him resort to drastic

measures. Eibenschütz requests his immediate dismissal or transfer and responds to the objection of his clerk by yelling, as if he were still at the parade ground. Yet, the clerk would have been of great help in exercising his control function. It is not without reason that theory regards the written word as one of the most important control mechanisms (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 671). This and all his subsequent decisions prove to be mistakes.³ Eibenschütz, who does not like scandals, becomes one of the biggest scandals in the border town. Eibenschütz, socialized in the military, privately and professionally frustrated and of indistinct official status, is placed by the narrator at the periphery of an empire, which is characterized by a decreasing level of integration and can be maintained only through intelligent bureaucratic government and well-balanced decisions. Eibenschütz, who is himself a marginal character, cannot fulfill this task.

At first, it does not look bad. Eibenschütz understands the language and is of Jewish descent, much like the author himself and the majority of the merchant characters he created. At first, the center can rely on him as a representative of those socially marginal groups that are, according to the theory of empire, useful in maintaining control of vast empires. Fixated on the idea that personal contacts might prove handy, he initially even makes the effort to get to know all the families in town and their way of life. The narrator withholds from him the guidelines from the center as well as information about the course of the world, since Eibenschütz never reads the newspaper: “Die Vorgänge in der Welt gingen ihn gar nichts an” (*DfG* 25). As a consequence, the events in the peripheral border area captivate the surveyor completely.

The surveyor is fascinated by the place where the peculiar, half-porous border situation materializes in the emblematic form of the border tavern. As a leading topos of Roth’s prose, the border tavern is a place for those who cannot quite be assigned either to order or to disorder (Kiefer 133). Sebastian Kiefer puts his finger on the problem when he notes that the motif of the border tavern is an ingenious play with the “Dilemma der Ordnung” (135). This is the place the narrator reserves for conducting business with Russian deserters, schnapps, and illegal goods. The owner is Leibusch Jadlowker, a figure who develops a personal interest in representatives of law and order. At the first appearance of government officials in the border tavern, Jadlowker develops ambivalent feelings toward them. As he is about to close an illegal business deal, Eibenschütz represents a nuisance. But since Eibenschütz stops by at night, at a time when the Habsburg sun does not reach the tavern, Jadlowker

sees this as a sign of hope: “Einerseits ärgerte ihn also die Anwesenheit des Eichmeisters, andererseits aber freute sie ihn. Endlich hatte er ihn, den Strengen, in der Nacht bei sich—und die Nacht war die große Freundin des Leibusch Jadowlker” (*DfG* 27). Nonetheless, the appearance of the strong one in the tavern is a presentation of power. The narrator describes him as tall and handsome, with a bushy, blonde, massive mustache. His persona appears so strong that all others fade out. In Roth’s text, the surveyor, who is aware of his power and behaves as if he were still supported by a sergeant of the gendarmerie with a fixed bayonet and a shimmering spiked helmet, becomes a representative of the power of the center, which uses military support in order to enforce its decisions.

What the narrator portrays after the first encounter of the surveyor and the host of the border tavern is a bizarre struggle between the center and periphery. Operating in the half-porous space of the border with a decreasing level of integration, both the examiner of weights and measures and the real ruler of the periphery owe their power to the odd situation in which imperial control ebbs and flows—a situation the empire basically endorses for its own benefit. The narrator seems aware of this imperial shrewdness in that he equips each of his protagonists with his own semantics. The semantics of the surveyor is the centrally based semantics of the empire, aiming at universal applicability. Eibenschütz wants to ensure that the law is respected by acting honestly, kindly, and strictly at the same time. This semantics is confronted by the particularly based but nonetheless universal guiding principle applied by Jadowlker, who paid off the majority of officials that could have threatened him and declares war on Eibenschütz against this backdrop. Jadowlker is convinced that every human being has not only a weak but also a criminal side: “Er konnte überhaupt nicht glauben—und wie hätte er auch anders leben können!—, daß irgendein Mensch in der Welt anders dachte und empfand als er, Jadowlker” (*DfG* 28). For him, people who lived honestly were ridiculous. The most ridiculous were those officials that required him to pretend he was honest. This was the way in which Jadowlker treated the world around him. As the narrator emphasizes, he had to put in a lot of effort to treat the surveyor Eibenschütz the same way.

Jadowlker’s worldview challenges the semantics that, though seemingly universal, in reality were developed by the center. As the theory of empire suggest, that semantics points directly to the “Glaubwürdigkeitsproblem” of empires (Münkler 30). Just like the surveyor who acts as one of its represen-

tatives, so too the empire itself cannot be neutral toward forces in their zone of influence. Neutrality is not possible, and so there is permanent pressure to intervene, legitimized by the illusion of moral credibility. Moral credibility, as Münkler argues, undoubtedly belongs to the resources of imperial power. Even so, it is not the measure of politics, simply its means. The logic of the empire knows how to use moral credibility as a power factor but would never judge itself by the same standard (Münkler 34). This is a lesson the surveyor has yet to learn. The narrator slowly leads him to his limits and then makes him wield his power until he, like Jadlowker, finally stops pretending to be honest.

On Trespassing and the Disappearance of Borders

The end of the story about the surveyor is told very quickly. Eibenschütz falls in love with Jadlowker's wife, exceeds his authority to selfishly convict Jadlowker and ultimately takes over his border tavern. Upon his release, Jadlowker kills him. In view of our focus on the theory of empire, we should pay special attention to the scene in which Eibenschütz arranges Jadlowker's arrest. The arrest happens on a Friday, a day that the surveyor dislikes because it is a market day, when there is a lot of work for him. The description of the day can be read as a footnote to all the problems with control discussed by the theory of empires. When gendarmerie and government officials appear in the market, there is a surge of panic. Buyers hurry away and sellers throw their weights into the middle of the road. There can hardly be a better illustration of what Luhmann refers to as mutual ignoring and "Kontaktvermeidungshaltung" between the inhabitants of the periphery and bureaucratic elites (Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* 672). According to theory, initially ineffective threats are usually followed by drastic measures, which in the novel plays out in Jadlowker's arrest. Jadlowker is standing in the market, selling fish. Although he does not have permission to sell his wares, he is not using any false weights or measures. The narrator tells us: "Das Gesetz kannte er: Ein Eichmeister hatte nichts mit Konzessionen zu tun. Mochte er nur kommen." But the narrator asks himself: "was weiß ein armer Mensch" like Leibusch Jadlowker (*DfG* 43)?

And a poor man is who fails to recognize the power of the center. As we remember from the theory of empire, the center not only operates on a semantic level but also defines borders and makes all relevant decisions. Doing so, it does not have to justify itself to the periphery, as Jadlowker will soon

find out. Even if Jadowlker were to know all the laws, customs, and character traits of officials, “Es kann ein Augenblick kommen, da steht plötzlich ein unbekannter Paragraph auf, und wenn es nicht auf den Paragraphen ankommt, so erwacht zum Beispiel eine ungeahnte Leidenschaft in einem Beamten. Beamte sind auch Menschen” (*DfG* 34).. Precisely the official also proves to be only human, since it is the clinking of the earrings worn by Jadowlker’s wife rather than the law that urges Eibenschütz to stop directly in front of Jadowlker’s fish barrel and insist on seeing his certificate. The master of the periphery protests against this and reminds the surveyor that he has no right to check on permissions. The narrator lets the surveyor respond only with “Sie leisten Widerstand!” and immediately orders a sergeant with a dangerously glittering spiked helmet and shining bayonet to single him out. Jadowlker, who is not intimidated by power symbols, attacks the gendarmerie sergeant with a fish knife and mutters wild imprecations at the emperor, state, law, and even against God (*DfG* 45). Representatives of these institutions then arrest him and bring him to the county jail in chains.

Jadowlker’s arrest raises the question of who should administer the border tavern and in the future deal with the dilemma of order. The community, that is the periphery itself, wants to trust the surveyor with this task. The center is not opposed to this idea and sends the surveyor a letter, letting him know that it is up to him to decide whether he will accept or decline this offer. Once again the narrator shows that Eibenschütz is accustomed to obey and not to make decisions. The narrator has him cry “Wäre er doch in der Kaserne, bei der Armee geblieben!” (*DfG* 60) and places him in the border tavern as Jadowlker’s substitution. Under his supervision, lucrative trade flourishes. It is here that the surveyor not only becomes more forgiving but begins to exercise his duties carelessly. After amorous nights and excessive alcohol intake, he needs his clever horse to bring him to work, to the thing he dreads more than lawbreakers: piles of paper.

In this case, the narrator does not allow this form of exercising power on the border of a bureaucratically based empire to go on for a long period of time. This is surprising inasmuch as Eibenschütz’s predecessor also had a loose understanding of control but was not punished by the center. The narrator interrupts the usual *laissez-faire* politics by sending cholera to the periphery: the disease that, whether one wanted to or not, could not be combated in Galicia. In the case of Zlotogrod the state sends doctors and medicine. Still, nothing helps. As the narrator relates: “Eines Tages kam von

der Militärbehörde der Befehl, das Regiment der Fünfunddreißiger möge unverzüglich den Bezirk Zlotogrod räumen, und jetzt entstand ein noch größerer Schrecken" (*DfG* 85). Had the inhabitants of the periphery up until now believed that death was just randomly scavenging their houses and cabins, with the withdrawal of the garrison they realize that the state decided and agreed that the "pest," as they call it, was a lasting affair. The power of the state that, as we already know, always decides against clearly establishing outer borders pulls back not only the military but also its borders, thereby stripping the periphery off a "farbiges, imponierendes Symbol der Ordnung" (Lunzer and Lunzer-Talos 8). Order in the border area is now not only loose but threatened by complete disintegration. Vibrancy and shine disappear altogether. Cholera, a state of emergency that has become normal, spreads like fire. Only remote farmsteads, the castle, and the border tavern are spared.

The decay of the surveyor unfolds before the eyes of the reader: "Er, der zeit seines Lebens so fleißig darauf bedacht gewesen war, sein Aussehen zu pflegen, aus dienstlichen Gründen, die eigentlich bereits Gebote seiner Natur geworden waren, begann jetzt, nachlässig zu werden" (*DfG* 96).⁴ The narrator confronts this new, altered Anselm Eibenschütz, who is aware of his own decay, with a corrective in the form of a new, exceedingly conscientious Polish sergeant. Although the center seemingly opts for the withdrawal of the garrison, it symbolizes its continued presence on the periphery by strengthening the power of the local gendarmerie, subordinated to the Ministry of War. Under its influence, the civil servant begins to punish everything that is half-porous, loose, and flexible, raging through the country in a manner even more woeful than the disease. The narrator makes the surveyor feel himself turning into an evil man. A formerly honest official now adopts Jadowker's semantics. There is no more balancing. Playing with the credibility problem, the narrator reverses the decrease in the level of integration: Eibenschütz breaks into a store belonging to a family that had heretofore deliberately been spared and fines them. Since they cannot pay, they are sentenced to four months in prison. Jadowker, who escapes prison thanks to cholera, spits into the surveyor's glass of schnapps and kills him.

Unfolding before the eyes of the reader is a world turned upside down, or at least a constellation out of joint. With the assassination of an official by outlaws, the integrational divide becomes total. In the end, the dilemma of order seems to be decided in favor of the periphery. As Luhman would say, the horizon of meaning developed by the center completely disintegrates.

Relevant cultural case studies on Roth can also be read in this way.⁵ They go beyond the reference to Roth's famous sentence, quoted at the beginning of this article, that the essence of Austria was not its center but the periphery. However, despite the scholarly discourse, it can be disputed that Roth actually adopted the peripheral perspective in his work. In favor of rejecting this understanding of Roth's work is the fact that Roth did not adopt this perspective until he moved to the center, having navigated the path from East to West, the path Jewish-Polish-Ukrainian peoples took into the mills of assimilation (Baumgart 337). If on his way from northeastern Galicia to the imperial capital of Vienna, Roth, indeed, hid his Jewish, provincial, almost illegitimate, petty-bourgeois<hmmm> origins (Baumgart 334) with elegant clothes, pomade, and monocle, then his is a perspective of the center and not of the periphery.⁶ Speaking in favor of this interpretation is Roth himself, for whom Otto von Habsburg represented a symbol and Austria "fast eine Religion" ("Schwarz-Gelbes Tagebuch" 5).

The Diagnostic Power of Literature: The Disintegration of Order and the Awareness of Contingency

With the help of the theory of empire, we could analyze the opposition between the centrally and peripherally based perspective and argue that in Roth's texts, just as in the case of great empires, the periphery cannot exist without the center and vice versa. Only in the overall view can we recognize the imperative of action and its boundaries. This also applies to the novel. Just as Maner suggests that the model of the center and periphery plays a central role in Habsburg reflections on state design, Roth also plays with this model, on the personal as well as the literary level. However, Habsburg reflections on state design lacked balance. The empire fell apart. According to Roth, the duty of the writer is to record in words the peculiar and at the same time genuinely human condition. The peculiar and genuinely human condition that Roth records in words after the fall of the Danube monarchy involves insight into the contingency of orders. What should be emphasized is that Roth's parable on the fall of the empire was completed at a moment when the empire was not only long gone but also every idea of order handed down by tradition. With respect to the fragility of orders, I return to the story about the surveyor one last time in order to capture "die diagnostische Kraft" of Roth (Müller-Funk 16), especially in terms of the post-imperial constellation.

As Reinhard Baumgart observes, “der Untergang Europas, seines Europas, und der Aufstieg des Autors Roth in sein Erzählreich” are closely related (Baumgart 343). In his narrative empire of 1937, Roth portrays the demise of the surveyor as a representative of a bureaucracy-based rule, just as much as the Polish sergeant Piotrak, who takes over control and arrests the most powerful men of the periphery. Whether they will be freed and whether the old surveyor will, as always, be replaced by a new one remains unknown. Instead of giving us those details, Roth describes the dream of the dying surveyor. In this dream, the surveyor is himself a trader with so many false weights that they do not fit his counter. As the greatest of all surveyors enters his shop, followed by a member of gendarmerie with a plume and a bayonet, he is afraid of its shine. However, to the utter astonishment of the surveyor, the great surveyor finally says: “Alle deine Gewichte sind falsch, und alle sind dennoch richtig. Wir werden dich also nicht anzeigen! Wir glauben, daß alle deine Gewichte richtig sind. Ich bin der Große Eichmeister” (*DfG* 120). According to the lore of Ilya Ehrenburg, this great inspector once, indeed, said that there are no accurate scales (Roth, *Briefe 1911–1939* 577).

The figure of the great surveyor neatly fits into the ambivalence of the novel, of its author and his empire. It is the personification of the mildly careless rule of the Habsburgs, which could, as Zweig writes, best be experienced precisely on the outer borders of the empire (Zweig 175). In this respect, ambivalence is a part of Roth’s legitimism. However, the words of the great inspector at the end of the novel can also be read as an awareness of possible otherness. What Müller-Funk refers to as Roth’s diagnostic power of modernity is expressed in an awareness of contingency that allows for experiences and expectations to appear “im Horizont möglicher Abwandlungen” (Luhmann, *Soziale Systeme* 152). As the final dream suggests, all this could have ended very differently. If Eibenschütz had not referred to the fundamental impossibility of establishing precise and even balances, he would not have been killed. This would have been possible. The decisions made by the surveyor were not necessary. His predecessor was much better at balancing. Since he was old and weak and abused alcohol excessively, he never bothered to personally check the weights and measures in the little town of Zlotograd. The center, thus, did not intervene and he was not killed, and he was even buried in a very nice funeral. In opposition to that, no one gave two hoots about Anselm Eibenschütz. The insight about the lack of accurate scales and definite borders, for Eibenschütz, comes too late.

But not for Roth—despite his “deep roots in the old empire” (Barker 61). In the words of the great surveyor, Roth portrays how the awareness of contingency of semantic and spatial order emerges on the horizon of meaning in the declining empire. But if these orders can also be different and if borders are not to be established only by military force, then every definition needs to be semantically legitimized in a universal way. In this respect, Roth’s often criticized legitimism appears completely legitimate. In the novel *Die Büste des Kaisers* (*The Emperor’s Bust*), which was published in 1935 in an antifascist daily paper, the protagonist, count Morstin, states that he is accustomed to living in a house with many doors and rooms for many different types of people. The monarchy was such a house, before it was divided up and destroyed. This is why the count has no business being here and hates nations and nation-states (Roth, *Die Büste des Kaisers* 192). These are significant, yet controversial statements that can be either dismissed as a position of a blind monarchist or interpreted as an “ex post geführte(n) Beweis für die heimatbildende Qualität des Vielvölkerstaats” (Lunzer and Lunzer-Talos 11).

A third possibility is to interpret them as an anticipation of a position, which can also be found in Münkler, when he refers to Eric Hobsbawm. For him, the fate of European politics in the twentieth century is a consequence of the right to national self-determination. Following this line of argument, the right to self-determination caused a plethora of (civil) wars, because former imperial space could not simply be divided by drawing up borders and national states without creating the paradox of new minorities and peripheries. As initially mentioned in the theory of empire, problems in Middle and Southeastern Europe are considered paradigmatic for post-imperial constellations. Even before this space was profoundly transformed by World War II, the interwar period was already marked by numerous developments that would be repeated in the post-imperial era (Münkler 218).

These developments were unfolding directly in front of Joseph Roth, triggering an “ambivalent nostalgia” accentuated by a particular kind of Jewish identity (Spencer 6). Roth objectively commented on the process of nation-building in *Die Büste des Kaisers* by letting count Morstin remark that peoples search “in vain for so-called national virtues, which are even more fragile than individual ones” (Roth, *Die Büste des Kaisers* 192). As a Jew Roth was especially aware of a process aptly described by Hirschhausen as a process leading from “imperial inclusion to national exclusion” (Von Hirschhausen 554–57).⁷ And it is certainly not by chance that, as Arens rightly points out,

most of the characters in Roth's novels, looking back at Austria Hungary, acknowledge that they had "a larger field of action before national boundaries were set down on the Balkans and Central Europe" (Arens 292; Barker 65). However, the order of the Danube monarchy was also fragile, otherwise the problem of balance would not have come to the fore. The fact that Roth realized this shows what an acute observer he truly was. The paradoxical form in which Roth literarily represents the challenge of achieving the right balance grants him, although once described as "homeless in political and terms of literary history," a central place in the discourse on empires (Amthor and Brittnacher 1).

Christine Magerski is a professor of German literature and culture at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. She studied literature and history at the Freie University of Berlin (Germany) as well as Cultural Studies at the Monash University of Melbourne (Australia), where she received her PhD. Before joining the Department of German Studies at the University of Zagreb in 2004, she was a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute of Advanced Research (Wissenschaftskolleg) in Berlin. Her main research interests include the sociology of literature, the study of modern literature and culture, and cultural and social theory. She has published widely on literary and cultural history and theory. Among her books are *Theorien der Avantgarde* (2011) and *Gelebte Ambivalenz: Die Bohème als Prototyp der Moderne* (2015).

Notes

1. For Münkler, disclosing the logic or the actions of empires is a descriptive-analytical process that abandons the normative-judgmental perspective.

2. There is disagreement about the extent to which the city was ruined and "in a provincial standstill" during Roth's life (Klanska, "Die galizische Heimat im Werk Joseph Roths" 143–56; Nürnberger 26).

3. On the problem of "making wrong decisions" on the periphery, which result from the strict application of very general principles, see Münkler 43.

4. Although it is beyond the scope of this article, the difference between territorial and ideal centers is very interesting. Connected to ideal centers is usually a fully trained body, i.e. disciplinary processes, which lead to character formation (Arbeitsgruppe "Zentrum und Peripherie" 70).

5. According to Claudio Magris, the "dimension of empire conveyed by Roth is of a typically Slavic-federalist, peripheral type. [...] His empire is an empire of crown lands, distant provinces on the Russian border, a Slavic-Jewish world of Galicia and Bukovina" (306). On Roth's perspective on the periphery, see also Müller-Funk 23; Coetzee 315.

6. Especially Roth's contemporaries were promoting this image. See Von Cziffra 59; Morgenstern 105; Bronsen 357.

7. According to Rozenblit, near the end of the war and the collapse of the monarchy, Jews were stripped of all political identity and "were truly cast adrift." This is why Jews from Galicia supported neither the autonomy of Galicia nor Polish rule. What they wanted was to retain the joint Austrian multinational state (110).

Works Cited

- Amthor, Wiebke, and Hans Richard Brittnacher, eds. *Joseph Roth—Zur Modernität des melancholischen Blicks*. De Gruyter, 2012.
- Arbeitsgruppe "Zentrum und Peripherie in soziologischen Differenzierungstheorien," ed. *Mythos Mitte: Wirkmächtigkeit, Potenzial und Grenzen der Unterscheidung "Zentrum/Peripherie."* VS, 2011.
- Arens, Katherine. *Vienna's Dreams of Europe*. Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Barker, Andrew. *Fictions From an Orphan State*. Camden House, 2011.
- Baumgart, Reinhard. "Drei Ansichten." *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 330–51, Diogenes, 2010.
- Bronsen, David. "Joseph Roth und sein Lebenskampf um ein inneres Österreich." *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 352–69, Diogenes, 2010.
- Buszko, Józef. *Zum Wandel der Gesellschaftsstruktur in Galizien und in der Bukovina*. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1978.
- Coetzee, J. M. "Joseph Roths Erzählungen." *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 313–29, Diogenes, 2010.
- Keel, Daniel, and Daniel Kampa, ed. *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*. Diogenes, 2010.
- Kiefer, Sebastian. *Braver Junge—gefüllt mit Gift: Joseph Roth und die Ambivalenz*. Metzler, 2001.
- Klanska, Maria. "Die galizische Heimat im Werk Joseph Roths." *Joseph Roth: Interpretation, Rezeption, Kritik*, edited by Michael Kessler and Fritz Hackert, pp. 143–56, Stauffenburg, 1990.
- . "Facetten des galizischen Elends: Stanislaw Szczepanowski's Das Elend Galiziens in Ziffern." *Galizien im Diskurs: Inklusion, Exklusion, Repräsentation*, edited by Paula Giersch et al., pp. 57–77, Peter Lang, 2012.
- Luhmann, Niklas. *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft*. Suhrkamp, 1997.
- . *Soziale Systeme*. Suhrkamp, 1984.
- Lunzer, Heinz, and Victoria Lunzer-Talos. *Joseph Roth 1894–1939. Katalog einer Ausstellung*. Zirkular, 1989.
- Magris, Claudio. "Joseph Roth." *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 299–312, Diogenes, 2010.
- Maner, Hans-Christian. *Galizien: Eine Grenzregion im Kalkül der Donaumonarchie im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. IKGS, 2007.

- . “Zum Problem der Kolonisierung Galiziens: Aus den Debatten des Ministerrates und des Reichsrates in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts.” *Habsburg Postcolonial: Machtstrukturen und kollektives Gedächtnis*, edited by Johannes Feichtinger et al., pp. 153–63, StudienVerlag, 2003.
- Morgenstern, Soma. “Joseph Roths Flucht ohne Ende.” *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 104–58, Diogenes, 2010.
- Müller-Funk, Wolfgang. *Joseph Roth*. Sonderzahl, 2012.
- Münkler, Herfried. *Imperien: Die Logik der Weltherrschaft—vom Alten Rom bis zu den Vereinigten Staaten*. Rowohlt, 2005.
- Nürnberg, Helmut. *Joseph Roth in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten*. Rowohlt, 1981.
- Roth, Joseph. “Brief an Gustav Kiepenhauer.” *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 7–12, Diogenes, 2010.
- . *Briefe 1911–1939*. Edited by Hermann Kesten, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1970.
- . *Das falsche Gewicht: Die Geschichte eines Eichmeisters*. Rowohlt, 1981 (1937).
- . *Die Büste des Kaisers*. Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1975 (1934).
- . *Radetzkymarsch*. Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1976 (1932).
- . *Die Kapuzinergruft*. Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1999 (1938).
- . “Erdbeeren.” *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 13–50, Diogenes, 2010.
- . “Schwarz-Gelbes Tagebuch.” *Die österreichische Post*, 15 February 1939.
- Rozenblit, Marsha L. *Reconstructing a National Identity: The Jews of Habsburg Austria during World War I*. Oxford UP, 2001.
- Spencer, Malcolm. *In the Shadow of Empire*. Camden House, 2008.
- Von Cziffra, Géza. “Der heilige Trinker.” *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 55–94, Diogenes, 2010.
- Von Hirschhausen, Ulrike. “From Imperial Inclusion to National Exclusion: Citizenship in the Habsburg Monarchy and in Austria, 1867–1923.” *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire*, 2009, pp. 551–37.
- Zweig, Stefan. “Joseph Roth.” *Joseph Roth: Leben und Werk*, edited by Daniel Keel and Daniel Kampa, pp. 175–89, Diogenes, 2010.

Intertextuality as Power

*Rosa Mayreder's Response to Goethe's
Faust and the Cult of Male Genius*

Ruxandra Looft

In 1928 Austrian writer and feminist Rosa Mayreder turned seventy years old and was decorated by the city of Vienna with the title of *Ehrenbürgerin*. After a lifetime of writing, publishing, composing, and painting, Mayreder achieved the kind of recognition enjoyed by few public scholars, let alone female writers, of her time. Yet that title was soon revoked by the Nazi officials who uncovered her Jewish lineage. Many years later, in 1997, Austria tried to make amends by printing Mayreder's image on the 500 schilling note. That too disappeared with the move from the schilling to the euro. Today Mayreder's contributions live on in the impact they made by creating a foundation for the women's movement in the German-speaking world. Scholarship on this writer, however, is marginal even though no history of the women's movement in Austria would be complete without the mention of Mayreder and her contributions.¹ One text in particular, *Anda Renata, ein Mysterium in zwei Teilen und zwölf Bildern*, published in 1934, deserves a closer look. Written to engage with Goethe's *Faust*, it challenges the canon by creating a female Faust figure to question women's education, gender roles, religious traditions, and historical narratives.

This article positions Mayreder's Faustian tale within a canon of female Faust figures and explores what it means to "write back" to one of Germany's most revered and widely read writers. I argue that Mayreder employs the technique of intertextuality as a strategic act of resistance to a male-dominated literary landscape that relegated nineteenth-century women's writings to the periphery. In what follows, I first explain my use of the term "writing back"

and how I am using intertextuality as a symbol for literary resistance and power. I then offer an overview of *Anda Renata* with particular focus on the intertextual engagement with Goethe's *Faust* especially as related to the fin-de-siècle women's movement, women's rights to education, generational conflict, and social change. I then position Mayreder's work within an oeuvre of texts authored by mostly women writers (although not entirely) with a female Faust figure at their center to better understand the literary tradition of creating female Fausts in response to this German canonical text.

Intertextuality as Power and Women Writing Back

In her 2009 work *Women Write Back: Strategies of Response and the Dynamics of European Literary Culture, 1790–1805*, Stephanie Hilger uses the term “writing back” to explore the relationship between four eighteenth-century women writers and canonical texts that their works engaged. More specifically, Hilger investigates the literary consequences of responding overtly and directly to a male-authored canonical text as well as the “stakes of writing in politically turbulent times” (11). Borrowing the term “writing back” from postcolonial theory, she explains it as using “the master’s tools in order to uncover the flawed foundation of the master’s house” (12).² Hilger makes a case for this type of literary strategy as powerful and dynamic, arguing that it allowed the women writers of her study to engage directly with well-established male writers and to position their own works more centrally within the eighteenth-century literary landscape. Rather than creating story lines that sought to reflect a female lived experience from a place in the margins, women writers who explicitly and strategically engaged with canonical texts written by male writers inserted their works into the mainstream with the aim of challenging the male voices dominating literary discourse of their time.

As such, women writers “writing back” were prone to criticism and derision. Hilger notes, “using a well-known text as an anchor caused an ambivalent reception; it ensured visibility yet also exposed authors to harsh criticism from the literary establishment” (12). Hilger argues that by positioning their writing in relation to a famous and widely read work produced by a male author, women writers both gained access to a literary dialogue already in place and risked being dismissed on the basis of having created a mere imitation of the already established work by a supposed male genius. Hilger notes that the term *intertextuality* was often reserved for literary exchanges between

two male-authored texts. When a woman engaged with a text written by a well-known and established male author, her work would often be dismissed as idolatry or aspirational mimicry (12). Despite this literary risk, women writers recognized the potential for power and subversion in taking a male-authored text and “writing back” as an act of defiance.

Two decades prior to Hilger’s publication of *Women Write Back*, feminist writer Audre Lorde penned her essay “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House.” Lorde’s use of this phrase was applied to a different context and did not focus on women’s writings in response to a male-dominated literary industry. Hers was a call to action for third-wave feminists to appreciate and understand difference in identity (race, class, age, sexuality) as a way to strengthen the women’s movement. In her essay, Lorde rejects the idea that working within system of injustice and oppression can redefine and subvert those principles of power. Emphatically, Lorde writes:

For the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. And this fact is only threatening to those women who still define the master’s house as their only source of power. (27, emphasis in original)

While Lorde’s argument is made in light of a different yet related topic, her use of the same tools/house metaphor, taken from postcolonial theory, is nonetheless helpful to us in considering Mayreder’s work and Hilger’s concept of literary resistance. Lorde goes on to write:

Women of today are still being called upon to stretch across the gap of male ignorance and to educate men as to our existence and needs. This is an old and primary tool of all oppressors to keep the oppressed occupied with the master’s concerns. (27)

In other words, Lorde sees this strategy of using “the master’s tools” to “dismantle the master’s house” as a distraction from a more effective and substantial dismantling of dominant power structures. She argues that radical and powerful change comes not from within a homogenized system of oppression but from recognizing the power in difference. In Lorde’s words, “The failure of academic feminists to recognize difference as a crucial strength is a failure to reach beyond the first patriarchal lesson. Divide and conquer, in our world, must become define and empower” (27).

How, then, can we reconcile Hilger's argument that women writers "writing back" are claiming power and subverting old tropes with Lorde's essay, which negates the possibility of using patriarchal tools of oppression to beat the master at his own game? I propose that a reading of Mayreder's *Anda Renata*, a Faustian tale that references and uses the narrative strategies of a patriarchal canonical text, needs to consider both of these viewpoints. Only when considering both Hilger and Lorde's arguments can we better understand how Mayreder and feminists of her time were negotiating the literary and sociopolitical landscape of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German-speaking world. I argue that Mayreder's work does function as a text of resistance by responding to Goethe's text and creating a female Faust figure. Yet she also falls victim to what Lorde identifies as a weakness in this approach: Mayreder still plays within the system of power established by a Western patriarchy and defines Anda's accomplishments and successes by the metrics used and implemented by her male contemporaries and predecessors.

This tension between wanting to subvert yet also wanting to play within the rules is at the core of Mayreder's work, both her theoretical works and her fiction. This may be also the reason that today's feminist scholars have largely turned away from Mayreder's writing, as it stands in conflict with more recent scholarship in gender and feminist studies as well as postcolonial and critical race theory. For instance, in her most widely read and distributed theoretical work, *Zur Kritik the Weiblichkeit* (1905), Mayreder creates a system for analyzing and understanding sex by offering a handful of categories. Women (a term used here to refer to individuals born with female anatomy) fall within one of the three types ("Frauentypen") she creates: "der Typus der erotischen Unterordnung" (118), "die Frauen der Mutterschaft mit egoistisch-frigidierender Grundnote" (119), and "die Männerhasserinnen" (122).

The first type is characterized by a fervent embrace of traditional "feminine" qualities, such as submission, dependence, fragility, and preoccupation with beauty and appearances. Mayreder writes, "Der Mann ist ihr Inhalt, ihr Oberhaupt, ihr Eigentümer; und die Vorstellung der Unterwerfung unter seine körperliche und geistige Herrschaft löst bei ihnen die erotische Lustempfindung aus" (116). She calls these women "Schwätzerinnen" (117) and "Vogel- und Puppennaturen" (119). The second type is the obsessive maternal type, whose life goal is reproduction and who views men only for their potential as fathers to their children rather than as partners or companions. This second type shares the "erotischer

Unterordnung” with the first type but is far more independent in her relationships as her primary interest is the well-being of the child and not her husband. Mayreder unflatteringly portrays this type as leaning toward frigidity and self-absorption while also propagating the myth of motherhood as a woman’s “natural” calling.

The third and last type of woman according to Mayreder’s classification system is the “Männerhasserin” or the “Mannweib” (123). She is the kind to reject anything traditionally feminine and is further characterized by resistance and aggression toward men.³ Anda, in *Anda Renata*, most closely resembles this third type in that she rejects traditional domesticity and has no desire for motherhood. Yet we see her as also contradicting Mayreder’s own classification system in that Anda is not a man-hating anomaly, and she certainly seduces and allures with her beautiful, feminine appearance.

What *Anda Renata* (and Mayreder) offers us as twenty-first century readers is a look at the complex and confused understanding of sex and gender at the fin de siècle in Vienna. It also makes plain how at that time and within that literary context, “using the master’s tools” allowed women writers to create a space to be heard within a male-dominated profession that all too eagerly expelled women from its midst.⁴ At the same time, we cannot discount the ways in which the women’s movement and women writers still needed to overcome internalized forms of oppression before they could seek out their own tools, as Lorde would suggest feminists do in her 1983 text on feminism and power.

Mayreder’s *Anda Renata* in Dialogue with Goethe’s *Faust*

The parallels between Mayreder’s *Anda Renata* and Goethe’s *Faust* are manifest. Both stories follow the development of a key central figure who is accompanied by a devil-like creature that transforms into an animal. Faust’s black poodle is Anda’s black cat. Both figures begin their journey by abandoning a traditional life in favor of a quest for discovery, knowledge, and autonomy. Along the way, they are confronted with multiple obstacles and challenges, including complicated relationships that result in an unwanted pregnancy, which naturally impacts Anda differently than it does Faust. Both figures rely on their mystical companion for guidance and counsel, yet both are also headstrong and reluctant to bend their will to follow the path suggested by someone else.

Mayreder's text makes use of parallels in plot and theme to alert the reader to the connection to Goethe's *Faust*. Yet it is often as a mirror-image version of Faust that we see Anda. Whereas Faust begins his tale by lamenting that he has acquired all the knowledge his books can offer and now wants to experience passion, life, and lust, Anda flips that narrative and asks for the opposite: she has been a slave to a destiny determined by her corporality and her female embodiment and wants nothing more than to escape her form and pursue the cravings of her intellect. This is what allows Mayreder's feminist arguments to come to the forefront: Where the male Faust takes for granted his access to learning and education, Anda, a woman shedding the expectations of generations past, wants nothing more than to live a hermit-like existence in a cottage in the woods surrounded by books and her writings, which she briefly does at the cost of abandoning her home, family, and community. The message is not lost on the early twentieth-century female reader: pursuing an education and a life of intellect comes at a cost. Whereas we talk about "having it all" in contemporary feminist narratives (however problematic that may be), that suggestion did not yet seem viable for the fin de siècle feminist writer who saw no possibility for her protagonist to pursue both a more conventional home life while also prioritizing her intellectual ambitions. When Anda embraces the latter, she pays a large price and finds herself ostracized and often vilified by those who cannot understand her obsession with knowledge and autonomy.

The objections to Anda's rejection of a more normative domestic existence not only come from those in her community but are perhaps most resounding at home. Her mother, who cannot understand why Anda would reject a suitor that her family has found for her, challenges her daughter's ideology and questions her rationale. Making a case for a more traditional life path, her mother argues:

Die Frau des Hauses ist des Hauses Herrin. Von allen Gütern schätzt ein Mann mit Recht die Frau am höchsten, deren Walten ihm das häusliche Behagen jeden Tag Erneut, den Wohlstand mehrt, in Zucht und Sitte die Kinder ihm zur Freude aufzieht; ihr gewährt er gerne Raum, sich zu entfalten, und läßt ihr alle Freiheit, die sie braucht. (29)

In other words, Anda's mother preaches the tenets of a more traditional heteronormative union that holds at its core a belief that a happy and

fulfilling marriage rests on the ability of the wife to keep a spotless home, a happy husband, and healthy children. By doing this, she in turn is rewarded with financial and social “freedom.” Anda, symbolic of a new generation of women, rejects this belief and challenges her mother’s thinking by replying: “Die Freiheit, ihm zu dienen. Wär’ er doch ein Tor, in dieser Freiheit sie zu hindern!” (29). To which her mother replies, “Ein wohlgerat’nes Weib wünscht keine and’re” (29). In short, a “proper woman” desires nothing but to serve her husband and keep a well-managed home.

Their exchange is demonstrative of the clashing narratives permeating early twentieth-century thinking. At this time, increasing numbers of groups were formed on the basis that they were fighting for women’s suffrage, the right to education, opportunities in the workplace, and financial autonomy, aiming to divorce the identity of woman from that of her husband, father, or brother. Mayreder too was a champion of social reform and greater gender equity. She was an active agent in the social justice efforts first championed by groups such as the Wiener Frauen-Erwerbsverein, founded in 1866, which functioned as a labor union for lower-class working women. In the 1870s, Austrian feminist Marianne Hainisch argued for the right of girls to attend *Realgymnasien* and to receive an equal education.⁵ It was not until 1893, however, that all the disparate women’s issues came together under one umbrella organization, namely the Allgemeiner Österreichischer Frauenverein (AÖVF). Mayreder’s name is most often associated with this organization, of which she was a long-time member, co-founder, and vice president. Other prominent members included Auguste Fickert (who went on to become president of the AÖVF), Marianne Hainisch, and Marie Lang.⁶

Fickert, Hainisch, and Lang are often named for their ties to Mayreder and their joint contributions to the women’s movement in Austria. Hainisch represented a more conservative viewpoint when it came to motherhood and domesticity, Fickert brought her talented financial skills to the group, Lang was the more creative and nonconformist one, and Mayreder was widely regarded as the intellectual and philosophical voice. While the others largely engaged in practical everyday issues such as education or wages, Mayreder’s fight was primarily on the intellectual and theoretical level—hers was a struggle to change the assumptions about women’s roles and intellect on a greater social scale. To that end, engaging with Goethe’s *Faust* offered Mayreder the chance to take up the issue most relevant to her work in the women’s movement: education and the antiquated schools of thought that governed women’s access to intellectual pursuits and scholarly development.

Goethe's Faust figure is equally invested in questioning the role of knowledge and learning, but for rather different reasons. His frustration comes in the form of ennui that he has exhausted all the learning and knowledge available to him while wondering what else life has to offer. A disillusioned Faust argues that no matter how much learning he has sought, the only certainty is that nothing is certain. Faust's pact with the devil figure of Mephistopheles is based on the former's desire to experience more of life beyond studying and learning. Faust wants to experience the world in a more visceral way, yearning for a corporeal and lust-induced approach to living. He enlists Mephistopheles' help to attract the object of his desire, Gretchen, and to help him conquer her affections, something Mephistopheles skillfully does through list and deceit.

In contrast, Mayreder's character Anda is tired of moving through the world as someone's object of desire and with her physicality and sexuality at the forefront of the narratives shaping her life trajectory. She wants to silence the talk about finding a husband and bearing offspring. Anda is driven by the very thing that bores Faust: she seeks more learning, increased access to literature and writing, and greater intellectual freedom. While Goethe's Faust lusts over Gretchen, Anda cannot escape her undeterred pursuers quickly enough. This is one of the key tropes used by Mayreder to highlight how women's roles and experiences were shaped by their constant objectification and unwilling participating in a patriarchal power system that made them the lusted-after rather than an active agent in their narratives. Faust's own participation in this system of power and lust only emphasizes the *longue durée* of the problem Mayreder thematizes in her twentieth-century writings.

To illustrate a new beginning, not just for Anda but for the New Woman of 1930s Vienna, *Anda Renata* begins with a ceremony that marks her entry into the world. Anda refuses the "Schleier" her elders want to place over her eyes, arguing:

Noch fühl' ich mich gestaltlos, ganz im Dunkel des Werdens, ohne Ziel und ohne Richtung, noch des Wortes harrend, das sie mir verkünde. Nur eines weiß ich und das versprech' es Dir: Die Wahrheit bleibe mir das göttlich Höchste, und nie will ich dem Schein sie unterwerfen. (8)

Anda vows to hold truth as her highest ideal and to never succumb to illusion. With this as her never-tiring mantra, Anda sets out to discover the world

around her. Before she leaves her home, however, her mother attempts one last time to dissuade her from her quest by making a case for marriage and a more traditional life path, something Anda promptly declines.

As noted, one of the most striking parallels between Faust and Anda is their insatiable search for a way out of the quotidian. While that search leads Faust to Gretchen and Anda to a life of solitude surrounded by books in a forest, both arrive at their destination due to what Mephistopheles terms “Unersaetlichkeit” (Goethe 52). They are both strong-willed and single-minded in their quest for visceral and intellectual experiences, respectively. Yet while their quest is for two polar ways of experiencing the world, the outcome brings them to the shared experience of an unwanted pregnancy and the consequences of their sexual deviation. Here is where Mayreder not only subverts the traditional Faust story but also highlights the gendered nature of the narrative: While Faust can walk away and leave Gretchen to her demise as the one physically carrying the burden of their transgression, Anda has no such choice to make. She is the one pregnant and alone, abandoned by her lover and left to face the social stigma and rejection that comes from stepping outside the conduct codes of her time. Her mother’s words prophetically declared early in the text prove true after all: “Ein Mann ist nie der Schuldige, wo sich die Weiblichkeit entzweit mit Brauch und Sitte” (27). According to Anda’s mother, who stands in as the voice of traditional Austrian culture, a man is never to blame for a woman’s departure from tradition and customs.

Like Gretchen, Anda contemplates infanticide when faced with her predicament. While Gretchen goes through with the murder of her unborn child only to be pardoned by a benevolent voice from above: “Ist gerettet!” (Goethe 135)—saved!—Anda’s crisis is resolved by Aschmedai, the devil figure serving as Mephistopheles’ double. In a turn both dystopian and fantastic, Aschmedai turns to a gathering of witches and asks them to take the child away, resolving for Anda the grief and guilt of any alternate solutions. Anda is both spared and denied her path to motherhood, thrust back into society as a woman with a dark and mysterious past. Ironically, it is this nebulous and suspicious past that makes her even more alluring and desirable to her male suitors despite her mother’s warnings about what will make Anda unattractive. Anda’s transgression thus functions as both stigma and sex appeal, highlighting the double standard governing the sexual and moral codes of the time.

Anda’s story does not end with her expulsion from her community and the loss of a child. She recovers from her loss and redefines herself as a self-

sufficient and self-proclaimed recluse, appropriating the role ascribed to her by her community and turning it into a choice rather than an undesirable fate. This strength from within is what makes her increasingly alluring, and she soon finds herself invited to live at court by an admiring duke. In contrast to Goethe's Gretchen, whose salvation by an invisible deus proclaiming "ist gerettet!" only highlights her victim status in a patriarchal system that has the last word over her—Anda's refusal to be "saved" serves to highlight her strength, power, and autonomy. Anda agrees to move into the royal home of the duke who has been ardently pursuing her as a love interest under the condition that she will serve as a muse rather than as a paramour. In this way, Anda is not the one being saved but is the one doing the saving by providing the duke guidance and inspiration.

In the end, Anda finds a way to secure material and social freedom outside of the institution of marriage, proving her mother—and tradition—wrong. She enters a calculated domestic relationship that is not unlike the arranged marriage proposed by her mother, except that it is Anda who defines the parameters of her future rather than a spouse or parent on her behalf. This is what makes Anda remarkable and different from Gretchen before her: She remains unwavering in her determination to find autonomy, power, and independence. She makes no secret of her desire for power, and she also does not apologize for it. Mayreder does not suggest that the path to social reform is an easy one, but her work makes the argument that defeat should not foreclose persistence and that gender roles, as understood at the fin de siècle, were not as rigid and static as the voices of older generations would suggest.

A Tradition of Female Fausts

Mayreder's literary exchange with Goethe can be situated within a larger opus of works authored by women writers across centuries and national lines. In her work *Framing Faust*, Inez Hedges presents an overview of multiple similar texts that engage with the canonical Faust story from a feminist perspective. Among those are Louisa May Alcott's *A Modern Mephistopheles* and *A Long Fatal Love Chase* and Hélène Cixous' *Révolutions pour plus d'un Faust* (97–105). Inez also points to Austrian author Frank Wedekind as having queered Faust in his work *Franziska* (100). *Franziska*, which was written in 1911 (twenty-three years prior to Mayreder's work), offers certain plot parallels to *Anda Renata*. Both works begin with the story of a young heroine rejecting

the social expectations of marriage and domesticity in favor of self-discovery and autonomy. Inez describes the character of Franziska as “strong” and “rapacious” (101): “In the opening scene [. . .] she refuses to marry the man who made her pregnant because she hasn’t yet had time to find out who she is. From the beginning, she appears to be a person who makes her own rules” (101). Mayreder adds to this theme with the story of Anda, who not only makes her own rules but in the end triumphs by her own standards. Anda’s fate may not be one that the average 1930s reader would desire for herself, but it is one that leaves Anda satisfied and empowered in her autonomy.

Nancy Kaiser unpacks what it means to look for women’s places and women’s roles in the Faust myth in her text “Faust/Faustine in the 19th Century: Man’s Myth, Women’s Places.” Kaiser points to the “dominant masculine subject” as much harder to swallow starting with the increasingly vocal women’s movement of the nineteenth century (65). According to Kaiser, beginning with the nineteenth century, the Faust myth with its “claim to universality,” the “subjugation of nature,” and the problematic treatment of female figures as objects and passive participants began being challenged by writers and historians (65). Kaiser writes,

Having long been excluded from powerful knowledge in patriarchal culture, kept unknowledgeable about power, and held as objects of desire, women must struggle against their cultural definitions in order to assert themselves as subjects with knowledge, power, and desires of their own. (66)

Although Kaiser does not reference Mayreder’s work, Kaiser’s argument could not be more in line with Mayreder’s writing in *Anda Renata*. We see Anda attempt all of the tasks that Kaiser identifies in the passage cited above. Kaiser also notes that the beginning of the nineteenth century marked a major cultural shift that took many women out of their homes and into the public spheres as producers of cultural content and meaning. We see Anda’s mother echo the words of generations before her, which, according to Kaiser, were tenets of an ideology slowly but surely crumbling as the nineteenth century fared on. Kaiser points to versions of the Faust myth written during the eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries and shows how the representations of womanhood in those texts conformed to archaic notions of femininity and gender. Describing these earlier versions of Faustines or female figures within Faust stories, Kaiser writes,

They also served to relegitimate patriarchal structures that had been challenged by the emancipatory expectations raised as a result of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. (67)

Later Faust stories, such as Ida Hahn-Hahn's *Faustine* (1872), break the mold and challenge dated notions of gender and women's roles. Kaiser writes, "[Faustine's] 'Streben' is perceived within the novel, by contemporaneous readers and by many modern critics, as characteristic of an 'Unweib,' as 'demonic.' Hahn-Hahn herself calls Faustine a 'Vampyrnatur'" (78). While we see parallels in story line between Hahn-Hahn's work and Mayreder's *Anda Renata*, that is where the similarities end. By the time Mayreder offers her female Faust to a changing and evolving readership, she makes no apologies for her narrative. Hahn-Hahn famously added a special preface to the third edition of *Faustine* explaining in a rather apologetic tone the choices of her heroine (her infidelity and sexual misconduct in particular). Mayreder, on the other hand, added an epilogue to *Anda Renata* that reads as anything but apologetic. Mayreder, instead, relies on historical and cultural examples to strengthen her arguments. Citing the infamous *Hexenhammer* and the witch hunts of the Middle Ages, Mayreder argues that women have been unjustly persecuted for far too long. The time has come for a new generation to rewrite old narratives. Mayreder writes, "Wenn ein neues Menschentum sich Bahn brechen soll, muß es über das alte hinausschreiten" (239), adding later,

Der Widerstand gegen das Überschreiten der häuslichen Tradition durch das Weib hat sich immer in harten Vorurteilen geäußert; Die christlich-asketische Feindschaft gegen sinnliche Regungen äußerte sich gegen das Weib noch fanatischer als gegen den Mann. (241)

In other words, Mayreder makes a case for a feminist reading of *Anda's* story, articulating how women have historically been the recipients of much harsher and more stringent puritanical laws when it comes to sexuality and autonomy. According to Mayreder's own deconstruction of her text, *Anda's* biggest crime is that she dares act like a man:

Anda hat sich das Gesetz des bürgerlichen Lebens als Weib gebrochen und sich in ihrer Handlungsweise dem Manne gleichgestellt; das Gesetz der Natur aber ist dem Weibe gegenüber noch unerbittlicher als das bürgerliche. (243)

Anda's greatest transgression is not that of getting pregnant out of wedlock. It is the crime of not desiring her pregnancy and her future child. Her rebellion plays out on a grander scale—she wants nothing to do with motherhood and her supposed “natural” role as mother. In this way, Anda's tragedy differs from that of Gretchen. Anda's pregnancy is not problematized because of its illegitimacy but rather because Anda does not want to become a mother—hers is a biological rebellion that transcends bourgeois norms and as such breaks new ground for the New Woman in Austrian culture.

Conclusion

By creating a character that engages with one of German literature's most iconic narratives, Mayreder ensures that her work becomes a part of a larger literary discourse. While she started her career by writing under the guise of a male pen name (Franz Arnold), she concluded it by subverting one of the most canonical works of German literature. As Hilger notes of this practice, it would not only have gained Mayreder the attention and recognition that came with inserting herself into a dominant discourse but also allowed her to challenge a system that was already defined and in place. To once more rely on our postcolonial metaphor, Mayreder did not first have to build the house before tearing it down but could simply get to work dismantling the master's house with the tools best available to her. While Mayreder's work does not propose direct solutions for women stepping into a new generation at the fin de siècle, it does offer a space for questioning and dismantling archaic beliefs about gender roles, sexuality, and the institutions of marriage and education. In doing so, Mayreder positions herself as an agent of social change rather than a victim of hegemonic narratives. She claims the tool of intertextuality as a symbol of resistance and wields it for the power it gives her to challenge tired norms.

Ruxandra Looft holds a PhD in German and comparative literature from Washington University in St. Louis (2012). She is the director of the Margaret Sloss Women's Center at Iowa State University, where she also serves as faculty affiliate in women's and gender studies. Her research focuses on gender, national identity, and visual culture. She can be found online on Twitter @advising_daily.

Notes

1. Two seminal works on Rosa Mayreder are Schmörlzer and Anderson. Both writers provide helpful texts analyzing Mayreder's works at the intersection of her personal life and activism.

2. On the concept of "writing back" in postcolonial theory, see Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin.

3. Mayreder's fin-de-siècle "Mannweib" (man-woman) would be indirectly problematized about a century later by feminist writer and trans activist Judith Halberstram in her 1998 text *Female Masculinity*. Halberstram argues that the tomboy stage of a girl's life is socially permissible as long as she outgrows it during adolescence. Women who read or perform as masculine later in life threaten the gender binary and become the focus of aggression and oppression. Using Halberstram's theoretical model, we can see how Mayreder identified these same social paradigms in early twentieth-century Austria but was not yet able or willing to voice a critique of this system.

4. For a useful analysis of the literary market in the nineteenth-century highlighting how women made up a small minority of published authors, see Heminghouse; Joeres.

5. On the women's movement, especially in relation to education reform, see Anderson, *Utopian Feminism*. Otto, *Das Recht der Frauen auf Erwerb* provides an insight into the women's movement from the perspective of one of Mayreder's contemporaries.

6. Some key texts for understanding the women's movement include Reingart Witzmann's *Aufbruch in das Jahrhundert der Frau? Rosa Mayreder und der Feminismus in Wien um 1900* (1989) and Harriet Anderson's *Utopian Feminism: Women's Movements in Fin-De-Siècle Vienna* (1992).

Works Cited

- Alcott, Louisa May. *A Long Fatal Love Chase*. Dell, 1995 [1866].
- Alcott, Louisa May. *A Modern Mephistopheles*. Roberts Brothers, 1889.
- Anderson, Harriet. "Gepresste Blumen: Die Tagebücher Rosa Mayreders." *Österreichische Tagebuchschriftsteller*, edited by Donald G. Daviau, Schaumberger, 1994.
- . *Utopian Feminism: Women's Movements in Fin-De-Siècle Vienna*. Yale UP, 1992.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. Routledge, 1989.
- Hélène Cixous. *Révolutions pour plus d'un Faust*. Editions du Seuil, 1975.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Faust: Der Tragödie Erster Teil*. Reclam, 1995 [1808].
- Halberstram, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Duke UP, 1998.
- Hahn-Hahn, Ida von. *Gräfin Faustine*. A. Duncker, 1841.
- Hedges, Inez. *Framing Faust: Twentieth-Century Cultural Struggles*. Southern Illinois UP, 2005.
- Heminghouse, Patricia. "Women and the Literary Enterprise if Nineteenth-Century Germany." *German Women in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, edited by Ruth-Ellen Joeres and Mary Jo Maynes, Indiana UP, 1986.

- Hilger, Stephanie. *Women Write Back: Strategies of Response and the Dynamics of European Literary Culture, 1790–1805*. Rodopi, 2009.
- Joeres, Ruth-Ellen. *Respectability and Deviance: Nineteenth-Century German Women Writers and the Ambiguity of Representation*. U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Kaiser, Nancy A. "Faust/Faustine in the 19th Century: Man's Myth, Women's Places." *Our Faust? Roots and Ramifications of a Modern German Myth*, edited by Reinhold Grimm and Jost Hermand, U of Wisconsin P, 1987.
- Lorde, Audre. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, Kitchen Table Press, 1983.
- Mayreder, Rosa. *Anda Renata: Ein Mysterium in Zwei Teilen und zwölf Bildern*. Buchhandlung Rudolf Kren, 1934.
- Otto, Louise. *Das Recht der Frauen auf Erwerb: Blicke auf das Frauenleben der Gegenwart*. Holzinger, 1886.
- Schmölzer, Hilde. *Rosa Mayreder: Ein Leben Zwischen Wirklichkeit und Utopie*. Promedia, 2002.
- Wedekind, Frank. "Franziska." *Werke*, vol. 2. Winkler Verlag, 1990.
- Witzmann, Reingart, ed. *Aufbruch in Das Jahrhundert Der Frau? Rosa Mayreder und der Feminismus in Wien um 1900*. Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien, 1989.

Reviews

Jürgen Hillesheim, *Die Wanderung ins "nunc stans": Wilhelm Müllers und Franz Schuberts Die Winterreise*. Rombach litterae 220. Freiburg: Rombach Verlag, 2017. 242 pp.

Jürgen Hillesheim, by beginning his new study of the famous song cycle, *Die Winterreise*, with the observation that “Studien, die sämtliche Gedichte bzw. Lieder der Winterreise von Wilhelm Müller und Franz Schubert analysieren, gibt es bereits” (7), invites the question: What makes this book a welcome addition? This study offers a double answer: It is an effective introduction to Müller’s and Schubert’s work and an original analysis of the *Winterreise* in its intellectual context.

It seems likely that this book will find the most use as an introduction to the song cycle—its themes, background and context and the major strands of criticism associated with it. Hillesheim begins with a substantial (c. 50 pp) *Einleitung*, divided into eight parts. The first sections are broadly informative, although perhaps of limited interest to the expert. They provide the details on the origins of Müller’s poems and point out the slight difference in arrangement between the printed poems and the songs in Schubert’s cycle before the subsequent sections move into the realm of interpretation.

As a starting point, Hillesheim emphasizes that he considers the final song cycle to be the work of both the poet and the composer—an idiosyncratic collaboration, given that the two never met. Here is his defense of Müller’s importance to the final product: “Dass es allerdings erst der Komponist gewesen sein soll, der dieser Lyrik ihre außerordentlich hohe Qualität verlieh, ist, obwohl man das heute noch immer gelegentlich hören kann, blanker Unsinn und keine nähere Erörterung mehr wert” (9).

The text strikes at times an overly dismissive note, offering such points of view as matters of fact. For example, the possibility that Müller's poems could be read autobiographically is dismissed in a single short paragraph. In general, however, Hillesheim does a fine job of outlining a dialogue between different critical approaches and offering the main points of their arguments. For readers and listeners new to these texts, the summary of the major points of critical interest, consensus, and disagreement is invaluable.

The main body of the book takes the poems/songs one by one. This strikes me as a compelling arrangement, in part because the text of each poem is printed at the head of Hillesheim's essay devoted to it. The result is that the reader feels expertly guided through the songs. Moreover, the clarity of organization makes it possible to dip in and out of the text, to find an illuminating remark on a single line, or to easily find a reference or elucidation.

Each text is taken as its own unit, integrated into the cycle. The argument refers to and draws on the scholarship but in general proceeds with the light touch of observations that, once stated, appear obvious. The essays begin by taking stock of where the previous poem had left the wanderer and from there move the analysis forward. The structure of the arguments supports the idea that the cycle represents an interplay of text and music, the work of the poet and the composer, which cannot be separated but nevertheless point out into a broader space. Consider for instance the opening paragraph of the essay "*Der Lindenbaum—Tod und Sentiment*" devoted to the most famous poem in the cycle:

In "mäßigen" Tempo, so Schuberts Vorgabe in der Partitur, schreitet der Zyklus mit seinem berühmtesten Lied, *Der Lindenbaum*, fort. Seinen Bekanntheitsgrad verdankt es nicht zuletzt Friedrich Silchers "idyllischer Verkürzung", die wohl verbreiteter sein dürfte als Schuberts Vertonung. "Mäßig" entspricht genau dem Tempo des einführenden Lieds *Gute Nacht*. Mit diesem, das die Situation vor dem Aufbruch des lyrischen Ich beschreibt und reflektiert, korrespondiert nun eines, das in einem Traumzustand die Wanderung unterbricht. Nach der besonnenen Entscheidung zu deren Aufnahme, kehrt nun im Zyklus [. . .] erstmals wieder Ruhe ein. Dies antizipiert beinahe die "Hermetik" des Zauberbergs Thomas Manns; vielleicht ist Hans Castorp deshalb ein idealer Hörer dieses Lieds. (95)

In this paragraph we can see Hillesheim's method and some of its advantages. In a few short sentences he has (a) introduced a key point about the reception of this poem (it is probably the most famous in the cycle), (b) placed this musical setting in a popular context (by comparing it to the more famous version by Silcher), (c) made a musical connection between it and another song in the cycle (both use a "moderate" tempo), (d) pointed out the presence of a major theme for the cycle at large ("Ruhe"), and (e) looked forward a century into the song's literary reception. Some may find the shortage of details unfulfilling, but the effect is to offer the reader a wealth of options for how to proceed on his or her own.

And in this sense Hillesheim has succeeded remarkably: He invites us into the wealth of ideas musical, poetic, philosophical and historical that intersect in this song cycle and offers the tools to continue down a number of paths. (The bibliography and *Personenregister* also facilitate use as a reference volume.) For the reader who knows the songs well, Hillesheim's new contribution is to link the poetic wanderer's musical journey to the deeper melancholy of Schopenhauer's pessimism and Büchner's fatalism—a compelling and provocative connection.

Andrew B.B. Hamilton
Bowdoin College

Luke Gartlan, *A Career of Japan: Baron Raimund von Stillfried and Early Yokohama Photography*. Photography in Asia 1. Leiden: Brill, 2016. 384 pp.

Luke Gartlan's *A Career of Japan* is that rare book that combines erudition, style, a compelling story, impeccable research, and commitment to innovative historical and cultural studies. Those in postcolonial studies and studies of images and media will find here new ways of thinking about the margins between East and West, colonized and colonizer, and art and commerce as well as about the overly simple assumptions about the production, circulation, and consumption of images within hegemonic discourses. It is also a showpiece of a beautifully produced book, with impressive reproductions (both black-and-white and color) and a fantastic layout.

Gartlan, a senior lecturer at the School of Art History, St. Andrews University, Scotland, and editor of the journal *History of Photography*, here tells

the story of Baron Raimund von Stillfried-Ratenicz (1839–1911), an Austro-Hungarian aristocrat born in what today is the Czech Republic. Like many of his class, his first profession was the military, with studies at the Imperial Marine Academy in Trieste and then the Imperial Military Engineering School in Tulln, Austria. That career lasted until 1863, when he took his love of painting into a new role as world traveler (including South America and China), ending up in Japan by 1864. There he took various positions in trade and diplomacy (for various countries), until he joined the Mexican army supporting Emperor Maximilian I until that monarch's 1867 assassination. After that, he was employed as secretary for the Prussian diplomatic corps. Stillfried's real story starts when he apprentices in a photographic studio and then opens his own in Yokohama in 1871; for the next decade he worked as a commercial photographer documenting Japan for both tourists and government ethnographic projects. He returned to Vienna for the 1873 World's Fair and left Japan permanently in 1881; he died in Vienna. Stillfried's legacy has been known but neither completely catalogued, appreciated, nor even fully identified. Gartlan has scoured archives worldwide to locate a few intact tourist albums and a larger number of photographs, including hand-colored ones, scattered in archives dedicated to other purposes.

Gartlan's first achievement is not just cataloguing; he also reconstructs the life and significance of commercial photography in an emerging market where East met West and stood in conscious dialogue—Stillfried's story is also a chapter in Japan's history of photography. Gartlan models for his readers how to understand images in the culture of everyday life at sites of cultural contact: He tracks what a commercial photographer did, what kinds of images were sold and in what form (individual, in albums, some pre-sold, some colored, some with a second life as etchings), and the economics and politics of photography as a factor in various kinds of identity politics.

Gartlan's second achievement is his reconstruction of the contexts in which these photos lived and Stillfried's various successes and failures occurred. That was the early years of Yokohama photography, which was central to the art's evolution in Japan. Stillfried was first and foremost a man seeking to learn a craft and earn a living. Some of his work originated when he was a journeyman, establishing his own portfolio by varying what successful photographers did (Felice Beato and Wilhelm Burger were the best established; Stillfried apprenticed in their shops). Some of his works stray far from touristic expectations (Stillfried would include Japanese subjects wearing modern dress, for example); some were taken under contract to the

Austrian and Japanese governments, each for their individual needs; others, later in his career, fall into the western-ethnographic mode of orientalism (with “standard” representations of costumes—often staged in the studios—and sites that were popularly purchased for tourists’ memory-book albums). And still later, he acquired popular photo archives and assembled albums that included heavily colored works called “photo-crayons.”

Gartlan’s third overwhelming achievement is rendering this diversity coherent, as part of Japan’s opening to western influences, not just as the West “consuming” Japan for its own purposes. After the Tokugawa shogunate, the new imperial government used photography to portray itself as a modern nation—and it was by no means passive in controlling photographic images like Stillfried’s. Gartlan thus reads images in an ongoing political dialogue as well. For instance, he tells the story of how Stillfried took an unauthorized photo of the Mikado in a western uniform, which sold well because it was the first picture to depict this. But the Japanese government confiscated it and then had an almost identical “official portrait” taken by a Japanese photographer, which Stillfried pirated back and colored for sale, making a different commodity. Stillfried’s ethnographic photos of Hokkaido (including representation of the non-Asian, indigenous Ainu), Japan’s northernmost island, were then commissioned by the government, later to be displayed in the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna. Yet Stillfried also had his own exhibit: his photos (for sale) in a full-size Japanese teahouse he imported, along with five servants (three of whom may have been prostitutes). These may have influenced Klimt, but they also ended his career when he ended up in bankruptcy court.

Gartlan’s dense weave teaches us much about orientalism and globalization—we all need to read it and learn new ways of approaching visual culture and cultural contact. Austrianists in particular will find much in it to reevaluate Vienna’s *fin de siècle* cosmopolitanism.

Katherine Arens

The University of Texas at Austin

Falk Strehlow, *Denkverläufe im Vergleich. Goethe und Kleist, Kafka und Brecht*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2016. 688 S.

Strehlows fast 700seitige Studie vergleicht zum einen Denkabläufe in Texten von Goethe und Kleist—Schriftsteller des späten 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts—und zum anderen in Werken von Kafka und Brecht—

Schriftsteller der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts. Diese Verläufe des Denkens ermittelt er durch vergleichendes Lesen. Er bedient sich methodologischer Begriffe wie z.B. textnahes Lesen, Modell-Leser, Fokus-Varianz. Zum Verständnis erstellt Strehlow zunächst vier Beispielanalysen von Kleist und Kafka. Der Schwerpunkt seines wissenschaftlichen Interesses liegt in den unterschiedlichen Arten des Strukturaufbaus von gedanklichen Zusammenhängen literarischer Werke. Themen, Motive und Inhalte werden ausgeklammert, denn es geht ihm um ein Abbild quasi-syntaktischer Strukturen von Literatur. Auf diese Weise sollen die Tiefenstrukturen literarischer Texte ausgelotet werden. Roman Jacobsens strukturbasierte Textauffassung ist u.a. in Strehlows Verlaufmodell integriert. Sein Forschungsansatz lässt eine unterschiedliche Geometrie literarischer Sinnzusammenhänge erkennen, d.h. er ermöglicht eine Visualisierung von Mustern bzw. Bildern. Dazu dient das vergleichende Lesen, bei dem literarische Texte wie zwei Folien übereinandergelegt werden, um deren Abweichungen sichtbar zu machen. Textnahes Lesen sodann soll Kontraste zum Vorschein bringen.

Strehlow findet so bei Goethe den Menschen als eine maßvolle, verhältnismäßige Gestalt, der seinen Bezug zur Welt erkennen kann. Die Studie konfrontiert dieses Resultat mit den Figuren bei Kleist, wo es um Verkennen und Aporien geht. Während sich Kafka auf eigene Weise Kleist anschließt, wird bei Brecht der Mensch sodann als Kollektiv- und Gattungswesen dargestellt. Strehlow geht davon aus, dass sich durch die Kleistschen Verlaufmodelle "Goethes Textkohärenzen trennscharf und signifikant konturiert" (105) herausarbeiten lassen. Er untersucht im ersten Teil des Buches mehr als notwendig gewesen wäre, das gesamte dramatische Frühwerk Goethes (*Die Laune des Verliebten*, *Götz von Berlichingen* und *Prometheus, Götter, Helden und Wieland*, *Claudine von Villa Bella* und *Clavigo*.) Nach einer ausführlichen strukturellen Analyse vergleicht Strehlow *Die Laune der Verliebten* mit Kleists *Die Familie Schroffenstein*. Bei Goethe sieht er die Welt im Drama durch Austausch und Verstehensmöglichkeiten liebes- und lebensfähig, während sich bei Kleist im Rahmen der inneren und äußeren Welten durch die "Übermacht einer omnipotenten Schuldzuweisung Austausch und Verstehensmöglichkeiten notwendig ausschließen" (164–65). Es ist etwas verwirrend für LeserInnen, dass Strehlow hier in dieser Goethe-Analyse nicht nur auf Kleists Denkverläufe sondern auch auf Brechts eingeht, wo er statt distinkten Grundstrukturen eine Dialektik findet. Bei Goethe, so wird ausgeführt, fehle der Widerspruch, der zu einer Dialektik notwendig sei.

Ansonsten zieht Strehlow nur bei Clavigo nochmals Kleist hinzu. Hier weist er darauf hin, dass es in keinem anderen behandelten Drama deutlichere Textäquivalenzen zwischen Goethe und Kleist gäbe als bei *Clavigo* und *Penthesilea*. Der Unterschied liege darin, dass die Protagonistin Marie bei Goethe “die Waffen für ihren psychosomatischen Freitod nicht selbst schmieden” (392) muss, wie es Penthesilea tut.

Erst im letzten Drittels des Buches verlagert sich der Fokus von Goethe auf Kafka und Brecht, denen gerade mal je ein Fünftel der Studie gewidmet ist. Eigentlich wäre dies eine separate Studie. Zum Beispiel wird nur für diesen Teil eine immerhin sechs Seiten lange tabellarische Gegenüberstellung texttypischer Merkmale bei Kafka und Brecht erstellt, die er “Stichpunkte gegenseitiger Abgrenzung” (671) nennt. Diese Gegenüberstellung gibt es für Goethe und Kleist nicht. Somit fällt an dieser Veröffentlichung eine gewisse Ungleichwichtigkeit auf, die für LeserInnen problematisch sein könnte.

In Sektion 2 des Buches werden die Argumentationsverläufe in Kafkas Proceß verfolgt, ohne dass irgendwelche Lesevergleiche vorgenommen werden. Es wird hier ein Denken in Gegensätzen und Widersprüchen erkannt und das antonyme Denken als innere Logik der Sinneszusammenhänge gesehen. Als kryptisch erscheinende Arbeitshypothese gilt diese Aussage: “Gegensätze ziehen sich an, vermischen sich und generieren einen Zustand der absoluten Stabilität.” (434) Es wird von einer Thematisierung des Verhältnisses zwischen “Mensch” und “Schuld” ausgegangen, einer persönlichen Schuld und der Schuld einfach Mensch zu sein. Das “konkrete Individuum,” Joseph K., stehe zwischen zwei Kraftfeldern, die diese zwei Schuldbegriffe vereinen müssen. K. stehe der “konkreten Menschenwelt des Gerichts” näher als der abstrakten Idee einer Schuld im platonischen Sinne. Kafkas Erzählstrategie baue auf Denkmuster durch eine Sinnkohärenz auf, die sich im Widerspruch zu den Erkenntnistatsachen der Leserschaft befindet.

In Sektion 3 wird Brechts *Dreigroschenroman* analysiert. Der Fokus liegt auf der Polly Peachum-Figur, durch die ein Verlaufsnetz des Romans geknüpft wird, das die Handlung organisiert. Strehlow findet bei Brecht eine umgekehrte Proportionalität von körperlicher Sinnlichkeit und Geschäftssinn. Hier werden zum Vergleich die Resultate des Kafka-Kapitels hinzugezogen. Es wird darauf hingewiesen, dass im Gegensatz zu Kafka Brecht den Widerspruch benutzt, was sich z.B. zeigt, wenn er die Figur des Coax im Roman als “verlogen, überkommen, ihren natürlichen ‘gesunden’ Bedürfnissen entfremdet” offenlegt. (595) Brecht stelle also mit

dem Instrumentarium des Widerspruchs die Figuren und ihre Verhältnisse als eine prinzipiell veränderbare Größe heraus. Während Kafka das auf Widersprüchen basierende Weltwissen angreift, entlarvt und attackiert Brecht das herrschende Geschehen.

In der tabellarischen Gegenüberstellung der texttypischen Merkmale bei Kafka und Brecht geht Strehlow davon aus, dass es sich bei Kafka um eine Poetologie einer Erschütterung des mentalen Lexikons handelt, da der Versuch zu erklären im Unerklärlichen enden müsse. Bei Brecht hingegen gäbe es eine Poetologie der Aufklärung. Bei ihm können Weltzusammenhänge erkannt werden; die Wahrheit ist konkret und Wissen ist Macht.

Zusammenfassend kann gesagt werden, dass Strehlow das in Goethes Frühwerken widergespiegelte, aufgeklärte und erkennbare Weltbild sowie die Emanzipation des Einzelnen durch Kleists Weltbild relativiert wird. Der Denkverlauf trifft hier auf Versehen, Unerkennbarkeit und die Unmöglichkeit konkretes Wissen zu erlangen. Damit verbindet die Studie gewissermaßen Goethe und Brecht als Pragmatiker, deren Texte Missstände erkennen und angehen können, sowie Kleist und Kafka als verzweifelt Suchende, da der Textverlauf ihrer Werke ein mögliches Wissen um die gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhänge negiere.

Helga W. Kraft

University of Illinois at Chicago

Günter Schütt, *Karl Kraus und sein Verhältnis zum (Ost-)Judentum*. Wien: Mandelbaum Verlag, 2017. 340 S.

Wie Karl Kraus' Verhältnis zum Judentum sei, wurde schon mehrfach diskutiert—nun nimmt sich mit Fokus auf das *Ostjudentum* Günter Schütt des Themas an. Dabei ist gleich vorweg anzumerken, und das tut Schütt auch, dass der Begriff selbst problematisch ist, sehr schnell flossen in der Geschichte höchst ungute Ressentiments und Wertungen in ihn ein, der zudem mit der nicht recht begründbaren Hypothese, das Judentum sei östlich (wovon?) anders, als es westlich (wovon?) sei, operiert.

Bekannt ist, dass Kraus Konvertit ist, bildungsbürgerlich sich assimilierte, gegen "die Verderbtheit 'jüdelnder' oder 'mauschelnder' Sprache jüdischer Journalisten" (10) Vorbehalte äußerte. Das ist nachweisbar, bis hin zu seinen Polemiken gegen Heine, die sich wie antisemitische Ausfälle jedenfalls zum

Teil lesen und zentral sind, wenn es um die Frage geht, ob hier in der Tat Kraus Antisemit ist, oder “subversive Strategien” (52) gerade gegen die antisemitische Propaganda in Stellung gebracht werden. Dabei müsste man wissen und zitieren, wie Kraus jenes *Jüdeln* und das Judentum nicht gleichsetzt. In der *Fackel* heißt es nämlich von einem, man zwingt ihn in der Redaktion der *Neuen Freien Presse* “zu jüdeln” und “beschneidet seine Artikel” (*Die Fackel*, Nr 341–42, 27.1.1912, 26), was zwar Stereotype des antisemitischen Diskurses gebraucht, aber eigentlich, um bestimmte Netzwerke zu bezeichnen, worin das Jüdische von Kraus zwar präsent und offenbar karikierbar erscheint, aber nicht der Grund für die von Kraus bezeichneten Missstände ist. Diese liegen in einer “Verhaberung,” wie man auf Wienerisch sagen würde, also im Nepotismus und dergleichen. Das *Jüdeln* wird so also Ausdruck einer mangelnden Sprachkultur, die er dem Judentum nicht nachsagt, oder allenfalls ihm wie allem, was ihn in seinem Brauchtum und seiner Unaufgeklärtheit stört. Schießt dabei Kraus übers Ziel hinaus? Gewiss, ungerecht ist er doppelt gegen Freud, wenn er formuliert, dass die “Psychoanalen jüdeln” (*Die Fackel*, Nr 649–56, 6.1924, 25), aber auch hier ist es wieder eine Stilkritik, sowieso ist es das, wenn Kraus dem passionierten Jäger Salten, der sich aber ins Wild einföhle und dieses sprechen lässt, ausrichten lässt, dass seine “Hasen jüdeln:” “Dieser Has [. . .] redet wie ein Buch, das im Zsolnay-Verlag erscheinen wird.” (*Die Fackel*, Nr 820–26, 10.1929, 46) Das geht gegen ein *empathisches Hasentum*, das durch die Sprache denunziert wird, als menschlich, aber dann unmenschlich menschlich, nicht universell, wie es Menschsein wäre—und das Lokalkolorit unterstreicht dies, wobei Kraus freilich blind für den Kontext ist, worin der diese Witze macht, und dann auch dafür, was kommen könnte und dann kam.

Es ist ein wenig erstaunlich, dass auf derlei Bezeichnendes Schütt lange nicht und nie hinreichend materialreich eingeht und stattdessen Studien von Beginn an zitiert, die zum Teil auf jene Probleme drängen, die es da gibt bzw. gäbe, die sich aber bei Schütt nicht erhellen. Stattdessen wird die “Journaille” sehr umfänglich beschrieben, gegen die es gehe, ohne jedoch das zu sagen, was man sich erwarten darf; generell liebt der Verfasser Umwege, aber manchmal sind es solche, die zudem nicht ans Ziel führen, und zwar auch nur irgendeines. Auf den prekären Essay *Heine und die Folgen* wartet man jedenfalls über 50 Seiten lang, obwohl er ein offensichtliches Epizentrum ist. Und eigentlich beantwortet der Verfasser die Frage dann nicht, sondern folgt Adornos Urteil bis zu Celans “adorno-kritische(r)” (56) Reaktion und deren Spiegel in der japanischen Germanistik.

Vieles bleibt dafür nur angedacht, etwa, ob Kraus' Wendung gegen die *jüdische* Publizistik vielleicht eine gegen jene, die allein "ebenbürtig" (49) war, sein mochte. Auch ist gerade das strikt *Nicht-Lokale* womöglich dem Jüdischen verbunden, die Bemühungen um eine Heimat in einer Sprache, die gegen Ressentiments des Orts so etwas wie ein universelles Recht stelle—und wo Judentum *Wien* meinte, oder *Berlin*, oder sonst einen Ort, und da war es wie dieser angreifbar, da stand also ein Jüdisches Erbe gegen Traditionen, die nicht jüdisch sein mussten.

Hier kommt Schütt zum Ostjudentum von Kraus, das also antisemitisch codiert sein mag, aber eigentümlich *unjüdisch* erscheint, wenn das Jüdische nicht mit Äußerlichkeiten gleichgesetzt wird, und dies kritisierte Kraus an den ahnungslosen Philosemiten, die da längst nicht mehr sind, was sie glauben. Bis zum Thema des Ostjudentums sind übrigens fast 70 Seiten verbraucht, ab Seite 114 wird es zu Kraus in Beziehung gesetzt. Aber eigentlich wird da dann etwa Soma Morgensterns Urteil zitiert, wonach mancher Vers Kraus' Himmler gefallen hätte:

Der Diener ist schon alt, als hätt' er viele Jahre
 schon Gott gedient, so sieht er in die fremde Zeit.
 Zehntausend Juden sind nicht wert dies eine, wahre,
 einfältige Gesicht voll Dienst und Dankbarkeit.
 (*Die Fackel*, Nr 406–12, 5.10.1915, 148)

Angesichts der Progrome mit einer halben Million ermordeten Juden wäre dieses Gedicht doppelt "belastend" (141), wäre es, wie Morgenstern meinte, nach 1919 entstanden, was allerdings nicht der Fall ist; hier irrte Morgenstern, dessen Fehler dennoch grundlos *in extenso* vorgetragen wird, weil Schütt es nicht so mit der Ökonomie der Darstellung hat. Hier folgt ein Abriss der Forschungsliteratur, bis—man höre und staune—auf Seite 214 (!) verheißen wird, nun solle es aber wirklich um die *Diskurse über "Ostjuden" in der "Fackel" gehen*. Und dann wird wieder verdienstvoll zusammengetragen, was so gesagt worden ist, wenig analytisch und ohne die Erarbeitung der Konstellation, das Buch hat stilistisch etwas von einer Obstipation, bis die "Zusammenfassung" (307) und das "Fazit" (319) getrennt auftreten. Im Fazit wird das Buch als "rudimentäre Annäherung" (323) bezeichnet, was Weiteres befürchten lässt, das noch folgen könnte, dann vielleicht mit einem Vorwort bis zur Bibliographie.

Schütt behandelt also das Thema wahrlich erschöpfend. Und doch bleibt zuviel unklar. Warum nicht gleich Karl Kraus selbst wieder lesen . . . ?

Martin Hainz
Universität Wien

Hugo Bettauer, *The Blue Stain: A Novel of a Racial Outcast*. Edited by Peter Höyng. Translated by Peter Höyng and Chauncey J. Mellor. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2017. 144 pp.

Hugo Bettauer, an author virtually unknown to the U.S., will see new appreciation with the recent translation of his novel *The Blue Stain: A Novel of a Racial Outcast*. Originally titled *Das blaue Mal: Der Roman eines Ausgestoßenen* and published in 1922, Peter Höyng and Chauncey J. Mellor's new and first translation of this book will make it more accessible to audiences in the English speaking-world. The translation of this novel arrives at a critical and relevant time particularly in the U.S., as the novel tells the story a half-white/half-black protagonist of Austrian and African-American descent and his life in various parts of the United States and Vienna. The novel offers crisp perspective during the U.S.'s ever-present crisis of racism and social injustice. Rather than nitpicking and fussing over the details of the translation, however, I will focus on the translators' note, the introduction, and the afterword, as these matter a great deal to those gaining access to Austrian literature without the benefit of the German language under their belt and therefore weigh heavily on the work's overall success.

Höyng and Mellor's notes on the translation process accurately explain how they rendered the novel into English but offer limited perspective behind some of their decisions. When explaining how to translate the interjection "Wehe," Höyng and Mellor assert that "possible dictionary translations for 'Wehe' were 'alack' and 'woe is me,' both of which sounded hopelessly stilted and obsolete, reminiscent of shallow melodrama, and out of character for Zeller. 'Good grief' was also rejected, because it evokes Charlie Brown's use of this stock phrase in *Peanuts* and the bemusement it conjures up. 'Good Gracious' showed up, but seemed a bit too pretentious, British, and possibly effeminate" (Höyng and Mellor, ix). For whom "Good Gracious" may seem pretentious, how the expression may seem too British, and why it would

sound too effeminate (or effeminate at all) remain unanswered. While I can appreciate any amount of constraints the translators may have had in writing their notes, their target audience seems to only be one that speaks English but not German. Dwelling on such *Kleinigkeiten* in their introduction diverts the reader's attention away from the text as a whole and down a rabbit hole on semantics and approximation. That said, the careful attention Höyng and Mellor gave to the work's title and the translation of pejorative language against African-Americans in the original and in the translation express the importance of the novel itself and could itself hardly be considered trivial.

Höyng's introduction gives the most thorough contextualization of the novel possible, guiding its readers through Bettauer's known biography and the historical milieu of the book and its author. Höyng notes that "*The Blue Stain* represents the first novel in German to address racism in the United States in the twentieth century" (xv), stressing an important part of the novel's position within the Austrian literary canon. He also emphasizes the important parallels made between Austria and the U.S. regarding race that converge in the novel, namely the "1867 law emancipating the Jews," when Jews "had been granted their civil rights" (xix, xiv). By stressing this historical event, Höyng draws attention to the parallels between institutional anti-Semitism in the Habsburg Empire and institutional racism against African-Americans in the U.S. While I think the historical similarities are a good place to start bringing these historical events into dialogue with one another, additional contextualization of *de jure* and *de facto* anti-Semitism in the Habsburg Empire before and after emancipation in 1867 would help the readers see the historical differences between the experiences of Jews in the Habsburg Empire and African-Americans in the U.S.

The more critical points made about Bettauer's novel can be found in Kenneth R. Janken's afterword. Although Janken asserts that "*The Blue Stain* shares many similarities with the race literature of the Harlem Renaissance produced by African-American authors," he notes that "it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Bettauer's novel [. . .] accepts the notions of the mass of African-Americans as imbecilic, unaware, self-hating, and fundamentally different from other human beings" (136, 141). While some may want to disregard Janken's comment here for any number of reasons (he was a product of his time, his firsthand experience with African-Americans was not without its limitations, etc.), but this critical perspective is still important to consider when jumping into this novel, especially while teaching it in the classroom.

However, Janke also concludes that “this novel is an anti-racist document worthy of an audience” (144) and overall, I am inclined to agree. The work offers marvelous opportunities in today’s “German Literature in Translation” courses, especially for those who wish to explore vast and complex dialogues between Austria and the world at large, while also coming close to home for many American readers, who will find the topics raised by the novel very relevant to the events surrounding them here and now.

Adam J. Toth
Ball State University

Vreni Amsler, *Veza Canetti im Kontext des Austromarxismus*. Würzburger Wissenschaftliche Schriften 869. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2017. 400 pp.

Veza Canetti (née Taubner-Calderon) was born to Jewish parents in Vienna in 1897, at the height of the cultural extravagance of the *fin de siècle*. She completed her education in the midst of the First World War, whose armistice left Vienna the grand capital of a rump state, stripped of its territories, its crown, and its self-narrative. Yet within months of the war’s end a set of young leftist intellectuals had embraced this loss of imperial prominence, proposing radical solutions to the state’s social and cultural ills. By the middle of the 1920s Veza Canetti had become a prominent member of that circle, a Marxist-inspired intellectual avant-garde that believed that poetry, novels, and polemical essays could shape a different, more humane future for Europe. Over the course of the interwar period, Canetti became the friend, confidant, co-writer, and amanuensis to some of the canonical figures of interwar Viennese culture: Karl Kraus (1874–1936), Hermann Broch (1886–1951), and Anna Mahler (1904–1988), to name just a few, as well as the man who eventually became her husband, Elias Canetti (1905–1994). Though her memory has largely been eclipsed by that of her more prominent interlocutors, Canetti was herself a prolific and versatile writer, composing (often under a variety of pseudonyms) essays, short stories, poems, novels, and translations: “Veza Canetti hat sich in ihren Erzählungen, Theaterstücken und Romanen nicht nur mit den verschiedenen zeittypischen literarischen und künstlerischen Strömungen wie *Neue Sachlichkeit* auseinandergesetzt, sondern sich auch intensiv mit vergangenen Epochen wie der *Wiener Moderne*” (9). Some of the-

se works appeared in her lifetime, primarily in the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, Vienna's socialist daily. But many more remained unpublished, resurfacing only in the opening decades of the twenty-first century, long after her death in London in 1963.

In her new book *Veza Canetti im Kontext des Austromarxismus*, Vreni Amsler seeks to reconstruct the role that Canetti's writings played in the Marxist-inspired circles of interwar Vienna. Those seeking a more comprehensive biography of Canetti's life and relationships should turn to Julian Preece's *The Rediscovered Writings of Veza Canetti*. Amsler points interested readers toward this and other, more biographical literature on Canetti, but Amsler's book is decidedly more focused. In this volume, Amsler attempts a new critique of the literature of "Red Vienna," asking the specific question: How might our understanding of interwar Viennese socialist culture change by including in our readings the work of Veza Canetti? The answer is, wonderfully, a great deal. For example, after a thirty-page intertextual reading of the works of Canetti and Broch, Amsler writes: "Dieser kurze Abriss der intertextuellen Bezüge zwischen den Texten von Veza Canetti und Hermann Broch bildet nur die Spitze des Eisberges. Eine vertiefte Auseinandersetzung—ganz im Sinne der Interdiskurses—könnte einiges an gesellschaftspolitisch Relevantem zu Tage fördern" (243).

These sorts of close readings—which Amsler conducts with depth and clarity—between Canetti and nearly a dozen other interwar Viennese writers and artists are the real triumph of the book. Amsler organizes these exegeses along two intersecting narrative axes: larger intellectual themes that both contextualized and compelled Canetti's work and particular literary personalities with whom Canetti was either closely aligned or with whose work hers was intimately engaged. Often, these come together in a single section, such as during Amsler's discussion of the writings of Canetti and Alice Rühle-Gerstel (1894–1943) or in the chapter on "Austro-Marxist Literary Theory," about Canetti and Ernst Fischer (1899–1972). (As much as is possible with the relevant sources, Amsler provides an important gender balance in her choice of subjects throughout the book.)

Many readers will find this book both useful and insightful. First, Amsler is systematic in her analysis of Canetti's literary works. A scholar who finds herself wanting a first-take exegesis of a particular Canetti story or essay should turn immediately to these pages. Second, through painstaking literary comparison, Amsler has successfully demonstrated that Veza Canetti was

not merely a secondary figure in the circle of the interwar Austrian Marxist intelligentsia but was rather a highly influential figure whose writings and ideas impacted every aspect of its development. Finally, Amsler provides a remarkably rich set of appendices, providing archival and bibliographical information for all of Canetti's known works, organized by location, language, and intellectual network. These pages alone constitute a fine bit of historical bibliographical scholarship.

For this reader, the major weakness of the book is also its strength. Amsler does not set out to provide a political or social history of interwar Vienna, nor does she engage at length with larger theoretical questions about such things as German-Jewish identity and culture. (It would have given this volume somewhat more purchase outside of its subfield had it dealt at greater theoretical length—separate from its occurrence in particular writings—with the question of Jewish identity in interwar Vienna.) Future readers of this volume will also need to be familiar with the basic outlines of interwar Austrian and German history and very likely also the works of Elias Canetti. (Even with the growing awareness of Veza's writings, Elias's name will still be the first point of recognition for many readers.) These absences make the book less useful for undergraduate students or for more diverse academic audiences familiar with German literature of other periods. But on measure they are a strength, as they allow Amsler the space to give a deep and synthetic account of Veza Canetti's remarkable body of work and its wide influence. Amsler has contributed a piece of scholarship that will make any future discussion of interwar Viennese culture much richer.

Samuel J. Kessler

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Günter Bischof and Hans Petschar, *The Marshall Plan—Saving Europe Rebuilding Austria: The European Recovery Program—The ERP Fund—The Austrian Marshall Plan Foundation*. Vienna: Christian Brandstätter Verlag, 2017. 333 pp.

Seventy years ago, the American secretary of state, George Marshall, gave a speech that would have a profound impact on both the U.S. and Western Europe. This address would lead to the creation of the Marshall Plan, a vast program for rebuilding postwar Europe and an important milestone in the de-

veloping Cold War. In recognition of the anniversary of that address, Günter Bischof and Hans Petschar have produced a massive text examining the impact of Marshall Plan programs on Austria. This is a large, glossy book with many high-quality photographs. On the surface, this might seem like an odd choice; the Marshall Plan was a U.S. government program and typically we do not think of economic policy as the most photogenic topic, but in this case the outcome of the program is eminently visual. Bischof and Petschar begin, logically, with images of Austria in 1945, showing the destruction left after the war, and then they illustrate the earliest programs to aid Europe in the post-war period, such as the distribution of CARE packages. The focus then shifts to depicting the most prominent figures in the creation of the Marshall Plan, including Secretary of State George Marshall, whose 1947 speech at Harvard University laid the foundation for the program that would eventually bear his name. Marshall recognized that it was in the United States' interest to invest in the rebuilding of Europe and that reconstruction had been hampered by infighting between the Allies. His Harvard commencement speech marked the beginning of a major project, but there were still hurdles to be overcome.

Austria, perhaps more than any other country in postwar Europe, exemplified those barriers to rebuilding. Most countries fell clearly into the sphere of interest of either the Americans or the Soviets. Some, such as Yugoslavia, followed a more independent path, but they were exceptional. Germany, while jointly occupied, was increasingly divided by occupation zones and would soon become two independent countries. Austria is the only place where all four Allied powers were present and where the country was not sharply divided by that occupation. It was because of this proximity to the Soviets that Austria argued to the Americans that they constituted a "special case." As Bischof and Petschar note, the Austrian government explicitly said that their case was unique in that they had lost the ability to trade with their Eastern neighbors. This view of Austria as exceptional regarding the Marshall Plan is consistent with the overall view of postwar Austrian governments. There was a near-consensus among Austrian politicians that they were the first victims of Nazism, that the Soviets were using the occupation to achieve retribution for the war, and that the Western Allies, led by the United States, were moving too slowly to rebuild an independent Republic of Austria.

The government of Leopold Figl was eager to sign on to the Marshall Plan, but not everyone involved in Austrian politics shared their enthusiasm for working closely with the Americans. Bischof and Petschar show that

Austrian Communists resisted the idea of the Marshall Plan, arguing that it would allow the United States to dominate the Austrian economy and ultimately undermine the country's independence. Communists within Austria joined the Soviets in denouncing the plan and focused their attention on undermining it.

The Marshall Plan, of course, varied depending on which of the sixteen countries in the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, or OEEC, one focuses on, and Austria was arguably one of the countries most transformed by the program. Initially the Marshall Plan supported the rebuilding of heavy industries, such as the United Austrian Iron and Steel Works, known in Austria as VÖEST. Later, the tourism industry benefited from Marshall Plan money. As the authors note, initially government officials were reticent to invest in tourism as the era of mass travel had not yet begun, but the idea of using American money to build an industry that would see not just European travelers come together in Austria but also Americans, who would serve as "ambassadors of Americanization" (167), was appealing in the midst of the by now well established Cold War. This emphasis on tourism as a means toward greater European integration represents one of the themes running through the book. The authors show how the various programs created around the Marshall Plan were intended not just to rebuild independent nation states but also to create connections between those countries as well as with the United States. In many respects, the political history of postwar Western Europe is about the interconnectedness of nations, and Bischof and Petschar show that Austria's experience with the Marshall Plan was one important step toward their integration into a united Europe.

Overall, this book is a welcome addition to scholarship on postwar Austria. The authors have gone into great detail on the subject of the Marshall Plan and showed the many ways in which this American program transformed the struggling economies of Europe, eventually fostering cooperation between Western European nation-states. The pictures that Bischof and Petschar have included are interesting and provide additional support for their thesis of transformation. I would recommend this book to anyone who is interested in the political history of the Republic of Austria or the economic development of postwar Western Europe.

Laura A. Detre
West Chester University

Pia Janke and Teresa Kovacs, Hrsg., *Schreiben als Widerstand. Elfriede Jelinek & Herta Müller. Diskurse.Kontexte.Impulse*. Publikationen des Elfriede Jelinek-Forschungszentrums 15. Wien: Praesens, 2017. 504 S.

In ihrer Essaysammlung *Der König verneigt sich und tötet* beharrt Herta Müller darauf, dass Sprache “zu keiner Zeit ein unpolitisches Gehege [war und ist].” Folgerichtig konzentriert sich der von Pia Janke und Teresa Kovacs herausgegebene Sammelband *Schreiben als Widerstand. Elfriede Jelinek & Herta Müller* auf die politischen und oppositionellen Aspekte hinsichtlich des Gesamtwerks der beiden Nobelpreisträgerinnen. Als Resultat dreier Symposien (Bukarest–Wien–Temeswar) mit jeweils unterschiedlicher Schwerpunktsetzung erweist sich der Band als materialreiches Konvolut nicht nur für jene LeserInnen, die sich mit Werk und Person der beiden Schriftstellerinnen befassen wollen, sondern auch für jene, die sich für diverse Aspekte österreichischer bzw. rumänischer Zeitgeschichte und Politik nach 1945 interessieren.

Auf die Einleitung, in der die Herausgeberinnen auf wenigen Seiten das Programm, den wissenschaftlichen Anspruch sowie die grobe Gliederung des Bandes skizzieren, folgt erfreulicherweise ein Intro-Kapitel, in dem die Stockholmer Nobelpreisreden beider Autorinnen dem Band als “poetologische Grundsatztexte” (11) vorangestellt werden. Auf diese Weise lassen sich höchst überzeugend sowohl die Gemeinsamkeiten als auch die (maßgeblichen) Unterschiede zwischen den Poetologien der beiden Schriftstellerinnen veranschaulichen, ohne dass die prominenten Texte einer Kommentierung von dritter Seite bedürften. In sieben umfangreichen Sektionen setzen sich daran anschließend zahlreiche LiteraturwissenschaftlerInnen und HistorikerInnen, aber auch SchriftstellerInnen wie etwa Ruth Klüger oder Robert Schindel, TheatermacherInnen wie beispielsweise Michael Thalheimer oder Rita Thiele, aber auch SchauspielerInnen wie Andrea Eckert und Sylvie Rohrer mit Leben und Werk der beiden sprachmächtigen Autorinnen auseinander. Auf diese Weise entkommt der Band einer streng literaturwissenschaftlichen Ausrichtung, bietet den LeserInnen stattdessen eine Polyphonie der Stimmen und Meinungen an, wodurch ein sehr viel facettenreicheres Bild der beiden Autorschaften entsteht. Dies trifft auch auf das Verhältnis der einzelnen Sektionen zueinander zu: Die ersten beiden großen Kapitel mit Schwerpunkt auf “Politische Kontexte” sowie das Verhältnis “Österreich–Rumänien” befassen sich ausführlich mit dem zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund zu den jeweils vorherrschenden politischen

Systemen und Umbrüchen in Österreich bzw. Rumänien und reichen von einer fundierten “vergleichende[n] historische[n] Analyse der Entwicklung von Diktaturen” (37), wie sie beispielsweise Oliver Rathkolb vornimmt, bis zur erschreckend aktuellen Darstellung der in Österreich nach 1945 beinahe ungebrochen fortbestehenden Verbreitung nationalsozialistischen Gedankenguts, wie Thomas Schmidinger ausführt. Anton Sterbling und Roman Hutter konzentrieren sich hingegen in ihren aufschlussreichen Beiträgen auf Rumänien und den zeitgeschichtlichen Entwicklungskontext, der zwischen “Prager Frühling” und kommunistischer Diktatur angesiedelt ist, sowie auf die komplexe Problematik des Rumäniendeutschen. Das Anliegen, nicht nur die Kontraste, sondern darüber hinaus auch die Verbindungslinien zwischen den Herkunftsländern der beiden Nobelpreisträgerinnen aufzuzeigen, ist durchaus legitim und mündet in Karin Cervenkas essayistischem Beitrag “Wien Bukarest retour?” in eine Darstellung, die beinahe etwas von dem “fremden Blick” hat, wie Herta Müller ihn beschreibt. Weniger überzeugend, auch weil die ästhetischen Bezugspunkte zur Thematik des Bandes zusehends in den Hintergrund treten, ist dagegen der Versuch, die österreichisch-rumänischen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen oder die Austausch- und Vermittlungsprogramme in die Diskussion zu integrieren—so relevant diese für einen grenzüberschreitenden Dialog auch sein mögen.

In der vierten Sektion werden anhand von Schlagwörtern wie “Sprache. Politik.Subversion” die Schreibverfahren von Jelinek und Müller eingehender betrachtet. Als besonders ergiebig erweisen sich hierbei Konzepte des “Widerständigen Schreibens” (Teresa Kovacs) oder des “Widersprechens” (Christa Gürtler/Maria Sass). Letzteres erlaubt es den Diskutantinnen, die zwei Autorinnen auf erhellende Art und Weise in ihrem jeweiligen literarischen Kontext bzw. der sie umgebenden Literaturszene in Österreich/Rumänien zu verorten, während Kovacs ihrem kenntnisreichen Artikel das Prinzip der Subversion zugrunde legt und nach “Formen der Unordnung” (237) sowie nach Leerstellen und neuen Sprachordnungen fragt. Kritisch hinterfragen ließe sich hierbei die Wahl der Definition von Dissens, die sich sicherlich noch verfeinern ließe. Dies schmälert jedoch nicht die Bedeutung des Beitrags, der aufzeigt, dass eine wesentliche Gemeinsamkeit zwischen Jelinek und Müller im Insistieren auf das “beständige Da-Sein von vermeintlich Vergangenen” (244) besteht. Auch die Artikel von Isolde Charim und Graziella Predoiu konzentrieren sich auf die Spielarten des Politischen: Charim situiert beide Autorinnen überzeugend im

Spannungsfeld von politischer Poetikstrategie (Müller) auf der einen und poetischer Politikstrategie (Jelinek) auf der anderen Seite, während Predoiu sich im Detail mit diversen Ausgrenzungsmechanismen sowie gemeinsamen sprachlichen Verfahren wie Collage, Sinnverschiebung oder Deformation befasst. Dem für das Werk beider Autorinnen grundlegenden Komplex von “Totalitarismus und Repression” ist die fünfte Sektion gewidmet, die von Ruth Klüger eröffnet wird. Mit Blick sowohl auf die Essays als auch die Collagen und das Prosawerk von Herta Müller gelingt es Klüger, auf bestechende Art und Weise das Idiosynkratische an deren Werk herauszuarbeiten. Dagegen erscheinen die Ergebnisse der in dieser Sektion angesiedelten Diskussionsrunden weniger verdichtet, da sie übergreifende Themen wie Politik oder Diktatur eher präzise einkreisen.

Ergänzt und komplettiert wird die umfangreiche Publikation durch eine dem Buch beigelegte Audio-CD, auf der insgesamt elf der regelmäßig zitierten politischen Texte der Autorinnen (gelesen von Sylvie Rohrer und Andrea Eckert) nachzuhören sind, wodurch der rote Faden des Politischen, der sich durch sämtliche Beiträge zieht, nicht nur noch deutlicher zu sehen, sondern in der Tat auch (nach) zu hören ist.

Der den Band von Janke und Kovacs auszeichnende Materialreichtum sowie die Zusammenführung zahlreicher SpezialistInnen aus unterschiedlichen Disziplinen bringt trotz aller Vorzüge auch gewisse Redundanzen bzw. Wiederholungen mit sich, insbesondere mit Blick auf die übergreifende Frage nach den politischen Dimensionen im Werk der beiden Nobelpreisträgerinnen, was allerdings nur demjenigen ins Auge sticht, der den Band komplett gelesen hat. Festhalten lässt sich in jedem Fall, dass Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler, die sich in Zukunft mit dem Werk und/oder der Person von Elfriede Jelinek bzw. Herta Müller befassen wollen, nicht an der Lektüre dieses breit angelegten Tagungsbandes herumkommen werden.

Irina Hron

Stockholm University/University of Vienna

Mirjam Bitter, *Gedächtnis und Geschlecht: Darstellungen in der neueren jüdischen Literatur in Deutschland, Österreich und Italien*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2016. 584 pp.

Mirjam Bitter's ambitious study of the interconnectedness between memory and gender in contemporary Jewish Austrian, German, and Italian litera-

ture promises to address a number of compelling questions: How is memory represented in literary texts at the end of the millennium and inflected by gender, and to what extent do the metaphors, genres, media, and modes that articulate memory reflect or transform gender identity? For, as she reminds us throughout her study, the question of *who* is engaged in the processes of remembering is always directly related to *what*, and *who* is remembered as well as the modes and genres in which memory is articulated. Indeed, the premise for her study is that memory and gender are intricately intertwined; they inform one another in their (re)constructedness. She demonstrates this persuasively in close readings of eleven novels published between 1988 and 2010 that demonstrate the interdependence of memory and gender paradigmatically as they engage in the construction of contemporary Jewish identity: the novels include Massimiliano Boni's *La parola ritrovata* (Die wiedergefundene Sprache, 2006); Esther Dischereit's *Joemis Tisch*; Elena Loewenthal's *Attese* (Wartezeit/Erwartungen, 2004); Gila Lustiger's *So sind wir* (2005); Eva Menasse's *Vienna* (2005); Robert Menasse's *Die Vertreibung aus der Hölle* (2001); Alessandro Piperno's *Con le peggiori intenzioni* (Mit bösen Absichten, 2006); Doron Rabinovici's *Suche nach M.* (1997) and *Ohnehin* (2004); Robert Schindel's *Gebürtig* (1992); and Benjamin Stein's *Die Leinwand* (2010).

Bitter prepares the terrain for her discussion of memory, history, and the construction of Jewish and gender identities in the novels with a comprehensive analysis of theoretical work by memory scholars sensitive to gender and (Jewish) identity construction. She successfully situates her own transnational analysis of the intersection of gender and memory in new fiction by Jewish-identified writers born after 1945 within a broad interdisciplinary discussion. She argues convincingly that since Austria, Germany, and Italy all have fascist pasts and all three countries belonged to Western Europe, it is productive to take a transnational literary approach. She embraces Ulrich Beck's understanding of transnationality and emphasizes an approach that does not negate national particularities but, in its function as a "Querbegriff zum Nationalen" (495), allows for cross-cultural comparisons that enhance our understanding of the construction of memory and gender.

In her transnational study of gender, memory, and the construction of Jewish identity, Bitter carefully interrogates a series of relationships traditionally considered dichotomous, i.e. memory vs. history, private vs. public spheres of remembering, familial vs. collective memory, emphasizing that, as cultural constructs, they reflect gendered valences. She identifies how the novels undermine and transform this dichotomous perception of memory and identi-

ty. Gender represents a performative, relational, and interdependent category of analysis for her.

Bitter's transnational study of the interdependence of memory and gender is organized organically rather than chronologically. While the study reads, at times, like a dissertation because there is a fair amount of repetition, her strategy of pairing literary texts according to thematic preoccupations and not necessarily along national lines and examining how each of the texts "does gender and memory" (110) is very effective. She launches her sequence of comparative close readings with a sophisticated analysis of Doron Rabinovici's *Ohnehin* and Schindel's *Gebürtig*, both examples of a "Poetik der Zeitgenossenschaft" (114). Particularly compelling is her analysis of the way repetition as trope in *Ohnehin* and, to a lesser extent, in *Gebürtig* shapes the narratives and concurrently reveals how the construction of memory and gender relies on and is structured by repetition. She also explores the novels' complex play with masquerade as a literary motif, another frequent trope that allows gender, the technologies of both individual and collective memory, and Jewish identity to be "unmasked" and deconstructed.

In contrast to the two male-authored "soziobiographischen Erinnerungsromanen," Bitter identifies Eva Menasse's and Gila Lustiger's literary fictions as "autobiographische Erinnerungsromane." In her comparison of these two family chronicles customarily read as "Vaterbücher," Bitter focuses on the way each interrogates the articulations and value of memory work (also about the Shoah), and how both are contingent on specific spheres, i.e. private familial contexts, and genres, i.e. autobiographical or oral media or modes of communication, all of which are consciously or unconsciously always also informed by gender. Bitter identifies a number of specific instances where both writers evoke and then transform the traditionally dichotomous gendered understanding of memory and history into a self-consciously "zwitterige" genre, (Lustiger 245) "familial historiography" or counter-memory (201).

In the third set of close readings, a comparison of Dischereit's *Joemis Tisch* and R. Menasse's *Die Vertreibung aus der Hölle*, Bitter focuses on the body both as the locus of memories and as a cultural category of analysis. Although memory is usually a mental act, literary texts, Bitter reminds us, often use the traumatized body as a metaphor through which repressed and inarticulate memory can be visualized and processed. Bitter finds significant how Dischereit stages Jewishness and "Weiblichkeit" in terms of bodily mar-

kings that each convey experiences of domination and persecution. While Dischereit's anxiety in *Joemis Tisch* that female suffering might distract from a more universal Jewish suffering leads her to reinscribe a gender hierarchy, the ambivalent and even grotesque staging of the botched male circumcision in Menasse's *Vertreibung* by contrast destabilizes any definite inscription of Jewish or male identity, thereby undermining the consolidation of patriarchal privilege.

The fourth and final set of comparative literary analyses deals more concretely with the use of specific gendered metaphors to represent and illustrate the structure and function of memory in literature. Bitter contrasts two metaphors that are particularly relevant within the transnational corpus of novels in which the memory of the Shoah figures either overtly or indirectly and emphasizes how these metaphors have traditionally been gender-coded: the (male) canvas and the (female) veil. She argues that all the protagonists in the novels of Stein, Rabinovici, Piperno, and Boni, "men in crisis" because their masculinity is called into question by their "inherited victim identity" as Jews, in their unique way use the canvas or painting(s) metaphorically as "memory screens" that serve as layered surfaces of projection by which they can process and ultimately reinvent both their masculine and Jewish identities. By contrast, Bitter finds Elena Lowenthal's use of the veil as a female-centric "Gedächtnismetapher" by which forgetting and remembering are interwoven, particularly compelling.

Bitter concludes that media and modes of memory are not invariably inflected by gender although they have the power to reinscribe gender norms and hierarchies. Certainly, the novels in her study tend to invoke traditional gender-coded narrative forms and metaphors with regard to memory although they also transform the category of gender into a means that illustrates and disturbs the power differential prevalent in contemporary memory discourse. She ends her fascinating study with a call for further study of how contemporary fictional narratives "queer" stable gender identities and thereby challenge and expand current forms of memory and commemoration, specifically in relation to the Shoah. The comprehensive bibliography of primary and secondary texts in the appendix is an added bonus for scholars of memory, Jewish-German literary, and gender studies.

Christina Guenther
Bowling Green State University

Michael Boehringer, Allison Cattell, and Belinda Kleinhans, eds., *Belief Systems in Austrian Literature, Thought, and Culture*. Vienna: Praesens, 2017. 260 pp.

This richly varied collection of essays, based on papers delivered in 2013 at the University of Waterloo, ranges informatively across a number of disciplines related to literature and other aspects of Austrian identity. The title, *Belief Systems*, is broad enough to compass architecture, hagiography, politics, feminist studies, opera, and examinations of the periphery in its influence on the center. The main forebear for studies of belief systems is historian Friedrich Heer—here invoked more than once—who explored the many cultural bases (politics, religion, literature) on which Austrians ground their identity in controversial studies such as *Der Kampf um die österreichische Identität* and *Der Glaube des Adolf Hitler*. The editors provide a very helpful listing of general works on the subject (17).

Collections like these are all the more valuable since opportunities for publication have dwindled in the English-speaking world. It is disheartening to note how trade presses and university imprints alike have yielded to market forces, repackaging narrow, politically correct platitudes about gender studies or class or race. A structural or historical study, an examination based on aesthetics, a close reading—these hardly stand a chance any more. On the other hand, smaller, serviceable European presses like Praesens Verlag, the publisher of this volume, have often benefited from subsidies that make it possible to preserve relatively ephemeral material—like conference proceedings—whose survival might otherwise not be guaranteed.

Even topics that could by nature be ideologically skewed are preserved from narrow vision by the scholarly vigor of their treatment. Dagmar Lorenz, for example, in “The Struggle of Ideologies: The Defeat of Socialist Feminism in 1930s Vienna as Reflected in Veza Canetti’s Fiction” (175–93), founds her research on meticulous examination of primary sources and treats the issue with balance, illuminating the extent to which Canetti both “wrote from the headlines” but shaped her fiction into self-contained entities. Likewise, Sarah Painitz (“A *Neue Frau?*: Women in Austria during the First Republic,” 152–74), under the heading of “*Weib, Frau* or *Mensch*” (162–65), sketches the discrepancy between the glamour of women’s lives as depicted in popular novels and the harsher reality confronting working women. Having once published on women as redeeming characters in Hofmannsthal’s libretti, the

present reviewer was especially persuaded by Kathleen Hulley's examination of "Women as Muse, Women as Music in *Fin-de-Siècle* Viennese Opera: Female Sexuality as Inspiration in Franz Schreker's *Der ferne Klang*" (108–28), which reveals the ambiguity of Grete as muse who both inspires and thwarts creativity. A general examination of the trope of the Muse in Vienna around 1900 (inevitably, Alma Mahler-Werfel takes center stage) is followed by a close analysis of the tensions in Schreker's libretto.

A history of the uses to which religious impulses (very literally a "belief system") can be put is found in Kerstin S. Jobst's provocative "Making Politics with Saints: The Initialization of the Josaphat-Kuntsevych Cult in the Habsburg Monarchy (1860s–1918)" (18–36). Malleable because of what Jobst calls his "globality" (Orthodox and Roman Catholics alike venerated him; he had a large following in Poland and Ukraine, even in Brazil), Josaphat "could not easily be instrumentalized" (19) along nationalistic lines, but his very adaptability has always made him a convenient screen on which to project assorted fervors.

Single-author studies examine Austrian belief systems from a fascinating multiplicity of approaches. Marie Kolkenbrock traces the function of stereotypes about destiny or fate in several of Schnitzler's works that center on negative perceptions of Jews and Jewishness (85–107). Doris McGonagill parallels the banishment of Ovid in Christoph Ransmayr's novel *Die letzte Welt* to binary views of such imperial configurations as East and West, center and periphery, regime-upholding religion and menacing cultism (194–215); memory, identity, and narrative are the three vehicles of apprehending binaries. Liminality, the space or energy where times, places, and identities overlap, is the dynamic that enables negotiation of the binary in Vladimir Vertlib's novel *Schimons Schweigen*, as analyzed by Michael Boehringer (232–57); the concept of a unified "self" is shown by Vertlib to be a fiction or a construct. Illness is not only a metaphor; it is also a full identity proceeding from belief systems about the individual self in relation to the environment. Daniela Roth adapts the insights of Susan Sontag to Cornelia Travnicek's novel *Chucks*, in which cancer and AIDS are belief systems.

Related to McGonagill's analysis of Ransmayr is Nicole McInteer's article "Mit ihren politischen Neigungen: Sacher-Masoch, Franzos, and Roth" (37–62) about the vibrancy of outlying regions in renewing the center. Drawing on recent research by Pieter Judson and Tara Zahra, McInteer argues that nationalism was nowhere close to being a dividing factor in the old Empire and

that language was much more unifying than has been previously thought. In an article about two authors, Belinda Kleinhaus shows how images of animals in Franz Kafka and Ilse Aichinger reveal the modern crisis of language and meaning (129–51), and Robert Dassanowsky provides an insightful study of belief systems expressed through architecture in paralleling Ringstrasse and Jugendstil buildings to Baroque structures in the service of Catholic belief (63–84).

Small houses like Praesens cannot afford copyeditors, so that work must fall on the volume's editors. This volume is good enough to survive its irritating sloppiness—misspellings and punctuation bloopers, parenthetical reference to sources not in the list of works cited. And some of the writing contains primitive gaffes like howlingly misplaced and precariously dangling modifiers, in addition to being plagued by trendy jargon (“teased out,” “unpacking”) that has long since grown tedious. While these lapses indeed mar the book, its content is nonetheless very strong.

Vincent Kling
La Salle University

Cathy S. Gelbin and Sander L. Gilman, *Cosmopolitanisms and the Jews*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2017. 352 pp.

As the authors of this study, two prominent cultural historians and scholars of literature, Cathy Gelbin and Sander Gilman, maintain, the uses and assessments of the term *cosmopolitanism* have undergone significant changes over time in the context of different ideologies and movements. Idealized during the Enlightenment, the ideals of universal humanity, brotherhood of men, or world citizenship were increasingly drawn into question with the rising acceptance of national and racist paradigms. Unsurprisingly, the key representatives of pre-Nazi cosmopolitanism featured in this study, Stefan Zweig and Joseph Roth, were sons of the multinational Habsburg Empire, and like Lion Feuchtwanger, a native of Munich, they were Jewish. In recent critical debates cosmopolitanism has been revisited in the realization that the preferred terms of the late twentieth century, multiculturalism, internationalism, and transculturalism, failed to address the entire spectrum of cosmopolitanism. In establishing the range of these and related terminologies, Gelbin and Gilman trace *cosmopolitanism* from its Greek origins through the centuries to differentiate it from other key concepts of modern and postmodern discussi-

ons on exile, migration, and “nomadism.” In the course of their undertaking, a panorama of literary authors and critics, philosophers, and historians unfolds, from Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Immanuel Kant to George Mosse, Wladimir Kaminer, and Lena Gorelik. By establishing links between this plethora of authors and associating them with expressions of cosmopolitanism, by critically examining the variety of these European cosmopolitanisms, the book represents a major scholarly contribution and a platform for further study.

The word *cosmopolitanisms* in the title points at the complexities of the subject matter and the conceptual layers evoke notions of cultural identity and positionality. These complexities include the divergent histories of post-Enlightenment urban cultures, notably Vienna, Berlin, and Prague. In the outset, Gelbin and Gilman review past and present controversies on cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitans in different cultural spheres and eras. Underlying their story of cosmopolitanisms, cultural historical narratives are established that support the study’s internal structure. Generally, *Cosmopolitanisms and the Jews* follows chronological lines with special emphases placed at important historical junctures, most prominently the time of the First World War and the interwar period in whose setting the rise of extreme nationalism, peace movements, and a politicized cosmopolitanism emerged in tandem with the economic and ideological struggles of the 1920s and 1930s. Gelbin and Gilman furthermore examine issues of internal and external positioning and identification that inform the ambivalent concept of Jewish cosmopolitanism in non-Jewish writing, and, conversely, cosmopolitan mobility as an inherent organizational principle in the Jewish imaginary in response to pressures and constraints emanating from the dominant societies. The study furthermore examines exemplary historical and contemporary texts in detail, testing the quality and validity of concepts of cosmopolitanisms and delineating conditions that produce varieties of cosmopolitan expression.

Rather than offering handy definitions of cosmopolitanism (cosmopolitanisms), the book allows an understanding of these phenomena to arise from a judicious selection of literature and critical works. Thus, Gelbin and Gilman shed light on the evolution of the controversial concept of Jewish cosmopolitanism by non-Jews from the eighteenth to the twenty-first century. Pertinent texts and theories are presented through the lenses of cultural theory, history, and literary studies in a multileveled approach that provi-

des *Cosmopolitanisms and the Jews* with the very sense of mobility the subject matter implies—the approach of the study reproduces the fluctuations of the cosmopolitanisms it discusses.

Gelbin's and Gilman's intellectual interlocutors and witnesses include historical giants such as Moses Mendelssohn, Franz Kafka, and Thomas Mann as well as lesser-known figures such as Ephraim Kuh and Berthold Auerbach. Their study also dialogues with modernist and postmodernist thinkers such as Walter Benjamin, Siegfried Kracauer, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Kwame Anthony Appiah, and Edward Said and contemporary authors whose critical insights validate the need for renewed attention to the concept of cosmopolitanism. Gelbin's and Gilman's critical readings of literary texts, contextualized with material from other disciplines, proceed in an interdisciplinary mode and contain observations about the social, political, and biographical situation of the authors I question. Thus, they document the quality of cosmopolitanism embraced by individuals and groups of authors from multiple sources. Jewish authors such as Zweig, Roth, or Feuchtwanger are foregrounded with non-Jewish writers as contrast figures, e.g., Lessing and Mann, who configured Jewish characters as cosmopolitans *par excellence*—favorably but with the implication of otherness. Veit Harlan's propaganda film *Jud Süß* epitomizes the repurposing of Lessing's idealized Jewish cosmopolitan under National Socialism, vilifying mobility and "world citizenship."

Cosmopolitanisms and the Jews uncovers the ambivalence of cosmopolitanism attributed to Jewish figures even in well-intentioned post-Enlightenment texts, in contrast to the cosmopolitanism integral to and expressed in writings emerging from the Jewish experience and relating to Jewish identity. Gelbin and Gilman compellingly reintroduce the concept of cosmopolitanism into the critical discourse as an element that was missing in earlier critical conversations about cultures in contact, nomadism, internationalism, and multi- and transculturalism, all of them relevant but not specific to the Jewish condition and experience. Closely relating to the displacements and migration in today's world, the erudite narrative this study presents centers on the long-neglected concept of cosmopolitanism, showing that it has the potential to lend specificity to and invigorate the discourse on the global condition. The book will be an indispensable resource for scholars and students in the humanities and literature, and it will provide fascinating insights to a general readership interested in European Jewish culture and history.

Dagmar C. G. Lorenz

University of Illinois at Chicago

Herbert Zeman, ed., *Bio-Bibliographisches Lexikon der Literatur Österreichs*. Vol. 2 (Bi–C). Freiburg: Rombach, 2016. 526 pp.

Browsing in reference books for the sheer pleasure of drifting from topic to topic with no immediate aim often has to be set aside under the pressure of deadlines and due dates, but only by unhurried rumination through this volume can readers gain an adequate idea of its richness and range of sheer information joined with balanced assessment and criticism.

In addition to the “Autorenartikel: Dichter und Schriftsteller [. . .] Buckdrucker, Buchhändler und Verleger” (x), this reference work also incorporates what it calls “Sachartikel: anonyme Werke, Almanache (Taschenbücher), Dichterkreise, Schriftstellervereinigungen, Kabarets, Leihbibliotheken, Verlage, Zeitschriften (Jahrbücher)” (xi). The editor points out with justifiable pride that the range of inclusion is greater than in any previous work of its kind, largely because the categories of inclusion are much wider and deeper.

The second volume likewise gives ample consideration to “Austrian” literature produced in the former Habsburg lands—Italy, the Slavic world (including the rich vein of Prague writers like Kafka, Rilke, Urzidil, and Werfel), Hungary, Romania, and points east. “Autoren dieser Regionen werden, sofern sie in deutscher Sprache schrieben, in diesem Lexikon berücksichtigt” (xiii). Latin is admitted for the late medieval and early modern periods, but other languages are necessarily excluded.

There are, then, thorough discussions of individual authors, ranging from acknowledged major figures like Hermann Broch, Elias Canetti, and Paul Celan, through perhaps slightly lesser figures like Alois Brandstetter, Arnolt Bronnen, Rudolf Brunngraber, Ignaz Castelli, and Conrad Celtis (note the historical spread), down to writers it’s safe to bet very few readers have ever heard of; regardless of their possible quality, writers like Caroline Bruch-Sinn or Gerhard Coeckelberghe-Dützele do not readily leap to mind, but they are treated with the same conscientious discussion of work and career, the same judiciousness of critical opinion, the same comprehensiveness in listing work by and about them, as the better-known figures. A good test is the entry on Vinzenz Chiavacci, a popular writer who could easily be relegated to “mere” journalism but whose surprisingly enduring contributions are lucidly discussed and evaluated; as in so many other cases, critical and scholarly work that seems to exist only in dissertations is listed for further consultation. No

entry seems hurried or truncated; length is usually proportional to current reputation, though occasional apparent discrepancies can raise questions—does the admittedly excellent and prolific Herbert Cysarz really deserve more space than Hermann Broch, for example?

Periodicals and anthologies come fully into their own in this volume. The entries on *Der Brenner*, Brenner-Archiv, and Brenner-Verlag are notable for their depth and detail, and the *Brennpunkte: Schrifttum der Gegenwart* series contains as much information about this publishing initiative out of Innsbruck than will be found elsewhere. Entries on anthologies and compendium volumes that appeared on a recurring basis, such as the Burgenländische Anthologien, are listed complete with the authors who appeared in them.

Organizations like Concordia (Wiener Journalisten- und Schriftsteller-Verein, founded in 1859) or the Budapest-Orpheumsgesellschaft, once a pinnacle of Jewish theater in Leopoldstadt, are treated with an amplitude it is hard to imagine surpassing. The entry on one organization, the Bund Deutscher Schriftsteller Österreichs (founded in 1936 from the former membership of renegade P.E.N. members), goes far to relieve the distress this reviewer experienced when the *Bekennnisbuch österreichischer Dichter* was ignored in the first volume—it is mentioned under the entry in question here, along with all its contributors, but it would still be advisable to include in a revised edition of the first volume a separate entry on the *Bekennnisbuch*. Without condemning, without endorsing, the entry on the “Bund” factually states it to have been a “zum Teil nationalsozialistisch getarnte Organization” whose members “befürworteten den Anschluss Österreichs und das Deutsche Reich und begrüßten den Einmarsch der deutschen Truppen unter Hitlers Staatsführung.” The plain statement of facts here partly makes up for the unconscionable omission in volume 1 and helps restore impaired credibility.

An ethical question arises about the use of sources, too; older studies like the renowned Nagl/Zeidler/Castle *Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte* are consulted, but there emerges a question as to whether “tainted” scholars whose work was nonetheless in many ways outstanding should be excluded. Readers may wince at the thought that scholars like Josef Nadler or Heinz Kindermann or Josef Gregor might have been included (just as it is virtually impossible in this day and age to advocate for Josef Weinheber as an important poet), but the question may at least deserve to be raised. Is it an exercise of restrictive censorship to pass over critics and scholars who fell prey to (or for that matter outright embraced) National Socialism?

Any area of research or scholarship can get into a rut, and Austrian studies, being a rather small field, is prey to this danger. How often can people predict in advance what will be said about a given author, what the topics of the next conference will be, what's in and what's out? This reviewer suggests a refresher of knowledge and spirit by randomly opening this lexicon five or six times. More than half of the entries thus found will pertain to an aspect of Austrian literature the given reader has never heard of—guaranteed. Our topic is much vaster than our limited assumptions admit, and the editors can be commended for opening unexplored worlds. An indispensable reference work.

Vincent Kling
La Salle University

John Zilcosky, *Uncanny Encounters: Literature, Psychoanalysis, and the End of Alterity*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 2016. 264 pp.

John Zilcosky offers in *Uncanny Encounters* another of his fresh, original scholarly projects, a worthy addition to his ongoing attempts to rescue the study of Germanophone culture from the isolation of the salon and library and to make the texts of modern literature speak not only *to* their eras, but *out of* their eras, as he did in his first major study of travel literature, *Kafka's Travels* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), which argued that Kafka found the exotic *within* Europe, a point made by setting Kafka's reading habits into historical context and by wedding cultural critique and psychological analyses (tying Kafka's psychological issues into the era's relationship with exoticism).

That volume outlined the relevance that Europe's imperial imagination had for Central European identity politics. *Uncanny Encounters* builds directly on the questions raised there, now by situating a broad palette of Germanophone colonial encounters within and outside of Europe's colonial imagination. His goal is to substantiate a more encompassing claim that a considerable body of Germanophone travel literature reflects general skepticism about exoticism and alterity in the European vein, and that the mental geography used at the late colonial moment of 1900 in this corpus is quite different from that of the rest of Europe. Most significantly, he includes Freud's work as a kind of travel literature to argue that this Germanophone literature documents experiences of being unsettled in identity rather than being reaffirmed in contact with colonial others—an experience of the *unheimlich*—traditionally “the

uncanny,” but probably better “the discomfiting”—that triggers aggression rather than self-affirmation.

Zilcosky introduces his work over the question of experiencing the blank spaces on imperial maps and their correlates in the unconscious (his own and that from the turn of the century, reacting to the rapidly filling map spaces of globalized Europe). He finds documentation for these experiences first in a popular 1911 novel by a Germanophone Belgian author, Norbert Jacques, *Heißes Land: Eine Reise nach Brasilien* (*Hot Land: A Journey to Brazil*). Around that text, Zilcosky builds a context of modernist travel literature (including Joseph Conrad, Hermann Keyserling, Ernst Jünger, Stefan Zweig, Waldemar Bonsels, and Max Pechstein). His German travelers do seek out these “blank spaces” on Europe’s maps in the hopes of discovery, but they ultimately find nothing but themselves and so experience a particular type of discomfiture (uncanniness): they have sought out “the other” in these exotic places, but have ultimately found only reflections of themselves. These travelers have been jolted out of their (mental) homes rather than finding themselves as “not the other,” as the paradigm of orientalism would have it.

The second chapter turns to Hermann Hesse’s writings from his voyages to “India” (Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia) and his *Robert Aghion* as examples of the colonial-orientalist desire to find “the other” absolutely thwarted by the discovery of red light districts and souvenir shops. The “natives” that Hesse found are not just thoroughly dependent on colonialist economies—they essentially resemble westerners.

Chapter 3 emerges as the linchpin for Zilcosky’s argument as he ties these experiences to “the uncanny” as defined in Freud’s 1919 essay, as this theoretical work implicates his own identity as a Jewish-Austrian citizen from the East. Most striking is that Freud in fact *used* as partial basis for his insights a popular colonialist short story by L. G. Moberly, entitled “Inexplicable,” published in the *Strand Magazine* in 1917 (which, this reviewer notes, also published Sherlock Holmes). As in the Kafka case, the colonial images to which Freud had recourse resemble nothing so much as H. Rider Haggard’s *She* (serialized 1886–87), drawing on an imperialist map that Freud took to heart. But then Zilcosky reminds us that Freud’s patients do indeed use in their dreams those tropes of Victorian travel and that it is possible to read *Totem and Taboo* as a kind of adventure story (107).

Chapter 4 then extends this logic about the colonial imaginary and identity formation, taking up modernist texts by Thomas Mann, Hugo von Hof-

mannsthal, and Robert Musil as “modernist ethnographies” that ultimately find “the other” within themselves. The epilogue, a more theoretical piece, moves another step forward, tying such unexpected encounters with the other to eruptions of violence, as a kind of spiritual gag reflex experienced by those discomfited when their assumptions that the stranger is “out there” are thwarted—the stranger is among us. Thus, Zilcosky concludes by drawing on a 1948 essay by Jacques Lacan, “Aggressiveness in Psychoanalysis,” which posits that the living space of the modern was shrinking (169); he analogizes this uncanniness to the situation today, where terrorists lurk among us.

Overall, *Uncanny Encounters* is a methodologically interesting approach to a historical epistemology, taking a term like *orientalism* or *exoticism* back into its context to see what it was used for. Zilcosky successfully calls into question the insistence of Said’s Orientalism and Homi Bhabha on difference as the core of a colonial encounter. The “End of Alterity” is a profound challenge to colonial studies, even if it is not a perfect text (reference to [post] colonial scholarship is spotty, leaving out particularly notable work in Austria like that of Clemens Ruthner). Yet its clear case for rethinking modernism in its historical context, and to appeal to popular culture in a way that British studies, but not German studies, has done, is compelling. A must-read.

Katherine Arens

The University of Texas at Austin

Franz Grafl, *Imaginiertes Österreich: Erzählung und Diskurs im internationalen Film*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2017. 378 pp.

Austria and Vienna, as they are imagined in non-German-language film, are the focus of Franz Grafl’s study *Imaginiertes Österreich: Erzählung und Diskurs im internationalen Film*, in which the author strives to cover film phantasies of Austria, which in 70 percent of the examined films is synonymous with Vienna (13). The book is organized topically, starting out with “Archäologie des Österreichbildes,” which deals with the first images of Austria before and during World War I. This section is followed by a section on *Merry-Go-Round* (1923) and *The Wedding March* (1928), which the author uses as some of the first film representations of Austria from outside the country. The following sections follow somewhat randomly: “Filmische Sprechweisen am Übergang zum Tonfilm,” “Musik,” “Frauen und Männer,” and “Das Jahr 1933.”

The book then tried to follow a chronological progression to 1945, dedicating about half of the book topically to films before 1945 and then continuing with “Jetztzeitfilme,” “Verfilmung von Literatur am Beispiel,” “Habsburg-Mythos,” and “Genre des Agenten- und Kriegsfilms.” Embedded within these sections, the reader will find subheadings, attempting to provide an encyclopedic overview that is followed by a filmography with over 450 film entries, a bibliography, and an index.

The book is essentially a project of introspection via the perspectives of foreign film that examine Austria. While the majority of examined films are American, there are French, Italian, Hungarian, Czech movies as well as ones made in other countries. The flaw with this study is that it puts Austria at the center around which foreign films revolve rather than realizing that Austria is imagined quite differently in different times and spaces and is hardly the focal point of most films made outside of Austria. Consequently, it is difficult to find much of a thesis in this book beyond an attempt to capture various ideas about Austria on film. But perhaps that is also the merit of the book, that it undoubtedly will introduce most readers to new films about Austria and thereby complicate how Austria has been depicted on the screen. The broad view of the book, of course, opens it up to criticism of possible omissions as it cannot possibly cover every film; in fact there are few films after 1990 that are covered in the book. It seems as if the project would have been better served, if there were a cutoff of films covered after a certain date. The subheadings conspicuously omit the most obvious category of films dealing with Austria, which would be films on the Holocaust in Austria. This is the most difficult topic for many Austrians to deal with, but yet it has been one of the most studied topics of non-Austrians studying and examining Austria, which again raises the problem of an author looking outside of his country to then look back in again.

Despite these obvious flaws of the book, there is no doubt that there is merit to another study examining depictions of Austria. There may also be an unintended benefit of this book: Readers from outside of Austria will learn how Austrians selectively see international film covering their country. The fact that Oscar and Hammerstein’s *Sound of Music* is mentioned less prominently says a lot about how this film is appreciated in Austria, but it also shows how the book does not provide information of how films about Austria actually influenced the imagined image of Austria abroad. Experts on films about Austria will undoubtedly find this book interesting, but its lack of

focus and obvious omissions would not make this book useful to students or scholars about to start studying this topic.

Joseph W. Moser
West Chester University

Michael Köhlmeier, *Idyll with Drowning Dog & Madalyn*. Translated by David Dollenmayer. Riverside, CA: Ariadne, 2016. 228 pp.

At first glance, it seems a curious decision on the part of Ariadne Press to publish David Dollenmeyer's formidable translations of the Austrian Michael Köhlmeier's *Idylle mit ertrinkendem Hund* (2008) and *Madalyn* (2010) in one volume. The reasons for this could be the rising costs of book production; the regrettable fact that American readers just don't read enough contemporary German, Swiss or Austrian literature; or the coincidence that in both stories, *Idyll with Drowning Dog* and *Madalyn*, the reader meets an author and a guest in his home. In *Madalyn*, the eponymous thirteen-year-old rings the doorbell of the famous fictional writer Sebastian Lukasser, her next-door neighbor and protagonist of Köhlmeier's magnum opus *Abendland* (2007). In *Idyll*, an editor visits an author and his wife, Monika, in their home in Hohenems, Vorarlberg, during a snowy January of 2006. The snow is actually so deep that the writer must fetch his guest from the train with a sled and Monika is forced to suspend her daily walks over the nearby Schlossberg. During his visit, the editor, himself an avid walker, befriends, despite his cynophobia, a feral dog on a walk. The next day, walking along the Old Rhine, author and editor encounter the strange dog and witness it break through the ice of a pond. The editor runs to get help while the poet chances the thin ice to rescue the dog at all costs. Over fifteen artful pages filled with sentences as cold and as clear as that winter day, a struggle over life and death ensues. Should he take off his coat and let it go under with the dog, so he can save himself if he can't help the animal? Should he thereby abandon his house key in the coat pocket? Will he get home, soaked and freezing? The struggle is about something greater than the life of an untamed dog. It is about rescue per se and it becomes clear that the author must rescue himself and the dog, if rescue is to happen at all.

We do not immediately understand what is happening now because we cannot face what happened then. The author is governed by unexplored engagements with the past—the death of his daughter. Köhlmeier's twenty-

one-year-old daughter Paula, a talented writer, fell to her death on a hike on the Schlossberg near her parents' house, and the daughter of the unnamed protagonist, it is safe to call him "Michael Köhlmeier," suffers a similar fate. In this novella, Köhlmeier purposefully blurred the boundaries of truth and fiction. The novella is dedicated to each member of his family and each appears by name in the book. In a similarly undisguised gesture, we are invited into his house, his life, his mourning. Without ever feeling as an indiscrete intruder, we follow Köhlmeier—author, protagonist, and father—into that very realm the editor dared not enter, as he abandoned dog and story: "Here is a conversation I would like to have had with him. [. . .] 'How can I write about the death of our daughter?' 'Do you want to write about it?' 'Yes, I'd like to.' 'I think I know what the problem is. You're not sure if you want to write literature or just remember.'" (45) In the end, we learn that the editor transferred all responsibilities to a colleague. Despite or perhaps because of his reluctance, we now have a beautiful story of the daughter's story.

In *Madalyn*, the events are considerably less serious, though it may not seem so to the teenager at the time. In love for the first time, with Moritz, ever since she heard one of his poems, Madalyn trusts her neighbor, not only because he taught her how to ride a bike and helped her in an accident, but also because both are lonely. Madalyn's parents show little interest in her daughter, and Lukasser's partner has just left. Madalyn visits Lukasser almost daily and tells him her adventures with Moritz—tales of teenage insecurity, deception, and deceit. The teenagers are tale-tellers in their own right, but Moritz is a notorious liar, who found the poem on the internet and double-times Madalyn with Claudia. In the meantime, Lukasser fails to write his own novel; luckily, Köhlmeier has written it for him. *Madalyn* is not only a story about the perils of early love but also ruminations about writing as such. This could be another reason for the publication of both stories together, as Köhlmeier's writerly protagonists regularly deliberate the possibilities of literature: "What good to me now was the ordering, shaping power of literature, its ability to make the confusions of life lucid and transparent?" (192). Perhaps the heaviness of the loss of a child or the acuteness of a teenage heartbreak become a bit lighter when we come to see that "literature was a catalogue of precedents meant to comfort us because they show that others before us have already done and suffered what we do and suffer" (192).

Dollenmeyer, with acclaimed care and sensitivity for tone and register—he is the recipient of the 2008 Helen and Kurt Wolff Translator's Prize for

Moses Rosenkranz's *Childhood* and the 2010 Translation Prize of the Austrian Cultural Forum for *Idyll with Drowning Dog*—carried over into English two very intimate stories. Do read them.

Jens Klenner
Bowdoin College

symplokē

editor
Jeffrey R. Di Leo

a journal for the intermingling of
literary, cultural and theoretical
scholarship

symplokē is a journal of comparative literature and theory that provides an arena for critical exchange between established and emerging voices in the field. It focuses on new and developing notions of comparative literature and theory and is committed to interdisciplinary studies, intellectual pluralism, and open discussion.

Recent issues of *symplokē*:

Passports (Volume 25, No. 1 & 2)

Materialisms (Volume 24, No. 1)

Posthumanisms (Volume 23, Nos. 1 & 2)

Austerity (Volume 22, Nos. 1 & 2)

Coming in *symplokē*:

Oceania in Theory (Volume 26, No. 1)

Blue Humanities (Volume 26, No. 2)

(Calls for papers are available at symploke.org)

This journal is available online through Project MUSE and JSTOR. Both offer free access via library subscriptions. Read it at bit.ly/SYLK_MUSE or bit.ly/SYLK_JSTOR.

For subscriptions or back issues,
visit nebraskapress.unl.edu
or call 402-472-8536.

UNIVERSITY OF
NEBRASKA PRESS 